


Δελτίον της Χριστιανικής Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας

Τόμ. 24 (2003)

Δελτίον ΧΑΕ 24 (2003), Περίοδος Δ'. Στη μνήμη του Νίκου Οικονομίδη (1934-2000)



Προσεγγίζοντας εκ νέου τον πέπλο της Βαμβέργης

Titos PAPAMASTORAKIS

doi: [10.12681/dchae.396](https://doi.org/10.12681/dchae.396)

Βιβλιογραφική αναφορά:

PAPAMASTORAKIS, T. (2011). Προσεγγίζοντας εκ νέου τον πέπλο της Βαμβέργης. *Δελτίον της Χριστιανικής Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας*, 24, 375–392. <https://doi.org/10.12681/dchae.396>



ΔΕΛΤΙΟΝ ΤΗΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΙΑΝΙΚΗΣ ΑΡΧΑΙΟΛΟΓΙΚΗΣ ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑΣ

The Bamberg Hanging Reconsidered

Titos PAPAMASTORAKIS

Τόμος ΚΔ' (2003) • Σελ. 375-392

ΑΘΗΝΑ 2003

THE BAMBERG HANGING RECONSIDERED

A Byzantine silk showing an equestrian emperor celebrating a triumph is preserved in the Diözesanmuseum in Bamberg (Fig. 1). This silk was first seen in modern times in 1830 when the tomb of Bishop Gunther of Bamberg (d. July 1065) was opened and the precious textile was found wrapped around his remains¹.

Depicted on the silk is an emperor on horseback moving towards the right and flanked by two female figures. The unnamed emperor has a halo and wears a crown decorated with pearls and a cross, but his face has been obliterated. In his right hand he is holding a square *labarum*, or standard, decorated with pearls and precious stones. He is dressed in a luxurious purple garment adorned with embroidery, gold, pearls and precious stones and his bright blue cloak floats behind him in the wind. The trappings on his horse are also elaborate and expensive, decorated with pearls, precious stones and gold, while the animal's legs and tail are tied with silk ribbons. The two female figures are turned towards the emperor and one of them offers him a *toufa*, or plumed helmet, while the other holds out a crown (now very damaged). They wear mural crowns which take the form of a *polos* topped with crenellations in imitation of city walls. Their dress is more or less identical, differing only in the colours and they have a distinctly classicizing look. They are each dressed in a long tunic over which they wear a sleeveless overgarment which reaches to just above the knee, leaving their arms bare. Over one shoulder they each have a pink

shawl which floats gently behind them. Their waists are encircled with elaborate belts, they wear earrings, and each has a necklace and three banded and bejewelled bracelets: one at the wrist, one just below the elbow and one on the upper arm. They go barefoot². Their draperies are edged with bands of pearls and precious stones; they have deep, almost parallel folds and their colouring indicates that they are silk. Both figures have long, luxuriant hair falling down their backs in plaits wound spiral-fashion. Draperies, adornment, belts and crowns all have exactly the same decorative motif: a bejewelled band between two rows of pearls. There are only two elements that distinguish the right-hand figure from her counterpart: the two artfully decorated strap ends, which hang down from behind her belt buckle are missing from the belt of the left-hand figure. And the lower edge of her sleeveless over-tunic is decorated with a bejewelled band set between two rows of pearls, whereas on the left-hand figure the lower edge of the sleeveless overgarment is simply decorated with a single row of pearls. These distinctions make the right-hand figure a *primus inter pares* in relation to her counterpart.

The figures float freely in space with no indication of the background against which they are set such as a groundline for them to stand on or an indication of the horizon against which they are viewed. They appear to move free from conventional constraints against a ground that is made up of a decorative geometric design consisting of heart-shaped floral

1. See S. Müller-Christensen, *Das Gunthertuch im Bamberger Dom-schatz*, Bamberg 1984, p. 3-4 which also lists all the earlier bibliography. A. Grabar, *L'empereur dans l'art byzantine*, Paris 1936, p. 51-53. Id., *La soie byzantine de l'évêque Gunther à la cathédrale de Bamberg*, *MünchJb* 3/7 (1956), p. 7-26, reprinted in: id., *L'art de la fin de l'antiquité au moyen âge*, Paris 1968, I, p. 213-227; III, figs 30-34. G. Prinzing, *Das Bamberger Gunthertuch in neuer Sicht*, *Byzantinoslavica* 54/1 (1993), p. 218-231. *Rom und Byzanz. Schatzkammerstücke aus bayerischen Sammlungen* (ed. R. Baumstark), exh. cat., Munich 1998, no. 64, p. 206-210 (B. Borkopp and M. Restle). A. Muthesius, *Byzantine Silk Weaving AD 40 to AD 1200*, Vienna 1997, p. 101-102.

2. The figures' bare feet are probably inspired by Late Antique Victo-

ries, though these fly rather than walk. There are, for example, common iconographic features between the two personifications on the Bamberg silk and the two wingless (?) Victories on the wall-hanging in the Brooklyn Museum, New York, measuring 96×223 cm. and dated to the fourth or fifth century A.C. They wear similar costumes, with full-length tunic, sleeveless overgarment, girdle and a floating shawl over one shoulder, with bracelets at the wrists and upper arms, and bare feet. See *Age of Spirituality. Late Antique and Early Christian Art, Third to Seventh Century* (ed. K. Weitzmann), New York 1979, no. 70, p. 82. See also the similar costume of maenad playing a *kithara* in Dionysos hanging, see M.-H. Rutschowskaya, *Tissus coptes*, Paris 1990, p. 86, fig. on p. 86.

motifs with stalks arranged in a dense rectangular framework, so as to form alternating vertical columns of “flowers” in two colours. Each floral motif is inscribed in a circle. In the space between the circles are diamond shapes. These three decorative motifs are set against a deep purple ground.

The present dimensions of the silk are 220×210 cm. but, as we shall see, it was originally larger³. The figural representation and its background are bounded nowadays on the lateral sides by a narrow ochre-coloured strip. The top edge is bounded by two horizontal bands, each decorated by a guilloche (two interlinking strands which combine to make large circles). Between the large circles in the guilloche smaller circles are inserted like links. The lower of these bands is narrower and has palmettes (i.e. stylized flowers shown in elevation) of two alternating types in the circles with tiny rosettes in the “links” between the circles. The row of circles is banded above and below by horizontal bands with small circles in alternating colours which probably represent precious stones. In the triangular spaces between the horizontal bands and the large circles are half-rosettes. The decoration of the upper, broader band is organized in a similar fashion except for the fact that the circles contain rosettes (stylized flowers shown from above). The spaces between edges of the upper band and the circles contain stylized four-petalled flowers (semi-rosettes). Between the upper band of decoration and the band below is a horizontal row of heart-shaped floral motifs with stalks exactly like those of the ground in the central part of the silk. The lower edge of the central panel is bounded by a horizontal strip that is identical to the narrow band that runs along the upper edge of the picture and undoubtedly the silk would once have been longer, ending in a second broader band with circles. And there can be no doubt that identical or similar bands of decoration would have extended down the length of the sides, so that the silk would have had borders on all four sides, as is the case with Late Antique hangings with secular or religious subjects⁴.

There are two prevailing opinions as to the explanation of

the iconography and the dating of the hanging. In 1956 André Grabar expressed the view that the hanging represents the triumphal entry into Constantinople in 1018, after the subjugation of the Bulgarians and his pilgrimage in Athens, by the Emperor Basil II, known as the Bulgar-Slayer⁵. Grabar interprets the two female figures as symbolic representations of the two cities, Constantinople, offering him the *toufa*, and Athens, offering him the crown. Grabar based his argument largely on Skylitzes account of Basil’s triumph, which relates how, on arrival at Constantinople, Basil “marched in triumph through the great portals of the Golden Gate wearing a golden crown topped with a crest”⁶.

In 1993 Gunther Prinzing⁷ reconsidered Grabar’s thesis and suggested another interpretation which would date the hanging to the early years of the reign of John Tzimiskes. Prinzing posits that the two different headdresses held by the female figures correspond to the Bulgarian regalia of the tsar Boris, which Tzimiskes took from him in front of the people of Constantinople during his triumphal entry as described by Skylitzes: “[that] took place in what is called the forum and once he was satisfied that the requisite acclamations had been performed and once he had delivered hymns of thanksgiving to the Mother of God and to her son for the victories, he stripped Boris of the regalia of the Bulgarian kingdom in full view of the citizens. This (i.e. the regalia) consisted of a gold crown and a tiara (*toufa*) crammed with silk and scarlet shoes”⁸. Prinzing concludes, on the basis of the colours of the draperies worn by the two female figures – blue and green – that they are personifications of the two Demes of Constantinople, the Blues and the Greens, offering the Emperor John Tzimiskes the *toufa* and the crown after his victory at Dorostolon (Dristra) in 971.

Both these theories have their weak spots, which I shall look at more closely below, taking some other points into account. The key to interpreting the image and the identity of the emperor must lie in the two female figures who flank him (Figs 2-3). The crenellated crowns they wear indicate by definition

3. Grabar, *La soie byzantine*, op.cit., p. 214, 217. Prinzing, op.cit., p. 220.

4. *Age of Spirituality* (n. 2), no. 70 p. 82, no. 129 p. 151, no. 150 p. 171, no. 477 p. 533. See also Rutschowskaya, op.cit., figs on p. 88, 120-121, 135.


