Sacchi, Paolo Felice , and Marco Formisano , ed. Epitomic Writing in Late Antiquity and Beyond: Forms of Unabridged Writing: Forms of Unabridged Writing. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2022. sera tela: Studies in Late Antique Literature and Its Reception. sera tela: Studies in Late Antique Literature and Its Reception. Bloomsbury Collections. Web. 10 Apr. 2025. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781350281967>;.

Accessed from: www.bloomsburycollections.com

Accessed on: Thu Apr 10 2025 14:57:22 British Summer Time

Copyright © Jaś Elsner. All rights reserved. Further reproduction or distribution is prohibited without prior permission in writing from the publishers.

CHAPTER 12
VISUAL EPITOME IN LATE ANTIQUE ART

Jaś Elsner[*]

Epitome, brevity, exemplarity

> *One picture is worth a thousand words.*[1]

My epigraph, an English proverb surprisingly first attested only in the 1920s, conveys the power of visual epitome in the popular imagination. The *Oxford English Dictionary* offers two basic meanings for the word *epitome* in English usage, both dating back to the early Renaissance.[2] The first represents the way we usually use the idea in classical philology – namely as an abridgement, summary or condensed account. The second takes that condensation to represent the essence in miniature of the thing referred to – in other words, to be a kind of ideal or perfect embodiment of its quality or type. It is in this sense that a picture as a visual epitome can be worth a thousand words and that it may function as a special form of exemplarity, a topic that has had some recent exposure in Classical studies.[3] I take it to be the case that the two meanings are not necessarily mutually exclusive and that both may be in play if we are to extend our understanding of the workings of epitome in late antiquity beyond the strict abbreviation of texts to a wider cultural spectrum that might include images.

Let me summarize my argument here. I will assume that epitome in the sense of the abbreviation of narratives, when it functions in the visual sphere, is actually ubiquitous in Roman art since all images from narratives effectively cut down a long diachronic process of reading or telling a story into a synoptic frame (or sometimes several) that effectively summarizes its key features and spurs the imagination or memory to fill in the rest.[4] In Roman art this goes with a particular quality of replication in which certain stock forms and figures are repeated with variations across different narratives (whether mythological, historical or biographical) and are made identifiable through their attributes.[5] The story of Narcissus, for example, as told at some length by Ovid, becomes a pictorial snapshot of a youth by a pool with his reflected head inside it.[6] A particular interest of this feature – one I will not discuss here – is that the forms of epitome in this model are actually independent of the specific narratives that they represent, and hence constitute a visual discourse and semiotics that is in conversation with itself as well as with the stories they epitomize. That independence also allows a distancing from the narratives they exemplify and a more generalized, even allegorical, range of reference – something I will claim is implicit in the ancient theoretical literature on abbreviation and something that becomes available to radical appropriation for new rhetorical models of meaning and signification in Christian late antiquity, with the rise of typology (the use

of images that are, in part, specifically evocative of a canonical series of Scriptures) and with the transformation of book culture from roll to codex. I will concentrate for the longest section on the implications of visual epitome and exemplarity for how images aided and enabled the codex, as a new kind of book, to function through a kind of pictorial epitomic paratextuality.

There has recently been a rich and thoughtful strand of work on the theme of epitome in Greek and Roman writing, of which of course this collection is a part.[7] That literature places the epitome within the large ancient rhetorical and scholarly culture generated in the Hellenistic world which throve during the period known as the Second Sophistic in Roman imperial times and carried on into late antiquity and the middle ages, significantly transgressing the barriers imposed on many aspects of earlier Classical culture by Christianity. Epitomes enabled collections, anthologies, commentaries, glossaries, lexicographies, grammaticographies, doxographies, and other scholarly genres (what have been called auxiliary texts)[8], themselves immensely conducive to the new book technology of the codex, which came to replace the roll roughly during the fourth century AD.[9] Likewise, epitomes were essential to education (and remain so!) – both in the provision of shortened texts and summaries (from biographies of exemplary characters to the *hypotheses* of plays) for school use, and of commentaries,[10] as well as in the management of large-scale histories.[11] The deep-play of epitome within the genesis of Greek and Roman writing can be seen in the extent of what has been called 'self-epitomization' in the use of narrative recapitulations (*kephalaia*) and other models of abbreviation by ancient writers of all periods.[12]

Although the term epitome does not appear among the technical figures of ancient rhetorical theory or training (unlike elaboration, *exergasia*, which broadly implies its opposite),[13] the concept of keeping things short and crisp (*brachylogia* in Greek or *brevitas* in Latin) has traction in both Greek and Latin rhetorical primers. On the Greek side, the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, transmitted with the manuscripts of Aristotle but nowadays attributed to Anaximenes of Lampsachus (perhaps compiled from a fourth-century BC source in its current form),[14] refers to *brachylogia*,[15] and is followed in the first century BC by the *de tropis* attributed to Tryphon of Alexandria (*c.* 60 BC–AD 10) which has sections on *brachytes* (brevity) and *syntomia* (concision),[16] and in the imperial period by the *ars rhetorica* 1.136–37, traditionally attributed incorrectly to Aelius Aristides but perhaps finally assembled from earlier models towards the end of the fifth century AD,[17] which has a section on *brachytes* and *syntomia*.[18] Notably, on the Latin side, the concept of *brevitas* appears in passing as a figure in the major rhetorical textbooks that survive from the Roman Republic – the *ad Herennium* (4.54.68), and several of Cicero's works on oratory (*orator* 40.139, *de partitione oratoria* 6.19 and 9.32, *de oratore* 3.202). Publius Rutilius Lupus, who was a Latin rhetorical theorist in the early first century AD, includes *brachylogia* as a figure in his *de figuris sententiarum et elocutionis* II.8;[19] he is followed by Quintilian (*Institutio Oratoria* 9.3.99) who cites him explicitly, the late Roman *carmen de figuris et schematibus* 46–48,[20] and by two fourth-century treatise writers, Julius Victor and Marius Victorinus.[21] This Latin tradition persists at least until Alcuin in the eighth century,[22] and includes an intriguing late antique fragment

from an eighth-century manuscript in Paris on *brevitas* as a virtue in the writing of history.[23] What this theoretical and text-book literature implies is that the skills of abbreviation and précis were a normal part of the educational armature of Hellenistic and later *paideia*, both in Greek- and in Latin-speaking contexts, which means that the arts, practices and instincts of epitomization were inculcated from an early age.

The range of scholarly approaches to epitome has largely remained in the area of texts and textuality, despite the clear potential of miniatures, that attempt to embody the quintessence of a subject, to be visual and pictorial as well as textual. If we take the concept of epitome to be entirely formal – about abbreviating particular texts – then it is a narrowly applicable term, useful in specific contexts. But it is reductive, in missing the clear cultural resonance of the art of epitome and the range of possibilities that abbreviation enables. And if we insist on textual abbreviation as the defining paradigm, we disable exploration of parallel processes in visual media. In the same way, we may insist that any of the epitomized versions of a classic work of fiction, such as *Pride and Prejudice*, from shortenings and parodies via graphic novels to audio adaptations, television series and films are simply irrelevant to modern culture's grasp of the original novel. But it is manifestly the case that in the current era many more people will have had various intermedial forms of vicarious contact with Jane Austen's literary world as conceived in that book through such media, than from actually reading the original. I will take an extended and cultural understanding of the concept of epitome as a theoretical assumption underpinning this paper, and attempt to explore some aspects of its resonance and uses in Roman and late antique visual culture.

It may be objected that concision and brevity are not the same thing as epitome. But consider the following passage from the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* (22):

> Βραχυλογεῖν δὲ βουλόμενον ὅλον τὸ πρᾶγμα ἑνὶ ὀνόματι περιλαμβάνειν, καὶ τούτωι ὅ ἄν ὑπάρχηι βραχύτατον τῶι πράγματι . . . καὶ παλιλλογίαν τὴν σύντομον ἐκ τῶν μερῶν ἀφαιρεῖν, ἐν δὲ ταῖς τελευταῖς μόνον παλιλλογεῖν.
>
> If you wish to speak briefly, you should include your whole subject in a single word and that word the shortest which is applicable to your subject. . . . you must do away with brief iterations in the separate divisions of the speech and only employ iteration in your final conclusion.

The art of finding the summarizing word is the skill of epitome in its sense of searching for the quintessential; that of cutting iteration is the skill of précis and abbreviation by which epitome must have been taught. It is striking that this whole section of the text lays out strategies for speeches that are prolonged, brief and of moderate length – with the implication that success lies in the art of 'as far as possible adapting the character of your speech to that of your audience'. Its training must constitute the acquisition of flexibility in both expansion and abbreviation. That flexibility – like the art of memory – effectively becomes a cultural trope in dealing with creativity that extends beyond the purely literary world to visual and material culture.[24]

Visual epitome and the figural

τῆι δὲ λέξει εἰς δύο χρῆσθαι . . .

'You must make your language serve a double purpose'

Rhetorica ad Alexandrum 22

In the same passage from the *Rhetoric to Alexander*, quoted above, which refers to brevity, the quotation that serves as epigraph to this section appears as well. Beyond the avoidance of repetition, rhetorical concision has the power of using language for a double purpose. It is epitome that points elsewhere or that essentializes in ways that take the listener or reader to a different place. The quintessential, which epitomizes a topic, has the potential for figural power – tending towards allegorical or metaphorical meanings.[25] In the visual arts of late antiquity, this double purpose – associated with simplification and abbreviation – is particularly marked, and has been described by the German literature as *Entmythologisierung*, the demythologization of narratives to render essential or symbolic themes, whether exemplary virtues or exemplifications of mortality.[26] The quality is particularly marked in both the main corpora of images from the later Roman world, namely mosaics and sarcophagi.[27] Exemplary simplifications are in fact completely normal across Roman art – one thinks of personifications, such as all those female figures for provinces,[28] or narrative epitomes where a single episode inevitably stands for an entire mythological story or cycle.[29]

One of the most powerful aspects of Roman art in general is the ability of figures through their formal appearance and allusion to earlier (semi-canonical) forms to hold meaning in what has been described as 'semantic system'.[30] This effectively means that the same type of a nude reclining youth becomes – in Pompeian painting for instance – an epitome for a variety of mythical narratives, such as that of Endymion, Narcissus, Cyparissus or Ganymede, with only a given set of attributes (Selene's presence for Endymion, the reflected head in a pool for Narcissus, a stag for Cyparissus, the eagle-lover for Ganymede) defining which story a viewer should bring to mind (Figure 1).[31] What is new with demythologization is the increased potential for figural meaning (already of course present in the figure of a female as a personification for a given province, for example, or that of a male for a river). In early Christian art, this feature of visual production achieves increased emphasis. The typological method, whereby the juxtaposition of Old Testament themes from the Hebrew Bible (like Jonah and the Whale or Daniel in the Lions' Den) are set side-by-side with scenes from the New Testament or with figures like the Good Shepherd that intimate Christian meanings, effectively creates a new Scriptural language for the visual arts.[32]

To cash out these general reflections in terms of material examples, let us take the interesting mid to late third-century Endymion lenos (tub-shaped sarcophagus) from Naples, once in the Cook collection and now in the British Museum (Figure 2). This shows the hero, carved with the portrait of the deceased, in a recumbent posture but with open eyes, surrounded by putti – some holding torches, one with a garland, two playing

musical instruments and a number with baskets of grapes or apples.[33] Here there is no figure of Selene to mark the full mythological narrative, which normally shows her approaching the sleeping figure of her beloved, and the piece was certainly recut in antiquity from a reclining Ariadne sarcophagus (with the removal of the breasts, the insertion of a penis and the change of portrait features to a male with close-cropped hair that may be as late as the Tetrarchy, potentially dating the recarving to the 280s).[34] When the image represented Ariadne, she too had no accompanying Dionysus, and one might argue that the iconography in the abbreviated form of the deceased as sleeper in a paradisal setting is not incompatible with interpretation as Jonah (who sleeps beneath the gourd vine at the close of the visual account of the Biblical Jonah narrative). Whichever narrative we choose, the figure is an epitome whose meanings serve a 'double purpose' in signalling – away from the narrative action of the myth – the various intimations of a happy sleep in death among erotes that such imagery might evoke.[35] What is striking is the ability of the same figure – with a little sculptural adaptation – to shift epitomic status from one narrative to another. In this case the simplification of content that goes along with abbreviation (the removal of Dionysus and all his retinue from Ariadne, the absence of Selene from Endymion) aids a generalization of meaning that extends beyond any one narrative frame.

