

UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research Archive

e-theses repository

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

The Development of Early Imperial Dress from the Tetrarchs to the Herakleian Dynasty

General Introduction

The emperor, as head of state, was the most important and powerful individual in the land; his official portraits and to a lesser extent those of the empress were depicted throughout the realm. His image occurred most frequently on small items issued by government officials such as coins, market weights, seals, imperial standards, medallions displayed beside new consuls, and even on the inkwells of public officials. As a sign of their loyalty, his portrait sometimes appeared on the patches sown on his supporters' garments, embossed on their shields and armour or even embellishing their jewelry. Among more expensive forms of art, the emperor's portrait appeared in illuminated manuscripts, mosaics, and wall paintings such as murals and donor portraits. Several types of statues bore his likeness, including those worshiped as part of the imperial cult, examples erected by public officials, and individual or family groupings placed in buildings, gardens and even harbours at the emperor's personal expense.¹

1. For a more theoretical discussion of the emperor's role as head of state: Cameron, 1987, 122-129; Belting, 1994, 102-107; Canepa, 2009, 100-106.

Despite the importance and ubiquitousness of the early emperor's image, no thorough study of his costume and the messages which it conveyed has been undertaken to date. Yet no other form of early dress was so charged with meaning;² and symbolism such as the purple colour of the emperor's robes is still associated with royalty today. Throughout this time period the purple colour of his garments was primarily reserved for his use;³ for another individual to wear the colour might be interpreted as an open declaration that he was a usurper;⁴ today the term to be "born in the purple chamber" still signifies to us that the individual was a ruling emperor's legitimate offspring.⁵

The types of clothing worn by the early emperor fall into three categories: military dress, which protected him during battle, consisting of a helmet, cuirass and tunic; civic dress, which he wore in the city, whose garments were the chlamys, diveteson and imperial brooch; and finally senatorial dress, which he wore on ceremonial occasions, consisting of a toga and under-tunic.⁶ Each type will be considered below. The empress, on the other hand, never wore military dress and only very occasionally a toga. Initially her dress was more conservative and continued earlier Roman types, but like the emperor's dress, later consisted of a chlamys and diveteson. At the beginning of the time period covered in this thesis, the reign of Diocletian in 284, the empress, like all high born Roman women, also wore a special form of bridal dress, whose primary garments were a tunic woven on an early type of loom, a yellow coloured mantle, veil and a marriage belt. But by the slightly later Theodosian dynasty (379-453), imperial brides wore full court dress.

2. See especially Canepa's discussion of imperial costume: Canepa, 2009, 190-192.
 3. Justinian, Bk. IV 40.1; Scott, 1932, [unpaged]. *ODB*, 1991, 1759; for a general discussion of purple: Canepa, 2009, 201.
 4. Canepa, 2009, 201.
 5. Dagron, 2003, 23-24.
 6. Philip Grierson is the first author to use these three categories. He also provides a discussion of why the terminology is...not wholly satisfactory". Grierson, 1968, 70.

Although in a recent monograph Jennifer Ball has written a chapter on imperial dress during the period from 800 to 1200 and Timothy Dawson includes sections in his recent thesis on the forms of garments and headgear worn by emperors and empresses from 900 to 1200, no work has undertaken to analyze developments in dress during the earliest period from the 3rd to 8th centuries, when the most change occurred.⁷ It will be the object of this thesis to trace developments in imperial dress on a monument by monument basis from the beginning of Diocletian's reign in 284 to the end of the Herakleian dynasty in 711. Earlier monuments will be drawn in where relevant. In a second section this thesis will trace developments in the empress' dress during the same time period and using the same methodology, although the monuments may not always show the garments which the emperor actually wore. The analysis will not simply be descriptive. It will also delineate the significance of each form of dress and what it revealed about the ruler's policies, beliefs and the mystique of rulership which, as we shall see, transcended individual regimes.

7. Ball, 2005, 11-35 and Dawson, 2002, 108-116, 154-165, 197-212, 214-217, and 223-240.

As my contribution to the subject, I plan to demonstrate that imperial dress was not simply, as Mary Harlow argues in a recent article, a form of elite male dress or, as Matthew Canepa believes, a product of the interaction between the Byzantine and the Sasanian courts. Instead it was a form of elite dress whose symbolism transcended individual reigns.⁸ The English essayist Carlyle first identified two types of symbols in dress: extrinsic ones, which were ephemeral, dictated by fashion and bound to an individual locale; and intrinsic symbols, which partake of the nature of what they represent, and endure for several generations and are not associated with a specific individual or region. According to Carlyle the Christian cross and royal sceptre are examples of intrinsic symbols. I believe that although few in number, the intrinsic symbols associated with the emperor's costume, which first developed during this time period, gave the office much of its power and was essential to creating a new mystique of rulership.

8. Harlow, 2004, 44; Canepa, 2009, 1; Carlyle, 1970, 204-211.

Since many monuments and artefacts depicting emperors have survived from antiquity, the study of imperial dress needed a few principles to organize such a large body of material. It was decided to follow the approach used by Philip Grierson in his Catalogue of the Byzantine Coins in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection, which organized by costume type and then by chronological arrangement within each type.⁹ Soldini's recent article on the surviving monuments in Constantinople is also arranged chronologically. In a few cases, however, a strictly chronological organization hampered analysis. Since the Arch of Constantine, for example, demonstrated not only the earlier Greco-Roman style found in the Hadrianic tondos but also the tetrarchic and elements from several sub-antique styles, it seemed best to analyze it before the slightly earlier Arch of Galerius. Although several scenes on each monument depict either Constantine or Galerius, only those reliefs which best illustrate changes in dress were analyzed. In a few cases the dating of artefacts and the identification of either the emperor or empress was uncertain; examples include the Great Hunt Mosaic at Piazza Armerina, the statue of Marcian, and the Trier Ivory. In each case my analysis accepted the dating and identification most commonly found in current scholarship.

Since this is the first full length study of costume, dress is treated both as an historical artefact and as a form of iconography.¹⁰ Each example is first placed in its historical context; the dress depicted is then described, noting any changes from earlier monuments. Finally an art historical analysis is provided. In some cases, such as Justinian's equestrian statue or the small medallion portraits of Ariadne, it follows in main outline previous interpretations but focuses on dress. In other cases such as the consular medallions of Constantine and his sons, the analysis reinterprets the medallions in terms of their dress. Finally in several cases, either where previous analysis seemed inadequate (as with the statues of the four tetrarchs in Venice) or when the monument had not been previously analyzed (as with Helena's seated statue) an entirely new analysis is provided.

9. Grierson, 1968, B. Imperial Types, 2. Imperial Costume, 68-80.

10. As mentioned above, since the emperor's identity is disputed in several cases such as the Trier Ivory, Rothschild Cameo and Ada Cameo, I have provided a list of other possibilities in a footnote with references to the article.