5. Grabar, *La soie byzantine*, op.cit., p. 213-227. Muthesius, op.cit. (n. 1), p. 101-103, accepts this view.

6. John Skylitzes (ed. I. Thurn), Berlin 1972, p. 364.89-365.90: καὶ διὰ τῶν μεγάλων πυλῶν τῆς Χρυσῆς πόρτης χρυσῷ στεφάνῳ λόφον ἐφύπερθεν ἔχοντι ἐθρίαμβευσεν ἐστεφανωμένος. On Basil’s triumphal entry into Constantinople in 1018 see M. McCormick, *Eternal Victory. Triumphal Rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium and the Early Medieval*

West, Cambridge University Press 1986, p. 178.

7. Prinzing, op.cit., p. 218-231. Prinzing’s view is supported by Borkopp and Restle in *Rom und Byzanz* (n. 1), no. 64, p. 206-210.

8. John Skylitzes (ed. I. Thurn), p. 310.62-66: ἐν δὲ τῷ λεγομένῳ φόρῳ γενόμενος καὶ ἀποχρώντως εὐφημηθεὶς καὶ τῇ θεομητορί καὶ τῷ ταύτης υἱῷ τὰς ἐπινικίους εὐχαριστίας παρεσχηνώς, τὰ παράσημα τῆς Βουλγαρικῆς βασιλείας ἐπ’ ὧφει τῶν πολιτῶν τὸν Βόρισην ἀποδιδύσκει. Τὰ δὲ ἦν στέφανος ἐκ χρυσοῦ καὶ τιάρα νενησμένη ἐκ βύσσου καὶ πέδιλα ἐρυθρά. On John Tzimiskes’ triumphal entry into Constantinople in 971 see McCormick, op.cit., p. 170-174.



1. The Bamberg hanging. Diözesanmuseum in Bamberg (after Rom und Byzanz).

that these figures are personifications of city *tychae* or of cities or countries⁹. Personifications of cities or countries in the form of female figures wearing mural crowns are found as early as the fourth century B.C. on the coinage of Cyprus

9. W. Deonna, *Histoire d'un emblème : la couronne murale des villes et pays personnifiés*, Genava 18 (1940), p. 144-146.

and Cilicia¹⁰. However, the representation of a city *tyche* as a female figure in an elaborately draped costume wearing a crown in the shape of a city wall is a creation of Hellenistic art and more specifically of the sculptor Eutychides, who created the statue of the seated *Tyche* of Antioch around 300 B.C.¹¹. From then on images of personifications of cities or their *tychae* with mural crowns abound¹². Personifications of cities or provinces continue to be represented throughout Late Antiquity, with Rome and Constantinople, as one might expect, being the most commonly represented¹³. The female figures on the Bamberg silk share many of the characteristics found in the personifications of cities throughout this long period, but mainly their mural crowns as well as their belts and adornments (earrings, necklaces and bracelets). Thus it is clear that the two female figures represent cities or provinces or the *tychae* of the cities they represent.

It is worth mentioning a few of the works of art from Late Antiquity that include personifications of cities or provinces, in which the personifications have some common features with those on the Bamberg silk. On the reverse of a solidus of Constantine the Great (of 324-326), the emperor is flanked by two female personifications of cities, one offering him a globe topped by a Victory holding out a wreath while the other holds out a wreath¹⁴. On the bronze relief

plaque found in Croatia (and now in the National Museum in Budapest) dated to between 330 and 358, four standing personifications of cities, including Constantinople, are each offering a wreath to the personification of Rome, represented seated in the central space¹⁵. In the bottom register on the south side of the base of the column of Arcadius (401-402), the two personifications of East and West are flanked by fourteen personifications of cities or provinces offering the emperor wreaths or other symbols¹⁶. On the Anastasius (491-518) plate four personifications of cities are depicted in roundels: the two enthroned figures are identified with Constantinople and Rome. The other two figures, depicted standing and with no special attributes to distinguish them, probably Alexandria and Antioch, are turned towards Rome, with Alexandria offering her a ship and Antioch a wreath, thus marking her precedence over Constantinople¹⁷.

All of the above suggests that Prinzing's idea, i.e. that the two female figures on the Bamberg silk represent the Demes of Constantinople, cannot be correct. Apart from anything else, if they were personifications of the Demes they would have been depicted as male figures and not female ones, since both in Antiquity and in the Byzantine period, personifications take the gender of the words that define them. Words with male or neuter genders, such as *okeanos* (ocean), *chro-*

10. Ibid., p.151-152. See also S.B. Matheson, The Goddess Tyche, in *An Obsession with Fortune. Tyche in Greek and Roman Art* (ed. S.B. Matheson), Yale University Art Gallery Bulletin, 1994, p. 24.

11. Deonna, op.cit. (n. 9), p. 135-140.

12. On *Tyches* see ibid., p. 119-236, esp. p. 167-168. K.J. Shelton, Imperial Tyches, *Gesta* 18/1 (1979), p. 27-38. See also articles by S.B. Matheson, in *An Obsession with Fortune*, op.cit., p. 18-33; P.B.F.J. Broucke, Tyche and the Fortune of Cities in the Greek and Roman World, ibid., p. 34-49; M. Stansbury-O'Donnell, Reflection of the Tyche of Antioch in Literary Sources and on Coins, ibid., p. 50-63.

13. On representations of Rome and Constantinople in Late Antiquity see J.M.C. Toynbee, "Roma" and "Constantinopolis" in Late Antique Art from 365 to Justin II, in *Studies Presented to David M. Robinson* (eds G. Mylonas and D. Raymond), St. Louis 1953, p. 262, 264, 269. Id., Rome and Constantinopolis in Late Antique Art from 312 to 365, *JRS* 37 (1947), p. 135-144. Among the most important examples are: the four silver statuettes from the fourth century A.C. found on the Esquiline (now in the British Museum) with representations of Rome, Constantinople, Antioch and Alexandria, see *Age of Spirituality* (n. 2), no. 155, p. 176-177; A. Cameron, The Date and Owners of the Esquiline Treasure: the Nature of the Evidence, *AJA* 89 (1985), p. 135-145; G. Dagron, *Naissance d'un capitale: Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451*, Paris 1974, p. 58. And the seventh-century cup from the Vrap Treasure found in Albania (now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York) with the personifications of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria and Cyprus,

see Shelton, op.cit. (n. 12), p. 27-38.

14. *Aurea Roma. Dalla città pagana alla città cristiana*, exh. cat. (eds S. Ensoli, E. La Rocca), Rome 2000, no. 247, p. 572. Another solidus (struck in 319/320) also featuring Constantine the Great, shows the emperor dressed in military costume being crowned from the right by a Victory, while on the left a personification of Rome leads a personification of a conquered city, wearing a mural crown, to kneel at the feet of the Emperor (ibid., no. 243, p. 571). On the reverse of a gold medal issued by Constantius Chlorus (297) a personification of London or Britannia is shown in front of a walled city as a kneeling female figure with arms raised in supplication to her equestrian conqueror (ibid., no. 221, p. 564-564).


15. See Toynbee, *Roma and Constantinopolis*, op.cit., p. 142; H. Buschhausen, *Die spätromischen Metallscrinia und frühchristlichen Reliquiare I*, Vienna 1971, p. 23-27, figs A.2-5; Dagron, op.cit. (n. 13), p. 56-57.

16. J.P. Sodini, Images sculptées et propagande impériale du IV^e au VI^e siècle : recherches récentes sur les colonnes honorifiques et les reliefs politiques à Byzance, in *Byzance et les images* (eds A. Guillou, J. Durand), Paris 1992, p. 63, fig. 15.

17. See J. Engermann, Ein Missorium des Anastasius. Überlegungen zum ikonographischen Programm der "Anastasius"-Platte aus dem Sutton Hoo Ship Burial, in *Festschrift für Klaus Wessel zum 70. Geburtstag, In Memoriam* (ed. M. Restle), Munich 1988, p. 103-115, esp. p. 104-107 and p. 110-111.



2. The Bamberg hanging. Female personification of a city or province standing to the right of the emperor to whom she offers a toufa (after Müller-Christensen).



3. The Bamberg hanging. Female personification of a city or province standing to the left of the emperor to whom she offers a crown (after Müller-Christensen).

nos (time), *kosmos* (cosmos), *ploutos* (wealth), *mythos* (myth), *anemos* (wind), *orthros* (dawn), *oinos* (wine) or *oros* (hill or mount) and so on are personified by male figures, whereas words of the feminine gender such as *oikoumene*, *ge* (earth), *thalassa* (sea), *nyx* (night), *pege* (spring or pool), *eirine* (peace), *poiesis* (poetry), *nike* (victory), *polis* (city), *tyche* (fortuna) and so on are personified by female figures¹⁸. Moreover the extra ornamentation on the right-hand figure (on the belt and on the overgarment), which marks her out as “first among equals”, cannot be explained if these two figures are seen as personifications of the Demes in Constantinople and, by extension, of Constantinople itself. By the same logic we have to exclude the possibility that they are vanquished races, since they would also be represented by male figures in submissive poses, as is the case, for example, on the base of the Theodosian obelisk, on the Barberini ivory and later in the Psalter of Basil II now in the Marciana Library in Venice¹⁹.

Grabar was right to identify the female figures with personifications of cities, but their identification with Constantinople and Athens needs reconsidering. First of all the absolute symmetry which results from the positioning, the pose and the gestures of the two female figures, but also their similarity – despite the small differences in details such as the belts and the ornamenting of the overgarment which give prominence to the figure on the right – would be strange if they really represented, as Grabar maintained, Constantinople and Athens. The two female figures are depicted as of equal status yet it is quite incredible that the Queen of Cities would not be significantly differentiated from the degraded Athens

of the eleventh century. This becomes absolutely clear from the way in which John Geometres contrasts these two cities in the late tenth century in his epigram entitled “*On the wise men of Athens*”²⁰. Even though we are dealing with a rhetorical reference to two different worlds, the superiority of Constantinople over Athens is such that the imperial capital has the world at its feet and particularly Athens, which is obliged to abase itself and pay homage.

