ANTÆUS

35-36

ANTÆUS

Communicationes ex Instituto Archaeologico Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae

35–36/2018

Sigel: Antaeus

ANTÆUS 35-36

Communicationes ex Instituto Archaeologico
Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae

Communicationes ex Instituto Archaeologico
Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae

Distribution of exchange copies by
the Library of the Institute of Archaeology, Research Centre for the Humanities,
Hungarian Academy of Sciences
H-1097 Budapest, Tóth Kálmán u. 4.

General Editor:

FRIDERIKA HORVÁTH

Editoral Board:

VIKTÓRIA KISS, BÉLA MIKLÓS SZŐKE, LÁSZLÓ TÖRÖK, CSILLA ZATYKÓ,
MIHAEL BUDJA, CLAUS VON CARNAP-BORNHEIM,
SIR DAVID WILSON

The publication of this volume was supported by a special grant of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences

HU ISSN 0238-0218

Desktop editing and layout by Archaeolingua
Printed in Hungary by the Prime Rate Kft.
Cover by H&H Design

INHALT – CONTENTS

Abbreviations 9

Transformation und Konfrontation mit der römischen Tradition in der Spätantike und im frühen Mittelalter – Romani und Barbaren in West- und Ost-Mitteleuropa / Facing and Transforming the Roman Tradition in the Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages – Romanness and the Barbarians in Western and Central Europe
Budapest, 10th–11th November 2016

Péter Kovács: Et semper habitatio imperatorum est – Notes on the imperial residences in Pannonia in the Late Roman period 13

Friderika Horváth – Anett Miháczi-Pálfi – Sándor Évinger – Zsolt Bernert:
Barbarisierte Römer – Romanisierte Barbaren? Interpretationsmöglichkeiten der fremden Komponente am Beispiel des Gräberfeldes von Somogyszil 39

Anett Miháczi-Pálfi: Form- und herstellungstechnische Analyse der Bügelfibeln von Balatonszemes aus dem dritten Viertel des 5. Jahrhunderts 67

Vujadin Ivanišević – Ivan Bugarski: Transformation of burial space in the cities of Northern Illyricum during the Late Antiquity 91

Orsolya Heinrich-Tamáska – Roland Prien: Keszthely-Fenékpuszta in der Spätantike: Ein Vorbericht über die deutsch-ungarischen Ausgrabungen zwischen 2009 und 2017 119

Róbert Müller: Romani et Barbari in der Keszthely-Kultur 147

Adrienn Blay: Überlegungen zur Bedeutung und Gültigkeit des Begriffs „Keszthely-Kultur“ und weitere mögliche Ansätze 167

Hajnalka Herold: Settlements of the Avar Khaganate 187

Levente Samu – Falko Daim: Die Pseudoschnallen in der Awarenzeit und ihre Transformation 205
Sonngard Hartmann: Materialanalyse der Pseudoschnallen aus Dunapentele 243

Ádám Bollók: Mortuary display, associated artefacts, and the resurrection of the body in early Christian thought: Some considerations for archaeologist 245

Sebastian Brather: ‚Christianisierung‘ im archäologischen Vergleich: Merowinger- und Mährerreich 271

Béla Miklós Szőke: Spätantike Reminiszenzen im Karpatenbecken des 8.–9. Jahrhunderts? 291

How long was the ninth century A.D. in the Carpathian Basin? New Data – New Approaches, Budapest, 8th–9th December 2015

Szabina Merva: Methodological approaches to the archaeology on ninth–tenth-century sites in Hungary. The current state of research 311

Zbigniew Robak: Chronology and periodisation of imports of Carolingian military equipment in the Carpathian Basin between the eighth and the tenth centuries 327

Krešimir Filipec: Zwei Kirchen aus dem 9. Jahrhundert in Lobor und ihr Inventar 345

Miklós Takács: How long indeed was the ninth century AD in the Carpathian Basin and the adjacent territories? Consclusions of a conference 363

Reports

Elek Benkő – Gergely Csiky – Beatrix Darázsy – Gyöngyi Kovács – Gabriella Kulcsár – Balázs Gusztáv Mende – Krisztián Oross – László Sópajti-Tóth – Tivadar Vida: The medium-term strategic plan of the Institute of Archaeology of the Research Centre for the Humanities of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and its scientific activity in 2016 and 2017 373

LIST OF AUTHORS

BENKŐ, ELEK
Institute of Archaeology
Research Centre for the Humanities
Hungarian Academy of Sciences
H–1097 Budapest, Tóth Kálmán utca 4.
benko.elek@btk.mta.hu

BERNERT, ZSOLT
Hungarian Natural History Museum
Department of Anthropology
H–1082 Budapest, Ludovika tér 2.
bernert.zsolt@nhmus.hu

BLAY, ADRIENN
Institute of Archaeology
Research Centre for the Humanities
Hungarian Academy of Sciences
H–1097 Budapest, Tóth Kálmán utca 4.
blay.adrienn@btk.mta.hu

BOLLÓK, ÁDÁM
Institute of Archaeology
Research Centre for the Humanities
Hungarian Academy of Sciences
H–1097 Budapest, Tóth Kálmán utca 4.
bollak.adam@btk.mta.hu

BRATHER, SEBASTIAN
Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg
Institut für Archäologische Wissenschaften
Frühgeschichtliche Archäologie und
Archäologie des Mittelalters
D–79085 Freiburg, Belfortstraße 22
sebastian.brather@ufg.uni-freiburg.de

BUGARSKI, IVAN
Institute of Archaeology
Serbian Academy of Sciences
Knez Mihailova 35/IV
SB–11000 Belgrade
ivan.bugarski@gmail.com

CSIKY, GERGELY
Institute of Archaeology
Research Centre for the Humanities
Hungarian Academy of Sciences
H–1097 Budapest, Tóth Kálmán utca 4.
csiky.gergely@btk.mta.hu

DAIM, FALKO
Archäologie der Universität Wien
Landesamt für Denkmalpflege und
Archäologie Sachsen-Anhalt
Landesmuseum für Vorgeschichte
D–55571 Odernheim am Glan,
Disibodenberger Hof 2
falko.daim@univie.ac.at

DARÁZSY, BEATRIX
Institute of Archaeology
Research Centre for the Humanities
Hungarian Academy of Sciences
H–1097 Budapest, Tóth Kálmán utca 4.
darazsy.beatrix@btk.mta.hu

ÉVINGER, SÁNDOR
Hungarian Natural History Museum
Department of Anthropology
H–1082 Budapest, Ludovika tér 2.
evinger.sandor@nhmus.hu

FILIPEC, KREŠIMIR
Department of Archaeology
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
University of Zagreb
HR–10000 Zagreb, Ivana Lučića 3
kfilipec@ffzg.hr

HARTMANN, SONNGARD
Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum
Leibniz-Forschungsinstitut für Archäologie
D–55116 Mainz, Ernst-Ludwig-Platz 2
hartmann@rgzm.de

HEINRICH-TAMÁSKA, ORSOLYA
Abt. „Mensch und Umwelt“
Leibniz-Institut für Geschichte und Kultur
des östlichen Europas (GWZO)
D–04109 Leipzig, Specks Hof (Eingang A),
Reichsstraße 4–6
orsolya.heinrich-tamaska@leibniz-gwzo.de

HEROLD, HAJNALKA
Department of Archaeology
University of Exeter
Laver Building, North Park Road
Exeter EX4 4QE, United Kingdom
h.herold@exeter.ac.uk

HORVÁTH, FRIDERIKA
Institute of Archaeology
Research Centre for the Humanities
Hungarian Academy of Sciences
H–1097 Budapest, Tóth Kálmán utca 4.
horvath.friderika@btk.mta.hu

IVANIŠEVIĆ, VUJADIN
Institute of Archaeology
Serbian Academy of Sciences
Knez Mihailova 35/IV
SB–11000 Belgrade
vujadin.ivanisevic@gmail.com

KOVÁCS, GYÖNGYI
Institute of Archaeology
Research Centre for the Humanities
Hungarian Academy of Sciences
H–1097 Budapest, Tóth Kálmán utca 4.
kovacs.gyongyi@btk.mta.hu

KOVÁCS, PÉTER
Pázmány Péter Catholic University
H 2081 Piliscsaba, Egyetem u. 1.
kovacs.peter@btk.ppke.hu

KULCSÁR, GABRIELLA
Institute of Archaeology
Research Centre for the Humanities
Hungarian Academy of Sciences
H–1097 Budapest, Tóth Kálmán utca 4.
kulcsar.gabriella@btk.mta.hu

MENDE, BALÁZS GUSZTÁV
Institute of Archaeology
Research Centre for the Humanities
Hungarian Academy of Sciences
H–1097 Budapest, Tóth Kálmán utca 4.
mende.balazs@btk.mta.hu

MERVA, SZABINA
Institute of Archaeology
Research Centre for the Humanities
Hungarian Academy of Sciences
H–1097 Budapest, Tóth Kálmán utca 4.
merva.szabina@btk.mta.hu

MIHÁCZI-PÁLFI, ANETT
Institute of Archaeology
Research Centre for the Humanities
Hungarian Academy of Sciences
H–1097 Budapest, Tóth Kálmán utca 4.
mihaczi-palfi.anett@btk.mta.hu

MÜLLER, RÓBERT
H–8360 Keszthely, Keringő utca 133/A
mullerrobi@gmail.com

OROSS, KRISZTIÁN
Institute of Archaeology
Research Centre for the Humanities
Hungarian Academy of Sciences
H–1097 Budapest, Tóth Kálmán utca 4.
oross.krisztian@btk.mta.hu

PRIEN, ROLAND
Institut für Ur- und Frühgeschichte
Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg
D–69117 Heidelberg, Sandgasse 7
roland.prien@zaw.uni-heidelberg.de

ROBAK, ZBIGNIEW
Institute of Archaeology
Slovak Academy of Sciences
SK–949 21 Nitra, ul. Akademicka 2
zbigniew.robak@savba.sk

SAMU, LEVENTE
Institute of Archaeology
Research Centre for the Humanities
Hungarian Academy of Sciences
H–1097 Budapest, Tóth Kálmán utca 4.
samu.levente@btk.mta.hu

SÓPAJTI-TÓTH, LÁSZLÓ
Institute of Archaeology
Research Centre for the Humanities
Hungarian Academy of Sciences
H–1097 Budapest, Tóth Kálmán utca 4.
sopajti.toth.laszlo@btk.mta.hu

SZŐKE, BÉLA MIKLÓS
Institute of Archaeology
Research Centre for the Humanities
Hungarian Academy of Sciences
H–1097 Budapest, Tóth Kálmán utca 4.
szoke.bela@btk.mta.hu

TAKÁCS, MIKLÓS
Institute of Archaeology
Research Centre for the Humanities
Hungarian Academy of Sciences
H–1097 Budapest, Tóth Kálmán utca 4.
takacs.miklos@btk.mta.hu

VIDA, TIVADAR
Institute of Archaeology
Research Centre for the Humanities
Hungarian Academy of Sciences
H–1097 Budapest, Tóth Kálmán utca 4.
vida.tivadar@btk.mta.hu

ABBREVIATIONS

AAC	Acta Archaeologica Carpathica (Kraków)
ActaAntHung	Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae (Budapest)
ActaArchHung	Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae (Budapest)
ActaMusPapensis	Acta Musei Papensis. A Pápai Múzeum Értesítője (Pápa)
ActaOrientHung	Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae (Budapest)
AFD	Arbeits- und Forschungsberichte zur Sächsischen Bodendenkmalpflege (Berlin)
Agria	Agria. Az Egri Múzeum Évkönyve (Eger)
AHN	Acta Historica Neolosiensia (Banská)
AHSb	Archaeologia Historica. Sbornik (Brno)
AiO	Archäologie in Ostwestfalen (Saerbeck)
AiWL	Archäologie in Westfalen-Lippe (Langenweißbach)
AKorr	Archäologisches Korrespondenzblatt (Mainz)
Alba Regia	Alba Regia. Annales Musei Stephani Regis (Székesfehérvár)
ANBad	Archäologische Nachrichten aus Baden (Freiburg i. Br.)
AncSoc	Ancient Society (Louvain)
Annales	Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales (Cambridge)
Antaeus	Antaeus. Communicationes ex Instituto Archaeologico Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae (Budapest)
AntTard	Antiquité Tardive. Revue Internationale d'Histoire et d'Archéologie (IVe–VIIe siècle) (Paris)
AÖ	Archäologie Österreichs (Wien)
AP	Arheološki Pregled (Beograd)
APN	Arheologija i prirodne nauke (Beograd)
AR	Archeologické Rozhledy (Praha)
ArchA	Archaeologia Austriaca (Wien)
ArchÉrt	Archaeologiai Értesítő (Budapest)
ArchHung	Archaeologia Hungarica (Budapest)
ArchKözl	Archaeologiai Közlemények (Budapest)
ArchLit	Archaeologia Lituana (Vilnius)
ArchSC	Archeologie ve středních Čechách (Praha)
ARG	Archiv für Religionsgeschichte (Berlin)
Arrabona	Arrabona. A Győri Xantus János Múzeum Évkönyve (Győr)
ASt	Augustinian Studies (Charlottesville)
AV	Arheološki Vestnik (Ljubljana)
BAR IS	British Archaeological Reports, International Series (Oxford)
BÁMÉ	A Béri Balogh Ádám Múzeum Évkönyve (Szekszárd)