Future scholars can consult my thesis simply for the careful descriptions of the dress found on individual monuments, on small objects or on coins and as a source for such subjects as the types of togas emperors wore, their crowns, the evolution of the imperial brooch, the development of the akakia from the mappa, and the evolution of the empress' dress from late Roman forms to a costume imitating her husband's. I have also analyzed two new consular coins: the nomisma of Justin I and miliarenses of Justin II for the first time. Of the seven early emperors who struck consular coins, these were the only two which had not been identified. My thesis is the first to discuss the consular medallion of Constantios II and his brother Constans. Finally my thesis is the first to introduce the gold medallion, which commemorates the marriage of Tiberios II Constantine's daughter Charito to Germanos, which brings the total number of large Byzantine gold medallions up to only three.¹¹

11. For a discussion of the three medallions: Berk, 2011, 166.

My analysis demonstrates that an interpretation of dress and the messages it conveys contributes significantly to our understanding of early Byzantine art. My monument-by-monument method of analysis also discusses several new modes of representation which continue throughout the time period. On the Arch of Constantine the emperor is depicted in the center facing frontally surrounded by courtiers and guards; Justinian is represented in this manner at San Vitale near the end of the period. Future scholars will benefit from reading my individual analyses and eventually develop their own insights. Though analysis of imperial dress is currently perceived as contributing very little to our understanding of late Roman and early Byzantine art, my thesis demonstrates that without the proper interpretation of imperial dress, we have little chance of ever completely understanding it.¹²

From Diocletian's to Justinian II's reign, official state art was mainly produced in a realistic style inherited from the Hellenistic period. Because these works occasionally lack a context, the ruler's identity has been disputed, but no one questions whether they depict a true likeness of the emperor or his dress. Large official monuments including sculpture, portrait busts and reliefs were usually created from marble or occasionally from bronze. All three of these types of art were also usually painted but have lost their coloration over the centuries. Although individualized portraiture, items of dress, and a figure's exact pose could be accurately depicted in marble, very fine details such as fabric weave, the suggestion of weight, colour, and occasionally which part of a figure's dress belonged to the under-tunic or to the cloak could not.

During the short lived tetrarchic period, rulers chose to use porphyry, a very hard stone, to communicate such ideas associated with their regime as their unity of purpose and loss of individuality. Porphyry's hardness made the sculpting of individual portraits difficult and the suggestion of fine details virtually impossible. The slightly later marble statues of Constantine

12. I agree with Philip Grierson that the Byzantine period begins with the reign of Anastasios I (491-518) because a distinct coinage and art were produced from his reign. Other possibilities are that the Roman period continued to Constantinople's fall in 1453, that the Byzantine period be dated from the construction of Constantinople in 324, and that it be dated from the division of the Empire between Theodosios' two sons Arkadios and Honorios: Grierson, 1982, 2-3.

from his Thermal Bath, Helena's seated statue and Constantine's bronze head from his marketplace are rendered in great detail on both the back and front. Parts of Helena's statue including her diadem, sandals, and hairpiece were even later attachments. Reliefs on Constantine's Triumphal Arch, the Theodosian Mosaic, and imperial diptychs such as the Barberini panel or Trier ivory were large enough to accurately show clothing style and even a fabric's pattern. But because all of these works are two dimensional, they depict dress only from a single point of view; but through the inclusion of several figures, they provide it with a ceremonial context.

Smaller items are in general also finely detailed. These include coins and medals such as the consular medallions of Constantine and his sons, gem stones such as the Rothschild or Ada Cameos, the gold glass portrait of four figures on the cross of Desiderius, bone statuettes of empresses, which were part of family lararia, small medallion portraits on consular diptychs, and portraits of Justin II and Sophia on the Crux Vaticani. On small consular nomismata, artists sometimes suggest fabric decoration through the use of patterning. The small portraits on coins can usually be identified only by coin inscriptions. The coins of Phocas can, however, be identified by his pointed beard and those of the Herakleian Dynasty by their bushy beards. On gold medallions of Constantine and his sons, the figure's stance is sometimes changed to better fit the ruler's bust into a small space.

On fifth-century imperial ivories and consular diptychs, the carvers have favored a single style at the expense of individualized portraiture. Included in this groups are the Barberini ivory, Ariadne ivories, and small medallion portraits on consular diptychs. Although their dress corresponds to that depicted in other contemporary art works, the figures in all of these works have similarly carved oval faces, rounded eyes, and carefully modeled features. In contrast, the creator of the gold glass medallion on the Cross of Desiderius used a style consisting of fine brush strokes to depict details in clothing and individualized portraits.

The imperial mosaics at San Vitale and manuscript illustration of Anicia Juliana are not only highly detailed but also have the added advantage of being in colour. Since mosaic tesserae never fade, the panels even retain the original colours

selected by the artist. Although no one doubts the accuracy of the images in the panels, we do not possess comparable portraits for comparison from Constantinople. The figures in both the panels and manuscript illumination seem flat, especially when compared with the roughly contemporary floor mosaic from the Great Palace, which even suggests depth. This flatness may result from the fact that in these works several figures have been fitted into a relatively small space.

Art produced from the tetrarchic period to the end of the Herakleion dynasty usually was in a realistic style inherited from antiquity. Although a few large monuments lack a context, official works of art such as sculpture or reliefs are sufficiently detailed to identify the individual ruler and his dress. Especially on small ivories and coins, the portraits were in a style which favored generalized facial features. The emperor could then be identified through an inscription. These works are, however, sufficiently detailed to accurately depict the emperor's costume.

Critical Review

1. Primary Sources

Although contemporary written sources are of less value for a fine arts thesis than visual ones, they are nevertheless useful for several reasons: they include valuable contextual information on monuments, they describe aspects of the garments not communicated in art including their colour and effect on onlookers, and they offer additional information on court ceremonies in which the garments were worn. There is never any reason to question whether individual historians are offering an accurate description of the emperor's dress. The visual record and contemporary histories all corroborate the appearance of his costume. This homogeneity partially results from the fact that with the exception of The Secret History the existing histories, panegyric literature and monuments were all either sponsored directly by the emperor or a high court official. The written works were only one part of a larger program, which included the construction of buildings and large monuments, the development of elaborate court rituals and protocols, and the dissemination of the emperor's image on large and small monuments, whose goal was to

promote the emperor and his regime.

The main contemporary source for the emperor Constantine and his mother Helena is Eusebios' Life of Constantine.¹

Although Eusebios (c260-337), the bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, did not know Constantine personally before the council of Nicaea in 325, detailed factual information contained in the Life is generally corroborated in other sources. The work therefore probably represents an accurate record of such details as the description in Bk. IV of the emperor's costume at he lay in state. As both Averil Cameron and Timothy Barnes note, Eusebios died only about a year after the emperor. As a result several parts of the Life, including the funeral, remained unfinished.² Eusebios' praises of Helena and of her official visit to the Holy Land probably result from the fact that she made generous gifts to the poor and to local churches in Palestine as well as founding the Churches of the Nativity and Ascension. Eusebios believed that individuals like Constantine and Helena succeed because their actions fulfilled God's will. Barnes even emphasizes that Eusebios believed that Constantine was an example of an individual living a godly life.³

1. Eusebios' Life of Constantine, trs. Averil Cameron and Stuart G. Hall. Oxford: Claerndon Press, 1999. There is no critical text of the original Greek and no critical studies devoted to the Life.

2. Cameron, 1985, 9; Barnes, 1981, 265.

3. Barnes, 1981, 271.

4. The standard text for the histories is Ammianus Marcellinus, J. C. Rolfe, 3 v. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963. No monograph is devoted to the history.