“Oh [city] of Athens abase yourself before to the Imperial City. You boast the olive tree; she [wields] the sceptre of state.

You boast honey; she [represents] the words that are sweeter than honey

of sophists and wise men. You [conquered] Xerxes; She enslaved the world to her dominion and above all you. Abase yourself before to the Imperial City”. Moreover Grabar’s identification of the two female figures with Athens and Constantinople cannot be justified because Athens was neither the scene of Basil II’s military exploits, which would explain the proffered *toufa*, nor was it conquered by him, which would account for the crown being offered as a gesture of submission. Moreover, from the moment personifications of Constantinople began to be depicted with personifications of lesser cities, they had to have distinctive attributes to identify them by, as can be seen in similar examples in Late Antiquity when the personifications of Rome and Constantinople have characteristic attributes which distinguish them both from each other and from personifications of all other cities²¹.

Marcell Restle has already pointed out that the manner and the style in which the female figures are represented on the

18. On personifications in classical antiquity see H.A. Shapiro, *Personifications in Greek Art. Representation of Abstract Concept 600-400 BC*, Zurich 1993. On personifications in Byzantium see E. Antonopoulos, Contribution à l’étude des abstractions personnifiées dans l’art médiéval byzantin, *Annuaire de l’Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes* 93 (1984-1986), p. 511-514. In the Joshua Roll, one of the most important manuscripts of the tenth century, the personifications of cities are depicted as female figures, while personifications of rivers and mountains are male figures, see K. Weitzmann, *The Joshua Roll. A Work of the Macedonian Renaissance*, Princeton 1948, p. 64-72. In another important tenth-century manuscript, the so-called Paris Psalter (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale cod. gr. 139) words with feminine gender are personified as female figures while those of male gender are personified as male figures, see A. Cutler, *The Aristocratic Psalters in Byzantium*, Paris 1984, figs 245-248, 251-254, 257-258. The same applies to the male and female personifications in the Vatican Library cod. gr. 394 dated to the end of the eleventh or the beginning of the twelfth century, see J.R. Martin, *The Illustration of the Heavenly Ladder of John Climacus*, Princeton 1954, figs

70, 72, 74-76, 98, 100-105, 107-108, 110-111, 115-120.

19. On the Theodosian obelisk see J.P. Sodini, op.cit. (n. 16), p. 72-73, fig. 20. On the Barberini ivory, see *Byzance. L’art byzantin dans les collections publiques françaises*, exh. cat., Paris 1992, no. 20, p. 63-66, fig. 20. On the Psalter of Basil II, see A. Cutler, *The Psalter of Basil II*, *ArteVen* 30 (1976), p. 9-19 and 31 (1977), p. 9-15, fig. 1.

20. PG 106, 110, 950: *Eἰς τοὺς σοφοὺς τῶν Ἀθηνῶν.*

Ἡ τῶν Ἀθηνῶν, προσκύνει τὴν δεσπότην.

Ἀρχεῖς ἐλαίαν· σκῆπτρα δ’ αὐτῇ τοῦ κράτους.

Μέλι σὺν τοῖς μέλιτος ἡδίοις λόγου.

Αὕτη σοφιστῶν καὶ σοφῶν. Σὺ τὸν Ξέρξην·

Αὕτη τέθεικε δοῦλα πάντα τῷ κράτει,

Καὶ σὲ πρὸ πάντων, προσκύνει τὴν δεσπότην.

21. Toynbee, *Roma and Constantinople*, op.cit. (n. 13), p. 135-144. Dagron, *Naissance* (n. 13), p. 49-51, 56-60. A. Cutler, *Roma and Constantinople in Vienna*, in *Byzanz und der Westen: Studien zur Kunst des europäischen Mittelalters* (ed. I. Hutter), Vienna 1984, p. 59-62.

Bamberg silk can be paralleled in the wall-paintings of the cave church, called the Great Pigeon House, at Cavaşın in Cappadocia²². These paintings are dated with certainty to the reign of Nikephoros Phokas and more specifically to the years 965-969²³. Something that is immediately striking in both cases are the tall, thin figures, in which the lower part of the body is disproportionately long in relation to the upper part. Common to both are the deep parallel lines, straight or slightly curved which outline the folds in the draperies (Fig. 4). Just as on the Bamberg silk, so too in the figures in the Cavaşın paintings parts of the body are discernible under flat stretches of drapery, the edges of which are outlined by folds forming various angles in order to articulate the limbs. Despite the differences in technique, the two works (the painted programme and the image on the silk) show distinct similarities in the distribution of the folds and the overall arrangement of the figures.

As is well known, the wall-paintings of the Great Pigeon House church at Cavaşın are a simplified version of the paintings in Tokali Kilise New Church, which have been compared with Constantinopolitan models dated to the mid-tenth century²⁴. In these paintings the denser and more regular lines of the folds are even closer to the way in which the draperies of the two personifications on the Bamberg silk are depicted (Fig. 5). The more geometric depiction of the folds on the latter result from the production methods of weaving. The close stylistic similarities between the Bamberg silk and the wall paintings of Tokali Kilise suggest a date in the mid-tenth century or slightly later for the textile. Similarities with the female figures on the Bamberg silk are also discernible in the arrangement of standing figures and the faces in the wall-paintings of San Pietro at Otranto, which are dated to the last decades of the tenth century and considered a simplified version of the metropolitan style²⁵.

Another important monument that shows similarities with the female figures on the Bamberg silk is the mosaic in the dome of Saint Sophia in Thessalonike, though this is dated to 883, which is a good deal earlier²⁶. The standing figures of angels and apostles at the edge of the dome are disproportionately long in the lower part of the body from the waist down, the folds are parallel and distributed in the same fashion, so as to emphasize the same areas of the body (one need only look at the stomachs, the thighs, the knees and the lower legs). The similarity is even greater between the faces of the female figures on the silk (Fig. 6) and the faces of the angels in Saint Sophia (Fig. 7): they are depicted in three-quarter profile, with the side turned towards the viewer being broad with a round spot of heightened (pink) colour and the chin distinguished from the neck by means of a curved line. All we can see of the other side is a narrow part between the nose and the outer contour of the face which makes a squared-off, almost right angle turn where it joins the chin. One might object that comparing the female figures from the Bamberg silk with the mosaics in the dome of Saint Sophia violates the tenth-century time-frame within which all the other relevant works fit. Yet I think that such a transgression is entirely justified. The style of the mosaics in the dome of Saint Sophia reflects the trends in Constantinopolitan monumental art towards the end of ninth century and it is perfectly natural that those trends should continue to crop up over a considerable period of time after their first appearance. The floral decoration, particularly in the guilloche pattern but also to a lesser extent on the ground corresponds to tenth-century works of art with a Constantinopolitan provenance²⁷, such as for example the palmettes in the headpieces of the Athos manuscript, Dionysiou 70²⁸, which dates to 955 and belonged to Basil the Parakoimomenos; the rosettes and the palmettes in the enamels that decorate the chalice of

22. In *Rom und Byzanz* (n. 1), p. 210. See also M. Restle, *Byzantine Wall Painting in Asia Minor*, Recklinghausen 1967, I, p. 135-138· III, figs 302-329.

23. L. Rodley, The Pigeon House Church, Cavaşın, *JÖB* 33 (1983), p. 301-309. N. Thierry, Un portrait de Jean Tzimiskès en Cappadoce, *TM* 9 (1985), p. 477-485.

24. A. Wharton-Epstein, *Tokali Kilise. Tenth-Century Metropolitan Art in Byzantine Cappadocia* (DOS, 22), Washington, D.C. 1986. N. Thierry, La peinture de Cappadoce au Xe siècle. Recherches sur les commanditaires de la Nouvelle Eglise de Tokali et d'autres monuments, in *Κωνσταντίνος Ζ' ο Πορφυρογέννητος και η εποχή του*, Athens 1989, p. 217-233.

25. M. Panayotidi, The Character of Monumental Painting in the Tenth

Century. The Question of Patronage, in *Κωνσταντίνος Ζ' ο Πορφυρογέννητος*, supra, p. 325, figs 32-33.

26. On the style of the mosaics in the dome of Saint Sophia in Thessalonike see M. Panayotidi, La peinture monumentale en Grèce de la fin de l'Iconoclasme jusqu'à l'avènement des Comnènes (843-1081), *CahArch* 34 (1986), p. 75-76. On the Constantinopolitan provenance of the mosaicists see R. Cormack and E.J.W. Hawkins, The South-West Rooms of St. Sophia, *DOP* 31 (1977), p. 237-238.

27. Grabar, La soie byzantine, op.cit. (n. 1), p. 226. *Rom und Byzanz* (n. 1), p. 210.

28. K. Weitzmann, *Die byzantinische Buchmalerei des 9. und 10. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin 1935, p. 22-23, pls 160-166.



4. Great Pigeon House, Cavuşin, Cappadocia. Angel, detail of the Ascension (after Restle).



5. New Church of Tokali Kilise, Cappadocia. Apostles, detail of the Peter ordaining the first deacons (after Epstein).



6. *The Bamberg hanging. Detail of the female personification offering the emperor a toufa (after Rom und Byzanz).*



7. *Saint Sophia, Thessalonike. Mosaic of the Ascension in the dome, detail of an angel.*

Patriarch Theophylact, which is dated to between 933 and 956²⁹; the palmette and rosette on the ceramic tiles of the tenth century now in the Musée du Louvre³⁰; and the rosettes on the enamels of the Martvili cross, also dated to the tenth century³¹.