BBD	Bericht der Bayerischen Bodendenkmalpflege (München)
BBVF	Bonner Beiträge zur vor- und frühgeschichtlichen Archäologie (Bonn)
BHVg	Bonner Hefte zur Vorgeschichte (Bonn)
BMMK	A Békés Megyei Múzeumok Közleményei (Békéscsaba)
BRGK	Bericht der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission (Berlin)
BudRég	Budapest Régiségei (Budapest)
Carinthia	Carinthia I. Zeitschrift für geschichtliche Landeskunde von Kärnten (Klagenfurt)
CarnunutmJb	Carnuntum Jahrbuch. Zeitschrift für Archäologie und Kulturgeschichte des Donauraumes (Wien)
CChSG	Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca (Turnhout 1977–)
CChSL	Corpus Christianorum Series Latina (Turnhout 1953–)
CCRB	Corso di Cultura sull'arte Ravennate e Bizantina (Ravenna 1959–1989)
Chiron	Chiron (München)
CIL	Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum (Berlin 1863–)
CommArchHung	Communicationes Archaeologicae Hungariae (Budapest)
CPh	Classical Philology (Chicago)
CPP	Castellum Pannonicum Pelsonense (Budapest – Leipzig – Keszthely – Rahden/Westf.)
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinarum (Salzburg 1866–)
Cumania	Cumania. A Bács-Kiskun Megyei Múzeumok Közleményei (Kecskemét)
CurrAnt	Current Anthropology (Chicago)
Diadora	Diadora. Glasilo Arheoloskoga Muzeja u Zadru (Zadar)
DissPann	Dissertationes Pannonicae (Budapest)
DMÉ	A Debreceni Déri Múzeum Évkönyve (Debrecen)
DOP	Dumbarton Oaks Papers (Washington)
EME	Early Medieval Europe (Oxford)
FBBW	Fundberichte aus Baden-Württemberg (Stuttgart)
FMSt	Frühmittelalterliche Studien. Jahrbuch des Instituts für Frühmittelalterforschung der Universität Münster (Berlin)
FolArch	Folia Archaeologica (Budapest)
FontArchHung	Fontes Archaeologici Hungariae (Budapest)
FR	Felix Ravenna (Faenza)
Germania	Germania. Anzeiger der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (Mainz)
GGM	C. Müller (ed.): Geographici Graeci Minores (1855–1861)
GRBS	Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies (Durham)
GSAD	Glasnik Srpskog Arheološkog Društva (Belgrade)
HAM	Hortus Artium Medievalium (Zagreb)
Hermes	Hermes. Zeitschrift für klassische Philologie (Wiesbaden)
HGM	Historici Graeci Minores (Lipsiae 1870)

HOMÉ	A Herman Ottó Múzeum Évkönyve (Miskolc)
HZb	Historijski Zbornik (Zagreb)
ILS	H. Dessau (ed.): Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae (1892–1916)
IMS	Inscriptiones de la Mésie Supérieure I–VI (1976–1982)
JAMÉ	A nyíregyházi Jósa András Múzeum Évkönyve (Nyíregyháza)
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society (Michigan)
JLA	Journal of Late Antiquity (Boulder)
JPMÉ	A Janus Pannonius Múzeum Évkönyve (Pécs)
JRGZM	Jahrbuch des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums (Mainz)
JRS	Journal of Roman Studies (London)
JThS	Journal of Theological Studies (Oxford)
KSIA	Краткие сообщения Института Археологии АН УССР (Киев)
MAA	Monumenta Avarorum Archaeologica (Budapest)
MBAH	Münstersche Beiträge zur Antiken Handelsgeschichte (Münster)
MBV	Münchner Beiträge zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte (München)
MEFRA	Mélanges de l'École Française de Rome, Antiquité (Rome)
MFMÉ	A Móra Ferenc Múzeum Évkönyve (Szeged)
MFMÉ MonArch	A Móra Ferenc Múzeum Évkönyve – Monographia Archaeologica (Szeged)
MFMÉ StudArch	A Móra Ferenc Múzeum Évkönyve – Studia Archaeologica (Szeged)
MGAH	Monumenta Germanorum Archaeologica Hungariae (Budapest)
MGH	Monumenta Germaniae Historica 1–15 (1877–1919; repr. 1961)
MhBV	Materialhefte zur Bayerischen Vorgeschichte (Kallmünz, München)
MIÖG	Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung (Innsbruck – Graz)
MittArchInst	Mitteilungen des Archäologischen Instituts der Ungarischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Budapest)
MPK	Mitteilungen der Prähistorischen Kommission der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Wien)
NZ	Niški Zbornik (Niš)
PA	Památky Archeologické (Praha)
Phoenix	The Phoenix. The Journal of the Classical Association of Canada (Toronto)
PLRE	Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire, 1: A. H. M. Jones et al. (eds) (1970); 2 and 3: J. R. Martindale (ed.) (1980–1992)
Pontica	Pontica. Studii şi materiale de istorie, arheologie şi muzeografie (Constanţa)
PWRE	A. Pauly – G. Wissowa et al. (Hrsg.): Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft (1893–)
Radiocarbon	Radiocarbon. Published by the American Journal of Science (New Haven)
RdAm	Revue d'Archéométrie (Rennes)
RégFüz	Régészeti Füzetek (Budapest)
RGA	Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde (Berlin – New York)
RIC	H. Mattingly – E. A. Sydenham et al. (eds): Roman Imperial Coinage (1923–67)

RIU	Die römischen Inschriften Ungarns (Budapest)
RKM	Régészeti Kutatások Magyarországon. Archaeological Investigations in Hungary (Budapest)
RLÖ	Der römische Limes in Österreich (Wien)
RÖ	Römisches Österreich (Wien)
RVM	Rad Vojvođanskih Muzeja (Novi Sad)
SA	Советская Археология (Москва)
SAI	Археология СССР. Свод археологических источников (Москва)
Saopštenja	Saopštenja (Beograd)
Savaria	Savaria (Szombathely)
SC	Sources Chrétiennes (Lyon)
SCIVA	Studii şi Cercetări de Istorie Veche (Bucureşti)
SHP	Starohrvatska Prosvjeta (Zagreb)
SJT	Scottish Journal of Theology (Cambridge)
SlA	Slovenská Archeológia (Bratislava)
SMK	Somogyi Múzeumok Közleményei (Kaposvár)
SMP	Studia Mediaevalia Pragensia (Praha)
Spomenik	Spomenik Srpske kraljevske akademije (Beograd)
Starinar	Starinar (Beograd)
StudArch	Studia Archaeologica (Budapest)
ŠtZ	Študijné Zvesti Archeologického Ústavu SAV (Nitra)
SzMMÉ Tisicum	A Szolnok Megyei Múzeumok Évkönyve (Szolnok)
TTH	Translated Texts for Historians (Liverpool)
TVMK	A Tapolcai Városi Múzeum Közleményei (Tapolca)
VAH	Varia Archeologica Hungarica (Budapest)
Viminacium	Viminacium. Zbornik Radova Narodnog Muzeja (Požarevac)
VMMK	A Veszprém Megyei Múzeumok Közleményei (Veszprém)
WMMÉ	A Wosinsky Mór Múzeum Évkönyve (Szekszárd)
ZalaiMúz	Zalai Múzeum (Zalaegerszeg)
ZfA	Zeitschrift für Archäologie (Berlin)
ZfAM	Zeitschrift für Archäologie des Mittelalters (Köln)
ZGy	Zalai Gyűjtemény (Zalaegerszeg)
Ziridava	Ziridava. Muzeul Judetean (Arad)
ZNMN	Zbornik Narodni muzej Niš (Niš)
ZRNM	Zbornik Radova Narodnog Muzeja (Beograd)
ŽAnt	Živa Antika (Skopje)

ANTAEUS 35–36 (2017–2018) 245–270

ÁDÁM BOLLÓK

MORTUARY DISPLAY, ASSOCIATED ARTEFACTS, AND THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY IN EARLY CHRISTIAN THOUGHT: SOME CONSIDERATIONS FOR ARCHAEOLOGISTS

In memory of a week spent in Heaven

Zusammenfassung: Im Mittelpunkt des vorliegenden Beitrags steht die Untersuchung möglicher Zusammenhänge zwischen den spätantiken christlichen Bestattungen und der Lehre der christlichen Kirche über den Tod und das Schicksal von Leib und Seele zwischen Tod und Auferstehung. Der Beitrag fokussiert in erster Linie darauf, ob und wie das Vorkommen von sog. „Beigaben" in spätantiken Gräbern mit den zeitgenössischen Vorstellungen über die Seele und die Auferstehung des Leibes zu vereinbaren ist. Anhand von einigen ausgewählten Textstellen spätantiker christlicher Autoren kann die These formuliert werden, dass die Hauptgründe für wiederholte Beanstandungen der Kirchenväter gegen aufwendige Bestattungen wie z. B. die Errichtung von prächtigen Gräbern oder die Verwendung kostbarer Totenkleidung nicht in der theologischen Auferstehungslehre, sondern vielmehr in einer Auflehnung gegen die starke soziale Ungleichheit der damaligen Zeit liegen.

Keywords: early Christian funeral, Church Fathers, late antique archaeology, resurrection, "grave goods", mortuary display

Despite all the difficulties caused by the lack of the proper documentation of the extensive nineteenth-century archaeological explorations undertaken in and around the Late Roman fortification at Keszthely-Fenékpuszta, this fort and its immediate area remain one of the most interesting and unique early medieval sites of the Carpathian Basin. Considering the long series of unique features documented in course of excavations conducted over the past century, it is not surprising that archaeological scholarship often uses this site as a springboard for further investigations. Among these features, a small burial ground excavated in 1959 within the confines of the fortification, by the eastern wall of the Late Roman granary, hence labelled the *horreum* cemetery, commands special interest.[1] One of the most intriguing aspects of the interments of this otherwise not particularly large burial compound is the presence of a comparatively rich array of valuable associated artefacts which have been interpreted as accompanying interments of a Christian population of Roman descent.[2] Although scholarly opinion was divided since the very first publication of these burials over their attribution to a local Roman population continually residing at and around Keszthely since Roman times or, conversely, to newcomers settling or re-settled there in the sixth century, as well as over the possible role individuals of Germanic origin might have played in the formation of the *horreum* burial community, the elite status of

[1] For the original publication of the burials, see *Barkóczi 1968*.

[2] For the last meticulous analysis of the cemetery, including its "Roman" and Christian features, see *Vida 2011*.

10.62149/Antaeus.35-36.2018_11

the deceased interred in this cemetery was never called into doubt.[3] However, at first glance, the comparative degree of richness characterising many of these burials seems to be in sharp contrast with the Christian attribution of the *horreum* graves, since in modern scholarship, burials of late antique and medieval Christians are generally, although hardly universally, expected to be modest in terms of the deposition of valuable artefacts.

The origins of scholarly assumptions regarding the modesty of Christian burials can be sought in different directions. To mention but a few, there can be little doubt, for example, that nineteenth-century views of the exclusively Christian affiliation of the majority of Roman catacombs significantly contributed to the emergence of postulates about the communal nature and self-imposed modesty of late antique Christian interments.[4] Even though there can be no doubt, particularly in the light of the funds spent on the painted decorations and the richly carved sarcophagi originating from Rome's catacombs, that middle-class Roman families were also quite happy to bury their dead in these subterranean burial spaces, their overall impression still gave rise to an interpretation favouring the catacombs as burial locations mainly used by the City's poor population. Modern Western European Christian practices and scholarly commonplaces constructed in nineteenth-century research based on the former and sometimes on even much older presuppositions[5] likewise played their role in the ossification of the ideas equating Christian burials with modesty in terms of the inclusion of material wealth. Mention must also be made of a long series of late Roman and late antique cemeteries excavated in Western, South-Western, and Central Europe, which largely yielded rather modest burial assemblages, especially in comparison to the inventories of the often lavishly furnished graves that are generally attributed to the new Barbarian groups settling on former Western Roman territories. Surprisingly enough, however, aside from alluding to this highly circumstantial evidence, very few attempts have been made for confirming the widespread views with direct documentary evidence provided by late antique and early medieval written sources. Therefore, all such undertakings deserve due attention and thorough critical examination. Doubly so, because if their arguments prove to be acceptable, they could have a much wider relevance, well beyond European continental archaeology, within whose framework most of these debates are conducted and, consequently, from which the main body of supportive evidence is drawn and where the chief target audience of the inquiries can be found.