The main source for the period immediately after Constantine's reign is the history of Ammianus Marcellinus (c330-392).⁴ Although originally covering the time period from the reign of Nerva to the death of Valens in 378, only Books 14-31, for the years 353 to 378, survive. The work was intended as a continuation of Tacitus' Histories and is written in a clear and impartial style. His descriptions of imperial dress, while accurate, occasionally also communicate whether the historian believed an individual was fit to rule or not. Two contrasting examples of this are his descriptions of the dress of the usurper Prokopios and of Constantios II during his entrance into Rome. Whereas the make-shift costume Prokopios wore when he was proclaimed presaged his later downfall, Constantios II's elaborate dress and carefully staged entrance into Rome suggested his reign's continued success.⁵

The primary source for the next period is Claudian's panegyric poems.⁶ The poet Claudian (c370-c404) lived during one of the most tumultuous periods of Roman history; his short life span included the Roman defeat at Adrianople in 378 and ended just before the sack of Rome by Alaric in 410. Several of his panegyrics, a type of poem praising the emperor and court, represent the record of an eyewitness. Although written primarily as poems of praise, the "Fescennine Verses" and "Epithalamium" contain valuable details about Maria's and Honorios' wedding. The wedding and bride's dress, as described in these works, conform to those of a traditional Roman bride. The poet's detailed description of Honorios' trabea also correlates with those found in other contemporary sources.

5. Ammianus Marcellinus, Bk. XXVI, 6. 15; Bk. XVI, 10, 4-13; Rolfe, 1963, 607, 243-249.

6. The standard text is Claudian, tr. Maurice Platinauer, 2 v.' Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976. A useful critical study is Cameron, 1970.

In his History of the Wars, Buildings, and Secret History, Prokopios of Caesarea (6th century), the chief historian of Justinian's reign (527-565), provides valuable descriptive and historical information.⁷ Since he was Belisarios' secretary and legal advisor on campaigns from 527-540, Prokopios' eight book history of Byzantine campaigns against the Persians, Vandals, and Ostrogoths represents the objective account of an onlooker. Although the work contains veiled criticisms of Justinian, he is never criticized openly. In his Buildings, a eulogistic work, Prokopios universally praises the emperor for undertaking building projects including the construction of Hagia Sophia and Justinian's equestrian statue. With the possible exception of a Renaissance line drawing, no other description of the statue exists besides Prokopios' with its enigmatic reference likening the emperor's garb to Achilles' dress.⁸ In Buildings, Justinian is sometimes characterized as divinely inspired and the source of every good. In the Secret History, an insider's unflattering biography, Prokopios, in contrast, seems bent on communicating the opposite. In this work his objective seems to be to reveal each of the emperor's and Theodora's character defects and personal mannerisms.

Whereas the Wars seems written in the tradition of a Thucydidean history and the Buildings, in a panegyric one, it is difficult to identify The Secret History's classical antecedents. Averil Cameron believed that the work was primarily an invective with some satirical elements.⁹ She feels that Prokopios wrote it to counter the panegyric excesses of the Buildings. The Secret History enabled the historian to express his moral indignation at the all too human defects of a great emperor who ruled during difficult times, which required him to make unpopular judgments.

Corippus's encomiastic poem In Laudem Iustini Augusti Minoris is not only an example of the poetry of praise in the tradition of the panegyric but also an invaluable source of information on dress and court ceremonial.¹⁰ The preface suggests that like the panegyric it was delivered before the emperor at

7. The standard texts are Prokopios, The History of the Wars, I-IV, tr. Dewing, Cambridge University Press, 1924; Buildings, VIII, tr. Dewing, Cambridge University Press, 1940; and The Secret History, VI, tr. Dewing, Cambridge University Press. Several monographs have been written on Prokopios.

8. Prokopios, I, ii, 1-13; Dewing, 1940, 35.

9. Cameron, 1985, 56. 59.

10. The standard text and translation is In Laudem Iustini Augusti minoris, tr. Averil Cameron, London: Athlone Press, 1976. No monographs are devoted exclusively to the work.

court. Little is known about Corippus (fl. 6th century) except that he came from Africa and was probably a school teacher. His four book account of Justin II's accession to the throne on 14 Nov. 565 might also be simply described as an artistically embellished eyewitness account.

Although Corippus's poem contains many useful details, two passages, the ceremony where Justin first puts on imperial dress and the later one on 1 January 566 where the emperor revived the consular office,¹¹ represent especially useful sources on court ceremonial. These passages may also have been included in his narrative to provide a detailed record for those who either did not attend the ceremony or who lived outside Constantinople.

The most useful work for the time period after Justin II's reign is The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor (c760-812).¹² Theophanes was born in Constantinople of aristocratic parents. During his early years he held several governmental offices but soon withdrew from Constantinople to the Monastery of Megas Agros, which he built with his own funds on Mt. Sigiane and where he spent the remainder of his life. His work continues the history of George, the Synkellos; it covers the time period from Diocletian's reign in 284 to the downfall of Michael I Rhangabes in 813. As an historical source The Chronicle is mainly valuable for information beginning with Justin II's reign; it always presents events in strictly chronological order without evaluating them. Theophanes was the first to describe Marcian's reign as a golden age probably because the reigns after his experienced attacks from several barbaric tribes.

11. Corippus, Bk. II, 105-125; Bk. IV, 115-330; Cameron, 1997, 96; 112-116.

12. The standard text is The History of Theophanes Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History, AD 284-813, eds. Cyril Mango and Roger Scott. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997. There are no standard studies to date.

The Book of Ceremonies written by the scholar-emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitos (905-959), who was crowned co-emperor shortly after his birth in 908 but was excluded from power for almost forty years, was an especially rich source of information.¹³ During his lifetime the emperor either sponsored or wrote several works, which are discussed in detail in the introduction to the emperor's dress. For my thesis the book represents a valuable source for several reasons. Because it was also a compilation of earlier, now lost, writings, it provides general historical information on imperial births, marriages and accessions. Its main value, as its name implies, is as a source of information on early court dress, ceremonial and protocols; it sometimes even includes the emperor's added commentary or, more accurately, perhaps that of individuals designated by him.

2. Secondary Sources

Surprisingly few scholarly books and articles have been written on the general subject of late Roman and early Byzantine dress; even fewer deal specifically with imperial dress. The only really useful general handbook is A. T. Croom's recent book, Roman Clothing and Fashion (2002). Since each chapter was arranged first by type of dress and then by century, information on several of the works studied in my thesis, including the frieze on the Arch of Constantine, Stilicho Diptych, and imperial panels at San Vitale, was easily located. The handbook even included separate sections on shoes, jewelry, and specialized forms of dress such as bridal and mourning costume. Two recent articles by Mary Harlow also analyze late Roman dress: "Clothes Maketh the Man: Power Dressing and Masculinity in the Late Roman World" (2004) and "Females' Dress, Third-Sixth Century" (2004). My thesis is indebted to these essays for their general approach. After an introduction, each is arranged by types of clothing and then examines individual monuments chronologically with close attention to detail. But since both articles are general overviews, they only occasionally discuss imperial dress; the monuments analyzed in the essays include the Piazza

13. The most valuable edition is Constantine VII Porphyrogenitos, The Book of Ceremonies, ed. Reiske, 1892. There is also a new translation: Constantine VII Porphyrogenitos, The Book of Ceremonies, tr. Ann Moffatt and Maxeme Tall, 2 v. Canberra: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, 2012.