If we move to a Christian example also from the late third century – the famous lenos from the church of Santa Maria Antiqua in Rome (Figure 3),[36] these kinds of isolated figure (either with some narrative referents or with none) juxtaposed against each other, create extraordinary potential for rich interpretative resonance. Here, on the far left side, Neptune is seated with his trident and beside him a ship. This segues into the sea monster (*ketos*) who swallowed Jonah, although the juxtaposition of monster and ship does not mean that this ship must necessarily be the one on which Jonah sailed. Beside the monster on the front of the sarcophagus lies Jonah sleeping beneath the vine, above which three sheep are grazing. Again the actual narrative of Jonah being swallowed and spewed by the beast is avoided. In the centre of the front are a female orant, a seated philosopher reading from a scroll (both of which have blank heads) and the Good Shepherd (or at any rate, a shepherd carrying a sheep). To the right of this is the Baptism of Christ and over the curve on the right-hand side are two figures who may be fishermen mending their nets. These certainly have a potential Christian meaning, but also pick up the marine imagery on the left end. Only two of the scenes here are narrative-related (Jonah and the Baptism), but the others all acquire potential symbolic resonance in relation to these and to each other. The imagery certainly does not abandon non-Christian Graeco-Roman thematics (notably the figure of Neptune, the ship, the philosopher and the fishermen) but it is also susceptible to strong Christian interpretation. Each image is exemplary and at least those with a narrative reference are epitomic. But it is the rhetorical potential for generating meaning through these symbols that marks the typological genius of early Christian culture, in this case with the Old Testament as represented by the recumbent Jonah (himself a figure for the Resurrected Christ) in juxtaposition with the Incarnation as defined by the fundamental act of Christian initiation in the Baptism.

Visual epitome and the codex

I will concentrate for the rest of this discussion on manuscripts. I have just indicated that the possibilities for visual epitome and its liberation of figures from the constraints of narrative structure to all kinds of rhetorical purposes (exemplary, metaphorical and so forth) was fundamental – although in rhetorically different ways – for all the visual arts both in the Roman world and in Christian late antiquity. I should say at the outset here that epitome was by no means the only purpose of illumination and that other ways in which pictures are worth a thousand words are well illustrated by the extraordinary naturalistic drawings of plants and herbs in the sixth-century Vienna Dioscorides,[37] or the fine drawings of buildings in the Agrimensores manuscripts.[38] We need not assume that all uses of images are epitomic or exemplary, but rather that their functions are rhetorically flexible and attuned to the contexts in which they were employed.[39]

The particular issue of visual epitome in the new medium of the codex and at a heightened level of intermedial juxtaposition with the painted picture set against or alongside the written text, makes the creative options developed by manuscript illumination of particular interest for the late antique moment. If we take visual decoration in books to have qualities of epitome and exemplarity that are exceptionally close to textual models, late antique examples nonetheless play in numerous ways. I will focus here on the variety of such issues inside illustrated manuscripts, rather than on the epitomic arguments made – for instance – by the decorated bindings of early books, which could represent complex themes and could be executed in valuable materials, for the consumption of a much wider public than the interiors of the same codices.[40] My focus will be on the complex visual strategies of epitome first in non-Christian books, although ones very likely produced in Christian contexts, and then in Bibles and Gospel books.

Let us begin with the surviving illuminations of a remarkable manuscript probably made towards the end of the fifth century in Rome. The so-called Roman Vergil (Ms. Vat. Lat. 3867 in the Vatican Library) was an enormous book of 410 fine sheepskin parchment folios, each measuring about 350 x 335 mm in size, containing the *Eclogues*, *Georgics* and *Aeneid*.[41] The book was richly illustrated. A small header illumination was supplied at the beginning of each of the *Eclogues* (the first seven of which survive), a double-page spread at the opening of each of the four *Georgics* (of which only two images survive from before the third Georgic) and a double-page spread with two illustrations at the opening of each book of the *Aeneid* (of which ten pictures survive out of the original twenty-four).[42] The text was written in highly legible large rustic capitals in brown ink with rubric for emphasis. I want to claim that the illuminations do effective epitomic work, of different kinds, in relation to the text they illustrate, and that as a sequence or collection of epitomes they make a major contribution to the formal effect and handling of the codex as well as offering interpretative or exegetic emphases (in the choice of what to illustrate) and creating a visual paratext through which – for instance – a non-literate peruser of the volume might nonetheless gain some sense of its contents.[43] We need to understand the illuminations as an essential part of the book technology of an expensive

luxury manuscript like the Roman Vergil,[44] so as to avoid modernizing errors in misunderstanding why some do not show what might to us seem like obvious narrative subjects.[45]

The illuminations of the *Eclogues*, at the first part of the book, are the only non-full-page pictures. In each case they illustrate the speaking voice of the given poem – giving the reader a visual cue as to whether she is being addressed by the poet directly or by a dialogue between speakers within the text. This works in an alternating fashion: *Eclogues* 1, 3, 5, 7 and 9 (this last now lost from the manuscript) are poetic conversations, with the speakers marked in rubric annotations to the left of the margin where the voice changes in the surviving poems, while *Eclogues* 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10 (the last two of these now lost) are works in a single voice. This vocal difference between alternating poems is performed by the miniatures. Vergil himself appears as a framed author portrait for the even-numbered poems in a single voice (even where that is largely the voice of a persona). Hence in Eclogue 2, a lament by the herdsman Corydon which carries the rubric heading 'POETA CORYDON' below the image, the marginal annotation 'POE' to the left of the first line, clearly indicating that the poet speaks and in the voice of Corydon, whose actual speech opening at line 6 is marked in the margin of fol. 4r. (Figure 4). The picture has a seated frontal author in tunic with clavi and a cloak, his feet on a footstool, holding a scroll with a lectern to his left and a capsa for containing rolls to his right (fol. 3v.).

This pattern is repeated for poems 4 and 6, though with the capsa and lectern reversed, the poet looking to the left and his feet (with no footstool) crossing the band that constitutes the picture's frame as though he were about to step into the space of the poem itself. The image for Eclogue 4 appears at the bottom of fol 9r. (at the end of poem 3), while the text only begins as you turn the page, where again the marginal annotation for the speaking voice reads 'POE' (fol. 9v.). The opening of the sixth Eclogue appears after the last line of poem 5 almost at the top of fol 14r (Figure 5). There is a long rubricated title line below the author portrait summarizing the poem's contents ('FAUNORUM SATYRORUM ET SILENORUM DELECTATIO') whose last letters taper away into the right margin, and again the cue for the speaking voice ('POE') in the left margin before the poem's first verse. In each of these cases, the illumination is an epitome of the poem (in the sense of choosing, and focalizing on, one quintessential aspect) that emphasizes its speaking voice as its author, and affirms the antiquated writerly context of a papyrus roll as opposed to the contemporary modernism of a parchment codex.

The pictures for the even-numbered *Eclogues* must be seen in dialogue with the very different visual strategy chosen for the odd poems, which are all conversations. In these cases, the header-picture always illustrates the speakers within the poem: two in the first Eclogue, three in the third, two in the fifth and three again in the seventh poem – although there a fourth herdsman, Daphnis, is mentioned as being present in the conversation (vv. 1–8) but omitted in the picture, one may surmise because he does not speak. We may assume that the ninth poem, now lost, would have reverted to two figures for its speakers Lycidas and Moeris. The range of images for the odd-numbered *Eclogues* provide collectively a chiasmic pictorial pattern of 2 figures, 3, 2, 3, 2. The somewhat abraided opening page of Eclogue 1 (fol. 1r.) has an image unlike any other in the book (Figure 6).

The illumination has no frame, extending across the upper half of the page (and has been cut down at the top when the folio was trimmed at some later point). The poem has no titular enumeration of its speakers in red ink (as in all the subsequent *Eclogues*) though their names are inscribed against their figures in the image; its first line is rubricated. As in the texts of later poems, the speaker is indicated at the right margin of the text, usually in red. The image appears specifically to illustrate the poem's opening verses, with Meliboeus standing and making a gesture of speech to the seated Tityrus, who is relaxing beneath a beech tree playing his pipe (as in vv. 1–2). Tityrus' pipe, virtually the first visual gesture of the entire codex, is the manuscript's only pictorial nod to the theme of pastoral music in the *Eclogues* (pipes are mentioned at the openings of Eclogue 1, v. 2; Eclogue 5, v. 2; Eclogue 6, v. 8 and at poem 10, v. 34), but the topic is visually revived in the left frontispiece to Georgic III (fol. 44v.).

The remaining Eclogue pictures are all within frames, the figures wreathed in bay crowns (perhaps reflecting Silenus' wreath in Eclogue 6, vv. 16–19) and carrying staffs, like the herdsmen in the prefatory images of Georgic III, fols. 44v. and 45r. In each case what has been identified as a herdsman's rustic shelter, a kind of tent perhaps made of reeds, with a flask suspended at the opening, appears within the illustration. The images do not represent the subjects or narrative content of their poems (for instance any love interest) but rather their setting, both rural and dramatic. The header for Eclogue 3 (fol. 6r.), at the top of the page, has the three speakers (Menalcas, Damoetas and Palaemon who will be the judge of their contest) seated, each making a gesture of speech. The rubric title, immediately below, names the three speakers in that order from left to right, but in fact the image depicts Palaemon on the left facing right, as the judge of the other two, who face him at the centre and to the right of the picture. No part of the picture extends beyond its frame. The image for poem 5 appears at the bottom of the page where the fourth Eclogue finishes (fol. 11r.), so that the text (including the rubric title with the speakers' names, Menalcas and Mopsus) is over the page on the other side of the folio (fol. 11v.). Here there is a rustic hut beside each figure – the one on the left greatly extending beyond the painting's left margin. The page with the image for Eclogue 7 (fol. 16v.) – again at the bottom of the folio, where the sixth poem ends – is the last in the run of the *Eclogues* to survive (Figure 7). This means the titulus and the text of the poem (which would have opened at the recto of the next page, facing this image) have been lost. This time the judge, Meliboeus, reclines on a rock in the centre of the visual field, listening to the two speakers, Corydon and Thyrsis, to his left and right. Again, the rustic hut and the feet of the dog beside it jut out beyond the frame to the right.