Neither is the most recent study devoted specifically to the question of the theological rationale underlying the assumed general *Beigabenlosigkeit*, that is, the lack of "grave goods" in early Christian mortuary contexts disjunct from the main debates of continental early medieval archaeology.[6] Its starting point is the scarcity of associated artefacts in the fifth- to sixth-century graves of Christians of Roman origin living in the Alpine region. However, unlike many previous contributions, it does attempt to present textual evidence, drawn mainly from the Pauline epistles and St. Augustine of Hippo's (354–630) writings, which is assumed to explain the lack of furnished graves in Christian mortuary contexts based on the Church's teachings on the fate of the soul and the body after earthly death. According to this line of reasoning, early Christian teachings about the transformation of the physical, earthly body into a spiritual body, in which form the resurrection was taught to take place, superseded the need of any provisioning of the dead through their bodies lying in their graves while awaiting the resurrection. Therefore, the argument goes, since *ein „Weiterleben" im Grab, also die Vorstellung einer fleischlichen Auferstehung, war aus*

---

[3] Cf. *Barkóczi 1968* 305–311; *Bierbrauer 2004* 62–67; *Vida 2011* 416–418; *Heinrich-Tamáska 2016* 142 (with the previous literature).

[4] For the current state of research on the origins of Roman catacombs, see, e.g. *Rebillard 2009; Bodel 2008; Borg 2013; Lewis 2016; Lewis 2018.*

[5] Cf., e.g. *Brather 2015* 198.

[6] *Bierbrauer 2012; Bierbrauer 2015.*

neutestamentlicher Sicht […] nicht vorstellbar",[7] *"eine „Investition in die Zukunft" ist […] mit christlichen Jenseitsvorstellungen nicht vereinbar […]*.[8] Taking this premise as a springboard, the study ultimately concludes that the identification of the burials of Christians with Roman traditions *(christlich-römische Gruppen)* based on the above criteria will enable the separation of their archaeological heritage from the burials of pagan Germanic communities *(heidnisch-germanische Gruppen)*.[9]

The present essay deliberately refrains from entering the current debates on the possibilities and limitations of ethnic interpretations of the archaeological record and thus, instead of addressing in detail the conclusions reached in the above-cited study, it concentrates on taking a closer look at late antique Christian intellectuals' teachings about Christian funerals. One of the burning questions provoked by the first part of the hypothesis briefly outlined in the above, namely whether the belief in a resurrection in the form of a spiritual body alongside the soul's absence from the burial location while waiting for the resurrection on the one hand, and the presence of associated artefacts in graves and tombs on the other mutually exclude each other has already been partially raised and answered in the negative in a brief recent study, which convincingly argued that a theologically proper Christian understanding of death did not necessarily exclude various forms of social display.[10] Leaving now further arguments in favour of this view to another paper currently in preparation,[11] the present study will focus on another major issue closely allied to the exploration of the theological background to Christian mortuary practices.

The question I would like to address in the following can be formulated as follows: Is it possible, and if so, to what extent, to directly associate the teachings of certain Church Fathers about the fate of the body and the soul after death with the mortuary practices of ordinary late antique lay Christians as reflected in the material record? The need for addressing this issue seems rather obvious in view of the early Christian world's vast extent both in geographical and chronological terms, not to speak of the immense regional differences fragmenting the ancient world into countless smaller communities.[12] In other words, before accepting the *general* relevance of the testimonies of authors like Augustine of Hippo, John Chrysostom (d. 407) and Basil of Caesarea (*ca*. 330–379), whose writings figure prominently in the above-mentioned debate, to the wider late antique Christian world, and especially to those geographical regions which are not covered in the available written record, it seems prudent to take a closer look at these texts with an eye as to how general, or, conversely, how localised the validity of the ideas and of the customs set down and described in their surviving writings.

The Fathers of the Church on the materiality of the risen body: Unity and variation

As a starting point, let me turn to the conclusions of the last major authoritative and widely acclaimed survey of early Christian eschatological thought, based on a careful reading and in-depth analysis of Christian writings from the earliest times up to the end of the Patristic age (roughly the end of the seventh century). Perhaps to the surprise of those who do not regularly immerse themselves in the writings of the Fathers, its author, Brian E. Daley concludes his survey by stressing that instead of finding a single "hope of the early Church" in the texts,

---

[7] *Bierbrauer 2015* 254.
[8] *Bierbrauer 2015* 260.
[9] *Bierbrauer 2015* 5, 251–284, esp. 260.
[10] *Brather 2015* esp. 204.
[11] *Bollók in preparation*.
[12] Cf., e.g. the very informative and eye-opening study by *Horden – Purcell 2000*.

> "[t]he range of images and ideas […] among early Christian writers, expressing their expectations for the future planet and individual, saint and sinner, suggests that one may perhaps better speak of *many* facets of a rapidly developing, increasingly detailed Christian view of a human destiny, of *many* hopes – and *many* fears – enveloped within a single, growing, ever more complex tradition of early Christian faith and practice."[13]

Of course, the surprising variability of the hopes and expectations should by no means be taken to imply that no unifying principles and teachings could be detected among the Fathers' views. As Daley continues,

> "a certain direction in the evolution of early Christian eschatology is evident: from a sense of imminent apocalyptic crisis to a well-developed theology of creation, a future-oriented cosmology and anthropology; from a vivid expectation of the end of this historical order, followed by the rising of the dead and the creation of the wholly new human world, to a systemic doctrine of 'the last things' as the final piece in a Christ-centered view of history's whole; from an early focus on the community's hope for survival in the coming cosmic catastrophe, to a later preoccupation with the hope of the individual as he or she faces death. But this pattern […] is a general and somewhat superficial one, admitting of many variations of emphasis and detail […]."[14]

In other words, although "hope for the future is an inseparable, integral dimension of Christian faith",[15] this hope was, to certain extent, constantly in flux. Expectations could and indeed have changed with the alteration of historical circumstances from one historical period to the next and, in their subtler details, from one school to another and from one intellectual to another. For understandable reasons, in the course of the process of assimilation to the social and historical realities of the earthly realm and with the passing of time, the expected time of the Second Coming of Christ and the Last Judgement receded into the more distant future, which gave increasingly more room to concerns relating to the handling of more mundane issues. This development, complemented by the teachings about death as a state of sleep,[16] by necessity raised the question of what happens during the time between the slumber after earthly existence and the General Resurrection and the Last Judgement.[17] Furthermore, Christian communities included not only individuals leading immaculate lives and clinging to their faith to the last breath, but also folks who had led sinful lives or who had wavered during the persecutions. Quite understandably, the differential fate of Christians with different lifestyles after death also became an issue to be exactly defined. Those searching for an answer to these pressing questions found little guidance in the canonical Gospels regarding the so-called "interim state" between death and resurrection.[18] The imagery in Jesus' parable about the rich man and the beggar Lazarus in Luke's Gospel[19] has sometimes been interpreted as an allusion to this.[20] Accordingly, the rich man living in luxury, but turning away from the poor would be condemned to torment in Hades after his death, while the beggar Lazarus, whose life had been one of distress and deprivation, would find relief in the

---

[13] *Daley 2010*^{2} 216 (my italics).

[14] *Daley 2010*^{2} 216.

[15] *Daley 2010*^{2} 217.

[16] Jn 11.11–14, Mk 5.39, Mt 9.24, Lk 8.52.

[17] For early views, see *Hill 2001*^{2}.

[18] The New Testament passages on the "interim state" are interpreted variously, similarly to the appraisal of this notion in modern scholarship. The relevant passages have been reviewed and commented on by *Osei-Bonsu 1991*.

[19] Lk 16.19–31.

[20] In its original context, the parable was hardly intended to illuminate the fate of the dead and thus these details are largely neglected in the text, allowing various interpretations, cf. *Lehtipuu 2007* esp. 265–275; *Merkt 2011*.

bosom of Abraham. (The "Bosom of Abraham" connoted, or was equated with, Paradise in the writings of many early Christian authors.[21])

Although the existence of this "interim state" has become a commonly accepted teaching both in the East and the West – even if not each Patristic authority felt the need to say something about it –, there was some disagreement regarding the exact details of the fate awaiting to the soul in this "interim state" among the Fathers.[22] To illustrate the extent of the room for disagreement, suffice it here to mention that according to the prevailing view among Syriac-speaking Christian communities, the sleep of the soul is a conscious, but inactive state and the souls of ordinary Christians did not depart very far from their bodies while in their state of slumber. Thus, for them, Sheol, where souls await the resurrection, is an earthly adobe, and sometimes souls were even imagined to remain in their sleeping state next to the bodies in earthly graves.[23] On the other hand, among Greek- and Latin-speaking Christians, the hope was regularly expressed that while their body rested ("slept") in its earthly grave, the souls of the righteous would be in Paradise or in Heaven, in the proximity of God, while awaiting resurrection.[24] Neither was there a single consensual view of how sinful souls are treated in the "interim state". Although, again unlike in the Syriac tradition, the idea of an ongoing process of purgation was maintained by several intellectuals both in Greek and Latin Christianity, the notion of the Purgatory of later Western Christendom started to emerge in its fairly evolved form only in the time of Gregory the Great (*ca*. 540–604), while the eastern Churches continued to adhere to the views of the late antique Fathers in this matter.[25]

By placing an emphasis on all these differences, I do not intend to imply that no commonly accepted ideas, schools of thought, well-traceable developments, and intellectual dependencies and genealogies can be detected in these matters among early Christian Church intellectuals. Yet, the differences and variations within similar intellectual constructs also matter, especially if we set out to compare the available textual sources with the behaviour of communities living in a given time and geographical space, or more adequately put, with the reflections of their behaviour as mirrored in the surviving material record.

Understandably enough, debates about the details of the resurrection also gained prominence among the most widely discussed topics relating to Christians' expectations of their fate after earthly death. To quote again the conclusions of Daley's survey, a fairly general consensus was reached on

> "the insistence that the fulfilment of human history must include the *resurrection of the body*. From the tracts of the second-century apologists, through Methodius' critique of Origen, to the detailed speculations of Gregory of Nyssa and Augustine's *De Civitate Dei,* Christian writers stressed the need to take the biblical promise of resurrection literally […]. Since the body is an integral part of ourselves, and an integral part of God's good creation, the body must share in whatever salvation is promised."[26]

Arguably, however, the subtler details of the generally agreed "resurrection of the body" remained moot points. In Daley's words,

> "[c]ontroversy […] continued, throughout the Patristic period, on the *materiality and physical character of the resurrection*. Origen stressed the Pauline teaching that the risen body, although in continuity with

---

[21] *Merkt 2011* 97–99; *Merkt 2012* 41–42.

[22] *Daley 2010²* 220, 223 and *passim*.

[23] *Gavin 1920; Daley 2010²* 73–75, 174–175. For a brief comparison of Syriac teachings with the Greek and Latin ones, see *Del Santo 2009.*

[24] *Dresken-Weiland 2007; Dresken-Weiland 2012*.

[25] *Brown 1997; Merkt 2005; Dresken-Weiland 2007; Daley 2010²* 223; *Del Santo 2009.*

[26] *Daley 2010²* 220 (italics in the original).

> its present form, will be 'spiritual' and so unimaginably different from any historical, fleshy body; and though reaction against Origen's conception, shaped by Methodius and later by Jerome, was often astonishingly violent, it continued to have its appeal, even after the condemnation of certain 'Origenist' propositions at Justinian's Councils of 543 and 553. Discussion of the qualities of the risen body by the Latin scholastics in the Middle Ages, and even renewed discussion in our own time, point up just how mysterious and unclear in content the notion of bodily resurrection remains, despite its unquestioned acceptance by Christians as an article of faith and hope."[27]

Daley's last remark is especially significant from our perspective because it highlights an important, and, one may argue, hardly unexpected or unfamiliar trait of late antique Christian teachings, namely that several issues were repeatedly raised and discussed *among educated Christians immersing themselves in theological debates* throughout the centuries without successfully reaching an agreement and a general acceptance of any of the proposed interpretations. In my understanding, this state of affairs also strongly suggests that one should hardly expect a more consistent approach among those – generally the lower – social strata of late antique Mediterranean societies whose opinions are but rarely recorded in the available written sources, but whose material traces are more often encountered in the archaeological record. Or, alternatively, if we are inclined to reckon with less divergent views about the resurrection of the body among these people, we may justifiably assume the prevalence of less sophisticated approaches than what we can find in the writings of the educated few.

It is perhaps not too far-fetched a comparison to point out that in my own experience, even today, several less educated Christians in Hungary are highly sceptical of the appropriateness of cremation and strongly insist on inhumation because they find it exceptionally difficult to accept that the full integrity of the human body can be restored at the time of the resurrection without a preservation of those human remains, practically the bones, which survive after decomposition. As another recent example of the persistence of diverging views within Christian orthodoxies, one may also refer to the unique situation in contemporary Greece, where the Greek Orthodox Church strictly forbids cremation and, although the Greek Parliament passed a law enabling cremation in 2006, while another law, enacted in 2016, opened the way for erecting cremation facilities, the Church refuses to provide her funerary service for cremated persons. To be sure, as far as we can learn from the available written evidence, although Christians opposed cremation from very early on,[28] their counter-arguments were not outright centred on its possible consequences for the resurrection, even if this concern cannot be ruled out in the emergence of their repudiation of this funerary practice.[29]

References to the insistence among certain Christian circles on the importance of preserving what can be preserved of the human body can also be found in the writings of late antique Christian Church authorities. Although being a strong supporter of the transformation of the earthly body into a spiritual body, Augustine nevertheless considered it important to stress that even if "[o]ne is turned to dust, another evaporates into the air; some men are consumed by beasts and some by fire; while others perish by shipwreck, or by drowning in some other circumstances, so that their bodies decay and dissolve away into liquid", their bodies will be restored by God at the time of the General Resurrection.[30] Although his polemic was formally addressed to "our adversaries", that is, mainly the educated non-Christians of his age, it can also be surmised from the period's other

---

[27] *Daley 2010*² 222 (italics in the original).