But there are also two de-luxe creations of the tenth century which have iconographic features in common with the Bamberg silk: the Joshua Roll, now in the Vatican Library, the iconography of which has already been linked with the great military achievements of the emperors Nikephoros Phokas

and John Tzimiskes³², and the Troyes casket. In the Joshua Roll the cities of Jericho, Ai and Gibeon are depicted as young women with classicizing draperies, leaving their arms bare from the shoulder, holding a sceptre or a cornucopia and wearing mural crowns³³. On the front face of the Troyes casket a female figure – the personification of the city itself – is depicted at the gate of a walled city, wearing a mural crown and classicizing dress and offering a crown to the emperor who returns victorious³⁴.

We have seen that the female figures on the Bamberg silk

29. *Le Trésor de Saint-Marc de Venise*, exh. cat., Milan 1984, no. 16, pls on p. 160-162.

30. *Byzance* (n. 19), no. 296, p. 388-389, figs 296c-d.

31. L. Khuskivadze, *Medieval Cloisonné Enamels at Georgian State Museum of Fine Arts*, Tbilisi 1984, no. 151, p. 116.

32. M. Shapiro, *The Place of the Joshua Roll in Byzantine History*, *GBA* 35 (1949), p. 161-175, reprinted in: id., *Late Antique, Early Christian and Medieval Art* (Selected Papers, 3), London 1980, p. 49-66, dates the Joshua Roll to the reign of the emperor Nikephoros Phokas or that of John Tzimiskes. C. Mango, *The Date of Cod. Vat. Reg. Gr. 1 and the "Macedonian Renaissance"*, *Acta IRNorv* 4 (1969), p. 121-126, esp. p. 126 accepts Schapiro's opinion and in turn dates the Joshua Roll to the

reigns of these two emperors. By contrast K. Weitzmann, *The Joshua Roll* (n. 18), p. 113-114, dates the scroll to the reign of Constantine Porphyrogenetos. O. Mazal, *Josue-Rolle. Vollständige Faksimile-Ausgabe im Originalformat des Codex Vaticanus Palatinus graecus 431 der Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana*, Graz 1984, p. 80-81 and p. 83, follows his lead.

33. Weitzmann, *supra*, p. 64-69, figs 65-74. Mazal, *supra*, p. 48, 51-52, 58, 75-76 (sheets 9, 12, 22, 30). According to D.V. Ainalov, *The Hellenistic Origins of Byzantine Art*, New Brunswick, N.J. 1961, p. 134, the pose of the young female figure personifying the city of Gibeon imitates the personification of the *Tyche* of Antioch by the sculptor Eutykhides.

34. On the casket, which is dated to the tenth century, see A. Gold-

seem to come, both from a stylistic and from an iconographic standpoint, from the artistic sphere of the tenth century and that this also applies to the decorative motifs on the panel. The stylistic characteristics, iconography, the rich colour spectrum and the large dimensions of the Bamberg silk combined with its artistry – considered unique among surviving Byzantine textiles – all incline us to think that it was created from a sketch, made for the purpose, by a leading painter of the period³⁵. I think it is perfectly natural that, in a textile of these dimensions, quality and artistic merit, the image depicted should directly reflect the painting of the period, given that the same thing happened with the great wall hangings that survive in the West from the high middle ages, the Renaissance and later. In these cases the designs and the decoration did not come from the usual workshop repertoire, which mainly contained decorative patterns or repeated schematic images, but were designed specially for the commission by a great artist of the period. We need only recall the wonderful images on the “Lady with the Unicorn” tapestries in the Musée de Cluny in Paris³⁶, the tapestries depicting the hunting of the unicorn in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York³⁷ and the great cartoons by Raphael that were designed to be copied in tapestries, now in the Victoria and Albert Museum in London³⁸.

In addition to the fact that the only Christian symbol in the whole composition is the small cross on the emperor’s crown, the subject matter of the image underlines its secular

nature and, judging by its dimensions, we can assume that it would have been exhibited in public view. But what was a deluxe silk hanging like this, with this sort of iconography and these dimensions, created for? In my opinion we can find the answer in an oration by the rhetor Manuel Holobolos entitled “*Encomium for the Emperor Lord Michael Palaiologos*” which dates to the period after the re-conquest of Constantinople in 1261³⁹. At the start of his encomium Holobolos addresses himself to the emperor in the following words: “O King and Emperor, exalted by God. This [is] an ancient custom and one inscribed on ancient slabs, that subjects should bring [something] in token of their gratitude to their king ; because it was thought to be a good thing and right-thinking people considered it laudable it has survived the many years that have gone by and it has come down to us just as fresh as ever today; wherefore one brings gold another silver, or precious stones, [and yet] another a purple covering [embroidered] with pearls, and someone else [brings] something else and, in simple terms, each one who has the means [gives] their [contribution] according to choice and dependent on their circumstances. This law also held sway among those who studied books and dedicated their whole lives to literature”⁴⁰. Then he (Holobolos) continues with a rhetorical device: he compares the art of rhetoric with the art of weaving and compares the words that orators dedicate to the emperor with woven hangings, concluding that the former are superior to the latter. “In any event as regards that

schmidt and K. Weitzmann, *Die byzantinischen Elfenbeinskulpturen des X.-XIII. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin 1934, II, p. 63, no. 122, pls LXIX and LXX. See also the more in-depth article by D. Talbot-Rice, Eastern and Western Elements in the Decoration of the Troyes Casket, *Stirnar* 20 (1969), p. 347-353. Its connection with the Bamberg silk is pointed out by Grabar, *La soie byzantine*, op.cit. (n. 1), p. 222-224, pl. 35.

35. Grabar, *supra*, p. 216-219 had already noted the dependence of the female figures on the Bamberg silk on contemporary painting. Moreover he also noted their dependence on Late Antique models and mentions that that it is the only example of a textile where the figures are represented in a painterly fashion and not reduced to decoration and where their hands and feet are bare. He gives some examples from the Late Antique period in which a victorious emperor on horseback accepts the proffered crown presented to him by a conquered city. He also considers that the Bamberg silk could have been inspired by a contemporary model in Constantinople.

36. A. Erlande-Brandenburg, *La dame à la licorne*, Paris 1993.

37. G. Souchal, Un grand peintre français de la fin du XVe siècle : Le maître de la Chasse à la Licorne, *Revue de l'Art* 22 (1973), p. 22-49. See also A.S. Cavallo, *The Unicorn Tapestries at the Metropolitan Museum of Art*, New York 1998.

38. J. Sherman, *Raphael's Cartoons in the Collection of Her Majesty the*

Queen and the Tapestries for the Sistine Chapel, London 1972. See also S. Fermor, *The Raphael Tapestry Cartoons*, London 1996.

39. M. Treu, *Manuelis Holoboli Orationes, I: Programm des Königlichen Viktoria-Gymnasiums zu Potsdam*, Potsdam 1906, p. 30-50. This encomium has also been published with corrections by X. Sideridis, Μανουήλ Ὁλοβόλου ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν αὐτοκράτορα Μιχαὴλ Η' τὸν Παλαιολόγον, *ΕΕΒΣ* 3 (1926), p. 174-191. The passage is highlighted and, in my opinion, correctly interpreted by R. Macrides in: The New Constantine and the New Constantinople – 1261?, *BMGS* 6 (1980), p. 28-30. On the dating of the encomium see also the article by P. Schreiner, Zwei Denkmäler aus der frühen Paläologenzeit: ein Bildnis Michaels VIII und der Genueser Pallio, in *Festschrift für Klaus Wessel* (n. 17), p. 249-258.

40. Sideridis, *supra*, p. 174: Βασιλεῦ, αὐτοκράτορ, θεομεγάλυντε. Ἔθος ἀρχαῖον τοῦτο καὶ παλαιαῖς ἀνάγραπτον κύρβεσι, τοὺς ὑπηκόους εὐγνωμόνως εἰσφέρειν τῷ βασιλεῖ· τοῦτο γὰρ ἅτε καλῶς ἔχον καὶ τοῖς εὖ φρονούσιν ἐπαιετόν· μακροὺς δ' ἐλάσαν χρόνους, φθάνει νεάζον ἄχρι καὶ νῦν· ἔνθεν ὁ μὲν πρόσσειι χρυσόν, ὁ δ' ἄργυρον, λίθον ἐκείνος τῶν ἐριτίμων, ἀλουργῇ χλαῖναν ἄλλος καὶ καταμάργαρον, καὶ ἕτερος ἕτερον, καὶ ἀπλῶς ἕκαστος ὅπερ ἔχει δυνάμειος περιστάτικώς τῆς σφῶν αὐτῶν προαρέσεως. Ἔσχε κράτος, ὁ νόμος οὗτος, καὶ κατὰ τῶν βίβλοις ἐσχολακῶν καὶ βίον πάντα πεποιηκῶν τὴν περὶ λόγους σπουδὴν...; Treu, *supra*, p. 30.5-14.

peplos (hanging), which the Romans used to weave each year, we must believe the writers and particularly those who dictate tokens of the goodwill of their subjects for rulers, and the garments which used to be refashioned for emperors, into which were supposedly woven all those things that they had achieved in each year, cities founded (or restored) and others overturned; and the victorious emperor ordering both, the enemy's forces defeated, with the emperor wearing the peplos like a victorious headband and parading in triumph surrounded by ranks of bodyguards; a lion that he has struck down [was shown] lying outstretched, a bear hibernating in its cave, or a leopard in chains then, and all these brave deeds were ascribed to the emperor; a court has been established, a trial set up and the emperor's judgement in the case is extolled in the picture"⁴¹.