Armerina mosaics, Stilicho Diptychs, and imperial panels at San Vitale.

Few works deal exclusively with either the emperor's or empress' dress. George Galvaris' early article, "The Symbolism of the Costume as Displayed on Byzantine Coins" (1958) and Philip Grierson's section on "imperial types" in his "introduction" to the Catalogue of Byzantine Coins in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection (1968) are of limited value because they deal only with the dress depicted on coins. Grierson's section, however, sometimes provides such basic information as a schematic drawing of types of imperial crowns and of developments in insignia including the mappa and akakia and of changing styles in portraiture such as those found on the coins of the Herakleian Dynasty. Two additional works, the short monograph by Lillian May Wilson, The Roman Toga (1924), and Shelley Stone's "The Toga from National Costume to Ceremonial Costume" (2001), are invaluable for their analysis of the types of late Roman togas, their dates and uses. Especially valuable for differentiating the four types of togas was Lillian Wilson's discussion of how each variety was wrapped around the body. Though neither of these works include a discussion of the loros, without their summaries that section of my thesis would have suffered greatly.

Two monographs were especially valuable for discussing the empress' dress: Kenneth Holum's Theodosian Empresses: Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity (1982) and Anne McClanan's Representation of Early Byzantine Empresses: Image and Empire (2002). Holum's book provides valuable information and analysis of coins and larger monuments on all the Theodosian empresses from Flaccilla to Pulcheria. His discussion of Flaccilla's life and the carefully crafted image which her coins and small ivory statuette suggest are especially informative. His identification of the imperial couple on the Trier Ivory through the use of early chronicles represents a further example of his perceptive, well documented analyses. A final work on the empress' dress is the short article by Ann M. Stout, "Jewelry as a Symbol of Status in the Roman Empire" (2001). This essay traces the development of such topics as the imperial brooch, the early diadem, and the first use of pendilia by an emperor.

In addition to the chapter in Jennifer Ball's monograph and the thesis by Timothy Dalton, which were both discussed previously, Maria Parani's monograph, Reconstructing the Reality of Images, discusses the dress worn by later emperors. But

unlike the first two works, which describe only imperial dress, Maria Parani's monograph sets out to achieve a more ambitious end.¹ Her analysis is divided into two parts: she first identifies the garments pictured in contemporary manuscripts as exemplifying realia, that is the dress which emperors wore and which therefore belonged to the "reality of contemporary secular life."² In a second section, she then identifies contemporary examples of imperial dress used symbolically by artists in the religious works of the day. Artists depicted personifications of nations, tribes and languages, biblical rulers, and angelic orders wearing the imperial costume illustrated in contemporary manuscripts.³ She concludes that these figures were shown wearing these garments because they suggested to viewers "imperial majesty and authority".⁴ The fact that for the first time in several centuries artists chose to picture contemporary dress symbolically in their manuscripts rather than the worn stereotypes inherited from antiquity seems to imply a dawning awareness of the importance of recording the dress viewers actually saw. Such an awareness seems a necessary prelude to the more realistic forms of representation depicted during the Renaissance.

1. See General Introduction, note 7.

2. Parani, 2003, 65.

3. Parani, 2003, 34-50.

4. Parani, 2003, 49.

In the period from the tetrarchs to the end of the Herakleian dynasty, this general process is reversed. Traditional modes of realistic representation, which Rome had inherited from Greece, begin to be mixed with more symbolic ones. Forms inherited from Greek and Hellenistic art, which like Maria Parani's later examples recorded the sensible reality of contemporary secular life, that is their realia, were mixed with more symbolic ones derived from sub-antique art.⁵ Kitzinger identified several types including "hybrid art from the eastern borderlands" and an "indigenous Roman style" favored by the people.⁶ Although these forms begin to emerge as early as the reign of Trajan, most of the devices can be found on the metre high frieze on the Arch of Constantine: axial symmetry, frontal presentation, isolation of figures, repetition and variable scale. All are used to suggest such ideas as absolute rule and uncontested authority.⁷ As part of this new style the figures in the frieze often have stubby proportions, angular features, and the ordering of parts and drapery through repetition and symmetry.⁸ Imperial costume demonstrates a similar process of development. For example, the emperor's civic costume was a combination of the traditional field marshal's cloak and a tunic with several new symbols of rule including the orb, sceptre, and diadem.

5. Kitzinger, 1977, 9.

6. Kitzinger, 1977, 10.

7. Kitzinger, 1977, 8.

8. Kitzinger, 1977, 9.

Representations of the Emperor's Dress

Introduction to the Emperor's Dress

The first Roman emperors were all members of the senate and continued to belong to it throughout their reigns.¹ All the

1. Under the law, the lex Ovinia (enacted by 318 BC), censors selected each senator according to prescribed criteria. Since only members who were expelled for misconduct ever left the senate, the appointment was lifetime. OCD, 1996, 1385.

2. OCD, 1996, 1386. Also see Stone, 2001, 15.

3. All of the thirteen emperors except two who ruled during this period (235-260) were acclaimed by the army. These were Maximinus I, Gordian I, Gordian II, Gordian III, Philip I, Trajanus Decius, Trebonianus Gallus, Aemilion, Valerion, Gallienus and Posthumus. Grant, 1985, vi.

4. Price, 1997, 97-98; Nixon, 1995, 51.

5. Aurelius Victor, 39; Bird, 1994, 41.

members of the senate including the emperor wore tunics and togas decorated with a wide purple band, the latus clavus, and special footwear.² During the period of instability in the early third century, several emperors were selected by the army.³ Initially this shift in power did not affect court ceremony and dress; but slowly both began to change. Court ceremony became more formal and as power became centered in the emperor, he increasingly distanced himself even from senators. Obeisance, which originally was required only for foreigners, now became standard practice.⁴

Aurelius Victor notes that the emperor Diocletian began wearing richly brocaded purple robes, silks and jeweled sandals at court.⁵ Although he was not the first emperor to wear lavishly embellished garments like these, during his reign they probably first became a standard feature of court ceremonial.⁶ A second addition to court ceremonial during Diocletian's reign was the adoratio, a ceremony in which individual court members approached the emperor and kissed the hem of his purple robe. Although the adoratio did not originate under Diocletian, during his reign it became more formalized with court members approaching the emperor in a prescribed order which indicated their exact placement in the government hierarchy.⁷

Two events, Diocletian's abdication and Constantine Chorus' death, illustrate that court ceremony and dress often still remained very simple and the only garment closely associated with imperial power was the emperor's purple robe. In his On the Deaths of the Persecutors, Lactantius records that in 305 when Diocletian abdicated, the ceremony consisted of the emperor standing under a statue of his patron deity Zeus before the assembled military, then removing his purple robe and lastly placing it on the shoulders of his successor. In the following year Eusebios states in his Life of Constantine that when Constantine Chorus died even such a simple ceremony was unnecessary to indicate a transference of power. As the emperor lay dying, his family gathered around his bed; after his death Constantine emerged from the house wearing his father's purple robe to indicate to all present that a smooth transition of power had been achieved.⁸