[28] Tert. *De anim.* LI.4, ed. *Waszink 1954* 857; Min. Fel. *Oct.* XI.4, XXXIV.10, ed. and transl. *Rendall 1931* 342–343, 420–421, transl. *Clarke 1974* 68, 116.

[29] For a nuanced analysis of the emergence of early Christian views and its historical background, see *Rebillard 2009* 79–85.

[30] Aug. *De Civ. Dei* XXII.12, ed. *Dombart – Kalb 1955* 832; transl. *Dyson 1998* 1140–1141.

writings that he and others felt the need of commenting upon this issue while addressing their fellow Christians, too. Augustine's middle Egyptian contemporary, Shenute of Atripe (348–466), too, emphasised that not only "those who are in tombs" will be resurrected, but also "those who died in waters, those who have been burned up […], those whom beast have eaten, and those who died in other various ways, it is necessary to rise according to the scriptures".[31] Similarly, one generation earlier, Gregory of Nyssa (*ca*. 335–394) attempted to explain the doctrine of the resurrection to his audience with the following train of thought:

> "[…] a part of the body which flesh-eating birds devoured thousands years ago will not be found wanting, and what sharks and dogs and sea-creatures fed on will rise again together with the reviving man, and what fire burnt up and worm consumed in graves, and in short all bodies which destruction annihilated since creation, will be yielded without defect and perfect from the ground […] [T]he rotten and composed bones may be restored hard and smooth, and from being scattered may unite and again come together in an harmonious system in their natural connexions. Then you observe the flesh being formed around and the stretched strands of sinews and the fine channels of veins and arteries folded under the skin, and an indescribable and innumerable host of souls stirred from their dwellings, each one recognizing its own body like a special dress and instantly inhabiting it again, exercising infallible judgement among so great a mass of cognate spirits."[32]

The same comforting voice can be heard some two and a half centuries after Augustine and Shenute's time, when Anastasios of Sinai (d. after 700) again underlines that those "destroyed by any number of animals",[33] or "dissolved, or burnt, or eaten up, still the fire, the water, the beasts, and whatever else"[34] will be restored by God on the day of the resurrection.

To be sure, for those educated in and arguing over philosophical and theological matters like Augustine and Gregory, these discussions were mainly centred on the debates with Platonic views, first and foremost with Porphyry in Augustine's case, with the supporters of the non-Nicene cause (the "Arians"), and with Manicheanism and "Origenism". The major philosophical issues were the doctrine of the creation out of nothing, and, in the strictest sense, the problem of how exactly the same atoms which made up the individual's body in their lifetime could be gathered at the time of the resurrection to restore precisely the same human being.[35] Approaching the question from these angles, insistence on the material aspect of the resurrection was not at variance with the transformed nature of the resurrected body. Although both were expected to be "material", the qualities of the materiality of the earthly body and of the body "transformed" by the omnipotent God to be "immortal", "incorruptible", and "eternal" resembling "angelic" bodies were expected to differ considerably.[36] As Augustine puts it, "[t]he flesh will then be spiritual […], but it will still be flesh and not spirit".[37] However, on a previous occasion, or more precisely put, in another apologetic context some two decades earlier, he also feels the need to stress that "[t]he body […]

---

[31] Shen. *C. Orig*. 16 (389), ed. and German transl. *Cristea 2011* 166, 254–255, English transl. *Brakke – Crislip 2015* 65.

[32] Greg. Nyss. *In s. Pascha*, ed. *Gebhardt 1967* 251–252, transl. *Hall 1981* 9–10.

[33] Anast. Sin. *Quaest. et resp.* Q22.4, ed. *Richard – Munitiz 2006* 44, transl. *Munitiz 2011* 100.

[34] Anast. Sin. *Quaest. et resp.* Q22.3, ed. *Richard – Munitiz 2006* 44, transl. *Munitiz 2011* 99–100.

[35] Cf. e.g. *Miles 1979* 103, 111–112; *Dennis 1981; Young 2009* (with the previous literature).

[36] Cf. Aug. *De Civ. Dei* XXII.11–21, ed. *Dombart – Kalb 1955* 829–842; transl. *Dyson 1998* 1136–1153. For "angelic" bodies, see, e.g. Aug. *Sermo* 362.18, 27–28, ed. *Migne 1865* 1622–1623, 1630–1631; transl. *Hill 1995* 255, 263–264.

[37] Aug. *De Civ. Dei* XXII.21, ed. *Dombart – Kalb 1955* 841; transl. *Dyson 1998* 1152.

that is not subject to decay", as, one may add, his spiritual body is definitely not, "is not properly called flesh and blood,[38] but simply body."[39]

Yet, it seems to me that the above subtle differences between the materiality of the earthly and that of the transformed, heavenly bodies may not have been too readily grasped by ordinary Christians unfamiliar with the subtleties of ancient philosophy and theology, and thus the above-cited and other similar testimonies may also testify to that, at least at given times, in given places and in given communities, the fate of their bodies was a matter of grave concern[40] for ordinary Christians, to whom sermons like Gregory and Shenute's above-quoted pieces were preached.[41] To be sure, the questions raised by these concerns were discussed well before the fourth century and continued to be discussed for several centuries afterwards, too.[42] After all, if all Christians had indeed been convinced by the highly sophisticated interpretations put forward by the well-educated Fathers, the detailed repetition of the same lines of reasoning during subsequent centuries would hardly have been necessary. That these subtle explanations apparently failed to wholly convince all ordinary Christians of the late antique Mediterranean is also indicated by a sermon delivered in two parts by Augustine in the second half of his career, in the early 410s. On those occasions, when according to his own testimony he was speaking in front of a select group of Christians which, in contrast to ordinary Sunday services, did not include non-Christians,[43] he labelled those, who "think that when the dead rise again they are going to live a carnal kind of life" as a "carnal kind of Christians".[44] While describing the "discussion […] which Christians usually have among themselves", by going over the following questions, irrespective of the rhetorical tone and exercise of such a homily, he implies that a goodly portion of his congregation imagined the next life to come in more carnal terms than what his own sophisticated interpretation would allow for them:

> "what we shall be like when we have risen again, how we shall live, what our businesses will be, whether there will be any business or none at all; if there won't be any, are we going to live idly with nothing to do; or if we do do anything, what shall we do; finally, are we going to eat and drink, are there going to be conjugal relations between male and female, or will there be a simple and incorrupt common life; and that's how it is, what sort of life it will be, with what sort of motions, what sort of shape the bodies themselves will have. These are questions for Christians – he concludes –, saving the faith in the resurrection."[45]

Then, by making explicit mention of "our brothers and sisters who are excessively materialistic, and almost pagan […]",[46] he also admits that even within his Christian congregation, there were a number of people who felt unsure about, that is, who doubted or downright denied[47] the very possibility of the resurrection. These "brothers and sisters", he says, in "their evil conversations"

[38] 1 Cor 15.50.
[39] Aug. *Sermo* 362.17, ed. *Migne 1865* 1622; transl. *Hill 1995* 253; similarly: 362.21, ed. *Migne 1865* 1626, transl. *Hill 1995* 258. For flesh and blood in Augustine's explanatory system, see also *Miles 1979* 110; *Daley 2010*^{2} 143.
[40] Cf. also *Volp 2002* 190.
[41] Cf. Dennis' (*Dennis 1981* 74) remarks about certain simplifying features of the Greg. Nyss. *In s. Pascha* which, in his view, can be ascribed to the work's practical purpose.
[42] Cf., e.g. *Miles 1979* 104–105; *Young 2009* 8–15.
[43] Cf. Aug. *Sermo* 361.3–4, ed. *Migne 1865* 1600; transl. *Hill 1995* 226–227.
[44] Aug. *Sermo* 361.3, ed. *Migne 1865* 1600; transl. *Hill 1995* 226.
[45] Aug. *Sermo* 361.3, ed. *Migne 1865* 1600; transl. *Hill 1995* 226. Repeated in a more concise fashion: Aug. *Sermo* 362.7, ed. *Migne 1865* 1614; transl. *Hill 1995* 244.
[46] Aug. *Sermo* 361.4, ed. *Migne 1865* 1600; transl. *Hill 1995* 226.
[47] Aug. *Sermo* 362.1, 20, ed. *Migne 1865* 1611, 1624–1625; transl. *Hill 1995* 241, 256.

usually raise the objection that "[t]he body of the dead person, once buried, doesn't remain entire; because if it did so remain, I would believe it would rise again."[48]

To be sure, his thorough discussions in these homilies and elsewhere of the scriptural passages of the Old and the New Testaments which contained concrete statements or less specific allusions to the resurrection of the dead and the importance of one's burial place clearly illustrate how challenging it must have been on occasions to work out a set of answers which covered and offered explanation for all scriptural sections in question that would be acceptable to all. After all, on the one hand, he needed to reconcile both St. Paul's statement according to which "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God"[49] and Jesus' teaching on the angelic life the risen dead would live,[50] while on the other, he had to address the question of the promise to all Christians that their "flesh rise in the same form as that in which the Lord appeared",[51] and "[t]hat Christ rose again in the same body as was buried; that he was seen, that he was touched and handled, that to the disciplines who thought he was in spirit he said, 'Feel and see, that a spirit does not have flesh and bones, as you can see that I have'".[52] Furthermore, his interpretations can hardly be divorced from his personal experiences or from the views advocated by the pagan and Christian heretical movements of his time.[53] Little wonder, then, that this task not only required an imaginative mind blessed with the ability of providing subtle and erudite readings of the Bible, but also the capability of mustering arguments for the literal and more symbolic interpretations of the scriptural passages in certain cases.

Contexts matter: Pastoral care and theological debates as driving forces

Before moving on to my next point, two further characteristics of Augustine's extant works quite certainly deserve mention. Firstly, that even if he did retain several of his early ideas throughout his life, his thoughts changed substantially with the passing of time in other matters, such as the qualities of the resurrected body, including its materiality itself.[54] To be sure, this should not appear as particularly surprising in the case of a writer whose literary oeuvre spans a period of some forty years.[55] Within these long decades, he was faced with more than one challenge, all of which left their marks on his teaching about the resurrection of the body, too. As Margaret R. Miles argues, from about the very last years of the fourth century,

> "[t]he change in his theoretical understanding occurs in connection with the disillusionment […] about the possibility of an immediate and lasting availability of the vision of God. The translation of Augustine's early experiences of momentary visions of life-style had proven overwhelmingly difficult. But a more direct reason for this change – and here I think we are dealing with an essential change, not simply a development of emphasis – was his ongoing personal polemic against Manicheanism, a polemic in which he was forced to study St. Paul's teaching on the resurrection in order to combat the Manichaean rejection of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body."[56]

---

[48] Aug. *Sermo* 361.12–13, ed. *Migne 1865* 1605; transl. *Hill 1995* 232.
[49] 1 Cor 15.50. (NRSV).
[50] Mk 12.18–27; Mt 22.23–33; Lk 20.27–40.
[51] Aug. *Sermo* 362.27, ed. *Migne 1865* 1630; transl. *Hill 1995* 263.
[52] Aug. *Sermo* 362.14, ed. *Migne 1865* 1619; transl. *Hill 1995* 250, quoting Lk 24.39: "Look at my hands and my feet; see that it is I myself. Touch me and see; for a ghost does not have flesh and bones as you see that I have." (NRSV).
[53] Cf. *Miles 1979* 111–125.
[54] Cf., e.g. *Miles 1979* 106–125; *Coyle 1999* 214–215; *Daley 2010²* 142–143; *Young 2009* 18.
[55] As regards his views on the last things, see the brief, but illuminating survey of *Daley 2010²* 131–150.
[56] *Miles 1979* 111.