The comparison that Holobolos draws describes an ancient custom that goes back to Roman times: once a year the emperor received a hanging as a gift. On this hanging were depicted his most important achievements in that year. This gift formed part of an annual ceremony in which a once-a-year tribute was paid to the emperor. According to Holobolos the scenes which could be seen depicted on such hangings were: the emperor as founder or conqueror of cities, as victorious general, courageous hunter and finally just judge. These subjects represent the activities of an ideal emperor and it is interesting in this respect that Holobolos maintains that he is basing his description on treatises which advise the emperors how to be ideal rulers⁴².

Thus Holobolos is describing a custom which, though it may have lapsed in his day, had been an established practice in earlier times. He maintains that his information on this custom and on the subjects that were depicted on the hangings

came from earlier writers. Given that no such texts are known to us, we could conclude that we are simply dealing with a rhetorical device, if, on the one hand, it were not for the extremely concrete manner in which Holobolos describes the form of these hangings, and, on the other, if the encomium itself did not end with a detailed description of a pallium depicting the martyrdom of St Laurence, a gift from the Emperor Michael VIII Paleologos to Genoa. On the basis of Holobolos's extremely accurate description this work has been identified with the silk pallium that is kept today in Genoa's Palazzo Bianco⁴³.

Surviving works of art as well as other literary sources indicate that the subjects described by Holobolos were really depicted on objects (crowns, gold cups and plates, manuscripts and ivory caskets) which are nowadays attributed to imperial patronage. However, according to Holobolos, we should assume that many of them were not commissioned by the emperors to whom they belonged, but created at the behest of their subjects as gifts to these emperors for various purposes. As this is a large and complex subject, I will restrict myself to mentioning just a few objects that I think can be classified in this category. For example, I think the three gold utensils depicting the victories of the emperor Manuel Komnenos in Hungary and Asia Minor, known to us from three epigrams in the Marciana codex 524⁴⁴ were commissioned by courtiers to be given as gifts to the emperor as a way of singing the praises of his victories. The crown given by the Protosevastos Protovestiaros Alexios to the young Emperor Alexios II Komnenos can be included in the same category, as we can see from the lemma and the content of an epigram in the Marciana Codex 524⁴⁵. Among surviving works of art, on the basis of the iconography Holobolos de-

41. Sideridis, op.cit. (n. 39), p. 174: ...καὶ ὑπὲρ ἐκεῖνον πάντως τὸν πέπλον, ὃν ἐπέτειον ἡτοῦργουν Αἰνεΐαδαι τὸ πρῖν, χρεῶν γὰρ πιστεῦναι τοῖς συγγραφεῦσι, καὶ μᾶλλον οἷς πρὸς τὸ ἄρχειν ὑπηκόων ὑπαγορεύουσιν εὐνοίαν, καὶ εἰς ἐσθῆτας τοῖς πάλοι μετεσκευάζον αὐτοκράτορσιν, ἐν ᾧ καὶ πάντα φασὶν ὑφαντικαῖς μεθόδοις ἰσουργεῖτο, ἅπερ ἐκεῖνοις χρόνον ἕκαστον κατόρθωτο, πόλεις αἱ μὲν ἀνιστάμεναι, ἄλλαι καταβαλλόμεναι καὶ βασιλεὺς ἐκεῖ προστάτων ἀμφοτέρω στρατεύματα νικῶντα, τὰ τῶν ὑπεναντίων ἡττώμενα καὶ τὸν βασιλέα εἶχεν ὁ πέπλος ταινίαν φοροῦντα νικητικῶς καὶ μετὰ πολλῆς δορυφορίας πομπεύοντα· ἔκειτο λέων θῆρ αὐτοῦ που πληγείς, ἢ ἄρκτος φωλάς, ἢ πάρδαλις δεσμώτης, καὶ τῷ βασιλεῖ τὰ τῆς ἀγιστείας ἐκείνης ἀνέκειτο· ἀνέφωτο δικαστήριον, ἐκεκρότητο δίκη, καὶ τὴν κρίσιν ἐκεῖ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐθαύμαζεν ἡ γραφή. Treu, op.cit. (n. 39), p. 31.3-14.

42. Macrides, op.cit. (n. 39), p. 28-30.

43. X. Sideridis, 'Ὁ ἐν Γενούῃ βυζάντιος πέπλος', *ΕΕΒΣ* 5 (1928), p. 376-378. P. Johnstone, The Byzantine "Pallio" in the Palazzo Bianco at

Genova, *GBA* 118 (1976), p. 99-108. Macrides, op.cit. (n. 39), 34-36. E. Parma-Armani, Nuove indagini sul "pallio" bizantino duecentesco di San Lorenzo in palazzo Bianco a Genova, *Studi di Storia delle Arti* 5 (1983-1985), p. 31-47. Schreiner, op.cit. (n. 39), p. 254-258.

44. "On a gold hanging on which are depicted the campaign against Iconium" (S. Lambros, 'Ὁ Μαρκιανὸς κῶδιξ 524, *NE* 8 (1911), no. 333, p. 176-177); "On a gold vessel on which is depicted our Holy Emperor triumphing over the Sultan" (ibid., no. 315, p. 172); "On a gold plate on which are depicted the emperor's triumphs over the Hungarians" (ibid., no. 330, p. 175-176; The latter is (?) part of the unpublished epigram entitled: "On a gold plate made for the Sebastos Kalaman[os] and given to our Holy Emperor [with] various depictions of triumphs against" [? the barbarians] from f. 46v of the same codex (ibid., no. 115, p. 119-120).

45. "On the crown of Lord Alexios given to him by the protosevastos" (ibid., no. 108, p. 115).

scribes, we may assume that both: the purple stained ivory casket in Troyes, with its hunting scenes and triumphal emperor, and the codex Coislin 79 in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris were created as gifts for emperors. The latter was intended for the emperor Michael VII Doukas and, as transpires from the iconography of the miniatures, meant to extol his administrative abilities⁴⁶.

Thus according to what Holobolos tells us, we can infer that the Bamberg silk would have been commissioned for presentation to an emperor in the traditional annual ceremony commemorating his victorious battles. We can also deduce that the two female personifications offering him the crown and the *toufa* as tokens of their subjugation should refer to two important imperial successes in conquering or annexing cities or provinces. An important new element that arises out of Holobolos' encomium is that these two successes had to have happened in the same year. In any event, that the emperor on horseback holding a standard, the trappings of the horse and the floral decoration on the Bamberg silk all point to a triumphal entry has never been questioned.

Representatives from the provinces and outlying regions participated in imperial triumphs and offered the victorious emperor the traditional victory gift of the *aurum coronarium*: a laurel wreath and a gold crown⁴⁷. It is also well known that between the emperor and each city there was a personal bond symbolized by the *aurum coronarium* that each city was obliged to present to their overlord as a token of respect, veneration and subjugation. This tradition has its roots in the Hellenistic and Roman periods. We need only recall the personifications of the four cities on the bronze relief plaque now in Budapest, the personifications of the two cities on the "Anastasius" plate and the personifications of cities or provinces on the column of Arcadius, all offering wreaths or other attributes to express their subjugation either to the emperor himself or to the imperial city.

The *toufa* seems to be directly linked with military campaigns as surviving examples show. The equestrian statue of

Justinian in the Augusteum showed him wearing a *toufa*, as we know from historical sources as well as from the later sketch which is preserved in the University Library in Budapest⁴⁸. The same emperor is also depicted wearing the *toufa* on the gold medal preserved in the Louvre⁴⁹. In a miniature in the ninth-century codex Parisinus gr. 510 (f. 409v) Julian the Apostate is shown wearing an identical *toufa* to the one depicted on the Bamberg silk, as is the hunter-emperor on the front panel of the Troyes casket⁵⁰. Both Basil II for his triumph in the year 1018 and the Emperor Theophilos in his triumph in the year 831 or 837 wore the *toufa*⁵¹. The emperor also wore a *toufa* in the ceremonial parade from Saint Mokios to the Chalke Gate at Mid-Pentecost (i.e. on the Wednesday of the fourth week after Easter) according to *De Ceremoniis*⁵².

In my opinion the crown that the right-hand female figure is offering in the image on the Bamberg silk means that she recognizes the authority of the emperor over her domain (Fig. 3), whereas the *toufa* being offered by the other female figure symbolizes the emperors victories in her lands or country (Fig. 2).

So to identify the figure of the emperor we shall have to see which emperors celebrated a triumph in Constantinople connected to two great military successes in the same year in the tenth century. We know of two such emperors: John Tzimiskes in 971 after the capture of the Bulgarian cities Preslav and Dorostolon and, slightly earlier, Nikephoros Phokas, in October 965 after subjugating Tarsus and Mopsuestia, in other words the definitive conquest of Cilicia, along with the annexation of Cyprus to the Byzantine state⁵³.

According to Leo the Deacon the Emperor John Tzimiskes began his campaign against the "Mysians" (i.e. the Bulgars) in 971 with a ceremonial visit to Saint Sophia and to the Blachernai Church⁵⁴. He renamed the two important Bulgarian cities that he besieged and won, Preslav and Dorostolon, giving his own name to the former and calling it Ioannoupolis and bestowing the name of the military saint that

46. J. Spatharakis, *The Portrait in Byzantine Illuminated Manuscripts*, Leyden, 1976, 112-116. See also C.L. Dumitrescu, *Quelques remarques en marge du Coislin 79: les trois eunuques*, *Byz.* 57 (1987), p. 32-45.

47. Dagron, *Naissance* (n. 13), p. 30. McCormick, *Eternal Victory* (n. 6), p. 46 and p. 210-211. See also J. Haldon, *Constantine Porphyrogenitus: Three Treatises on Imperial Military Expeditions (An Introduction, Edition, Translation, Commentary)*, Vienna 1990, p. 263.