6. Canepa, 2009, 201.

7. Stern, 1994, 187; Harries, 2012, 84.

During Constantine's reign, the primary event which resulted in changes to court ceremony and dress was the emperor's decision to support Christianity.⁹ The effect of this decision is perhaps best illustrated by his funeral. According to the only account by the Christian bishop Eusebios, the ceremony, which blended Christian and pagan elements, was primarily designed to create a smooth transition of power. Cameron reasonably believes that the Christian Eusebios may have felt awkward in reporting such an unprecedented blending of elements and for that reason recorded events unadorned.¹⁰ Hence Eusebios's description of the ceremony is probably an accurate one. The first half of the funeral followed Roman practices. But once Constantine's successor Constantius II had led the procession to the Church of the Holy Apostles, the funeral followed Christian ones. After the service instead of being cremated like every emperor before him, Constantine's body was interred as that of the thirteenth apostle in a mausoleum containing twelve coffins.¹¹

Constantine's funeral represented a break from all previous ceremony; its splendour and new Christian elements foreshadowed rituals and protocols found in the Middle Byzantine period as described in Constantine VII Porphyrogenitos' Book of Ceremonies.¹² These mingled elements from the Roman past with the Christian present. But rather than being mere apostles, later emperors claimed that they were God's representatives and that their courts mirrored the heavenly one. Because the empress' role was initially less well defined, her dress resembled that of other noblewomen; but beginning with Helena, both slowly began to reflect her new status as the emperor's wife or, in Helena's case, first as Constantine Chlorus' concubine and then as the emperor's mother.¹³

8. Lactantius, XIX; Fletcher, 1867, [8]; Eusebios, Bk. I, 22,1; Cameron and Hall, 1999, 78.

9. Price, 1987, 99.

10. Eusebios, IV, 60, 3; Cameron and Hall, 1999, 78; Cameron and Hall, 1999, 349.

11. Eusebios, IV, 71, 1; Cameron and Hall, 1999, 181.

In the Book of Ceremonies Constantine VII Porphyrogenitos (913-959) or persons designated by him set out to write a detailed description of Byzantine court ceremony from the perspective of a court official.¹⁴ Since court ceremonial changed over time, the book is often more of a compilation that gathers together parts of earlier works than a new composition.¹⁵ Since it was sponsored by an emperor, the Book of Ceremonies is an important source of information.¹⁶ Constantine commissioned several other works including those on such subjects as foreign affairs, military ceremonial, imperial government, and recent history. Like several of Constantine's commissioned works the Book of Ceremonies is devoted to a single subject, court ceremonial.¹⁷

The court rituals which Constantine VII described fall roughly into three groups depending upon how frequently they occurred: the first one, which included imperial marriages, baptisms, funerals and coronations, occurred very infrequently; a second group, such as imperial victory celebrations, the reception of diplomats and bestowal of offices, occurred more often; and the final most common group which the emperor and court participated in was the religious festivals which followed the liturgical year.¹⁸ Through this regular and proper celebration of court ceremony an ordered relationship between the earthly and heavenly courts was believed to be maintained.

12. Constantine VII Porphyrogenitos, preface, 29-33; Reiske, 1935. Also see Cameron, 1987, 107 and Maguire, 2004, 247.

13. For developments in the empress' role see James, 2001, 36-37.

14. Cameron, 1987, 106. For a detailed discussion of the authorship of the numerous works attributed to Constantine VII: Sevchenko, 1992, 167-195, especially 168, 189.

15. Cameron, 1987, 110.

16. Cameron, 1987, 106.

At the end of his introduction to the Book of Ceremonies, Constantine VII Porphyrogenitos even describes order or taxis as the goal of all court ceremonial; he compared it to the harmonious movement bestowed by the creator on all the universe and the kingdom.¹⁹ Wearing the correct costume in each ceremony was also an important element in achieving harmony between the heavenly and earthly courts.²⁰ The attainment of an ordered life was considered the primary goal, not just of the court, but of all Christians.²¹ The splendour and dignity of Byzantine court ceremony so impressed foreigners and so engendered a sense of awe that a scholar has recently claimed they were envied by the whole world.²²

In a single ceremony participants might change their dress several times. Their garments and their accessories represented a highly developed dress code which identified the participant's court rank and status.²³

Contemporary historians preserve a record of the diplomatic missions received by the emperor from neighboring states. Much of the state ritual of diplomacy including costume was designed to impress foreign embassies into believing as Robin Cormack stated that "the Byzantine emperor in the Great Palace was the king of kings, the most powerful monarch on earth".²⁴ From the standpoint of diplomacy, costume itself can be viewed as simply one of several props designed to impress diplomats; other forms of diplomacy included sumptuous throne rooms such as the Chrysotriclinos built by Justin II,²⁵ elaborate ceremonies and banquets, and the bestowal of gifts and titles.²⁶ Among these groups, only the emperor's costume referred exclusively to his person and contributed to creating the more generalized mystique surrounding his office.

17. Cameron, 1987, 110.

18. Cameron, 1987, 111-112.

19. Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, introduction, ll. 15-33. Vogt, 1936, 2.

20. Ball, 2005, 3.

21. Cameron, 1987, 111; Mango, 2002, 16.

22. Ball, 2005, 3.

23. Cameron, 1987, 118; Ball, 2005, 3.

24. Cormack, 1992, 222.

25. Cameron, 1987, 116.

Before the tetrarchic period and Constantine's reign, emperors were usually elected by the Roman senate and their dress was identical to other senator members'. Beginning with the tetrarchs, emperors, however, were increasingly selected by the military. During Constantine's reign Christianity was first supported by the state. Later emperors were considered more than just an earthly ruler; they were also God's representative on earth. The imperial court was believed to mirror the heavenly one and the emperor's dress reflected his newly elevated status. For example, in Corippus' poem about Justin II's inauguration, each garment even has its own significance, and the transference of power is completed only after the new emperor finishes dressing.

It will be the object of this thesis to trace on a monument by monument basis chronological developments in each type of dress from the beginning of the tetrarchic regime to the end of the Herakleian dynasty. Although Jennifer Ball has analyzed the imperial dress of the Middle Byzantine Period and Tim Dawson that of the time period of 900-1400, no scholar has undertaken the study of developments in dress during the early period when the greatest number of changes in ideology and costume occurred.²⁷

The Emperor in Military Dress

27. Ball, 2005; Dawson, 2002.

On October 28, 312, Constantine defeated Maxentius at the Milvian Bridge and returned to Rome the uncontested ruler of the western empire. According to Eusebios, he attributed his victory to the new monogram, the Chi-Rho symbol, which was displayed on his standards during the battle.¹ A silver medallion struck in 315 shows Constantine wearing the symbol on his helmet;² his shield, however, is decorated with the she-wolf suckling the twin founders of Rome (pl. 1). As conquering heroes, Constantine and his immediate successors continued the traditions of the Roman past. Art which represents the emperor in military dress was the form which commemorated the achievements of these early ruler generals.

The central part of Rome, which Constantine entered the following day in 312 to celebrate his victory, was already filled with such monuments as marble temples, circuses, thermal baths, fora, and theatres glittering with gold and decorated with statuary. This lavish display represented the combined largesse of many generations, and included the monuments of Augustus, Trajan, Hadrian, Marcus Aurelius, Vespasian, and Titus.³

1. Eusebios, Bk. I, 30-31; Cameron and Hall, 1999, 80-81.

2. For a discussion of the monuments see Krautheimer, 1983, 7-8; for a picture of the medallion see 36. For additional reproductions see Weitzmann, 1979, 66; Kleiner, 1992, 435 and Lenski, 2006, Coin 1.