In the odd *Eclogues*, the frontispiece as pictorial epitome, while still insisting on the visual embodiment of the poem's speaking voices, gestures to the poems' dramatic content and context. The even *Eclogues* – as interiors with the poet in his imagined space of composition – visualize not the poem but the extra-textual figure of its creator; the odd *Eclogues* – as bucolic landscapes, with trees, grass, sheep, goats or cattle as well the herdsmen who are the speakers – picture a world and characters internal to the text they prefigure. In moving from the *Eclogues*, with their part-page prefatory single images for each poem, to the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid*, the *Roman Vergil* keeps the model of

frontispiece illuminations but shifts gear. From the *Georgics*, each book (admittedly much longer than any Eclogue) is given a double page pictorial spread before the start of the text, on what is frequently an inserted bifolium where the pages on the reverse of each illustration are left blank (Figure 8a and 8b). The images are not drawn in the centre of the page but with a wider margin to the outside, so that they sit relatively close to the central binding, but within the generous space afforded by the book's size.

The epitomic model – as two full-page pictures with no adjacent text, preceded by textual summary – is very different from the *Eclogues*, but remains prefatory. Moreover, as with the full prefatory scheme for the books of the *Aeneid* (only surviving complete for Books II and X), this is a complex mix of epitomic text and image. The double-page spread of images are preceded by a closing colophon for the preceding book and an *incipit*, in a border above and below made of red and brown ink, on one page (which may also include the last lines of the preceding book); this is followed on a separate page by a prose summary – itself a textual epitome – of the content of the next book in alternating red and brown ink lines (four lines for Georgic 3, eleven lines including title for the books of the *Aeneid*) again within a red brown ornamental border at top and bottom of the page; then there are blank pages before and after the pictures and finally the opening of the new book on a new page, signalled by three lines of rubric (see the Appendix).[46]

In the Georgics, only the two images from Book III have been preserved (Figure 8a and 8b). These are bucolic idylls with animals, herdsmen (one playing a flute) and rustic tents, which pick up the imagery and even the colour scheme of the odd *Eclogues* pictures but greatly expand the pictorial surface and ambition. They appear not to make any specific narrative reference to the text of the poem itself. However, there seems a potential exegetic inflection in the way they borrow much of their imagery (herdsmen, pipes, rustic hut) from the odd *Eclogues* yet their yellow colour scheme from the interiors of the even *Eclogues*, as if bringing the earlier set of poems together in a crowning synthesis.[47]

By contrast the ten full-page miniatures in a richer and more varied palette that survive (out of twenty-four) in the *Aeneid* are largely definitive selections from the narrative of the given book, almost as if they were quotations, excerpted from the main thrust and set aside at the front as a kind of summarizing pictorial epitome. In Book I only one image survives, the right half (i.e. the second picture) of the original pair, depicting Aeneas' response to the storm at sea (*Aen.*1.93–96, fol. 77r.). Book II preserves the original double illustration pattern as its frontispiece opening (Figure 9a and 9b). The first illustration shows Dido's banquet with Aeneas (fol. 100v.), Dido in the centre and Ascanius (who is in fact Cupid in disguise) reclining at table. Dido's hand is raised indicating her request to her guest to tell his tale (the closing lines of *Aen.*1.753–56) and Aeneas' hand is raised as he recounts his story (*Aen.* 2.1–2). The second picture shows the story of Sinon bringing the Wooden Horse to Troy (*Aen.* 2.57–194, fol. 101r.), which is both the first major episode of Book II and part of the content of Aeneas' speech as depicted in the preceding picture. This image may thus stand for itself as an epitome of the narrative and may also be a kind of speech bubble, summarizing what Aeneas is saying in the previous painting. No picture survives from Book III and only the second of the two from Book IV. This is a sober and fully-clothed depiction of the love-making

of Dido and Aeneas in the cave (*Aen*. 4.160–68), with the bulk of the scene including trees, horses and an ochre pastoral background recalling the imagery of the odd *Eclogues* and the *Georgics*. The one surviving miniature from Book V, mis-bound at fol. 76v., shows a very loose version of the sacrifice in honour of Anchises (*Aen*. 5.42–103); it is less clearly tied to the text of the *Aeneid* than any of the other miniatures.[48] No image survives from Book VI and from Book VII only that on the right hand side of the original pair, which shows a crucial episode, Ascanius shooting Silvia's pet stag (*Aen*. 7.496–99, fol. 163r.). No picture remains from Book VIII but from Book IX the left half of the original pair shows Iris appearing to Turnus (from the very opening of the Book, 9.1–5, mis-bound at fol. 74v.). The double page spread from Book 10 shows two frontal images of the Council of the Gods (10.1–95, fol. 234v. and 235r.) both beneath a dome-like rainbow flanked by sun and moon.[49]

The final surviving miniature from the *Aeneid* (mis-bound at fol. 188v.) is the left side of the two frontispiece images (Figure 10). It clearly indicates a battle scene, perhaps from the last book of the epic. It has been suggested this is the single combat of Aeneas and Turnus on which the epic climaxes (*Aen*. 12.704–24) before Turnus turns to flight (from verse 731), but in that episode no one has a bow and arrow (as does the leading warrior in the Phrygian cap on the left with his quiver emphasized on the ground between the two heroes in the painting)[50] and their duel is explicitly by sword (*Aen*. 12.695 and 709 (*ferro*), 729 (*ensem*), 731 (*ensis*)).[51] If we stress the pictorial emphasis on an archer as the main protagonist to the left, then other options arise. At 12.266, Tolumnius the Rutulian augur breaks the truce by hurling his dart (*telum contorsit*): could this have been understood by the draughtsman as shooting an arrow rather than throwing a spear? At 12.311–23, in response to the rise of battle, Aeneas attempts to hold back the Trojans from responding, and is struck explicitly by an arrow (*sagitta*) shot from an unknown hand. But in this passage Aeneas is described as bare-headed with right hand unarmed (which is to say, certainly without the helmet and shield of the lead-warrior to the right of the miniature): *dextram tendebat inermem/nudato capite*, 12.311–12. And the miniature makes a major protagonist of the archer by contrast with the poem's insistence on uncertainty (*incertum qua pulsa manu, quo turbine adacta*, 12.320). Also, in principle, the artist has distinguished Trojans from Rutulians by their helmets (Phrygian caps for the Trojans on the left and plumed helmets on the right): both the last two options I have suggested from the text have the archer as an Italian, rather than a Trojan, whereas in the painting the archer is clearly leading the Trojans. At the same time, since the image has been displaced and misbound, it is not impossible it refers to a contest in a different book. A strong candidate whose textual detail fits most of the pictorial intimations is Aeneas's son Ascanius' victory with bow and arrows over Turnus' brother-in-law Numanus Remulus (9.590–637). Unfortunately, the miniature is a left-hand opening, just like the one surviving picture from Book 9 (fol. 74v.), which appears to make this identification impossible or at any not possible for the opening of Book 9.[52] Perhaps the search for illustrative precision is misguided, and the point of this visual epitome is a generalized evocation that can stand for each of these episodes or all together, in effect an epitomic summary of all the battles that characterize the second

half of the *Aeneid*. Indeed, if the scene evokes (or also evokes) the killing of Achilles by Paris's arrow, foretold at his death by Hector at *Iliad* 22.358–60 and recapitulated in Aeneas' prayer as he enters the underworld at *Aeneid* 6.56–58, then the miniature is an epitome of the entire *aristeia* tradition of individual battles in epic. Certainly, this is a case where no one passage in the text fully coheres with the visual details, and so 'illustration' (if that were ever the intent) is not precise.

By contrast with the miniatures of the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, where the epitomic strategy avoids narrative quotation from within the text, those of the *Aeneid* are largely drawn from the narrative as illustrations, with the interesting exception of fol. 188v., just discussed, but by virtue of their being pulled out to the front and emphasized they function also as an exegetic emphasis that potentially directs the reader's interpretation of what is important. An illiterate peruser of the manuscript would gain some version of its narrative content through looking only at the selection of 24 pictures. At the same time, the visual strategy is one that abbreviates the text radically in choosing what to illustrate. If we take all the illustrations together, then clearly each is an epitomic frontispiece, but the strategies of summary and abbreviation are radically different. The varied strategies include emphasizing the speaking voice within a given poem (in the *Eclogues*); evoking a poem's general character (in the case of Georgic III); and selecting from a long and complex epic narrative (in the case of the *Aeneid*), which also implies imposing a potential interpretive scheme upon it. The twenty-four pictures that made up the epitome of the *Aeneid* were themselves of course effectively a mini-narrative in pictorial form, a medial transformation of the textual narrative into discrete visual segments constructing a kind of chronology. Finally, the images all define the beginnings of independent poems or books within a longer cycle, which means they also aid the reader in knowing where an earlier poem has ended. There is no surviving overall image for the entire collection of the three canonical works of Vergil, although there might well have been one (for example a portrait) to accompany an overall title. Visual epitome here has a pragmatic function in aiding a reader's navigation through the monolithic blocks of text that constitute a codex of over 400 folios, but it also has a series of exegetical functions in stressing particular aspects of the text that it introduces. Here the difference in palette between the illuminations of the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, on the one hand, and the *Aeneid*, on the other, may have some significance, as might the repeated visual motifs – such as rustic huts and suspended flasks in the bucolic books and military gear like shields and quivers in the epic. It is worth noting that the images of the *Roman Vergil*, even as they visualize Vergil's poetic works, make no reference to the rich textual visualizations within his poems in the form of ekphrasis.[53] The illuminations of the *Roman Vergil*, quite apart from their art-historical significance and their place in the history of the illustrated codex, are a contribution to and out of the rich late antique culture of the reception of Vergil.[54] This is a world steeped in epitome – from the passages picked out for commentary by Servius,[55] to the making of new poems out of selected spolia from Vergil's verses in the art of the cento.[56]

The richness of functions – effectively arising from the 'double purpose' of brevity as defined by the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* – is typical of late antique illumination. In the

now lost manuscript of the plays of Terence, made in Rome about 400 AD, which was copied along with its illuminations in a series of major Carolingian and later versions,[57] there was an initial frontispiece to the entire collection showing the author, Terence, in an imago clipeata within a square frame on a pedestal, held by two figures in theatrical masks (Figure 11).[58] Each play was then given a separate frontispiece – a fine aedicule flanked by coloured columns containing shelves, on which were placed theatrical masks in the same number as the given play's speaking parts (Figure 12).[59] These are highly formalized epitomic strategies with significant functions in the book's ancient handling – to indicate the single authorship of the collection and to define the opening of each play as well as its voices. But then within each play a very rich range of miniatures offer illustration of particular chosen episodes, with several figures, usually labelled, as well as a speaking figure for each prologue (Figure 13). Here a complex strategy of emphasis of particular scenes within the dramatic action is enacted through representation, a literal visualization of the given play alongside and interspersed within its written text.[60] It has generally been accepted that these illustrations of the dramatic action coincide with scene divisions.[61] Here we have different kinds of epitomic strategies again – on the one hand, prefatory and formal, on the other, forms of condensing a written text into brief visual vignettes.