48. See C. Mango, Justinian's Equestrian Statue (letter to the Editor), *ArtB* 41 (1959), p. 351-356.

49. *Byzance* (n. 19), no. 113, p. 167-168.

50. Grabar, *La soie byzantine*, op.cit. (n. 1), p. 217, figs 34b, 35b.

51. Haldon, op.cit., p. 141.838-839 and p. 288.

52. *De Cerimoniis aulae byzantinae* (ed. J.J. Reiske), Bonn 1829, p. 104.22-23 and p. 107.20.

53. *Leo the Deacon* (ed. C.B. Hase), Bonn 1828, p. 61.1-11 § 4. *John Skylitzes* (ed. I. Thurn), p. 270.34-40 (Tarsus), p. 270.45-48 (Cyprus). McCormick, *Eternal Victory* (n. 6), p. 170.

54. *Leo the Deacon*, op.cit., p. 129.7-9.

he believed had helped him capture it to Dorostolon, which became Theodoroupolis. The emperor was to ensure that his campaign would end exactly as it began. Returning to Constantinople, he placed the icon of the Virgin and Child at the head of his triumphal procession because, according to Leo the Deacon, this was the most glorious of the spoils seized on the campaign and, according to John Skylitzes, because the Virgin was the guardian of the imperial city⁵⁵. His triumphal procession ended at Saint Sophia where he dedicated the crown of the Bulgarian tsar Boris to God, having stripped the Bulgarian ruler of his regalia beforehand in the Forum. So, if we recognize John Tzimiskes in the anonymous triumphal emperor of the Bamberg silk and the *toufa* and crown being offered to him by the two personifications as the regalia of the Bulgarian tsar, then we must assume these personifications represent not the *Demes* of Constantinople (as proposed by Prinzing) but the two conquered and rechristened Bulgarian cities of Ioannoupolis (Preslav) and Theodoroupolis (Dorostolon).

According to the Escorial *Taktikon*, published by Nikos Oikonomides⁵⁶, Nikephoros Phokas completed the conquest of Cilicia in 965. This was preceded by the definitive conquest of Anabazus in 964, while Tarsus, Mopsuestia and Eirenoupolis were all taken in 965. In that same year Cyprus was annexed to the empire. The emperor himself never fought there. Both Leo the Deacon and John Skylitzes relate the strategies Nikephoros employed in the conquest of Mopsuestia that resulted in its surrendering straight after Tarsus. The conquest of Cilicia opened the way to Syria; the next year he took the cities of Artach and Palatza near Antioch, which finally fell in 969.

Among the many conquests of Nikephoros Phokas, his great admirer John Geometres chooses to make specific reference to Tarsus and Antioch, the most important cities in

Cilicia and Syria respectively, in two of his poems as well as to the two important islands, Crete and Cyprus, calling them the emperor's greatest military successes. The first of these works, entitled "*On the Lord Emperor Nikephoros*"⁵⁷ relates the great exploits of the emperor in the following terms:

"I forced the towns of the Assyrians to yield, and the Phoenicians all,

I brought invincible Tarsus beneath the yoke.

I swept the islands clean; I drove out the barbarian foe

In Spacious Crete and pre-eminent Cyprus".

In Geometres' *ethopoiia* entitled "*A few words related by the lord Nikephoros among the saints, on the beheading of his images*"⁵⁸ Nikephoros' conquests are mentioned in very similar terms:

"Well-born Crete and pre-eminent Cyprus,

Invincible Tarsus and the subdued cities of Cilicia,

The walls of Antioch and the cities of Assyria..."

The conquests of the cities of Cilicia by Phokas in 965 were considered highly significant in military terms while the annexation of Cyprus in the same year was given great symbolic significance. This can be seen from the way in which they are mentioned in John Geometres' verses quoted above but also in the text that relates to the translation of the Holy Tile to Constantinople under Nikephoros Phokas⁵⁹. So, in trying to identify the two female figures on the Bamberg silk, an offering made to the emperor for his triumphs in a single year, one might be led, on the basis of the foregoing, to two alternative hypotheses. If the two female figures are considered to be personifications of provinces or outlying regions then they must represent Cilicia, which is where Tarsus and Mopsuestia were located, and Cyprus. The former, that is the vanquished Cilicia, gives him the *toufa*, as a dominion in which the emperor has distinguished himself by his victories. In its turn the annexed Cyprus gives him the crown as an out-

55. Ibid., p. 158.10-13. *John Skylitzes* (ed. I. Thurn), p. 310.60-61.

56. N. Oikonomides, L'organisation de la frontière orientale de Byzance aux Xe-XIe siècles et le Tactikon de l'Escorial, *Actes du XIVe CIEB*, I, Bucarest 1974, p. 285-302, reprinted in: id., *Documents et études sur les institutions de Byzance (VIIe-XVe s.)*, London 1976, p. 288-289.

57. PG 106, 927, 51; *Leo the Deacon* (ed. C.B. Hase), p. VII: *Εἰς τὸν κυρὸν Νικηφόρον τὸν βασιλέα*:

... Ἀσσυρίων δ' ἔχλινα πόλεις, καὶ Φοῖνικας ἄρδην·

Ταρσὸν ἄμαιμακέτην εἶλον ὑποζύγιον

Νήσους δ' ἐξεκάθηρα, καὶ ἦλασα βάθβαρον αἰχμὴν

Εὐμεγέθη Κρήτην. Κύπρον ἀριπρεπέα...

58. PG 106, 932, 66: *τίνας ἂν εἴποι λόγους ὁ ἐν ἀγίοις βασιλεὺς κυρὸς Νικηφόρος, ἀποτεμνομένων τῶν εἰκότων αὐτοῦ*:

... Εὐγενέτιν Κρήτην, Κύπρον ἀριπρεπέα;

Ταρσὸν ἄμαιμακέτην, Κίλικων πόλιεθρα κλιθέντα,

Τείχεα τ' Ἀντιόχου, ἅσπερ τ' Ἀσσυρίων...

59. See F. Halkin, Translation par Nikephoros Phokas de la brique miraculeuse d'Hiéropolis, in *Inédits byzantins d'Ochrida, Candie, Moscou* (SubHag 38), Brussels 1963, p. 256, in which the anonymous author of the text describes the wholesale destruction and devastation wrought by the Arabs in Crete, Cyprus and Cilicia. Michael Psellos's account is reminiscent of the references in John Geometres, see *Historia Syntomos* (eds H.G. Beck, A. Kambylis, R. Keydell), Berlin 2000, p. 98.92-94 § 105: "These were Tarsos, a great and crowded town in Cilicia, Adana as well as Laodicea, the celestial Antioch and the greater part of Phoenicia..." See also A. Markopoulos, Zu den Biographien des Nikephoros Phokas, *JÖB* 38 (1988), p. 225-233, esp. p. 229-230.

lying region accepting his absolute hegemony. If they are seen as personifications of cities then one must represent Mopsuestia and the other Tarsus, both conquered in 965 by the Emperor Nikephoros Phokas.

So of the two triumphs which might have been depicted symbolically on the Bamberg silk I think that of Nikephoros Phokas, which arguably corresponds more closely to the iconography of the *peplos*, has the stronger claim. Indeed none of the saintly or historical figures that played a role in the victorious campaign and the subsequent triumph of Tzimiskes can be recognized in the composition depicted on the silk. I am referring to the Virgin, the military saints Theodore and George and the Bulgarian tsar Boris; their presence was so marked both in the events and the symbolism of the campaign and the triumph celebrated by Tzimiskes that their absence from a symbolic representation of that triumph would be bizarre. By contrast, in Nikephoros Phokas' triumph there were no significant figures, only cities (Tarsus and Mopsuestia) or provinces (Cilicia and Cyprus) in the abstract. Moreover John Tzimiskes' triumph was organized in such a way as to credit strictly divine intervention, whereas Phokas' triumph, while it maintained all the conventions of traditional piety, made clear allusions to a revival of classical traditions with the foundation of victory monuments using the treasure captured from the vanquished such as the gates of Tarsus and Mopsuestia.

I think that if the emperor depicted on the Bamberg silk is Phokas, then the female personifications are more likely to be Tarsus and Mopsuestia rather than Cilicia and Cyprus. I come to this conclusion having in mind the choices Nikephoros made in respect of his triumph in Constantinople in October 965. So let us examine these choices. According to Leo the Deacon and John Skylitzes, Nikephoros' triumph after the subjugation of Tarsus and Mopsuestia was grandiose. Leo the Deacon recounts how the emperor was re-

ceived in Constantinople with great ceremony by the people and how in Saint Sophia he dedicated: "The cross-standards worked in gold and precious stones which the citizens of Tarsus had captured in various battles where they overcame the might of the Romans"⁶⁰ and he organized races in the hippodrome and other spectacles for the entertainment of the public. John Skylitzes relates in more detail how the emperor: "having ravaged the other cities of Cilicia and reduced them to ashes in October, in the ninth indiction, returned to Constantinople, bringing with him the gates of Tarsus and of Mopsuestia, which he had gilded and set up as a tribute to the imperial capital, putting one set on the acropolis (that is the fortifications of the Great Palace) and the other in the walls by the Golden Gate. And he gave as a tenth [of the spoils] from his campaign to God the cross-standards that had been captured ...which he dedicated in the most holy Church of the Wisdom of God"⁶¹. In the second year of his reign, Nikephoros also annexed the whole island of Cyprus to the Roman Empire, having driven the Arabs out..."⁶².