Secondly, and from the perspective of our survey, it is equally, if not even more interesting that in several of his works, and first and foremost in his homilies, Augustine turns out to have been more practically minded than in his formal treatises. In other words, what he preached was a sort of "context-driven theology".[57] As Kevin Coyle puts it,

> "[i]n his case, the communication of an idea entailed choosing between at least three types of discourse: one at the more abstract level called for by his formal treatises; another, preaching, whose context was oral and liturgical; and a third dictated by the circumstances, content, and addressees of his written correspondence."[58]

Among others, this observation explains why he generally confined himself to considerably fewer details when preaching about the resurrected body to his congregation than what he wrote about the same subject in his treatises. More often than not, he seems to be content with stating that "[…] even our flesh will rise again. What will this risen body be like? Will I have to struggle even then?" Then he answers the question raised by himself in the negative by simply quoting Paul's famous passage,[59] that "this corruptible body must put on incorruptibility, and this mortal body be clothed in immortality".[60]

His practical-mindedness likewise helps us to understand his reasons for using a different, usually less sophisticated and less rhetorical language in his homilies delivered in front of an audience made up of people of "various ages, social classes, and walks of life, even pagans" for expressing the same ideas than in his other writings.[61] At the same time, it is also interesting to note that despite the large body of his surviving sermons, "his homiletic discourses […] pa[id] direct attention to human resurrection" surprisingly seldom.[62] Moreover, at some points in his discussions of matters of the "last things", a clear tension can be detected between his formal treatises and his sermons, the latter of which painted "a relatively optimistic outlook on salvation, presenting a far more positive image of heaven than the exclusive adobe of the select few suggested by his views on election and predestination"[63] in order to "respond[…] to the anxieties of his audience with perceptive concerns and the sensitive desire to console", to "stimulate his listeners, to shake them out of the lethargy of fear".[64]

One major insight that can be drawn from the above is that in the case of most audiences addressed by Church authorities, even those listening to expressly eschatology-oriented Fathers like Augustine, we cannot regard it self-evident that they had been familiar with the finer subtleties of all the teachings which modern scholars use for reconstructing the Church's teachings, who also have recourse to other writings of the same Fathers. In some cases, considering the make-up and needs of the audience, the preacher palpably simplified and condensed his message and its morals into a lighter version. And even if this did not mean that a particular Father preached in a significantly different vein to his flock than what he set down in his writings targeting the educated classes, we cannot automatically assume that the majority of a leader's congregation wholly agreed with or was even intimately familiar with the views on more sophisticated matters expounded in the Father's other writings. Knowing that teachings on the resurrection of the body were among the basic tenets of the Christian faith, it can hardly be contested that the average members of the Church communities quite certainly had some knowledge of the matter, although

[57] *Coyle 1999; Martin 2009* 32.
[58] *Coyle 1999* 205.
[59] 1 Cor 15.53.
[60] Aug. *Enarr. in Ps.* 140.16, ed. *Dekkers – Fraipont 1956* 2037; transl. *Boulding 2004* 316–317.
[61] *Coyle 1999* 207–208.
[62] *Coyle 1999* 210.
[63] *Martin 2009* 38.
[64] *Martin 2009* 39–40.

in the lack of relevant sources, we have little to go by when trying to determine the depth of this knowledge and to what extent these conformed to the sophisticated views of the Church leaders.

We can be even less certain about whether the customs of Christian communities living near each other or, conversely, far from each other in both space and time were governed by the same interpretation of Christian teachings or by the observance of the same set of norms. Suffice it here to allude to the Christian thinkers whose doctrines were deemed unacceptable over time and to the various heretical movements. To be sure, we can find considerable differences of opinion regarding certain issues even *within* Christian Orthodoxies. For example, Gregory of Nyssa and Augustine took different positions on the custom of *depositio ad sanctos*, despite their roughly similar views on the materiality of the risen body. As it is wellknown, in his famous *De cura pro mortuis gerenda*, Augustine argued that the place of final interment in the vicinity of the martyrs meant, in itself, neither a genuine advantage, nor a disadvantage, since the judgement awaiting the dead would be passed in accordance with their earthly deeds. In his view, the soul of the deceased would only benefit from commemoration in the Eucharist, the prayers of the living and the alms given to the poor, but even these could solely provide assistance to those who had committed minor sins – the truly wicked would hardly win salvation in this manner. The Eucharist and prayers, however, are not tied to martyrs' tombs and therefore commemorations held in their proximity would hardly result in any true advantages, even if the frequency with which prayers were recited by the family and members of the community could indirectly benefit the deceased's soul.[65] In sharp contrast to the North African bishop's opposition to burial *ad sanctos*, the fourth-century Cappadocian bishop, Gregory of Nyssa buried his parents and his sister Macrina in a church furnished with relics of the Forty Martyrs of Sebaste lying on his family's estate in the hope that "they may rise at the time of the resurrection with those who are filled with greater confidence".[66] On the strength of several other late antique Christian writings and in view of the widespread appearance of burials *ad sanctos* throughout the late Roman world, and especially in the late Roman West, including Augustine's North African region, too,[67] it may be confidently claimed that Gregory's convictions were much more widely shared by late antique Christians than Augustine's rather sceptical position. To be sure, this state of affairs is not particularly surprising, because according to the majority view among Christians, martyrs ascended to God's side (in Paradise or in Heaven) immediately after their death, and thus they were regarded as particularly competent for interceding with God on behalf of the living.[68] Their proximity also meant an ideal burial location because various benefits were hoped for the dead. It was believed by many that the martyrs' relics would keep demons and grave looters away, they would console sinful souls in the interim state to bear the suffering awaiting them and, with the end of time, they would be resurrected near the dead who had found particular favour in the eyes of the Lord and who would intercede on their behalf.[69] And last, but by no means least, securing a burial location as close to the martyr's grave as possible was an important means of showing off the buried person's and their family's wealth and social position, which thereby became an eminent medium of social display.

However, before drawing too great a contrast between Augustine's views and the position taken by his contemporaries, it seems instructive to look at the broader context in which his *De cura pro mortuis gerenda*, a letter to Paulinus of Nola (353–431), was born, addressed to one who endorsed

[65] For St. Augustine's arguments, see Aug. *De cura mort.*, ed. *Zycha 1900;* transl. *Lacy 1955,* and the detailed comments to the text by *Rose 2013*.

[66] Greg. Nyss. *Hom. 2 in XL mart.*, ed. *Migne 1863* 784; transl. *Limberis 2010* 47.

[67] *Duval 1982; MacMullan 2009* 51–67.

[68] E.g. *Hill 2001*[2] 128–142; *Ameling 2011b; Rose 2013* 29–30, 37–38.

[69] *Duval 1988* 171–201; *Rose 2013* 38–39.

the practice of burials *ad sanctos* at the time, even if not wholly without reservations during the late years of his life.[70] Similarly to his close friend and spiritual guide, Ambrose of Milan (330s–397), Augustine also felt the need of at least attempting to hold in check the cult of the martyrs and the festivals to celebrate the martyrs' feasts in order to gain ecclesiastical control over several popular cult activities practiced by lay Christians at Christian *martyria*. Worshipping the martyrs, offering sacrifices to them, as well as getting drunk and participating in debauchery while feasting on the occasions of memorial meals held in the shrines were all widespread customs severely condemned by the Fathers of the later fourth and earlier fifth centuries both in the West and the East.[71] Burial near martyrs' graves, and the desire to secure the most prestigious place possible increased the risk that wealthier Christians would not refrain from stooping to corrupt means to attain their goal.[72] Christian ecclesiastical authorities, Augustine among them, who promoted the cult of the martyrs and were also aware of the importance of the memorial services held on the festive days[73] thus attempted to strike a balance which would simultaneously enable the abolishment of the undesirable practices and as tight a control as possible over all aspects of the cult on the one hand, and the encouragement and promotion of cult of the martyrs, otherwise deemed desirable, on the other. Their efforts were by no means solely restricted to drawing under their control the cult of the dead around *martyria*, which is hardly surprising in view of how strongly the late antique cult of the martyrs was rooted in private Christian piety.[74] Yet, it is also interesting to note that other bishops, like Augustine's own friend, Paulinus of Nola, were less rigorous in these matters and that by leaving more room for the traditional conduct of lay Christians, they became especially successful in promoting their martyrs' cults.[75]

Therefore, in my understanding, the emphasis Augustine placed on the irrelevance of the Christians' burial places, and even on the very fact of whether their bodies are properly interred at all, can be best understood in the partly pastoral, partly apologetic context in which it was expressed and which was framed by practical considerations. As students of the *De cura pro mortuis gerenda* aptly note, "[i]t is not possible to deduce from Augustine's works a consistent concept of the hereafter",[76] and in matters of the cult of the dead neither did "Augustine […] preach a systematic doctrine and therefore *his ideas and comments* usually *arise from contemporary phenomena*".[77] It is therefore prudent to always bear in mind the context of his time when reading his argumentations. And, as his writings demonstrate, neither was Augustine indifferent towards the final fate of earthly bodies, nor did he show any lack of respect to them. Similarly to other Christian intellectuals before him, like Origen (d. *ca*. 253)[78] in the East and Lactantius (d. *ca*. 325)[79] in the West, he openly argued that

> "the bodies of the dead […] are not to be despised or cast aside. The soul has used them as organs and vessels for all good work in a holy manner. If a paternal garment or a ring or anything else of this kind is as dear to children as is their love for their parents, in no way are their very bodies to be spurned, since they are much more familiar and intimate than any garment we put on."[80]

---

[70] Cf. Aug. *De cura mort.* 1(1), ed. *Zycha 1900* 621–622; transl. *Lacy 1955* 352. For the possibility that Augustine's reasoning might have partially convinced Paulinus, see *Morehouse 2016* 112.

[71] *Volp 2002* 234–239; *Rebillard 2009* 146–153; *MacMullan 2009; Morehouse 2016*.

[72] Cf. *Bond 2013*.

[73] For the evolution of Augustine's views on the cult of the martyrs, see *Morehouse 2016* 100–109.

[74] Cf. *Bowes 2008*.

[75] *Morehouse 2016* 109–116.

[76] *Rose 2013* 25.

[77] *Kotila 1992* 61 (my italics).

[78] Orig. *C. Cels.* V.24, ed. and French transl. *Borret 1969* 72–75; transl. *Chadwick 1980* 282.

[79] Lact. *Inst. Div*. VI.12.30, ed. *Brandt 1890* 530, transl. *Bowen – Garsney 2003* 358.

[80] Aug. *De cura mort.* 3(5), ed. *Zycha 1900* 627; transl. *Lacy 1955* 356.

Then, after briefly reviewing a few scriptural passages which underscore the importance of providing proper treatments, including burial duties, for the body, he concludes: "such care for the bodies of our dead indicates a strong belief in the resurrection".[81] This conclusion is further emphasised when he speaks of "the humanity of burial",[82] "a duty of our humanity according to that love by which 'no one ever hated his own flesh'[83] […]",[84] by stressing that "it is fitting that one exercise what care he can for the body of his relative […]. And if they do this who have no hope in the resurrection of the body, how much more ought we who have faith that *a duty of this kind is due to a dead body which shall rise again and live forever*? And this is *in some way a testimony of one's faith*."[85] The bottom line of his argumentation, then, can hardly be understood as if he had considered it pointless to care about the burial of the dead or had not laid any stress on providing the proper burial treatments.[86] What he fought against were the views according to which being hindered in performing the necessary funeral duties in certain unfortunate cases robbed the dead from even the hope of resurrection and, although less openly, but still sensibly, against mortuary display in the form of burials *ad sanctos* and facilitating the misuse of martyrs' shrines for feasts not under full control of the Church. Neither did he condone the belief that the physical proximity of the dead body's burial location to a martyr's relics would *in itself alone* offer any help to the deceased, but he did not reject entirely the possible advantageous side-effects of this act for the soul.[87]

A similar conclusion can be drawn from taking a closer look at his *De Civitate Dei*, composed at roughly the same time as the *De cura*, in which parts of the former's discussion are adapted.[88] His arguments are likewise targeted against the idea that the individual's salvation would in any way depend on the burial of the body. As he puts it, "the lack of those funeral and burial rites customarily performed for the bodies of the departed" does not "make miserable those who are already at rest in the hidden abodes of the godly."[89] At the same time, he also considers the deliberate denial of burial to ordinary people with the intent of punishment and humiliation to be an act which merely proves "the cruelty of those who did these things",[90] but which has no effect whatsoever on the salvation of their victims. To my mind, the respective sections of the *De Civitate Dei* again discuss these matters in a contemporary apologetic context, setting out to demonstrate the falsehood of the accusations levelled against the Christian God, charging Him

[81] Aug. *De cura mort.* 3(5), ed. *Zycha 1900* 628; transl. *Lacy 1955* 357.
[82] Aug. *De cura mort.* 10(12), ed. *Zycha 1900* 640; transl. *Lacy 1955* 367.
[83] Lk 12.4.
[84] Aug. *De cura mort.* 18(22), ed. *Zycha 1900* 658; transl. *Lacy 1955* 383.
[85] Aug. *De cura mort.* 18(22), ed. *Zycha 1900* 658–659; transl. *Lacy 1955* 383 (my italics).
[86] As it has been duly emphasised both by Éric Rebillard and Paula J. Rose: "In conclusion, Christians are less pressed by Augustine to abandon their beliefs in the sensibility of the body in the tomb than to accomplish their burial responsibilities as an act of faith in the resurrection, and not simply out of the human sentiment that causes them to do so naturally. My reading of *De cura* departs from the traditional one. *Far from it being a treatise on the uselessness of burial, I believe, on the contrary, that the treatise offers a Christian explanation of the importance of burial*.", *Rebillard 2009* 87 (my italics). "[…] Augustine does not summon his audience to disregard the usual burial rituals. On the contrary, if possible, Christians should pay attention to a proper burial for their dead, for two reasons: first, the burial of the dead is a human duty; second, and more specifically, *for Christians the burial of the dead is a testimony to their belief in the resurrection of the body*.", *Rose 2013* 50 (my italics).
[87] Aug. *De cura mort.* 5(7), ed. *Zycha 1900* 631–633; transl. *Lacy 1955* 359–361.
[88] Aug. *De cura mort.* 2(3), 3(5), ed. *Zycha 1900* 624, 629; transl. *Lacy 1955* 354, 358; the arguments of the previous work, sometimes retained in verbatim form, can be found in Aug. *De Civ. Dei* I.12–13, ed. *Dombart – Kalb 1955* 13–15; transl. *Dyson 1998* 20–23.
[89] Aug. *De Civ. Dei* I.13, ed. *Dombart – Kalb 1955* 15; transl. *Dyson 1998* 22.
[90] Aug. *De Civ. Dei* I.12, ed. *Dombart – Kalb 1955* 15; transl. *Dyson 1998* 21.

with cruelly abandoning His people and allowing them to perish under miserable conditions during the Gothic sack of Rome in 410.