That mixture appears beyond ancient pagan texts in the miniatures of the Christian visual tradition. For example, in the sixth- or early seventh-century Syriac Bible in Paris, known as Syr. 341, each book in both the Old and the New Testaments is prefaced by an illumination.[62] The book is unfortunately incomplete but it offers three kinds of epitomes: author portraits for several of the prophets and for St James the apostle (fol. 174r., 175r., 178r., 178v., 179v., 180r., 180v., 181r., 181v., 182r., 212r., 218v., 248r., e.g. Figure 14), narrative vignettes for books such Exodus, Numbers, Job and Ezekiel (fol. 8r., 25r., 46r., 162r., e.g. Figure 15), and a fascinating typological image as the frontispiece for the Book of Proverbs (fol. 118r., Figure 16). This shows the Virgin standing between Solomon who holds a book (presumably the text of Proverbs itself, of which he is the author) with his right hand raised in blessing and a female personification who carries a cross and a Bible – conceivably Ecclesia (the Church) or Sophia, Wisdom, the subject of Proverbs (who is personified female within it, e.g. Proverbs 3:13–18). The Virgin holds a blue mandorla containing the Child, who stands inside (as if in her womb) and makes a blessing with his right hand in emulation of Solomon. Here the image of Solomon is a portrait of the book's author, but the Christian resonances of the text are signalled by the Virgin and Ecclesia, as well as the way Christ is presented – both incarnate and at the same time inside his mother. In this manuscript, very similar combinations of prefatory and epitomic visual strategies are in use but with the addition of Christian typology in an exegetic frame to show how Solomon's proverbs effectively prefigure the coming of Christ.

The immense complexity and range of possibilities for prefatory epitome in the visual culture of the Christian late antique codex may be glimpsed by looking at the manuscript of the Rossano Gospels,[63] written in Greek in the sixth century and from the Eastern Mediterranean (scholarship currently assumes Syria or Palestine),[64] which is now in the Diocesan Museum of Rossano in Calabria. This book was of about the same grandeur as the Roman Vergil – roughly half of it survives, comprising the Gospels of Matthew and

most of Mark, at 188 parchment folios or 366 pages with a size of 300 × 250 mm per page but this after some later trimming.[65] But it was more lavish than the Vergil – all its pages dyed purple and its text written in silver ink, with the opening three lines of each Gospel in gold.[66] The images – of which fourteen remain and many (including the Canon Tables) have been lost – were painted on thicker parchment than the rest of the manuscript and were collected in a spectacular burst at the front,[67] with an additional evangelist portrait probably prefacing each Gospel in the original binding, of which only Mark (fol. 121r.) survives (Figure 17).[68] In particular, the Rossano Gospels, like the sixth-century Syriac Rabbula Gospels and the spectacular eighth-century full Bible known as Codex Amiatinus,[69] makes use of a model of the preliminary gathering of an extended cycle of images to give a rich visual and exegetic introduction to the book.[70]

The splay of prefatory miniatures in its surviving form (which includes some images bound in the wrong places as well as losses) represents an extended Passion cycle, starting with the Entry into Jerusalem (fol 1v.) and in its current condition ending with the Trial of Christ in two miniatures back to back on the same leaf (foll. 8r. and 8v.), intermixed with miracle scenes (the raising of Lazarus, fol. 1r.) and the healing of the blind man (fol. 7r.) and parables (the Wise and Foolish Virgins, fol. 2v. and the Good Samaritan, fol. 7v.). It has been suggested that in addition to the now lost Eusebian Canon tables, and their prefatory folio depicting the four evangelists in a ring surrounding the title to the Canons that reads 'Structure of the Canon of the harmony of the Gospels' (fol. 5r.), there may have been four leaves of initial miniatures (perhaps with Nativity narratives) and two further leaves with concluding miniatures.[71] In the eight pages that remain bound in their original order (foll. 1r.–4v.), a relatively detailed Passion narrative is outlined – the Entry to Jerusalem (fol. 1v.), the Expulsion of the Money Changers from the Temple (fol. 2r.), the Last Supper and Washing of the Feet (fol. 3r.), two versions of the Communion to the Apostles on facing pages (foll. 3v. and 4r.), and the Agony in the Garden (fol. 4v.) – but headed by the Raising of Lazarus (fol. 1r.) and with the insertion of the Parable of the Virgins (fol. 2v.). This mixture is enforced by the deliberate use of episodes from all four Gospels to create the images as a unified diatessaron.[72]

The total effect of the visual cycle at the book's opening is to summarize a series of key narrative events of scripture, through visual epitomes that are displaced from direct relation to the flow of the Gospel text or juxtaposition with the specific texts or titles to which they relate (by contrast to other illuminated sixth-century manuscripts).[73] Moreover the narrative thus created, at any rate in the elements of the cycle that survive, combines events from Christ's Passion with his miracles and his teaching in the form of parables. The visual epitomes of the two parables supply significant interpretative exegesis in that in both cases the male protagonist is represented as Christ himself (the Good Samaritan and the Bridegroom that comes for the Wise Virgins, Figure 18). This is extra-textual in relation to the Gospel narratives illustrated, but deeply embedded in traditions of Patristic commentary.[74] Since the visual epitomes allude to texts from all four Evangelists, they together enact a harmonization in visual form of the four Gospels.[75] This unification of Scripture as a prefatory pictorial sequence itself appears to have framed the Canon tables, which enact the model of harmonization in textual form and

through visual tabulation. In other words, the pictorial preface of the Rossano Gospels uses the juxtaposition of Scriptural imagery to construct a visual summary of the book for which it is frontispiece and to frame the written Scripture that follows in a highly interpretative, although entirely orthodox, fashion.

If we move to the level of the individual page, then the subtlety of the typological use of pictorial epitomes becomes still more clear. Ten of the illuminated pages employ the following format. A title or *kephalaion* is written in silver letters at the top of the page and the image related to this titulus is painted in the top third of the page, with a ground line that runs across the entire width. Below that there are four bust-length portraits of Old Testament prophets, themselves identified by written inscriptions, pointing upwards; either they hold open scrolls on which their texts are written (although with some seepage across the scroll into the background)[76] or they appear atop white-framed transparent columns over which extracts from their books in the Septuagint version are placed.[77] These excerpts and their placement reflect considerable scholarly and exegetic care in their selection, and several appear – alongside a liturgical focus in the images chosen for epitome (for instance a double-page opening of the Eucharist to the Apostles (foll. 3v. and 4r.) – to be quotations used in early liturgy.[78] Let us take an example. The page with the Good Samaritan (fol. 7v, illustrating Luke 10.30–36) has the title 'Concerning one who fell among thieves' (see Figure 18).[79] The miniature shows a walled city to the left, presumably Jerusalem from which the robbed man makes his journey (Luke 10. 30), then a scene of him lying naked while Jesus himself, as the Good Samaritan, in blue tunic and gold cloak with a gold cruciform halo tends to him, accompanied by a white-robed angel holding a golden bowl with veiled hands. To the right Jesus as the Samaritan leads the naked man, whom he has seated on his donkey, to the innkeeper into whose hands he puts the two pennies (Luke 10.34–35). It is worth noting that – as in a number of the other Scriptural miniatures – more than one episode is rendered, with Christ shown twice.[80]

Beneath the ground line are the names of the four Prophets or authors of the four texts that are written out as columns below the portraits of the Prophets. They are (left to right) David, Micah, David (repeated) and Sirach (Ecclesiasticus). The bust portraits of the figures below the inscribed names all have haloes and point upwards with their right hands directly signalling the Scriptural image above. These images effectively move the epitomic discourse from the visual abbreviation of narratives with exemplary pictures illustrating its content to the defining of a book (or excerpt) through its author, something also effectively done through the ring page with Evangelist portraits that prefaced the Canons (fol. 5r.). As we saw, both strategies are used in the Roman Vergil and the Vatican Terence, but not together on the same page as part of the same total synthesis of images and texts (including the epitomic *kephalaion*). David wears a golden crown and is dressed like Christ in blue and gold (probably the most expensive pigments – lapis lazuli and gold),[81] announcing the royal heritage of the Messiah. He is by a long way the figure who appears most frequently across the surviving Rossano illuminations in this context,[82] probably reflecting the liturgical significance of the selected texts since he is invariably present as author of the Psalms. The texts beneath are from Psalm 93.17: 'Unless the Lord

came to my aid, my soul would have soon dwelt in Hades'; from Micah 7.19: 'He will turn and will have compassion upon us because he is the one who desires mercy'; from Psalm 117.7: 'The Lord is my helper and I will gaze upon my enemies'; from Sirach 18.13: 'The mercy of a man is on his neighbour, but the mercy of God is on all flesh'.[83] The texts are themselves excerpted epitomes that stand figurally or typologically for the New Testament episode to which their portrayed speakers point. But the choice of four creates a dynamic of foretelling voices that emphasize respectively the perspective of the robbed traveller (to whose aid the Lord has come in the first Psalmic quotation), the action of the Samaritan as Jesus (in the second quotation about compassion), the sense of being saved by the help of the Lord (in the third passage, and the image of the naked man on the donkey) and a general commentarial reflection on the entire episode in the reflection on the mercy of man and the mercy of God in the last excerpt.[84] This immense richness of meaning is itself underpinned by the Patristic tradition that aligned the Samaritan with Christ, but which is not cited explicitly in the page. The fact that the four texts appear as if they were columns on which their authors sit gives the sense, visually, that they not only foretell but uphold the Incarnational dispensation of the upper image, which not only shows Jesus but actually illustrates his spoken words from the Gospel – the epitomic work being visually parallel to that of the odd *Eclogues* in the Roman Vergil (illustrating the frame and action depicted in the text) but in this case conflating speaker with actor, by contrast with the author portraits, which only illustrate their respective speaking voices.

Conclusion

I have argued that visual epitome was essentially a rhetorical trope in Roman culture – parallel and related to the literary model of concision for a double purpose and its relation to exemplarity. In Roman art it was one of the key features of the freedom that motivated replication (figural and non-figural), which underpins what I would describe as the discursive (rather than semantic) nature of Roman visual culture,[85] in which the decorative and the ornamental are quite as powerful as figures,[86] the frame quite as substantial as the content, from the rhetorical point of view.[87] But in keeping with the late antique focus of this collection, I have concentrated particularly on the remarkable richness of strategies whereby an epitomic image used to encapsulate text, often a frontispiece, performs radically different functions in the new medium of the illuminated codex. The multiplicity of options – including the juxtaposition of verbal epitomes with visual ones – comes to a climax in the brilliant word-and-image conflations of the greatest early Christian codices, with their use of this rhetorical structure to perform significant exegetical and interpretative work.