John Zonaras also describes Nikephoros' triumph in similar terms and he adds that the bronze 'gates of the cities of Cilicia were of exquisite craftsmanship: "the emperor returned to Constantinople bringing with him the gates of Tarsus and of Mopsuestia. They were made of bronze and demonstrated very fine workmanship and after he [the emperor] had had them further adorned, he fitted one set into the east wall by the acropolis and the other into the west wall..."⁶³. Zonaras' description is endorsed by Arabic sources which refer to "mighty Tarsus" prior to its conquest by Nikephoros Phokas. They mention the two encircling fortifications that surrounded and protected the city, making it impenetrable, and especially its five great iron doors⁶⁴.

The choices that Nikephoros Phokas made in respect of his triumph in 965 tell us several things. Let us not forget that Nikephoros chose to enter Constantinople for the first time

60. *Leo the Deacon* (ed. C.B. Hase), p. 61.1-11: τοὺς σταυρικοὺς τύπους ἀνελιγφῶς, οὓς ἐκ χρυσοῦ καὶ λίθων ἐξεργασμένους κατὰ διαφόρους μάχας, τὴν Ῥωμαϊκὴν δύναμιν τρέποντες, οἱ Ταρσεῖς ἤχμαλῶτησαν. McCormick, *Eternal Victory* (n. 6), p. 247 is referring to σταυρικοὺς τύπους and 'τιμίους σταυροὺς' when he talks about "The imperial battle standard, a gilded war cross containing a relic of the true cross".

61. *John Skylitzes* (ed. I. Thurn), p. 270.34-40: Δηώσας δὲ καὶ τεφρώσας καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς πόλεις τῆς Κιλικίας τῷ Ὀκτωβρίῳ μηνί, τῆς ἐννάτης ἰνδικτιῶνος, ὑπέστρεψεν εἰς Κωνσταντινούπολιν, ἔχων μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τὰς τῆς Ταρσοῦ πύλας καὶ τὰς τῆς Μόψου ἐστίας, ἃς καὶ χρυσῷ καταστίξας ἔξωθεν ἀνάθημα τῇ βασιλίδι διεκόμισε, τὰς μὲν κατὰ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν στήσας, τὰς δὲ κατὰ τὸ τῆς Χρυσῆς πόρτης τεῖχος. Διεκόμισε δὲ καὶ τῷ θεῷ δῶρον καὶ δεκάτην τῆς ἑαυτοῦ στρατιᾶς τοὺς αἰ-

χμαλωτευθέντας τιμίους σταυροὺς..., οὓς δὴ καὶ τῷ πανσέπτῳ τεμένει τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σοφίας ἀνέθετο.

62. *Ibid.*, 270.45-48: Τῷ δὲ αὐτῷ δευτέρῳ τῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλείας χρόνῳ ὁ Νικηφόρος καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν νῆσον Κύπρον τῇ τῶν Ῥωμαίων προσήγαγεν ἐπικρατεία, τοὺς Ἀγαρηνοὺς ἀπελάσας ἐκείθεν.

63. *John Zonaras* (ed. M. Büttner-Wobst), III, Bonn 1897, p. 502.18-503.5: ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἐπανεξεύξεν εἰς τὴν Κωνσταντινούπολιν τὰς τῆς Ταρσοῦ πύλας καὶ τὰς τῆς Μόψου ἐστίας ἐπαγόμενος ἐκ χαλκοῦ πεποιημένας καὶ τέχνης δεικνύουσας ἀκριβείαν, ἃς ἀκείνους ἐπικοσμήσας τὰς μὲν τῷ κατὰ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν ἐφ' οὗ τείχει προσήρμοσε, τὰς δὲ τῷ τεῖχει τῷ δυτικῷ...

64. See M. Canard, *Quelques observations sur l'introduction géographique de la Bughyat at-t'alab de Kamal ad-din ibn al-'Adim d'Alep*,

as emperor on 16th August 963⁶⁵, that is to say on the two hundred and forty-fifth anniversary of the saving of the city from the Arab siege of 718⁶⁶. The same day sees the celebration of the commemoration of the translation from Edessa to Constantinople in 944 of the Holy Mandylion, the most important *acheiropoietos* icon of Christ, and the feast of Saint Diomedes of Tarsus⁶⁷. Two years later, in 965, Nikephoros arranged things so that he made his triumphal entry into the conquered city of Tarsus once again on the 16th August⁶⁸. The spoils that were abandoned by the Arabs when the city was ceded were given over to imperial curatorship⁶⁹. In the triumph that Nikephoros celebrated in Constantinople, he chose to have paraded alongside him two kinds of booty of great symbolic importance: the cross-standards that had fallen into the hands of the Arabs in the ninth century, which he dedicated in Saint Sophia, and the gates of the two conquered cities of Tarsus and Mopsuestia, which he offered to Constantinople itself. These choices remind us of the close relationship between the emperor (King), Christ (King of All) and Constantinople (Queen of Cities). The removal of the gates of Tarsus and Mopsuestia and their transfer and dedication to Constantinople symbolize the subjugation of these two cities to the imperial city. The placing of the gates in the walls next to the Golden Gate and by the (so-called) acropolis as well as the dedication of the cross-standards captured by the Arabs in the Great Church intensifies the relationship between the emperor and his city. Based on Nikephoros' choices we can distinguish three main stages (two secular and one religious) on his imperial triumph: the first halt was at the triumphal entrance to the walls that defined the enclosed space of the city; the next stage of the procession went to the palace; and finally the closing stage of the procession led to Saint Sophia. Nikephoros' choices balance the secular and the religious elements, both as regards the specific booty that he provided, and as regards the particular places where he deposited them. The secular nature of the triumph is demonstrated by the fact that the gates of

the two cities of Tarsus and Mopsuestia were gilded and offered, not to a church, but to Constantinople itself, the Queen of Cities. Of course, on the other hand, as a pious Byzantine ruler, he was careful to dedicate to the Great Church all the cross-standards that he had acquired from Tarsus. In Nikephoros' triumph the Golden Gate, the Imperial Palace, and the Great Church are united, indicating the all-embracing image of the imperial city that was identified with its universal emperor.

For all these reasons I think that the Bamberg silk is connected with Nikephoros Phokas' triumphal entry of 965 after the subjugation of Tarsus and Mopsuestia. The *toufa* and the crown which are being held out to the emperor by the two personifications of cities may be interpreted in accordance with the way in which these cities were defeated (Figs 2-3). Mopsuestia, which Nikephoros besieged and conquered is offering him the *toufa*, while mighty Tarsus, which finally surrendered, is offering him the crown. Identifying the figures in this way could also explain the fact that the right-hand figure, as the personification of Tarsus, has more elaborate decoration on the belt and on the bottom edge of her overgarment by comparison with the left-hand figure, the personification of Mopsuestia, because Tarsus was the most important city in Cilicia.

Similar depictions to that on the Bamberg silk are found in manuscripts painted in the reigns of the Holy Roman Emperors Otto III (987-1002) and Henry II (1002-1024). On ff. 23v and 24r of the Gospels of Otto III (Clm. 4453 in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich) (Fig. 8a) are two full-page miniatures⁷⁰. On the right-hand leaf Otto is enthroned holding orb and sceptre and surrounded by clergy and high-ranking military men supporting his power. On the left-hand leaf are depicted four female personifications of the main provinces of the Holy Roman Empire, Roma (Italy), Gallia (Lorraine), Germania and Sclavinia (the christianized part of what is now Poland), approaching the emperor offering him a bowl full of jewels, a palm branch, a cornucopia full of

AnnIEOAlg 15 (1957), p. 41-53. See also C.E. Bosworth, The City of Tarsus and the Arab-Byzantine Frontiers in Early and Middle Abbasid Times, *Oriens* 33 (1982), p. 268-286.

65. *De Cerimoniis* (n. 52), p. 437.20-440.11.

66. McCormick, *Eternal Victory* (n. 6), p. 169.

67. *Synaxarium EC*, p. 893-904.


68. *Histoire de Yahya-Ibn-Sa'id d'Antioche* (eds J. Kratchkovsky, A. Vasiliev), *PO* 18/5, 1957, p. 98.

69. Oikonomides, *op.cit.* (n. 56), p. 288.

70. U. Kuder, L'enluminure ottonienne, in *Histoire artistique de l'Europe. Le moyen âge* (ed. G. Duby), Paris 1995, p. 150. *Rom und Byzanz* (n. 1), no. 41, p. 154-159, which lists all the earlier bibliography. R. Kahsnitz, Herrscherbilder der Ottonen, in *Krönungen. Könige in Aachen - Geschichte und Mythos*, Mainz 2000, p. 287. A similar composition to that in the Gospels of Otto III is found in the two full-page miniatures from a manuscript now in the Bamberg Staatsbibliothek Msc. Class. 79. See Kahsnitz, *supra*, p. 286 and J. Fried, Politik der Ottonen im Spiegel der Krönungsordnungen, in *Krönungen*, *supra*, fig. 3.



a



b



c

8. a. Female personifications of provinces of the Holy Roman Empire. a. Gospels of Otto III, Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 4453, ff. 23v and 24r; b. Bamberg Apocalypse, Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, Ms. Bibl. 140, f. 59v; c. Gospel Lectionary of Henry II, Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 4452, f. 2r.

gemstones and a golden globe respectively. In the miniature on f. 59v of the Bamberg Apocalypse in the Bamberg Staatsbibliothek (Ms. Bibl. 140) the upper part depicts the coronation of the German ruler Otto III by the apostles Peter and Paul while the lower part has four identical personifications of provinces, who are offering the emperor bowls of jewels and cornucopias (Fig. 8b)⁷¹. In the full-page miniature on f. 2r of the Gospel Lectionary of Henry II (Clm. 4452 in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich) the upper part depicts Christ crowning Henry II and Kunigunde, attended by the apostles Peter and Paul to whom the cathedral of Bamberg was dedicated, while in the lower part a full-scale personification of Rome is surrounded by personifications of Gallia and Germania and another six smaller provinces who are all offering tribute (Fig. 8c)⁷².