Taken together, in the light of the few select passages analysed in the above, Augustine's position does not seem to suggest that either he himself or the teachings of the Christian Church of his age, if such a generalisation can be made at all, had denied the importance of granting a proper funeral service for the departed and of taking care of their earthly remains in all instances whenever this was possible. On the contrary, the duty of providing an appropriate resting place for human cadavers out of respect for God's creation emerged as an important Christian task at a very early stage of the Christian development.[91] Significantly enough, this happened in the midst of the Roman world, where such concerns were anything but common,[92] and continued to maintain its importance throughout the late antique centuries. Neither did the legitimacy of the families' concerns for properly burying their dead relatives ever decline, nor was it called into question. In the majority of cases, only their too emphatic insistence on the body's fate and excessive mortuary display provoked criticism. As a special category of the former, the understandable fears over the fate of people who had disappeared in natural catastrophes and in the course of other ill-fated events, whose bodies could not be appropriately buried, were often commented upon and answered to the satisfaction of Christian intellectuals by emphasising God's omnipotence.

Christianity and local Christianities

Although the role outlined for the body and the soul in resurrection in the writings of the Church Fathers did not expressly encourage *excessive* care for the dead body, neither did it categorically forbid that those performing the burial should not follow their own counsel during the funeral. While excessive mortuary display was severely criticised during the later fourth and the earlier fifth century,[93] this was only indirectly motivated by the oft-repeated argument that the dead body has no need for it to be wrapped in precious garments. Looking at the Fathers' criticism in a broader context, it becomes clear that their disapproval of exaggerated mortuary display was not interpreted and understood merely in the context of the care of the dead. It was an element that fitted neatly into the discourse against the luxury of the wealthy and in this sense, it reflects one aspect of the struggle against the period's social inequalities by the Church leaders. Neither is it a mere coincidence that the majority of the available texts criticising these forms of mortuary display originate from the later fourth and the earlier fifth centuries, although both the material record and the later scattered references would suggest that excessive social display in the mortuary realm did not die out around the middle of the fifth century.[94] The reasons for the chronological disparity should thus rather be sought in the fact that the roughly one hundred years after the mid-fourth century marked the period when the population of the Roman world converted to Christianity *en masse* and when the truly wealthy began to have a most tangible presence in the Church.[95] It is therefore hardly surprising that Church leaders, seeing the palpable reluctance of the new converts to adapt to the requirements of Christian teachings, felt an increasingly pressing need for acquainting their new followers with the regulations and for steering them onto the desirable path with harsh words and frequent admonitions.

This did certainly not mean that their efforts were generally crowned with conclusive and lasting success or that each and every community leader had to struggle with the same problems,

[91] Cf. *Rebillard 2009* 91–122.
[92] *Bodel 2000*.
[93] *Bollók in preparation*.
[94] Cf. *Bollók in preparation*.
[95] *Brown 2014*.

or that they dealt with these challenges in a similar manner, or that this struggle affected all wakes of life and that the ultimate goal was to create a Christian world with uniform norms. Augustine himself clearly set down the principle of respecting local customs as opposed to promoting a single acceptable view:

> "As to other customs, however, which differ according to country and locality, as the fact that some fast on Saturday, others do not; some receive daily the Body and Blood of the Lord, others receive it on certain days; in some places no day is omitted in the offering of the Holy Sacrifice, in others it is offered only on Saturday and Sunday, or even only on Sunday; and other such differences as maybe noted, there is freedom in all these matters, and *there is no better rule for the earnest and prudent Christian than to act as he sees the Church act wherever he is staying. What is proved to be against neither faith nor morals is to be considered optional and is to be observed with due regard for the group in which he lives*."[96]

His position, on which he no doubt agreed with the leaders of countless other Christian communities, that something that was "against neither faith nor morals is to be considered optional", allowed a very wide room for the survival of regional customs. This, we may add, could hardly have been otherwise, given the enormous geographical extent and cultural diversity of the Christian world. It is thus hardly a coincidence that the process of Christianisation proceeded at very local and regionalised levels and in contexts where local customs and practices were often assimilated into Christian practices.[97]

As far as the mortuary realm is concerned, we can again turn to Augustine, who commented upon the description of Jesus' burial as set down in the Gospel of John with the following words:

> "'They took therefore the body of Jesus and bound it in linen cloths, with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury.' It does not seem to me that the Evangelist intended to say 'as the manner of the Jews is to bury' without a purpose, for indeed, if I am not mistaken, he thus advised that *in duties of this sort that are performed for the dead, the custom of each nation ought to be preserved*."[98]

Local customs which were regarded by local church authorities as passing the test of being "against neither faith nor morals" may thus have been "considered optional" and did not necessarily call for being rejected or reformed. To be sure, the burial of the dead accompanied with certain artefacts could hardly have been regarded as being against either faith or morals. Of course, its exaggerated forms, like all other manifestations of vainglorious richness and excessive social display, could have been and, as the available sources attest to, were actually often seen as being against good morals in a world where the poor suffered serious hardships and struggled for their everyday living. Yet, even if associated artefacts, strictly speaking, were vanities from a theological point of view, their inclusion into mortuary contexts was, in fact, hardly "against faith" and thus they were not necessarily intolerable.[99]

The archaeological record provides ample evidence that for the ordinary lay Christians, the decent interment of their dead involved the fitting dressing and bejewelling of the body in several regions of the late antique Mediterranean. It is also clear from the archaeological traces of the feasts held in cemeteries in commemoration of the dead that family members accorded a greater significance to the earthly remains when tending to the cult of the ordinary Christian dead than we would expect in an ideal case in the light of the position taken by most Fathers, particularly from the final decades of the fourth century. Even if some success was achieved by the efforts

[96] Aug. *Ep*. 54.2, ed. *Daur 2004* 227; transl. *Parsons 1951* 253 (my italics).
[97] For an illuminating in-depth analysis of the Christianisation of and of local Christianities in Egypt, see *Frankfurter 2018*.
[98] Aug. *Tract. Ev. Io*. 120.4, ed. *Willems 1954* 662; transl. *Rettig 1995* 53 (my italics).
[99] As rightly argued by *Volp 2002* 198.

similar to Ambrose and Augustine's endeavours to regulate these practices, particularly regarding the curtailment of these cults around *martyria*, it seems unlikely in the light of the archaeological record that the beliefs regarding the need for protecting the dead body and the importance of the burial location would have disappeared among Christians.

Suffice it here to quote but a single example: In the eastern Mediterranean, and especially in the Levant, objects of apotropaic significance were regularly included in mortuary contexts.[100] Of course, the precise function of these apotropaic devices in mortuary contexts cannot be unequivocally established. Still, in my view, a strong case can be made for the protective role ascribed to their inclusion. It remains, and will remain, uncertain whether the protection afforded by these articles (1) was meant to ensure the long-term protection of the body resting in the grave awaiting resurrection, (2) was a reflection of the beliefs current among Syriac Christians that the soul awaiting resurrection was located somewhere near the body, and (3) to what extent these were regarded necessary solely for the brief interim period when the soul left the body and reached the "interim state". While the notion that the soul had to undertake a perilous journey after leaving the body might seem unusual in a Christian context at first sight, the widespread nature of this belief is amply documented in late antique and early medieval texts, both in Greek- and Latin-speaking Christianity, similarly to the belief that angels and demons fought over the soul leaving the body at the moment of death.[101] In addition to these apotropaic devices, the eastern Mediterranean also saw the appearance of what were most likely prayers from the funeral liturgy inside the burial chambers, in other words, in spaces invisible to the living visiting the cemetery, that were symbolically meant to ensure the continuous prayers recited for the dead.[102] The custom of depositing pilgrim *eulogiai* beside the deceased is also attested in this region, which, similarly to burials *ad sanctos* was believed to provide protection for the dead through the proximity of saints' relics.[103] The latter two seem to definitely confirm the supposition, more so than in the case of ordinary amulets, that in addition to the protection afforded the soul for its journey, some late antique communities deemed it equally important to ensure the protection of the earthly remains of the body.

In place of conclusions

It would quite certainly be a mistake to draw too general conclusions from the above. Nevertheless, we may perhaps conclude that a search for a single Christian understanding in matters of the resurrection that was accepted by all late antique clerics and lay Christians would be an exercise in vain. Even if the range of acceptable theological positions was not infinite, there was still ample room for varying interpretations and differing emphases. To be sure, any explanation of the details of the afterlife, and especially of the resurrection, was to navigate stormy waters and all Christian intellectuals who entered this field had to be careful to avoid both the Scylla of exaggerated materialistic understandings and the Charybdis of rejecting too strongly the continuity between the earthly and heavenly bodies (and thereby incurring the charge of "Origenism"). When staking out their views, they had to be mindful of the other aspects of the period's theological debates (like Gregory of Nyssa[104]) and the challenges of the social milieu (like Augustine). They had to speak of these matters to their philosophically and theologically untrained or but little trained audiences and to explain various passages of the Old and New Testaments that had been conceived during

[100] For preliminary discussions, see *Bollók 2013; Bollók 2016*.
[101] *Recheis 1958; Carozzi 1994; Dirkse 2014.*
[102] *Felle 2014*. For prayers included in Christian mortuary inscriptions with the intention of their being loudly recited for the departed by passers-by, see also *Rose 2013* 35 (with further literature).
[103] *Bollók 2018*.
[104] Cf. *Dennis 1981; Young 2009*.

long centuries in widely differing contexts and could therefore often only be reconciled with each other with difficulty in a manner that would be understandable even to their less cultivated audience.

Therefore, when we attempt to interpret the Christian funerary customs through the writings and sermons of the Church Fathers, we cannot be certain that their more sophisticated interpretations provide a direct springboard to this exercise. Even greater caution needs to be exercised when studying the material record of regions in whose case we have to turn by necessity to the works of authors living in more distant lands. Neither the teachings promoted by the Fathers, nor the formation of the material record can be divorced from the local/regional and temporal contexts in which they were born. It is difficult, for example, to know whether the people whose material remains we are studying were illuminated by the Church's teaching in the same spirit and depth as we might assume on the strength of our written sources. Irrespective of the actual extent of the success of this enterprise, on a few occasions Augustine did set out to offer his community a detailed introduction and explanation of his teachings about resurrection and the life of the world to come.[105]

Whether his contemporaries and their successors in the northern Alpine regions did the same, and if so, as it may be assumed with some justification, whether they possessed the same intellectual powers and erudition to enlighten and convince their audience remains a matter of conjecture. What seems quite possible, though, is that members of the local ecclesiastical hierarchy of the fifth century who were active in the wider region of Sabiona/Säben, the site on which the arguments cited in the introduction are based, were in all likelihood better educated and later preached to their local community in the spirit of the teachings of Ambrose of Milan rather than of Augustine of Hippo. Although the two were close friends and Ambrose's ideas, including his insistence on strictly controlling the cult activities of lay people taking place in *martyria*, clearly influenced Augustine,[106] the former was apparently keener on the dissemination of the cult of the martyrs and their relics than the latter. Neither is Ambrose known to have taken a stand against the custom of burials *ad sanctos*,[107] and thus, theoretically at least, his ideas would be more in line with the appearance of inhumation graves in and around the Sabiona church.[108]

Although in the foregoing greater stress was put on the difficulties bedevilling our work while searching for a deeper understanding of late antique Christian mortuary practices and their correlations with the teachings of Christian intellectuals, nothing can be further from my intention than to deny the necessity and the potentials of such a research. Methodologically, the best approach is if, in our quest to explore the background to the patterns outlined by the regionally assessed material record, our springboard is the analysis of the written sources that are chronologically, regionally and culturally closest, and an assessment that is mindful of the context in which these writings were conceived. This is all the more difficult, given the imbalances in the spatial and chronological distribution of the two source materials – yet, at the end of the day, the collation of these regional syntheses will outline the divergences typical for local Christianities and transregional patterns. One of the latter, for example, is represented by the "golden garments", that is, silk garments sewn with golden threads or decorated with golden appliqués that played a significant role in the mortuary display of the late antique Mediterranean rich and the well-to-do, and whose use was widely criticised by the Fathers both in the East and West.[109]

---

[105] As the most detailed discussion, his Aug. *Sermo* 361–362, eloquently shows.

[106] *Kotila 1992* 62–63; *Volp 2002* 237.

[107] On Ambrose's views and his role in the rise of the cult of saints, see the concise summary of *Morehouse 2016* 89–100.