It is worth noting the vast quantity of issues I have not mentioned – such as the richness of visual epitome as portraiture as well as abbreviated mythology in the Roman art of the mid-to-late empire (for instance in the use of portrait heads on figures or in medallions on sarcophagi, including ones whose features are left blank, as are the heads of the philosopher and the orant in the Santa Maria Antiqua sarcophagus).[88] And, of

course in turning to manuscripts, I have neglected the range of epitomic uses of Christian narratives not only on all kinds of small-scale objects from liturgical implements to reliquaries, from household cutlery and crockery to textiles and gems, but also on the large-scale painted and mosaic cycles that came to decorate church space as well as funerary contexts. That is, in addition to the relatively small-scale and specific but immensely intricate process of inventing the Christian book as a material artefact, there is a vast world of Christian visual epitome – drawing on that of pre-Christian Roman art, and developing from it in a wide range of creative ways – that would need a full account. late antiquity is of particular interest as being a crucial hinge point where rhetorical models of visual culture both remained close to and indeed drew on the long and vibrant tradition of Roman imperial art, on the one hand, but at the same time developed radically new models that would come to define the arts of the Middle Ages, on the other.

Appendix

The prefatory structure of the Books of the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid* in the Roman Vergil

The three places where the full run of these pages survives are:

Fol. 43r. end of G II/incipit G III, in a double red/brown border above and below, beneath the last 3 lines of G II on same page
Fol 43v. summary of G III in 4 lines (alternating in red and brown ink) within a red/brown ornamental border at top and bottom of page
Fol 44r. blank
Foll 44v. and 45r. picture pages
Fol. 45v. blank
Fol 46r. opening of G III (first 3 lines in red)

Fol 99r. end of A I/incipit A II, in a double red/brown border at top and bottom of page
Fol 99v. summary of A 2 in 11 lines (first one a title, alternating in red and brown ink) within a red brown ornamental border at top and bottom of page
Fol 100r. blank
Foll 100v. and 101r. picture pages
Fol. 101v. blank
Fol 102r. opening of A II (first 3 lines in red)

Fol 232v. end of A IX/incipit A X with a single red/brown border above and below, beneath the last 5 lines of A IX on same page
Fol 233r. blank
Fol 233v. summary of A X in 11 lines (first one a title, alternating in red and brown ink) within a red brown ornamental border at top and bottom of page

Fol 234r. blank
Foll 234v./235r. picture pages
Fol 235v. blank
Fol 236r. opening of A X (first 3 lines in red)

Notes

* This paper was commissioned by the editors for this volume. I gave versions in person before the Covid-19 crisis at the Ethical Reading Seminar run by Constanze Güthenke and Hindy Najman in Oxford and during the crisis at the Late Antique and Byzantine Art seminar organized by Robert Nelson and Vasileios Marinis at Yale via Zoom. I am grateful to all who participated, commented and sent me notes by email – they helped me sharpen both my argument and my observations.

1. Proverb, first attested in 1927, according to the *Oxford Dictionary of Quotations and Proverbs* (proverb 726).
2. See OED online under 'epitome'. For epitome in early modern English literature, see Wheatley 2011: esp. 1–38 and Osorio Whewell 2019 with interesting reflections on issues of paratextuality.
3. E.g. Lowrie and Lüdemann 2015; Goldhill 2017; Roller 2018; Langlands 2018; Rood, Atack and Philips 2020: 145–68. Oddly, this literature does not address issues of abbreviation or epitome that always accompany the choice and use of examples.
4. On synopsis, see e.g. Stansbury O'Donnell 1999: 5–7, 89–91; Squire 2011: 252–9. Recently on the visual figuration of Ovidian narratives, see Salvo 2015.
5. E.g. Pearson 2015: 158–62, or Elsner 2020a: 19–22.
6. Narcissus: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 3. 339–510; Hodske 2007: 166–71 for a repertoire of images.
7. Notable earlier accounts include Opelt 1962. More recently, see Risch 2003; Gärtner and Eigler 2004; Nosarti 2009: 30–42; Horster and Reitz 2010; Gasti 2015: 345–67; Schwedler, Schwitter and Dusil 2017**;** Borgna 2018: 47–105; Grethlein 2019; Manafis 2020.
8. See Dubischar 2010: 40–8.
9. For the revolution from roll to codex, see Turner 1977; Roberts and Skeat 1983; Blanck 1992: 75–101; Cavallo 1997 and 2010; Mazal 1999: 125–51; Szirmai 1999: 7–94; Schipke 2013: 143–52; Boudelis 2018. For the Christian book in particular, see e.g. Halbertal 1997; Gamble 2000; Stanton 2004; Hurtado 2006: 43–94; Grafton and Williams 2006; Klingshirn and Safran 2009; Wallraff 2013; Stroumsa 2014.
10. E.g. Luhtala 2010.
11. For instance, in Latin Livy, with e.g. Chaplin 2010 and Horster 2017; in Greek Dio Cassius with e.g. Mallan 2013.
12. See for instance Dubischar 2010: 48–50 (on Galen and self-synopsis); Müller 2010; Whitmarsh 2010: 316–19; Dyck 2010; Ingelbert 2010.
13. See e.g. the *progymnasmata* of Aelius Theon 16, ed. Patillon and Bolognesi 1997: 110–12.
14. See Patillon 1997; Chiron 2007: 101–4.
15. Anaximenes of Lampsachus, *ars rhetorica* 6, in Spengel 1853: 209; Fuhrmann 2000: 30; Chiron 2002: 38.

16. Tryphon, *de tropis* in Spengel 1856: 202.
17. See Patillon 2002, vol. 1: viii–x.
18. Spengel 1853: 500; also Patillon 2002, vol. 1: 151–2.
19. See Halm 1863: 17; Barabino 1967: 192; Brooks 1970: 33.
20. Halm 1863: 65; d'Angelo 2001: 56 and 93–4 for discussion.
21. Julius Victor, *ars rhetorica* 419, 423–24, in Giomini and Celentano 1980: 65, 71–2; Marius Victorinus, *commenta in Ciceronis rhetorica* 1.20 and 22, in Halm 1863: 204–5, 210 and Ippolito 2006: 90–1, 99; see also Riesenweber 2015, vol. 1: 13–17 for authorship.
22. Alcuin (Albinus Magister), *disputatio de rhetorica et de virtutibus* 23–25: Halm, 1863: 536–7; translation in Howell 1965: 102–5. Note section 23: 'reduce the speech to main points which are brief in statement, comprehensive in scope and few in number . . .'
23. Anonymous, *excerpta rhetorica ex codice Parisino 7530*: Halm, 1863: 588; http://digiliblt.lett.unipmn.it/upload/pdf/DLT000178.pdf at p. 3 'de historia'.
24. See e.g. Elsner and Squire 2016. The uses of images (*Imagines*) placed in particular spaces (*loci*) in the instructions for the art of memory in Roman textbooks is a clear example of visual epitome being instrumentalized: see e.g. the anonymous *ad Herennium* 3.29.
25. For allegorical signification of myths on sarcophagi, see e.g. Newby 2016: 273–319.
26. See e.g. Raeck 1992: 71–8; Borg 2013: 162–3, 164–78, 209–11; Borg 2014; Allen 2022.
27. Mosaics: Dunbabin 1978: 38–45 (although unfortunately focused around 'decline'); Muth 1998: 282–9. Sarcophagi: Sichtermann 1966: 82–7; Brandenburg 1967: 210 and 240–3; Blome 1978; Wrede 1981: 171–5; Koch and Sichtermann 1982: 615–17; Koortbojian 1995: 138–41; Muth 2004; Borg 2013: 161–211; Borg 2014: 328–51; Allen 2022 *passim*.
28. For instance: Smith 1988; Hughes 2009.
29. This is archetypally true of the so-called Iliac tablets of the first century BC, where a single minuscule picture represents a whole book of the Iliad. See the recent accounts of Squire 2011, and Petrain 2014.
30. See esp. Hölscher 2004: 2–3, 86–101, 113–16, 125–7. For some discussion, see Elsner 2006: 270–6, 293–4.
31. See Pearson 2015: 151–8 on ephebic figures and 159–60 on 'accoutrements, background scenery and subordinate figures to build up layers of meaning' and to 'make a precise mythological character identifiable'; Elsner and Squire 2016: 191–203. A handy collection of illustrated examples from Pompeii are available in Hodske, 2007.
32. On Christian typology in art, see Thümmel 1985; Schrenk 1995; Elsner 1995: 271–87; Mohnhaupt 2000; Tkacz 2002: 51–62; Elsner 2014b: 338–47.
33. See Sichtermann 1992: 54–5 (under 'Robert nr. 92') and https://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?assetId=376347001&objectId=459806&partId=1. There is a rich discussion including Gerke 1940, 17–19 and 331 (no. II, 27); Sichtermann 1966: 68–75; Fittschen 1969; Engemann 1973: 29–30; Walker 1990, no. 36; Koortbojian 1995: 91–2, 137–41; Birks 2013: no. 576 and pp. 146–7.
34. See esp. Sichtermann 1966: 68–75. Other isolated Endymion sarcophagi include that in the Palazzo Braschi (with Sichtermann 1992, no. 102), while other isolated Ariadne sarcophagi include one in Naples (with Matz 1969, no. 229 and Birks 2013, no. 559) and one in Copenhagen (with Wrede 1981, no. 54 and Birks 2013, no. 21).
35. See Zanker and Ewald 2012: 100–2.