These depictions of personifications of regions or provinces led H. Wentzel to propose in 1972 that the Bamberg silk had been made for the Emperor John Tzimiskes in token of his victorious campaigns, was then given to Theophano in 973 in honour of her wedding to the German ruler Otto II, was transported to Germany and provided the inspiration for the miniatures in the manuscripts of Otto III and Henry II⁷³. His theory has not been given serious consideration by later scholars who wrote about the silk, who have continued to cling to the opinion that the textile was given in 1065 to Bishop Gunther by the Emperor Constantine X Doukas (1059-67) as a diplomatic gift for the German Emperor Henry IV (1056-1106) and that, when he (Gunther) died in the same year, he was wrapped in it.

It is well known that such textiles were not available to foreigners in Byzantium and that they were forbidden to buy or export them. Such objects were exchanged as luxury gifts, sent from a ruler to some other dignitary, and had great symbolic value. It therefore seems unlikely to me that such a gift, and one acquired so recently, would have been given up by Henry IV in order to wrap the remains of a bishop, however important he may have been.

The theory I am proposing, that is that the silk was created in the reign of Nikephoros Phokas, leads me to agree in part

with Wentzel's hypothesis as to the explanation for the silk's being exported to Germany. I agree with him that the silk was transferred from Byzantium to Germany in the reign of the Emperor John Tzimiskes as a diplomatic gift accompanying Theophano. However, I believe that John Tzimiskes wanted it out of Constantinople for very specific reasons, which I shall explain. As has already been mentioned, the absence of inscriptions on the silk naming the emperor represented opens up the possibility of interpreting the figure not just as a symbol of the specific emperor for whom the textile was created, but as a generalized symbol of imperial power, thus making it a suitable diplomatic gift, indicating the universal ambitions of the Byzantines at the territorial and symbolic level. John Tzimiskes, the murderer of Nikephoros Phokas, whose place on the throne he had usurped, managed in an official and painless fashion, by giving the silk to Theophano and Otto II, to get rid of a work which, for those who knew it and recognized the identity of the imperial figure, emphasized the majesty of Nikephoros, whose life John himself had taken. At the same time it gave him the opportunity to send abroad a de-luxe creation which symbolized the strength and power of the Byzantine Emperor. If the images of Nikephoros Phokas really were destroyed after his death by John Tzimiskes⁷⁴, it is certain that a de-luxe and thus official textile such as the Bamberg silk must have shared the same fate. But rather than destroy it, John Tzimiskes chose a more thrifty remedy: he got rid of it by exiling it to a geographical and political region where its links with Nikephoros Phokas would be certain to go unrecognized.

It is well known that the Gospels of Otto III, which after Otto's death came into the possession of Henry II, the Bamberg Apocalypse (which remained half finished on the death of Otto III and was finished in the reign of Henry II) and the Gospel Lectionary of Henry II, which was created *in toto* at the behest of the latter, were all donated by Henry to Bamberg Cathedral on the occasion of its inauguration. The dedicatory epigram from the Lectionary mentions that it was given by Henry II to the cathedral of Bamberg as a gift along with other luxury objects⁷⁵. The precious decoration of its

71. J. Ott, *Krone und Krönung*, Mainz am Rhein 1998, p. 39, 191, fig. 113, cat. no. 113, which also lists all earlier bibliography.

72. Ibid., fig. 122, cat. no. 122, which also lists all earlier bibliography.

73. H. Wentzel, *Das byzantinische Erbe der ottonischen Kaiser - Hypothesen über den Brautschatz der Theofano*, *Aachener Kunstblätter* 43 (1972), p. 34-35 and n. 88. Wentzel's hypothesis about the influence of the Bamberg silk's iconography on the Ottonian manuscripts does not hold water. See Kuder, op.cit. (n. 70), p. 150, who considers that the

models for the manuscripts with personifications of cities, provinces or countries in the reigns of Otto II, Otto III and Henry II are to be found in older codices such as the Roman Calendar or the *Notitia Dignitatum*.

74. T. Papamastorakis, *Tampering with History*. From Michael III to Michael VIII, *BZ* 96 (2003) (Forthcoming).

75. Kuder, op.cit. (n. 70), p. 148. Among other things Henry gave four rare and de-luxe vestments to Bamberg, which have been preserved to this day. See P. Lasko, *Ars Sacra 800-1200*, Yale University Press 1994, p. 131-132.

binding includes twelve Byzantine enamels which have been thought to come from a Byzantine crown given to Theophano to celebrate her marriage to Otto II and dismantled on the instructions of Henry II to decorate the cover of his Gospel Lectionary⁷⁶.

A large part of the luxury objects given by Henry II to the cathedral of Bamberg came from Otto III's collection, which came into Henry's possession at Augsburg in 1002⁷⁷. Could the Byzantine hanging with the triumphant emperor and the two personifications of cities have been one of these objects? If so, it is very likely that this Byzantine silk would have been transferred with other luxury goods from Otto III's imperial collection to the cathedral of Bamberg by Henry II when he founded this church in 1007 or on its inauguration in 1012.

The new recipients of the silk would have had no difficulty in interpreting the image with the two personifications and the unnamed emperor, given that in all the manuscripts given them by Henry II similar iconographic elements were used to symbolize in artistic terms the claims to universality of the German Emperors Otto III and Henry II. In other words the anonymity of the triumphant Byzantine emperor would ultimately favour the identification of his figure with the office of the Holy Roman Emperor. If indeed the Byzantine silk was among the precious objects that belonged in the cathedral of Bamberg from early in the eleventh century it would seem reasonable that Gunther, Bishop of Bamberg, "should take it with him" to his tomb in 1065.

Τίτος Παπαμastoράκης

ΠΡΟΣΕΓΓΙΖΟΝΤΑΣ ΕΚ ΝΕΟΥ ΤΟΝ ΠΕΠΛΟ ΤΗΣ ΒΑΜΒΕΡΓΗΣ

Επανεξετάζοντας παλαιά και νέα δεδομένα οδηγήθηκα στα ακόλουθα συμπεράσματα ως προς τον πέπλο που βρίσκεται στην Αρχιεπισκοπή της Βαμβέργης.

Α. Η μαρτυρία του ρήτορα Μανουήλ Ολοβόλου οδηγεί στο συμπέρασμα ότι ο πέπλος δωρήθηκε σε έναν αυτοκράτορα μετά από δύο επιφανή κατορθώματά του που συνέβησαν μέσα στην ίδια χρονιά.

Β. Τα υφολογικά στοιχεία του πέπλου επιβάλλουν τη χρονολόγησή του στα μέσα ή στο δεύτερο μισό του 10ου αιώνα.

Γ. Με βάση τα παραπάνω, δύο είναι οι δυνατότητες ταύτισης των μορφών: είτε ο εικονιζόμενος αυτοκράτορας είναι ο Ιωάννης Τζιμισκής και οι γυναικείες μορφές προσωποποιήσεις των δύο βουλγαρικών πόλεων (της Πρεσλάβας και του Δωρόστολου), που κατέλαβε το έτος 971, είτε ο αυτοκράτορας είναι ο Νικηφόρος Φωκάς και οι γυναικείες μορφές είναι προσωποποιήσεις των δύο περιοχών (της Κιλικίας και της Κύπρου) ή των δύο πόλεων (της Ταρσού και της Μοψουεστίας), που κατέλαβε το έτος 965. Από τον τρόπο με τον οποίο τέλεσαν οι

παραπάνω αυτοκράτορες τον θρίαμβό τους στην Κωνσταντινούπολη, καταλήγω ότι η πιθανότερη ταύτιση των τριών μορφών είναι η ακόλουθη: Ο εικονιζόμενος αυτοκράτορας είναι ο Νικηφόρος Φωκάς. Η Μοψουεστία, την οποία ο Φωκάς πολιορκήσε και εκπόρθησε, του προσφέρει την τούφα, ενώ η Ταρσός, η οποία του παραδόθηκε αμαχητί, του προσφέρει το στέμμα. Οι πύλες των δύο κατακτημένων πόλεων, αφού χρησιμοποιήθηκαν στον αυτοκρατορικό θρίαμβο, επιχρυσώθηκαν και αφιερώθηκαν στην Κωνσταντινούπολη.

Δ. Ο πέπλος στάλθηκε στη Γερμανία ως διπλωματικό δώρο από τον Ιωάννη Τζιμισκή, νομίζω όμως ότι αυτό έγινε για να απαλλαγεί από ένα έργο τέχνης που στους Βυζαντινούς θύμιζε τον Νικηφόρο Φωκά, ενώ στους ξένους ηγεμόνες δήλωνε την ισχύ των βυζαντινών αυτοκρατόρων εν γένει. Ο πέπλος θα πρέπει να δωρήθηκε από το γερμανό αυτοκράτορα Ερρίκο Β' όταν οικοδομήθηκε ο καθεδρικός ναός της Βαμβέργης και στη συνέχεια, ως περιουσία του ναού, επελέγη για να τυλίξει τη σορό του επισκόπου Gunther.

76. K. Wessel, *Die byzantinische Email-Kunst vom 5. bis 13. Jahrhundert*, Recklinghausen 1967, no. 26, p. 80-85, which also lists all earlier bibliography. See also *Rom und Byzanz* (n. 1), no. 41, p. 154-159. Kahsnitz,

op.cit. (n. 70), p. 287.

77. Lasko, op.cit. (n. 75), p. 123. Kuder, op.cit. (n. 70), p. 148-150.