3. Krautheimer, 1983, 25-26.

Shortly after his victory, Constantine demonstrated his generosity by erecting an equestrian statue of himself in the Roman Forum, a huge statue portraying him as Jupiter in the apse of the Basilica of Constantine, and a large thermal bath.⁴ Inside its domed halls this building displayed a variety of statuary, including horse tamers, statues of Constantine and his sons, river gods, and conquered barbarians. The only large monument now surviving, his triumphal arch, exhibits a meter-high frieze, which shows Constantine's victory over Maxentius, his triumphant adventus into the city, the distribution of largesse, and the emperor's adlocutio to the Roman populace (pls. 2-4).⁵ Although he wears military dress only in that section which depicts the siege of Verona, several other of his now lost donations may have represented him as a victorious Roman general.

4. Kleiner, 1992, 447.

5. For reproductions of the reliefs on the Arch of Constantine see Weitzmann, 1979, 68; Kleiner, 1992, 448-451; and Lenski, 2006, 17-18. Although the bibliography on the Arch of Constantine is extensive, Kleiner presents a balanced overview of the issues, 444-455. Jas Elsner, 2000, discusses the monument in its contemporary context, 149-184. Pierce, 1989, sees the monument as imperial propaganda, 387-418.

6. Kleiner, 1992, reproduces the statue, 436; also Lenski, 2006, fig. 20.

A large marble statue of Constantine, one of a family dynastic group of four from his thermal bath, also still exists and is displayed in S. Giovanni Laterani (pl. 5).⁶ The work, dated from 312-324, is in a style similar to that of the statues of Constantine's Roman predecessors and shows the emperor as no longer a youth but still at the peak of his physical powers. Constantine's face is strongly modeled with a broad forehead, prominent cheekbones, and a rectangularly shaped jaw. The emperor's overall appearance suggests that he was physically strong but still graceful. His face and appearance seem appropriate for a triumphant ruler general. The emperor's face as shown on coins dated to this time period is very similar (pl. 6). The statue to some extent probably represents his appearance at the time of his victory over Maxentius. According to the early bishop Eusebios' perhaps flattering description of the first Christian emperor, as a young man Constantine was tall and graceful and so surpassed "his contemporaries in personal strength that he struck terror in them".⁷ The statue's style connects him with similar examples depicting past rulers and seems appropriate for a heroic ruler-general.

The emperor, as depicted in the statue, wears typical military dress. In addition he wears a special type of crown awarded by the senate to emperors for saving citizens' lives, the corona civica; this crown is composed of large gems alternating with pearls and oak leaves.⁸ His military costume consists of an ankle-length military cloak, the paludamentum, clasped on his left shoulder by a circular fibula that is looped over his hand to better display his belted cuirass. The double rows of its fringed leather pteryges and of its leather flaps, which hang slightly above his knees, are decorated with crosses or rosettes; such double rows belong to a type of ceremonial antique cuirass which probably imitated those worn by his predecessors.⁹ The statue's large size, the emperor's youthfulness, his physical strength, the civic crown, and antique cuirass enhance the grandeur and dignity of the statue and were probably meant to suggest that Constantine was part of a long line of victorious Roman generals and his regime was the renewal of a revered past.

7. Vagi, 1999, v. I, 473. Eusebios, an early bishop, depicted him favourably.

8. Stout, 2001, 82. It symbolized the emperor as pater patria; Flory, 1995, 54.

The Ticinium medallion struck in 313 shows jugate busts of Constantine and Sol Invictus on its obverse and the iconography of an imperial adventus on its reverse (pl. 7).¹⁰ On the obverse, a bust of Sol Invictus behind a youthful portrait of Constantine is shown wearing a radiate crown. The inscription on the coin INVICTUS CONSTANTINUS MAX AUG (invincible Constantine, greatest emperor) appropriates the sun god's epithet for Constantine.¹¹ The emperor wears military dress and a laurel crown, a type originally awarded by the senate to victorious generals but later only to emperors; even his shield is decorated with Sol's quadriga to emphasize his connection with the god.¹² Under the tetrarchs, the association of the emperor with Sol was part of imperial ideology.¹³ The similarity of their jugate portraits implied Constantine's appropriation of that god's powers. On the reverse, the coin's symbolism is of an imperial adventus, an emperor's triumphant return from battle. Constantine wearing a cuirass is shown on horseback being led by Victory, who brandishes aloft a laurel branch. The images on both sides of the medallion have different messages: those on the obverse have their origin in contemporary tetrarchic ideology, which associated each of the four rulers with a protective patron deity, and those on the reverse preserve the late antique iconography of an imperial adventus.

9. Vermeule, 1959, 29.

10. The medallion is shown in Krautheimer, 1983, 33 and Lenski, 1981, 60. Its iconography is discussed by MacCormack, 1981, 60.

11. Marlowe, 2006, 231.

12. For symbolism of the laurel: Florey, 1995, 43; for Sol: Stout, 2006, 231.

Reflecting contemporary propaganda developed shortly after Constantine's victory over Maxentius, the medallion emphasizes the emperor's association with the sun god and his youth and vigour.¹⁴ In a panegyric delivered in 310 Constantine also is likened to the sun god: "since you are like, O Emperor, like him, youthful, joyful, a bringer of health and very handsome".¹⁵ On coins minted between 313-317, Constantine's portraits sometimes depict him wearing Sol's rayed crown; the inscription SOLI INVICTO COMITI (companion of the invincible sun) also appears on coins issued at that time.¹⁶ The Arch of Constantine was also placed immediately in front of a colossal bronze statue of Sol which originally stood in the vestibule of Nero's Domus Aurea and whose face once bore that emperor's features. This statue was later moved by Hadrian and relocated beside the Flavian amphitheatre.¹⁷ The remains of its base are still visible beside the colosseum behind the Arch of Constantine. Even a decade later when he founded Constantinople, Constantine erected on top of a large porphyry column in his forum a statue of Sol, whose face was re-cut with his features.¹⁸

13. MacCormack, 1976, 139.

14. See Smith, 1999, 185-187, for a more detailed description of the portrayal of Constantine at this time period see; see Canepa. 2009, 46, for a discussion of Constantine's attitude toward Sol Invictus at this date.

15. Panegyrici Latini, 6, 21, 7; Nixon, 1995, 251.

Several reliefs on the Arch of Constantine also depict Sol Invictus. On the east facade, the emperor is shown seated in a wagon during his triumphant entry into Rome. Above this panel is a tondo showing Sol Invictus riding in his chariot (pl. 8). These parallel scenes imply that Sol and the victorious emperor were related. The god is depicted in the tondo raising his right hand in a distinctive gesture, which along with his rayed crown, chariot and globe, was one of his standard attributes. Healing and destructive powers were believed to emanate from the god's raised right hand.¹⁸ In the siege of Verona, the enlarged figure of Constantine is shown wearing military dress with his hand raised in a similar gesture (pl. 9). His hand is shown stretching forth over his men, saving and protecting them during battle.¹⁹ With the sun god's help, he is depicted as possessing the powers of a semi-divine hero. He wears military dress to further imply his protective powers.