36. See Bovini. and Brandenburg 1967, no. 747; Engemann, 1973: 70–6; Huskinson 2008: 290–2; Zanker and Ewald 2012: 262–3.
37. Codex Medicus Graecus 1, Austrian National Library: with Mazal 1998–9.
38. See e.g. Carder 1978.
39. For mss. illustration within the larger pattern of relations between image and text in Roman culture, see Squire and Elsner forthcoming.
40. See Lowden 2007; Boudelis 2018: 97–145.
41. See Effenberger 1977; Bertelli 1985; Wright 1992: 15–34 and 131–40 for codicological reconstruction; Wright 2001 and the fine digitized version at https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.lat.3867.
42. See Wright 1992: 17–23.
43. For these reasons and because my topic is visual epitome, I will not engage in the discussion about the extent to which the images of the *Roman Vergil* come from stock themes or are copies of some lost earlier exemplar. See Wright 1992: 58–9, 70–3, 75–6, 80–1, 84, 89–90, 93, 96–7, 101–2, 106, 108–9, 114, 118–19, 122–4.
44. This is one reason why I am hesitant about the 'illustration' model for studying the images in manuscripts (on which e.g. Penny Small 2003: 118–54). For more on prefatory images within the structure, apparatus and reception of the early codex, see Elsner 2020b.
45. Wright systematically falls into such errors: e.g. Wright 2001: 19 'the illustration . . . does not correspond to any specific moment in the narrative and so must be thought of as an improvisation out of stock elements . . . rendered with less than complete understanding', or 20 'taking the easy path by avoiding mythological content'. This kind of thing is nonsense, fundamentally (and anachronistically) misconstruing what the illuminations are doing.
46. This pattern appears, in cases where there have not been losses or mis-bindings, for Georgic III, fol. 43r. to 46r.; *Aeneid* 2, fol. 99r. to 102r.; *Aeneid* 10, fol. 233r. to 236r. See the Appendix.
47. My thanks to Tobias Reinhardt for this suggestion.
48. Wright 2001: 33.
49. The rainbow picks up that raised by Iris in fol. 74v. from Book 9.
50. The quiver on the ground with arrows inside between figures is an odd repeated fixture of a number of the surviving *Aeneid* miniatures, rather like the rustic hut of the *Eclogues*. It recurs in the surviving images from Books 7 (fol 163r.), relatively comprehensible in the shooting of the stag, and very oddly between Iris and Turnus in the image from Book 9 (fol 74r.)
51. Wright 2001: 43. Wright places Aeneas as the figure on the left with the Phrygian cap and the bow, although he admits there is no bow in the text. Thanks to Christina Shuttleworth Kraus for discussion of the episode and miniature.
52. The problem here is that fol. 188v. is certainly a left-side opening, as is fol. 74 r. which is most likely from Book 9. Only one of these could have occupied that position, which is the strong argument for pushing 188 v. to Book 12. Of course, it is not impossible that, exceptionally, Book 9 might have had two images painted for the left-hand side and then bound together either consecutively or to face each other, but this strays into realms of speculation that cannot be tested or proven.
53. See e.g. Kainia 2016: 82–8 on the 'notional ekphrasis' in Georgic III.1–48, which has no place in the manuscript's visual programme . . .
54. See e.g. Rees 2004; Ziolkowski and Putnam 2008; for bibliography see: http://virgil.org/bibliography/

55. For a bibliography of Servius, see http://virgil.org/bibliography/.
56. On the cento see e.g. Polara 1990; McGill 2005; Bažil 2009; Formisano and Sogno 2010; Pelttari 2014: 96–112; Hinds 2014, 171–98; Elsner 2017.
57. See Webber Jones and Rufus Morey 1931; Wright 2006; with https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.lat.3868 and http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b84525513/f1.image.
58. Jones and Morey 1931, plates 1–4; Wright 2006: 6–7.
59. Jones and Morey 1931, plates 7–8 (Andria), 323–4 (Heauton timoumenos), 448–9 (Adelphoe), 582–3 (Hecyra), 678–9 (Phormio); Wright 2006: 8–9 (Andria), 66–7 (Heauton timoumenos), 94–5 (Adelphoe), 126–7 (Hecyra), 148–9 (Phormio). The aedicule for Eunuchus appears to have been lost from the original late antique exemplar before it could be copied: see Wright 2006: 35.
60. See Dodwell 2000: 1–100, for some discussion.
61. E.g. Grant 1973: 90.
62. See Sörries 1991 and Sörries 1993: 89–93 with plates 47–50.
63. The fundamental literature includes: Gebhardt and von Harnack 1880; Haseloff 1898; Muñoz 1907; Ainalov, 1961: 108–24 (originally published in Russian, 1900); Cavallo, Gribomont and Loerke 1987 (with long review by Sevrugian 1989); Sevrugian 1990; Sörries 1993: 70–7, plates 38–40. See also http://www.codexrossanensis.it/en/.
64. But see the doubts about such assumptions (doubts with which I agree) in Lowden 1999: 21.
65. Details in Cavallo 1987: 24.
66. Cavallo 1987: 27.
67. The most comprehensive discussion of the prefatory sequence with codicological reconstruction is by Loerke 1987: 111–14. Thickness of parchment: Cavallo 1987: 24 and Loerke 1987: 109.
68. The portrait of St Mark, inspired by an unnamed female personification (who may be Sophia), is the only image without silver ink – both the title and the scroll on which he writes are inscribed in a red-orange ink, apparently cinnabar: see Bicchieri 2014: 14151, https://arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/1404/1404.6414.pdf. On the basis of the different ink and of the page's palaeography, some have argued that this image is not original to the book but a later pastiche (by no means unimpressively produced and of high quality): see Kresten and Prato 1985; Cutler 1989: 407; Lowden 1999: 20–1; Krueger 2004: 220, n. 67 (*contra* e.g. Sörries 1993: 76 and Loerke 1995). Recent scientific analysis has argued that the page is authentic and was not afflicted by the invasive and irreversible restoration to which the prefatory group of miniatures were subjected in 1917–19: see Bicchieri 2014: 14156.
69. On the Rabbula Gospels (Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, MS syr. Plut. 1.56), see Cecchelli, Furlani, and Salmi 1959; Bernabò 2008 and 2014. On Codex Amiatinus (Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, MS Amiatino 1), see Gameson 2018 and Chazelle 2019.
70. The placement and function of the Eusebian canon tables in Gospel Books is key to this model of a parade of frontispiece miniatures, which then appears to have acquired extra images beyond the arcades of the tables themselves. On the canon tables, see now Bausi, Reudenbach and Wimmer 2020. For rich discussion in relation to the eclectic selection of images in the preliminary gathering of Amiatinus, see Chazelle 2019: 311–449.
71. Loerke 1987: 111–14.
72. Loerke 1987: 110–11 for details and discussion.
73. For instance, the forty-three remaining folios from the Gospel of Matthew of the once huge Sinope Gospels, now in Paris, written entirely in gold on purple parchment, where on the five

illuminated pages the images appear at the bottom margin and in direct relation both to the Biblical episode illustrated and to the *kephalaion* or chapter title at the head of the page (which were supplied as organizing paratexts to Scripture in the fourth century). See e.g. Omont 1900; Muñoz 1907; Grabar 1948; Sörries 1993: 78–80; Lowden 1999: 21–4. One might also cite the two great sixth-century Genesis mss that are known to us, the Cotton Genesis (all but destroyed by fire in 1731) and the Vienna Genesis, both with half page illustrations interspersed in the text: see (with their bibliographies) Mazal 1980; Weitzmann and Kessler 1986; Sörries 1993,: 45–66; Lowden 1999: 13–18.

74. See Loerke 1987: 130 and 144 for some examples, although there are many more.
75. Loerke, 1987: 110.
76. For the view that they are scrolls, see Weitzmann 1977: 89; Loerke 1987: 122; Lowden 1999: 20. In the Sinope fragment, similar Old Testament figures as busts appear above similar framed texts alongside the miniatures. There the case for the frames representing scrolls rather than columns is stronger because the Prophets appear to be holding onto the thick bar at the top. But in the Rossano Codex their hands appear to be resting on the top as if on a parapet.
77. See Loerke 1987 for fullest discussion of the imagery; on the texts see now Hixson 2016.
78. See esp. Hixson 2016: 541; also Loerke 1975: 69, 72–3; Loerke 1987: 126–45.
79. περὶ *τοῦ ἐμπεσόντος εἰς τοὺς λῃστάς* (the italics here being a direct quotation from Luke 10.36); for transcription see Hixson 2016: 512, also 537. On the page's imagery, see e.g. Wetizmann 1977: 93–4; Loerke 1987: 143–5; Sevrugian 1990: 41–3
80. Other examples are fol 3r. (the Last Supper and Washing of the Feet, again with Jesus shown twice), fol. 4v. (the Agony in the Garden, with Jesus shown twice) and fol. 7r. on the reverse of the Samaritan page (the Healing of the Blind and the Washing at the Pool of Siloam).
81. See the table at Bicchieri 2014: 14150.
82. Twice at fol. 1r., fol. 1v., fol. 2r., fol. 3v., fol. 4r., fol. 4v., fol. 7r. fol. 7v.; three times at fol. 2v., fol. 3r. For more on David and pairing, see Loerke 1975: 69; Hixson 2016: 539–40. On the consistency of the David portrait across 22 instances, see Loerke 1987: 122.
83. Loerke 1987: 130; Hixson 2016: 512 (whose version I quote).
84. For some discussion, see Loerke 1987: 145; Hixson 2016: 533–4.
85. On art as rhetoric in Roman culture see especially Elsner 2014a.
86. On issues of Ornament, see Dietrich and Squire 2018.
87. On the question of framing, see Platt and Squire 2017.
88. For instance, on sarcophagi and portraiture, recently and in a long literature: Newby 2011; Studer-Karlen 2012; Birk 2013. On blank heads: Huskinson 1998; Russell 2013: 301–7; Elsner 2018.

Works cited

Ainalov, D. (1961), *The Hellenistic Origins of Byzantine Art*, New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Allen, M. (2022), *The Death of Myth on Roman Sarcophagi: Allegory and Visual Narrative in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

d'Angelo, R., ed. (2001), *Carmen de figuris et schematibus*, Hildesheim: Olms.

Barabino, G., ed. (1967), *P. Rutilii Lupi*, *Schemata dianoeas et lexeos*, Genoa: Istituto di filologia classica e medioevale.

Bausi, A., B. Reudenbach and H. Wimmer, eds (2020), *Canones: The Art of Harmony: The Canon Tables of the Four Gospels*, Berlin: De Gruyter.

Bažil, M. (2009), *'Centones Christiani': Métamorphoses d'une forme intertextuelle dans la poésie latine chrétienne de l'antiquité tardive*, Paris: Institut d'études augustiniennes.

Bernabò, M., ed. (2008), *Il Tetravangelo di Rabbula: Firenze, Biblioteca medicea laurenziana, Plut. 1.56; l'illustrazione del Nuovo Testamento nella Siria del VI secolo*, Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura.

Bernabò, M. (2014), 'The Miniatures in the Rabbula Gospels: Postscripta to a Recent Book', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers,* 68: 343–58.

Bertelli, C. (1985), *Vergilius Romanus*, Zurich: Belser.

Bicchieri, M. (2014), 'The Purple Codex Rossanensis: Spectroscopic Characterization and First Evidence of the Use of the Elderberry Lake in a 6th Century Manuscript', *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* 21: 14146–157.

Birks, S. (2013), *Depicting the Dead: Self-Representation and Commemoration on Roman Sarcophagi with Portraits*, Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.

Blanck, H. (1992), *Das Buch in der Antike*, Munich: Beck.

Blome, P. (1978), 'Zur Umgestaltung griechischer Mythen in der römischen Sepulkralkunst. Alkestis-, Protesilaos- und Proserpinasarkophage', *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Rom* 85: 435–57.

Borg, B (2013), *Crisis and Ambition: Tombs and Burial Customs in Third-Century* CE *Rome*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Borg, B (2014), 'Rhetoric and Art in Third Century AD Rome', in J. Elsner and M. Meyer (eds), *Art and Rhetoric in Roman Culture*, 235–55, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Borgna, A. (2018), *Ripensare la storia universale: Giustino e l'*Epitome *delle* Storie Filippiche *di Pompeo Trogo*, Hildesheim: Olms.

Boudelis, G. (2018), *The Codex and Crafts in Late Antiquity*, New York: Bard Graduate Center.