[108] *Bierbrauer 2015* 193–194, Beil. 4.

[109] For Sabiona and northern Italy, see *Bierbrauer 2015* 280–281. For a survey in the eastern Mediterranean, see *Bollók in preparation*.

The last example takes us back to the two, strongly intertwined questions raised in the introduction: the richness of the *horreum* cemetery, which, being in sharp contrast to what we would expect in the case of Christian burials, seems to be an anomaly, and the interpretation of the associated artefacts from mortuary contexts within the frames of a "Barbarian-pagan" *vs*. "Roman-Christian" dichotomy. It seems to me that there is no need to particularly accentuate that a Christianisation occurring according to local patterns and in local contexts was not necessarily coupled with the rapid decline of the custom of depositing a rich array of artefacts, particularly in the case of non-Mediterranean communities, where the constant presence of an ecclesiastical hierarchy could not always be ensured, and whose deep-rooted traditions included the expression of social display by means of various artefacts. Given that aside from food and drink offerings, there are few elements in the burials identified as "pagan-Barbarian" interments which can be seen as having an unmistakably non-Christian nature, the identification of pagan *vs*. Christian burials along these lines rests on very shaky ground indeed. (Disregarding here the issue of *libatio* for the deceased in the grave, i.e. the feeding of the dead, for which examples from clearly Christian contexts can also be cited from the late antique Mediterranean.) It is likewise uncertain whether the deceased needed the artefacts deposited in the grave conforming to the norms of the "pagan Germanic" religious beliefs in the long term, that is, whether, in addition to the social display, these articles were needed by the deceased for his or her existence in the netherworld according to the beliefs of the family and the relatives performing the funeral, or whether they were merely used during the journey leading there, as is usually assumed in the case of the food and drink offerings.[110] Another entirely different issue is that when searching for the differences in social display between communities rooted in Mediterranean urban culture and *gens*-based Barbarian groups, should we look at the differences between Christian and pagan beliefs or at the differences of the means of social display? While early medieval, often mobile groups on the *gens* level of social organisation could mainly, but hardly exclusively, express social differences in mortuary contexts with the deposition of associated artefacts, Mediterranean communities living in urban societies had several other, much more sophisticated means at their disposal. On the testimony of the written sources,

(1) the size of the burial structure beyond the town and its external and internal ornamentation as well as the superbness of its craftsmanship,
(2) its commemorative inscription,
(3) the pre-eminent prestige of the burial location, for example within a church or in the proximity of a martyr's grave,
(4) the use of valuable perfumed ointments during the preparation of the body and their placement beside the deceased during its lying-in-state,
(5) and the performative parts of funerals, namely
  (5.1) the number of mourners visiting the deceased and his or her family during the lying-in-state and the number of people participating in the vigil held over the dead body,
  (5.2) the route of the funeral procession and its visual impact,
  (5.3) the number and the social position of the participants in the funeral cortège,
  (5.4) the person holding the funeral oration were all equally important elements of mortuary display,[111]
(6) and thus, understandably, the garment worn by the deceased, the jewellery and the other articles deposited in the grave played a proportionately smaller role.

Obviously, this should not be taken to imply that the Christian and non-Christian rich and well-to-do of the late antique Mediterranean did not resort to these means. Both the literary testimonies

[110] Cf. *Bierbrauer 2015* 280.
[111] *Bollók in preaparation*.

of the Church Fathers and the material record point into this direction.[112] Despite the general state of research of eastern Mediterranean funerary archaeology and the extensively disturbed and looted nature of mortuary contexts, it seems to me that while a part of the artefacts known from the *horreum* cemetery can be regarded as representing local traditions, the "richness" of some burials would not be particularly striking compared to the known Mediterranean grave inventories. One major difference is that in part owing to the research strategy of eastern Mediterranean archaeology, the lavish burials from that region are principally known from urban environments, while the *horreum* cemetery can be linked to a settlement functioning as a central place in the context of local conditions. In this sense, its "outstanding richness" rather seems to reflect the conditions of the local milieu, namely a society where the main means of expressing wealth in funerary display were the associated artefacts "put on" the deceased. This flexibility may be justifiably seen as a strong indication of Christian communities' ability to readily adapt their practices to local circumstances and conditions. To be sure, this is not particularly surprising since many of their customs initially grew out of local practices that were "against neither faith nor morals" and were thus adopted for and adapted to Christian usage. In a sense, the many-facetted structure of mortuary display outlined in the above and the relatively subordinate role of associated artefacts can be traced to the funerary culture of late Roman times, at least in most regions of the eastern Mediterranean I am familiar with. However, this should by no means be taken to imply that profound changes had not taken place between the first and seventh centuries in the burial customs of the population inhabiting this enormous region, partly in the wake of the spread of Christianity, and partly through other social and cultural impacts as well as the natural shifts in the dynamics of these customs.

The social display principally achieved through the artefacts deposited in burials as practiced by late antique and early medieval Eurasian *gens*-based societies was no longer typical among the communities living in the Mediterranean in this period, despite the obvious diversity of spoken languages, traditions, and cultural preferences. Whether one prefers to label this phenomenon as a *reduzierte Beigabensitte*, i.e. a custom of burying the dead with a "reduced" number of associated artefacts, mainly depends on one's perspective on how "adequate", "normal", "justifiably expectable", and "reduced" numbers are defined. The bottom line remains that the contrast between the attitudes calling for the provisioning of the deceased with a restricted number of associated artefacts while, at the same time, relying on a wide array of other means in mortuary display on the one hand, and predominantly using associated artefacts for the same purpose on the other has to do both with differing social complexities and the creation of differing symbolic idioms for expressing various layers of the deceased's and the burial community's identities.

WRITTEN SOURCES

Anast. Sin. *Quaest. et reps.* — Anastasius Sinaiticus, *Quaestiones et responsiones*

Richard – Munitiz 2006 — M. Richard – J. A. Munitiz (eds): Anastasii Sinaitae, Quaestiones et responsiones. CChSG 59. Turnhout 2006.

Munitiz 2011 — J. A. Munitiz (transl., intr. and comm.): Anastasios of Sinai, Questions and Answers. CChSG 59. Corpus Christianorum in Translation 7. Turnhout 2011.

[112] For the assembled evidence, see *Bollók in preparation*.

Aug. *De Civ. Dei*	Aurelius Augustinus, *De Civitate Dei contra paganos*
Dombart – Kalb 1955	B. Dombart – A. Kalb (eds): Sancti Aurelii Augustini, De Civitate Dei. CChSL 47: Aurelii Augustini Opera XIV.1–2. Turnhout 1955.
Dyson 1998	R. W. Dyson (ed. and transl.): Augustine, The City of God against the Pagans. Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought. Cambridge 1998.
Aug. *De cura mort.*	Aurelius Augustinus, *De cura pro mortuis gerenda*
Zycha 1900	J. Zycha (ed.): S. Aureli Augustini, De cura pro mortuis gerenda ad Paulinum, in: I. Zycha (ed.): Sancti Aureli Augustini, Opera. CSEL 41. Prague – Vienna – Leipzig 1900, 619–660.
Lacy 1955	J. A. Lacy (transl.): Augustine, The Care to be Taken for the Dead, in: R. J. Deferrari (ed.): Saint Augustine, Treatises on Marriage and Other Subjects. The Fathers of the Church. A New Translation 27. New York 1955, 347–384.
Aug. *Enarr. Ps.*	Aurelius Augustinus, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*
Dekkers – Fraipont 1956	D. E. Dekkers – I. Fraipont (eds): Sancti Aurelii Augustini, Enarrationes in Psalmos CI–CL. CChSL 40: Aurelii Augustini Opera X.3. Turnhout 1956.
Boulding 2004	M. Boulding (transl.): Expositions of the Psalms (*Enarrationes in Psalmos*) 121–150. The Works of Saint Augustine. A Translation for the 21st Century III.20. New York 2004.
Aug. *Ep.*	Aurelius Augustinus, *Epistulae*
Daur 2004	Kl.-D. Daur (ed.): Sancti Aurelii Augustini, Epistulae I–LV. CChSL 31: Aurelii Augustini Opera III.1. Turnhout 2004.
Parsons 1951	W. Parsons (transl.): Saint Augustine, Letters I: 1–82. The Fathers of the Church. A New Translation 12. Washington 1951.
Aug. *Sermo*	Aurelius Augustinus, *Sermones*
Migne 1865	J. P. Migne (ed.): Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Series Latina 39: Sancti Aurelii Augustini, Opera Ominia: Sermones ad populum, classis IV: De diversis. Paris 1865, 1493–1658.
Hill 1995	E. Hill. (transl.): St. Augustine, Sermons 341–400: On Liturgical Sermons. The Works of Saint Augustine. A Translation for the 21st Century III.10. New York 1995.
Aug. *Tract. Ev. Io.*	Aurelius Augustinus, *In Evangelium Ioannis tractatus*
Willems 1954	D. R. Willems (ed.): Sancti Aurelii Augustini, In Iohannis evangelium tractatus CXXIV. CChSL 36: Aurelii Augustini Opera VIII. Turnhout 1954.
Rettig 1995	J. W. Rettig (transl.): St. Augustine, Tractates on the Gospel of John 112–124; Tractates on the First Epistle of John. The Fathers of the Church 92. Washington 1995.

Greg. Nyss. *Hom. 2 in XL mart.* Gregorius Nyssenus, *Homilia 2 in XL martyres*

Migne 1863 J. P. Migne (ed.): Patrologia Cursus Completus, Series Graeca 46: S. P. N. Gregorii Episcopi Nysseni, Opera Quae Reperiri Potuerunt Ominia: Orationes. Paris 1863, 774–788.

Greg. Nyss. *In s. Pascha* Gregorius Nyssenus, *In sanctum Pascha*

Gebhardt 1967 E. Gebhardt: Gregorii Nysseni, In Sanctum Pascha, vulgo In Christi Resurrectionem oratio III, in: E. Gebhardt (ed.): Gregorii Nysseni Opera Omnia 9. Leiden 1967, 245–270.

Hall 1981 S. G. Hall (transl.): Gregory of Nyssa, Discourse on the Holy Pascha, in: S. Spira – Ch. Klock (eds): The Easter Sermons of Gregory of Nyssa. Translation and Commentary. Patristic Monograph Series 9. Cambridge 1981, 5–23.

Lact. *Inst. Div.* Lactantius, *Institutiones Divinae*

Brandt 1890 S. Brandt (ed.): L. Caeli Firmiani Lactanti, Opera Omina I: Divinae Institutiones et Epitome Divinarum Institutionum. CSEL 19. Prague – Vienna – Leipzig 1890.

Bowen – Garsney 2003 A. Bowen – P. Garnsey (transl.): Lactantius, Divine institutes. TTH 40. Liverpool 2003.

Min. Fel. *Oct.* Minicius Felix, *Octavius*

Rendall 1931 G. H. Rendall (ed. and transl.): Minicius Felix, Octavius, in: T. R. Glover – G. H. Rendall (eds and transl.): Tertullian: Apology, De Spectaculis; Minucius Felix: Octavius. Loeb Classical Library 250. Cambridge 1931, 303–437. https://doi.org/10.4159/DLCL.minucius_felix-octavius.1931

Clarke 1974 G. W. Clark (transl.): The Octavius of Marcus Minicius Felix. Ancient Christian Writers 39. New York 1974.

Orig. *C. Cels.* Origen, *Contra Celsum*

Borret 1969 M. Borret (ed. and transl.): Origène, Contre Celse 3: Livres V et VI. SC 147. Paris 1969.

Chadwick 1980 H. Chadwick (transl.): Origen, Contra Celsum. Cambridge 1980.

Shen. *C. Orig.* Shenoute, *Contra Origenistas*

Cristea 2011 H.-J. Cristea (ed. and transl.): Shenute von Atripe: Contra Origenistas. Edition des koptischen Textes mit annotierter Übersetzung und Indizes einschließlich einer Übersetzung des 16. Osterfestbriefs des Theophilus in der Fassung von Hieronymus (ep. 96). Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 60. Tübingen 2011.

Brakke – Crislip 2015 D. Brakke – A. Crislip (intr. and transl.): Selected Discourses of Shenoute the Great. Community Theology, and Social Conflict in Late Antique Egypt. Cambridge 2015. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139136846

Tert. *De anim.* Tertullianus, *De anima*

Waszink 1954 J. H. Waszink (ed.): Q. S. Fl. Tertulliani, De anima, in: Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani, Opera II: Opera montanistica. CChSL 2. Turnhout 1954, 779–869.

REFERENCES

Ameling 2011a W. Ameling (Hrsg.): Topographie des Jenseits. Studien zur Geschichte des Todes in Kaiserzeit und Spätantike. Altertumswissenschaftliches Kolloquium 21. Stuttgart 2011.

Ameling 2011b W. Ameling: Die Jenseits der Märtyrer, in: *Ameling 2011a* 69–81.

Angerstorfer – Dresken-Weiland – Merkt 2012 A. Angerstorfer – J. Dresken-Weiland – A. Merkt: Himmel – Paradies – Schalom: Tod und Jenseits in christlichen und jüdischen Grabinschriften der Antike. Handbuch zur Geschichte des Todes im frühen Christentum und seiner Umwelt 1. Regensburg 2012.