Twelve years after his triumphant entry into Rome on September 18, 324, Constantine defeated his eastern rival Licinius at Chrysopolis. By this date he had won many victories fighting under the new Chi-Rho symbol placed on his labarum (pl. 10).²⁰ Since the Chi-Rho symbol first used by Constantine is derived from Christ's name and continues today, it represents the first example of a new type of symbolism, the intrinsic symbol.²¹ Although Constantine was probably over fifty on the day he traced the new city's walls,²² four major structures are associated with his reign: his palace, forum, the hippodrome, and the Mausoleum of Holy Apostles, his place of burial in 337.²³

Over the gate of the palace entrance underneath its bronze doors, Eusebios reports that Constantine had painted a panel

16. Marlowe, 2006, 226

17. Marlowe, 2006, 225-229, for a description of the statue and its history.

18. Marlowe, 2006, 235; L'Orange, 1953, 148.

19. Marlowe, 2006, 236.

20. The labarum is pictured in Lenski, 2006, Coin 31.

21. For a definition of the "intrinsic symbol" see p. 4.

22. The year of Constantine's birth has never been established; most historians favour the year 272. Lenski provides a detailed discussion with the arguments favouring various dates, 59.

23. Works on the Great Palace include Bardill, 1977, 217-230 and Brett, 1947; on the Holy Apostles, Epstein, 1982, 79-92 and Mango, 1990, 51-62; on the early Hippodrome, Dagron, 1974; Cameron, 1976.

24. Eusebios, Bk. III, 3, 1-2; Cameron and Hall, 1999, 122.

which showed the Chi-Rho symbol and Constantine piercing a dragon with a spear and accompanied by his sons.²⁴ Eusebios identifies the dragon

with the “crooked serpent” from Isaiah (27: 1). The addition of the Chi-Rho symbol indicates that Constantine’s victories were sanctioned by God. The serpent represents the satanic forces of evil and chaos which created disorder within the ruler’s kingdom. But in the context of his recent victory, the serpent may represent the defeated Licinius.²⁵ A contemporary gold nomisma minted in 365-375 shows a similar image (pl. 11).²⁶ The figure of Constantine dressed in military garb stands triumphantly over a dead serpent holding a long cross in one hand and a globe in the other. The emperor wears military dress to suggest that he has subdued the dragon. In the panel the figures of Constantine’s sons suggested a potential source of strength and his dynastic hopes.

In his new forum Constantine constructed a large column made of nine porphyry drums.²⁷ Its top was surmounted by a bronze statue of the emperor, from whose head radiated the seven rays of Helios or Sol. A similar gilded image was drawn around the Hippodrome at the opening of games. Little is known about it; a Renaissance drawing suggests that it was nude (pl. 12); since it was re-carved with the emperor’s face, it may have been adapted from earlier Hellenistic statues which depicted emperors as heroic nudes.²⁸ Perhaps it was a reused statue of Sol, of Constantine’s genius, or of Apollo brought from elsewhere. Its only military attribute was its lance.

The historian Sozomenos (c.400-c.450) also mentions an equestrian statue of Constantine beside the Strategion, the Mansion House of the two chief magistrates.²⁹ According to Cyril Mango, victory monuments were concentrated near the palace;

25. See Krautheimer, 1983, 49-50 for additional information; also Canepa, 2009, 104-105.

26. A reconstruction of the statue is pictured in Krautheimer, 1982, 57.

27. Krautheimer, 1983, 62.

28. Krautheimer, 1983, 62. For further information on heroic nude statues of Diocletian see MacCormack, 1981, 31.

but none depict an emperor in a cuirass.³⁰ The palace, as the emperor's residence, was probably associated more with civic life and dress.

A porphyry statuary group divided into two separate pairs of figures depicting tetrarchs wearing military dress is dated to about 300 (pl. 13).³¹ Although perhaps brought from elsewhere, the statues are first recorded as belonging to the imperial palace in Constantinople; they later were brought to Venice by the Crusaders. They are now attached to the southwest corner of the Basilica of San Marco in Venice. The original location of this group in a part of the palace called the Philadelphion, where Constantine's sons first met after his death, has recently been confirmed by the discovery of one statue's missing porphyry foot. It was found attached to its original bracket. Both groups were mounted on the bases of separate columns.³²

29. Sozomenos, XVI, 4; *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, v. II, 1891.

30. Mango, 2000, 178.

31. Kleiner includes a picture of the statuary group, provides an interpretation of the monument and its present location. See Kleiner, 1992, 401-405. A recent analysis is included in Kampen, 2009, 104-122.

32. Verzone was the first author to publish this discovery: Verzone, 1958, 8.

During the tetrarchic period (284-313) the Emperor Diocletian developed new forms of art designed to bolster the claims of emperors selected by the military instead of the Roman senate.³³ According to this new system of rule, two senior Augusti would reign for a prescribed number of years and then abdicate in favour of their junior rulers or Caesars.³⁴ The eastern emperors were protected by Jove and the western by Hercules. These two deities were selected because Jove first overcame the Titans, the forces of darkness, and imposed order on the world; and Hercules successfully performed twelve superhuman labours.³⁵ Both Constantine and his father, Constantius I Chlorus, had been tetrarchic rulers. The art which these emperors commissioned was designed to demonstrate their unity of purpose and to promote ideas such as their concord, unity, and care of the realm.³⁶

The porphyry group may connect his sons with the early part of their father's reign as a tetrarchic ruler. Although no one knows precisely where the statues came from,³⁷ at the Philadelphion the statues not only suggested the earlier tetrarchs and their concord but also the mutual concord of Constantine's three remaining sons, Constantine II, Constantios II, and Constans. Constantine's fourth designated heir Dalmatius was executed shortly after his death.

33. Price, 1987, 93; Kleiner, 1992, 400.

34. ODB, 1991, 2027-2028.

35. Canepa, 2009, 105.

36. Rees, 1993, 198.

37. Kampen, 2009, 121.

In the statuary group each of the two Augusti identified by their lightly etched beards places his right hand on the shoulder of his Caesar; the left hand of all four is grasping the sheathed hilt of his ornamental sword. Each of the four is of the same height and identically dressed in a rounded Pannonian cap, mantle, tunic, cuirass and kampagnia.³⁸ Scholars such as Natalie Kampen have interpreted their embrace as a ceremonial greeting performed by rulers who lived far apart and needed to reassure on-lookers of their continued mutual support.³⁹ Since this greeting was part of court ritual, their costume is a form of ceremonial dress. The fact that the four rulers wear identical costumes which are depicted in great detail with eagle handled swords, triple rows of leather shoulder flaps and double ornamental belts, also suggests that their dress might be ceremonial.⁴⁰

38. MacMillan, 1964, states that Pannonian caps were usually worn by commoners, 182-183; Eutropius, however, mentions that it became part of imperial costume under Diocletian, Kleiner, 1992, 403. See Dawson, 2002, for a discussion of ancient footwear.

39. Kleiner identifies the cap: Kleiner, 1992, 403; Kampen, 2009, 121.

40. The only major difference between the four figures is that two of the statues have lightly chiseled beards. These were thought to be the two tetarchs who were the Augusti. Natalie Kampen, however, believes the beards were later additions: Kampen, 2009, 105.