Bovini, G. and H. Brandenburg (1967), *Repertorium der christlich-antiken Sarkophage I. Rom und Ostia*, Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Brandenburg, H. (1967), 'Meerwesensarkophage und Clipeus-Motiv', *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 82: 195–245.

Brooks, E., ed. (1970), *P. Rutilii Lupi*, *De figuris sententiarum et elocutionis,* Leiden: Brill.

Carder, J. (1978), *Art Historical Problems of a Roman Land-Surveying Manuscript*, New York: Garland.

Cavallo, G. (1987), 'The Purple Codex of Rossano: Book, Object, Symbol', in G. Cavallo, J. Gibromont and W. Loerke, *Codex purpureus Rossanensis, Museo dell'Arcivescovado, Rossano calabro: commentarium*, 23–41, Rome: Salerno.

Cavallo, G. (1997), 'Du volumen au codex: la lecture dans le monde romain', in G. Cavallo and R. Chartier (eds), *Histoire de la lecture dans le monde occidental*, 85–114, Paris: Seuil.

Cavallo, G. (2010), 'Libri, lettura e biblioteche nella tarda antichitá: un panorama e qualche riflessione', *Antiquité Tardive* 18: 9–19.

Cavallo, G., J. Gribomont and W. Loerke (1987), *Codex purpureus Rossanensis, Museo dell'Arcivescovado, Rossano calabro: commentarium*, Rome: Salerno.

Cecchelli, C., G. Furlani, and M. Salmi (1959), *The Rabbula Gospels: Facsimile Edition of the Miniatures of the Syriac ms. Plut. 1, 56 in the Medicaean-Laurentian Library*, Olton: Urs Graf.

Chaplin, J. (2010), 'The Livian Periochae and the Last Republican Writer', in M. Horster and C. Reitz (eds), *Condensing Texts – Condensed Texts*, 451–67, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Chazelle, C. (2019), *The Codex Amiatinus and Its 'Sister' Bibles*, Leiden: Brill.

Chiron, P., ed. (2002), *Pseudo-Aristote*, *Rhétorique à Alexandre,* Paris: Belles Lettres.

Chiron, P. (2007), 'The Rhetoric to Alexander', in I. Worthington (ed.), *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 90–105.

Cutler, A. (1989), 'The End of Antiquity in Two Illuminated Manuscripts', *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 2: 401–12.

Dietrich, N. and M. Squire, eds (2018), *Ornament and Figure in Greek and Roman Art*, Berlin: De Gruyter.

Dodwell, C. (2000), *Anglo-Saxon Gestures and the Roman Stage*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dubischar, M. (2010), 'Survival of the Most Condensed? Auxiliary Texts, Communications Theory and Condensation of Knowledge', in M. Horster and C. Reitz (eds), *Condensing Texts – Condensed Texts*, 39–67, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Dunbabin, K. (1978), *The Mosaics of Roman North Africa: Studies in Iconography and Patronage*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dyck, A. (2010), 'Cicero's Abridgement of His Speeches for Publication', in M. Horster and C. Reitz (eds), *Condensing Texts – Condensed Texts*, 369–74, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Effenberger, C. (1977), 'Die Miniaturen des Vergilius Romanus, Codex Vat. Lat. 3867', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 70: 58–90.

Elsner J. (1995), *Art and the Roman Viewer*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Elsner, J. (2006), 'Classicism in Roman Art', in J. Porter (ed.), *Classical Pasts: The Classical Traditions of Greece and Rome*, 270–97, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Elsner, J. (2014a), 'Art and Rhetoric in Roman Culture: Introduction', in J. Elsner and M. Meyer, *Art and Rhetoric in Roman Culture*, 1–34, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Elsner, J. (2014b), 'Rational, Passionate and Appetitive: The Psychology of Rhetoric and the Transformation of Visual Culture from non-Christian to Christian Sarcophagi in the Roman World', in J. Elsner and M. Meyer, *Art and Rhetoric in Roman Culture*, 316–34, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Elsner, J. (2017), 'Late Narcissus: Classicism and Culture in a Late Roman *Cento*', in J. Hernandez Lobato and J. Elsner (eds), *The Poetics of Late Latin Literature*, 176–205, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Elsner, J. (2018), 'The Embodied Object Recensions of the Dead on Roman Sarcophagi', *Art History* 41: 546–65.

Elsner, J. (2020a), 'Mutable, Flexible, Fluid: Papyrus Drawings for Textiles and Replication in Roman Art', *The Art Bulletin* 102.3: 7–27.

Elsner, J. (2020b), 'Beyond Eusebius: Prefatory Images and the Early Book', in A. Bausi, B. Reudenbach and H. Wimmer (eds), *Canones: The Art of Harmony: The Canon Tables of the Four Gospels*, 99–128, Berlin: De Gruyter.

Elsner, J. and M. Meyer, eds (2014), *Art and Rhetoric in Roman Culture*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Elsner, J. and M. Squire (2006), 'Vision and Memory', in M. Squire (ed.), *Sight and the Ancient Senses*, 188–212, London: Routledge.

Engemann, J. (1973), *Untersuchungen zur Sepulkralsymbolik der späteren römischen Kaiserzeit*, Münster: Aschendorff.

Fittschen, K. (1969), 'Review of Sichtermann (1966)', *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 221: 41–9.

Formisano, M. and C. Sogno (2010), 'Petite poésie portable: The Latin Cento in Its Late Antique Context', in M. Horster and C. Reitz (eds), *Condensing Texts – Condensed Texts*, 375–94, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Fuhrmann, M. ed. (2000), *Anaximenes*, *Ars rhetorica*, Leipzig: Teubner.

Gamble, H. (2000), *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Gameson, R. (2018), 'Codex Amiatinus: Making and Meaning', *Jarrow Lecture 2017*, Jarrow: The Parish Church Council of St. Paul's Church.

Gärtner, H. and U. Eigler (2004), 'Epitome', *Brill's New Pauly* 4: 1154–6.
Gasti, F. (2015), *'La forma breve della prosa nella storiografia latina d'età imperiale tarda'*, *Koinonia* 39: 345–67.
Gebhardt, O. and A von Harnack (1880), *Evangeliorum codex Graecus purpureus Rossanensis S, seine Entdeckung, sein wissenschaftlicher und künstlicher Wert*, Leipzig: Giesecke and Devrient.
Gerke, F. (1940), *Die christlichen Sarkophage der vorkonstantinischen Zeit*, Berlin: De Gruyter.
Giomini, R. and M. Celentano, eds (1980), *Julius Victor, ars rhetorica,* Leipzig: Teubner.
Goldhill, S. (2017), 'The Limits of the Case Study: Exemplarity and the Reception of Classical Literature', *New Literary History* 48: 415–36.
Grabar, A. (1948), *Les peintures de l'évangéliaire de Sinope*, Paris: Bibliothèque nationale.
Grafton, A. and M. Williams (2006), *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book: Origen, Eusebius, and the Library of Caesarea*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Grant, J. (1973), 'T and the Miniatures of Terence', *Classical Quarterly* 23: 88–103.
Grethlein, J. (2019), 'Epitome und Erzählung. Die Rekapitulationen am Ende der Odyssee', *Poetica* 50: 169–92.
Halbertal, M. (1997), *People of the Book: Canon, Meaning, and Authority*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Halm, C., ed. (1863), *Rhetores Latini Minores*, Leipzig: Teubner.
Haseloff, A. (1898), *Codex purpureus Rossanensis, die Miniaturen der griechischen Evangelien-Handschrift in Rossano*, Berlin: Giesecke and Devrient.
Hinds, S. (2014), 'The Self-Conscious Cento', in M. Formisano and T. Fuhrer (eds), *Décadence: 'Decline and Fall' or 'Other Antiquity'*, 171–98, Heidelberg: Winter.
Hixson, E. (2016), 'Forty Excerpts from the Greek Old Testament in Codex Rossanensis (Rossano, Museo Diocesano, S.N.), a Sixth-Century Gospels Manuscript', *Journal of Theological Studies* 67: 507–41.
Hodske, J. (2007), *Mythologische Bildthemen in den Häusern Pompejis: die Bedeutung der zentralen Mythenbilder für die Bewohner Pompejis*, Ruhpolding: Rutzen.
Hölscher, T. (2004), *The Language of Images in Roman Art*, Cambridge: Cambridge Unversity Press.
Horster, M. and C. Reitz, eds (2010), *Condensing Texts – Condensed Texts*, Suttgart: Steiner.
Horster, M. (2017), 'Livius-Epitome: Ein spätantiker Blick auf die (kurzgefasse) römische Republik', in G. Schwedler, R. Schwitter and S. Dusil (2017) *Exzerpieren – Kompilieren – Tradieren: Trasfortmationen des Wissens zwischen Spätantike und Fühmittelalter*, 25–48, Berlin: De Gruyter.
Howell, W. (1965), *The Rhetoric of Alcuin and Charlemagne*, New York: Russell and Russell.
Hughes, J. (2009), 'Personifications and the Ancient Viewer: The Case of the Hadrianeum "Nations"', *Art History* 32: 1–20.
Hurtado, L. (2006), *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
Huskinson, J. (1998), '"Unfinished Portrait Heads" on Later Roman Sarcophagi: Some New Perspectives', *Papers of the British School at Rome* 46: 129–58.
Huskinson, J. (2008), 'Degrees of Differentiation: Role Models on Early Christian Sarcophagi', *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome. Supplementary Volumes* 7, *Role Models in the Roman World. Identity and Assimilation*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 287–99.
Ingelbert, H. (2010), 'Lactance abbréviateur de lui-même', in M. Horster and C. Reitz (eds), *Condensing Texts – Condensed Texts*, 491–515, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
Ippolito, A, ed. (2006), *Marii Victorini*, *Explanationes in Ciceronis rhetoricam*, Turnhout: Brepols.
Kainia, R. (2016), '"Unbounded Views": Incomplete Ekphrasis and the Visual Imagination in Virgil' *Ramus* 45: 74–101.
Klingshirn, W. and L. Safran, eds (2007), *The Early Christian Book*, Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press.
Koch, G. and H. Sichtermann (1982), *Römische Sarkophage*, Munich: Beck.

Koortbojian, M. (1995), *Myth, Meaning and Memory on Roman Sarcophagi*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kresten, O. and G. Prato (1985), 'Die Miniatur des Evangelisten Markus im Codex Purpureus Rossanensis: Eine spätere Einfügung', *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 27: 381–403.

Krueger, D. (2004), *Writing and Holiness: The Practice of Authorship in the Early Christian East*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Langlands, R. (2018), *Exemplary Ethics in Ancient Rome*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Loerke, W. (1975), 'The Monumental Miniature', in K. Weitzmann, W. Loerke, E. Kitzinger and H. Buchtal (eds), *The Place of Book Illumination in Byzantine Art*, 61–97, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Loerke, W. (1987), 'The Rossano Gospels: The Miniatures', in G. Cavallo, J. Gribomont and W. Loerke (eds), *Codex purpureus Rossanensis, Museo dell'Arcivescovado, Rossano calabro: commentarium*, 109–73, Rome: Salerno.