Barkóczi 1968 L. Barkóczi: A 6th Century Cemetery from Keszthely-Fenékpuszta. ActaArchHung 20 (1968) 275–311.

Bierbrauer 2004 V. Bierbrauer: Die Keszthely-Kultur und die romanische Kontinuität in Westungarn (5.–8. Jh.). Neue Überlegungen zu einem alten Problem, in: H. Seibert – G. Thoma (Hrsg.): Von Sachsen bis Jerusalem. Menschen und Institutionen im Wandel der Zeit. Festschrift für Wolfgang Giese zum 65. Geburtstag. München 2004, 51–72.

Bierbrauer 2012 V. Bierbrauer: Christliche Jenseitsvorstellungen und romanische Beigabensitte vom 5. bis zum 6./7. Jahrhundert, in: N. Krohn – U. Koch (Hrsg.): Grosso Modo: Quellen und Funde aus Spätantike und Mittelalter: Festschrift für Gerhard Fingerlin zum 75. Geburtstag. Forschungen zur Spätantike und Mittelalter 1. Mannheimer Geschichtsblätter, Sonderveröffentlichung 6. Weinstadt 2012, 39–50.

Bierbrauer 2015 V. Bierbrauer: Gräber und Bestattungen, in: V. Bierbrauer – H. Nothdurfter: Säben I. Die Ausgrabungen im spätantik-frühmittelalterlichen Bischofssitz Sabiona-Säben in Südtirol: Frühchristliche Kirche und Gräberfeld 1–3. MBV 58. München 2015, 191–353.

Bodel 2000 J. Bodel: Dealing with the Dead. Undertakers, Executioners and Potter's Fields in Ancient Rome, in: V. Hope – E. Marshall (eds): Death and Disease in the Ancient City. London – New York 2000, 128–151.

Bodel 2008 J. Bodel: From Columbaria to Catacombs: Collective Burial in Pagan and Christian Rome, in. L. Brink – D. Green – R. Saller (eds): Commemorating the Dead: Texts and Artifacts in Context. Studies of Roman, Jewish and Christian Burials. Berlin – New York 2008, 177–242. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110211573.3.177

Bollók 2013 Á. Bollók: Apotropaion and Burial in Early Byzantium: Some Preliminary Considerations, in: E. Juhász (Hrsg.): Byzanz und das Abendland: Begegnungen zwischen Ost und West. Antiquitas – Byzantium – Renascentia. Bibliotheca Byzantina I. Budapest 2013, 227–241.

Bollók 2016 Á. Bollók: The "Phylactery of the Cross" and Late Antique/Early Medieval Mortuary Practices in the Eastern Mediterranean and on Its Fringes, in: I. Bugarski – O. Heinrich-Tamáska – V. Ivanišević – D. Syrbe (Hrsg.): GrenzÜbergänge: Spätrömisch, frühchristlich, frühbyzantinisch als Kategorien der historisch-archäologischen Forschung an der mittleren Donau/Late Roman, Early Christian, Early Byzantine as Categories in Historical-Archaeological Research at the Middle Danube. Akten des 27. Internationalen Symposiums der Grundprobleme der frühgeschichtlichen Entwicklung im mittleren Donauraum, Ruma, 4.–7.11.2015. Forschungen zu Spätantike und Mittelalter 4. Remshalden 2016, 215–230.

Bollók 2018 Á. Bollók: "Portable Sanctity" Brought to the Afterlife: Pilgrim Eulogiai as Grave Goods in the Late Antique Eastern Mediterranean, in: T. A. Bács – Á. Bollók – T. Vida (eds): Across the Mediterranean – Along the Nile. Studies in Egyptology, Nubiology and Late Antiquity Dedicated to László Török on the Occasion of His 75th Birthday. Budapest 2018, 763–803.

Bollók in preparation Á. Bollók: Mortuary Display and the Burial of the Rich in the Late Antique Eastern Mediterranean (in preparation).

Bond 2013 S. E. Bond: Mortuary Workers, the Church, and the Funeral Trade in Late Antiquity. JLA 6 (2013) 135–151. https://doi.org/10.1353/jla.2013.0004

Borg 2013 B. Borg: Crisis and Ambition. Tombs and Burial Customs in Third-Century CE Rome. Oxford Studies in Ancient Culture and Representation. Oxford 2013.

Bowes 2008 K. Bowes: Private Worship, Public Values, and Religious Change in Late Antiquity. Cambridge 2008.

Brather 2015 S. Brather: Bestattungen und Grabbeigaben. Religiöse Vorstellungen und soziale Praktiken in Spätantike und Frühmittelalter, in: O. Heinrich-Tamáska – H. Herold – P. Straub – T. Vida (Hrsg.): „Castellum, civitas, urbs". Zentren und Eliten im frühmittelalterlichen Ostmitteleuropa. CPP 6. Budapest – Leipzig – Keszthely – Rahden/Westf. 2015, 197–208.

Brown 1997 P. Brown: Vers la naissance du purgatoire. Amnistie et pénitence dans le christianisme occidental de l'Antiquité tardive au Haut Moyen Âge. Annales 52 (1997) 1247–1261. https://doi.org/10.3406/ahess.1997.279630

Brown 2014 P. Brown: Through the Eye of a Needle: Wealth, the Fall of Rome, and the Making of Christianity in the West, 350–550 AD. Princeton 2014.

Carozzi 1994 C. Carozzi: Le voyage de l'âme dans l'au-delà d'après la littérature latine (V[e]–XIIIe siècle). Collection de l'École française de Rome 189. Rome 1994.

Clarke – Claydon 2009 P. Clarke – T. Claydon (eds): The Church, the Afterlife and the Fate of the Soul. Studies in Church History 45. Woodbridge 2009.

Coyle 1999 J. K. Coyle: Adapted Discourse: Heaven in Augustine's *City of God* and in His Contemporary Preaching. ASt 30 (1999) 205–219. https://doi.org/10.5840/augstudies199930225

Daley 2010² B. E. Daley: The Hope of the Early Church: A Handbook of Patristic Eschatology. Grand Rapids 2010².

Dennis 1981 T. J. Dennis: Gregory on the Resurrection of the Body, in: S. Spira – Ch. Klock (eds): The Easter Sermons of Gregory of Nyssa: Translation and Commentary. Patristic Monograph Series 9. Cambridge 1981, 55–80.

Dirkse 2014 D. Dirkse: Τελωνεια: The Tollgates of the Air as an Egyptian Motif in Patristic Sources and Early Byzantine Hagiography, in: P. Roilis (ed.): Medieval Greek Storytelling: Fictionality and Narrative in Byzantium. Mainzer Veröffentlichungen zur Byzantinistik 12. Wiesbaden 2014, 41–53.

Dresken-Weinland 2007 J. Dresken-Weinland: Vorstellungen von Tod und Jenseits in den frühchristlichen Grabinschriften der Oikumene. AntTard 15 (2007) 285–302. https://doi.org/10.1484/J.AT.2.303124

Dresken-Weinland 2012 J. Dresken-Weinland: Tod und Jenseits in antiken christlichen Grabinschriften, in: *Angerstorfer – Dresken-Weiland – Merkt 2012* 71–175.

Duval 1982 Y. Duval: Loca sanctorum Africae: le culte des martyrs en Afrique du IVᵉ au VIIᵉ siècle 1–2. Collection de l'École Française de Rome 58. Roma 1982.

Duval 1988 Y. Duval: Auprès des saints corps et âme: l'inhumation "ad sanctos" dans la chrétienté d'Orient et d'Occident du IIIᵉ au VIIᵉ siècle. Collection des Études Augustiniennes 121. Paris 1988.

Felle 2014 A. E. Felle: Expressions of Hope Quoted for Biblical Texts in Christian Funerary Inscriptions (3rd–7th cent. C.E.), in: W. Kraus – S. Kreuzer (Hrsg.): Die Septuaginta – Text, Wirkung, Rezeption. 4. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 19.–22. Juli 2012. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 325. Tübingen 2014, 775–824.

Frankfurter 2018 D. Frankfurter: Christianizing Egypt. Syncretism and Local Worlds in Late Antiquity. Princeton 2018. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400888009

Gavin 1920 F. Gavin: The Sleep of the Soul in the Early Syriac Church. JAOS 40 (1920) 103–120. https://doi.org/10.2307/593409

Heinrich-Tamáska 2016 O. Heinrich-Tamáska: Burials in Keszthely-Fenékpuszta and Its Surroundings (Fourth to Ninth Centuries AD), in: E. Tóth – T. Vida – I. Takács (eds): Saint Martin and Pannonia. Christianity on the Frontier of the Roman World. Pannonhalma – Szombathely 2016, 139–142.

Hill 2001² C. E. Hill: Regnum Caelorum. Patterns of Millennial Thought in Early Christianity. Grand Rapid – Cambridge 2001².

Horden–Purcell 2000 P. Horden – N. Purcell: The Corrupting Sea: A Study of Mediterranean History. Oxford 2000.

Kotila 1992 H. Kotila: Memoria mortuorum: Commemoration of the Departed in Augustine. Studia Ephemeridis "Augustinianum" 38. Roma 1992.

Lehtipuu 2007 O. Lehtipuu: The Afterlife Imagery in Luke's Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 123. Leiden – Boston 2007. https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004153011.i-361

Lewis 2016 N. D. Lewis: Reinterpreting "Pagans" and "Christians" from Rome's Late Antique Mortuary Evidence, in: M. R. Salzman – M. Sághy – R. L. Testa (eds): Pagans and Christians in Late Antique Rome. Conflict, Competition, and Coexistence in the Fourth Century. Cambridge 2016, 273–290.

Lewis 2018 N. D. Lewis: The Early Modern Invention of Late Antique Rome: How Historiography Helped Create the Crypt of the Popes. ARG 20 (2018) 91–109. https://doi.org/10.1515/arege-2018-0007

Limberis 2010 V. Limberis: The Cult of the Martyrs and the Cappadocian Fathers, in: D. Krueger (ed.): Byzantine Christianity. A People's History of Christianity 3. Minneapolis 2010, 39–58. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv19cwbkt.8

MacMullan 2009 R. MacMullan: The Second Church: Popular Christianity A.D. 200–400. Society of Biblical Literature. Writings from the Greco-Roman World, Supplement Series 1. Atlanta 2009.

Martin 2009 E. Martin: *Timor mortis*: The Fear of Death in Augustine's Sermons on the Martyrs, in: *Clarke – Claydon 2009* 31–40. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0424208400002394

Merkt 2005 A. Merkt: Das Fegefeuer. Entstehung und Funktion einer Idee. Darmstadt 2005.

Merkt 2011 A. Merkt: Abrahams Schoss. Ursprung und Sinngehalt eines antiken christlichen Jenseitstopos, in: *Ameling 2011a* 83–99.

Merkt 2012 A. Merkt: Das Schweigen und Sprechen der Gräber. Zur Aussagekraft frühchristlicher Epitaphe, in: *Angerstorfer – Dresken-Weiland – Merkt 2012* 9–70.

Miles 1979 M. R. Miles: Augustine on the Body. Eugene 1979.

Morehouse 2016 N. Morehouse: Death's Dominion. Power, Identity, and Memory at the Fourth-Century Martyr Shrine. Studies in Ancient Religion and Culture. Sheffield 2016. https://doi.org/10.1558/isbn.9781781793084

Osei-Bonsu 1991 J. Osei-Bonsu: The Intermediate State in the New Testament. SJT 44 (1991) 169–194. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0036930600039107

Rebillard 2009 É. Rebillard: The Care of the Dead in Late Antiquity. Translated by E. Trapnell Rawlings and J. Routier-Pucci. Cornell Studies in Classical Philology 59. Ithaca – London 2009.

Recheis 1958 A. Recheis: Engel, Tod und Seelenreise. Das Wirken der Geister beim Heimgang des Menschen in der Lehre der alexandrinischen und kappadokischen Väter. Temi e testi 4. Roma 1958.

Rose 2013 P. J. Rose: A Commentary on Augustine's *De cura pro mortuis gerenda*: Rhetoric in Practice. Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology 20. Leiden – Boston 2013. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004251281

Del Santo 2009 M. J. Del Santo: Philosophy, Hagiology and the Early Byzantine Origins of Purgatory, in: *Clarke – Claydon 2009* 41–51. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0424208400002400

Young 2009 F. Young: Naked or Clothed? Eschatology and the Doctrine of Creation, in: *Clarke – Claydon 2009* 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0424208400002370

Vida 2011 T. Vida: Das Gräberfeld neben dem Horreum in der Innenbefestigung von Keszthely-Fenékpuszta, in: O. Heinrich-Tamáska (Hrsg.): Keszthely-Fenékpuszta im Kontext Spätantiker Kontinuitätsforschung zwischen Noricum und Moesia. CPP 2. Budapest – Leipzig – Keszthely – Rahden/Westf. 2011, 397–455.

Volp 2002 U. Volp: Tod und Ritual in den christlichen Gemeinden der Antike. Vigiliae Christianae Supplements 45. Leiden – Boston 2002. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004313309