Loerke, W. (1995), 'Incipits and Author Portraits in Greek Gospel Books: Some Observations', in D. Mouriki et al. (eds), *Byzantine East, Latin West*, 377–81, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Lowden, J. (1999), 'The Beginnings of Biblical Illustration', in J. Williams (ed.), *Imaging the Early Medieval Bible*, 9–60, University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Lowden, J. (2007), 'The Word Made Visible: The Exterior of the Early Christian Book as Visual Argument', in Klingshirn, W. and L. Safran (eds), *The Early Christian Book,* 13–47, Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press.

Lowrie, M. and S. Lüdemann eds (2015), *Exemplarity and Singularity: Thinking Through Particulars in Philosophy, Literature, and Law*, London: Routledge.

Luhtala, A. (2010), 'Late Schulgrammatik and the Emergence of Grammatical Commentaries', in M. Horster and C. Reitz (eds), *Condensing Texts – Condensed Texts*, 209–43, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

McGill, S. (2005), *Virgil Recomposed: The Mythological and Secular Centos in Antiquity*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mallan, C. (2013), 'The Style, Method and Programme of Xiphilinus' *Epitome* of Cassius Dio's *Roman History*' *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 53: 610–44.

Manafis, R. (2020), *(Re)writing History in Byzantium: A Critical Study of Collections of Historical Excerpts*, Abingdon: Routledge.

Matz, F. (1969), *Die Dionysischen Sarkophage 3*, *ASR 4.3* Berlin: Mann.

Mazal, O. (1980), *Kommentar zur Wiener Genesis: Faksimile-Ausgabe der Codex theol. gr. 31 der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek in Wien*, Frankfurt am Main: Insel-Verlag.

Mazal, O. (1998–9), *Der Wiener Dioskurides*, 2 vols., Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt.

Mazal, O. (1999), *Geschichte der Buchkultur. Band I: Griechisch-römische Antike*, Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt.

Mohnhaupt, B. (2000), *Beziehungsgeflechte: typologische Kunst des Mittelalters*, Bern: Lang.

Müller, M. (2010), 'Die Epitome: Das Bessere Original?', in M. Horster and C. Reitz (eds), *Condensing Texts – Condensed Texts*, 69–89, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Muñoz, A. (1907), *Il codice purpureo di Rossano e il frammento sinopense*, Rome: Danesi.

Muth, S. (1998), *Erleben von Raum – Leben im Raum: Zur Funktion mythologischer Mosaikbilder in der römisch-kaiserzeitlichen Wohnarchitektur*, Heidelberg: Verlag Archäologie und Geschichte.

Muth, S. (2004), 'Drei statt vier. Zur Deutung der Feldherrsarkophage', *Archäologischer Anzeiger*: 263–73.

Newby, Z. (2011), 'In the Guise of Gods and Heroes: Portrait Heads on Roman Mythological Sarcophagi', in J. Elsner and J. Huskinson (eds), *Life, Death and Representation: Some New Work on Roman Sarcophagi*, 189–227, Berlin: De Gruyter.

Newby, Z. (2016), *Greek Myths in Roman Art and Culture: Imagery, Values and Identity in Italy, 50 BC-AD 250*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Nosarti, L. (2009), *Forme brevi della letteratura latina*, Bologna: Pàtron.
Omont, H. (1900), *Notice sur un très ancient manuscript grec de l'évangile de Saint Matthieu*, Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
Opelt, I. (1962), 'Epitome' *Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum* 5: 944–73, Stuttgart: Hiersemann.
Osorio Whewell, E. (2019), 'For the Sake of Arguments: Reading the Headnotes to the *Fairie Queene*', *The Review of English Studies* 71: 460–85.
Patillon, M. (1997), 'Aristote, Corax, Anaximène et les autres dans la *Rhétorique à Alexandre*', *Revue des études grecques* 110: 104–25.
Patillon, M. and G. Bolognesi, eds (1997), *Aelius Théon, Progymnasmata,* Paris: Belles Lettres.
Patillon, M., ed. (2002), *Pseudo-Aelius Aristide, Ars rhetorica*, 2 vols., Paris: Belles Lettres.
Pearson, S. (2015), 'Bodies of Meaning: Figural Repetition in Pompeian Painting', in S. Lepinski and S. McFadden (eds), *Beyond Iconography: Materials, Methods, and Meaning in Ancient Surface Decoration,* 149–66, Boston: Archaeological Institute of America.
Pelttari, A. (2014), *The Space that Remains: Reading Latin Poetry in Late Antiquity*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
Penny Small, J. (2003), *The Parallel Worlds of Classical Art and Text*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Petrain, D. (2014), *Homer in Stone: The* Tabulae Iliacae *in Their Roman Context*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Platt, V. and M. Squire, eds (2017), *Framing Antiquity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Polara, G. (1990), 'I centoni', in G. Cavallo, P. Fedeli and A. Giardina (eds), *Lo spazio letterario di Roma antica: v.3. La ricezione del testo*, 245–75, Rome: Salerno.
Raeck, W. (1992), *Modernisierte Mythen: Zum Umgang der Spätantike mit klassischen Bildthemen*, Stuttgart: Steiner.
Rees, R., ed. (2004), *Romane memento: Vergil in the Fourth Century*, London: Duckworth.
Riesenweber, T., ed. (2015), *C. Marius Victorinus, Commenta in Ciceronis Rhetorica*, 2 vols., Berlin: De Gruyter.
Risch, F. (2003), 'Was tut ein Epitomator? Zur Methode des Epitomierens am Beispiel der pseudoclementinischen "epitome prior"', *Das Altertum* 48: 241–55.
Roberts, C. and T. Skeat (1983), *The Birth of the Codex*, London: The British Academy.
Roller, M. (2018), *Models from the Past in Roman Culture: A World of Exempla*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Rood, T., C. Atack and T. Philips (2020), *Anachronism and Antiquity*, London: Bloomsbury.
Russell, B. (2013), *The Economics of the Roman Stone Trade*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Salvo, G. (2015), *Miti scolpiti, miti narrati: riflessioni sulla produzione di sarcofagi romani tra arte e letteratura*, Padua: Padua University Press.
Schipke, R. (2013), *Das Buch in der Spätantik. Herstellung, Form, Ausstattung und Verbreitung in der westlichen Reichshälfte des Imperium Romanum*, Wiesbaden: Reichert.
Schrenk, S. (1985), *Typos und Antitypos in der frühchristlichen Kunst*, Munster: Aschendorff.
Schwedler, G., R. Schwitter and S. Dusil, eds (2017), *Exzerpieren – Kompilieren – Tradieren: Transformationen es Wissens zwischen Spätantike und Fühmittelalter*, Berlin: De Gruyter
Sevrugian, P. (1989), Review of G. Cavallo, J. Gribomont and W. Loerke (1987) *Codex purpureus Rossanensis*, *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 32: 233–40.
Sevrugian, P. (1990), *Der Rossano-Codex und die Sinope-Fragmente: Miniaturen und Theologie*, Worms: Wernersche Verlagsgesellschaft.
Sichtermann, H. (1966), *Späte Endymion-Sarkophage: Methodisches zur Interpretation*, Baden-Baden: Grimm.

Sichtermann, H. (1992), *Die mythologischen Sarkophage 2. Apollon biz Grazien, ASR 12.2*, Berlin: Mann,

Smith, R. R. R. (1988), '*Simulacra Gentium*:The Ethne from the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias', *Journal of Roman Studies* 78: 50–77.

Sörries, R. (1991), *Die syrische Bibel von Paris: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, syr. 341; eine frühchristliche Bilderhandschrift aus dem 6. Jahrhundert*, Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Sörries, R. (1993), *Christlich-Antike Buchmalerei im Überblick*, Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Spengel, L., ed. (1853), *Rhetores Graeci* II, Leipzig: Teubner.

Spengel, L., ed. (1856), *Rhetores Graeci* III, Leipzig: Teubner.

Squire, M. (2011), *The Iliad in a Nutshell: Visualizing Epic in the* Tabulae Iliacae, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Squire, M. and J. Elsner (forthcoming), 'Latin Literature and Material Culture', in R. Gibson and C. Whitton (eds), *Cambridge Critical Guide to Latin Literature*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stansbury O'Donnell, M. (1999), *Pictorial Narratives in Ancient Greek Art*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stanton, G. (2004), 'The early Christian preference for the codex', in C. Horton (ed.), *The Earliest Gospels: The Origins and Transmission of the Earliest Christian Gospels. The Contribution of the Chester Beatty Gospel Codex P45*, 40–9, London: T&T Clark.

Stroumsa, G. (2014), 'On the Status of Books in Early Christianity', in C. Harrison, C. Humfress and I. Sandwell (eds), *Being Christian in Late Antiquity*, 57–72, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Studer-Karlen, M. (2012), *Verstorbenendarstellungen auf frühchristlichen Sarkophagen*, Turnhout: Brepols.

Szirmai, J. (1999), *The Archaeology of Medieval Bookbinding,* Aldershot: Ashgate.

Thümmel, H. (1985), 'Typologische und analogische Argumentation in der christlichen Kunst', in J. Rogge and G. Schille (eds), *Theologische Versuche*, IV, 195–214, Berlin: Evangelische Verlags-Anstalt.

Tkacz, C. (2002), *The Key to the Brescia Casket*, Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.

Turner, E. (1977), *The Typology of the Early Codex,* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Walker, S. (1990), *Catalogue of the Roman Sarcophagi in the British Museum*, London: British Museum Press.

Wallraff, N. (2013), *Kodex und Kanon: Das Buch im frühen Christentum*, Berlin: De Gruyter.

Webber Jones, L. and C. Rufus Morey (1931), *The Miniatures of the Manuscripts of Terence*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Weitzmann, K. (1977), *Late Antique and Early Christian Book Illumination*, New York: George Bazilier.

Weitzmann, K. and H. Kessler (1986), *The Cotton Genesis: British Library, Codex Cotton Otho B VI*, Princeton: Princeton University Library.

Wheatley, C. (2011), *Epic, Epitome, and the Early Modern Historical Imagination*, Farnham: Ashgate.

Whitmarsh, T. (2010), 'Epitomes of Greek Novels', in M. Horster and C. Reitz (eds), *Condensing Texts – Condensed Texts*, 307–20, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Wrede, H. (1981), *Consecratio in formam deorum. Vergöttlichte Privatpersonen in d. röm. Kaiserzeit*, Mainz: Von Zabern.

Wright, D. (1992), *Codicological Notes on the Vergilius Romanus*, Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana.

Wright, D. (2001), *The Roman Vergil and the Origins of Medieval Book Design*, London: British Library.

Wright, D. (2006), *The Lost Late Antique Illustrated Terence*, Vatican: Biblioteca apostolica Vaticana.

Zanker, P. and B. Ewald (2012), *Living with Myths: The Imagery of Roman Sarcophagi*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ziolkowski, J. and M. Putnam, eds (2008), *The Virgilian Tradition: The First Fifteen Hundred Years*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.