41. Kleiner, 1992, 405.

42. ODB, 1991, 1701.

The statues of the tetarchic rulers are built up of groups of blocky, rectangular shapes.⁴¹ This was a result of their being carved from purple porphyry, a regally coloured stone,⁴² but one which was very hard to work. Each of the figures is squat, has an oval shaped head, lined face, and round drilled eyes. As R. R. R. Smith mentions in his essay on late Roman portraiture, the statues' eyes are round because they have the "burning gaze" (fulgor ocularorum) of rulers, who believed that one of their tasks was the re-establishment of a lost unity by rooting out the moral decay of their times.⁴³ As mentioned earlier, in accomplishing this task the tetrarchs were aided by the most powerful gods, including Jove, who had overcame the Titans, and also Hercules, who performed superhuman labours. All the figures are further connected through the repetitive groups of folds in the sleeves of their tunics, their cloaks, the flaps of their cuirasses, and even their furrowed brows. The round shape of their eyes is found in the ornaments on their belts and the shape of their Pannonian caps. Though the rulers' bodies are placed frontally, each pair of figures is turned toward his neighbour locked in their ceremonial embrace.

43. For a discussion of the emperor's "burning gaze": Smith, 2000, 182. The term is used in *Pan. Lat.*, 6, 17, 1; *XII Panegyrici Latini*, 1992. The best example is Galerius' bust from Athribis in Egypt (ca. 300); it is pictured in Kleiner, 1992, 405.

44. L'Orange, 1965, 121.

All the statues of tetrarchic rulers, regardless of the type of stone from which they were made, had features which were so roughly defined that individuals were often difficult to identify; one of the objectives of the tetrarchic style of art was to represent all the rulers as having similar features.⁴⁴ In the porphyry group each of the figures, however, is depicted as not just similar but as identical to his neighbour.⁴⁵ This sameness is conveyed at all levels, including treatment, style, and iconography.⁴⁶ Their identical dress is only one of the more prominent examples of this sameness. In effect the group becomes a symbol of a new type of collective power which represented the cohesiveness not only of the group but also of the empire itself.⁴⁷ Through their identical treatment the figures are linked as equals, as a new form of unified leadership and legitimacy.⁴⁸ Since differences of dress often signify individual rank, the figures' identical dress is one of the most important means by which the sculpture implied that the rulers shared power equally. At another level, the manner in which the four military rulers are depicted, locked in their collegial embrace, demonstrated such virtues as their unity of purpose, vigilance and care of the realm.

45. Kleiner, 1994, 400.

46. L'Orange, 1965, 121.

47. Kampen, 2009, 119.

48. Kleiner, 1994, 401.

49. Mango, 2000, 180.

The ceremonial core of Constantinople took its final form in the late fourth and early fifth centuries during the reigns of Theodosios I (379-395) and his son Arkadios (395-408).⁴⁹ Both of these emperors erected several new monuments on the city's ceremonial way. The Emperor Theodosios I claimed that he was a descendant of Trajan; the forum, which he built, contained a column decorated with a narrative, a triumphal arch, and equestrian and other statuary which consciously imitated features of Trajan's earlier forum in Rome.⁵⁰ He also erected an Egyptian obelisk on a marble base in the spina of the Hippodrome. When the obelisk was broken during transport, its lower part was then placed near the Strategion.⁵¹ Only a few fragments of the monuments from Theodosios' forum survive today; his son Arkadios also built a forum decorated with monuments which consciously imitated those erected by his father. Arkadios' column remained standing until 1719 when it was finally destroyed by an earthquake (pls. 14-16).⁵²

Anonymous drawings on fold out sheets in a vellum-bound album dated to 1574 show that Arkadios' column differed from its earlier Roman counterparts in several ways.⁵³ The monument had fewer spirals and was taller. The scenes on the column probably depicted the defeat of an Ostrogothic general, Gainas, in 400. On the column, Arkadios is represented in several scenes either receiving messages in the camp or giving audiences at the palace.

The decorated sides of the base, however, are noteworthy because, in addition to traditional military imagery, they include Christian sources. On each of the four sides, Arkadios is

50. Mango, 2000, 180.

51. Mango, 2000, 187-188.

52. The drawings of Arkadios' column are reproduced in Grabar, 1936, XIII-XV and in *Byzance et les Images*, 1994, figs. 14-15.

53. Weitzmann, 1979, 29.

accompanied by his brother and co-ruler Honorios. The generalized scenes carved on three sides celebrate the concord and triumph of the newly divided empire's eastern and western parts. The scene on the western side shows the emperors as military generals accompanied by a bodyguard.⁵⁴ The two ruler-generals hold long sceptres, wear ankle-length paludamenta clasped on their left shoulders, cuirasses and leather boots. The fact that they are unarmed probably signaled to onlookers, including the row of barbarians beneath them pleading for clemency, that their intentions were peaceful, and a standard is displayed in the centre. The south and north sides also show the emperors as victorious generals; their garb is also the same as on the western side except that they hold *victoriolae* and are now accompanied by court officials.⁵⁵ Since on all three sides the emperors are depicted as victorious generals, they wear military dress.

54. Grabar, 1936, pl. XV.

55. Grabar, 1936, pl. XIII.

56. Grabar, 1936, pl. XIII.

57. There is disagreement about the identity of the two figures. They may, however, be the co-rulers. For further information see Grigg, 1977, 472.

The eastern side shows the co-rulers as consuls; below this scene, the senate presents them with crowns.⁵⁶ Each ruler is flanked by personifications of Constantinople and Rome. On all sides except the eastern, the upper register depicts a Latin cross in a wreath supported by Victory angels. On the eastern side, angels support a square containing two figures flanking an unadorned cross.⁵⁷ The imagery on the column base confirms the ideal of mutual concordia between the newly-divided eastern and western empires in an ever victorious state under God's protection.⁵⁸ Since they are being awarded victory crowns by the senate, the emperors are depicted on the eastern side in togas, the dress worn by all senators. In all these reliefs, the imagery conforms to earlier Roman iconography.

Another victory monument in Constantinople erected as a tribute to an emperor was a huge bronze statue on a pedestal (pl. 17) of Marcian near the Capitolium.⁵⁹ Although the attribution has been disputed, a colossal bronze washed up on the shore at Barletta in 1309 has been identified as this work. The emperor's dress, hair style and age conform to Marcian's time-period. The emperor's seven year reign (450-457) was considered a golden age.⁶⁰ Because Marcian was a professional soldier who rose to the rank of domesticus to Asper, he is depicted in the statue wearing military dress. On his deathbed Theodosios II indicated his preference for Marcian to succeed him; his choice was first ratified by the senate and then Marcian was married to Pulcheria, Theodosios' sister, to strengthen his claim to the throne.⁶¹ The statue's base, still in Constantinople, is of sufficient size to accommodate the statue, which is almost three times life-size.⁶²

The emperor depicted in the statue is past middle age, a light beard is etched on his face, and his hair is arranged in tight curls over his forehead. The figure wears a diadem decorated with pendilia and double rows of pearls, long and short-sleeved tunics,

58. Grigg, 1977, 481.

59. Pictures of the statue are found in Weitzmann, 1979, 29; Grabar, 1936, pl. 1 and Byzance et les Images, 1994, 79.

60. Theophanes, AM 5946; Mango and Scott, 1977, 166. Grierson, 1992, 157.

61. Grierson, 1992, 157.

62. Weitzmann, 1979, 79.

63. For a discussion of various forms of military footwear see D'Amato, 2005, 20-21. One of the tunics would have been padded to protect the skin from being scratched by the metal cuirass.

a belted cuirass, paludamentum, and cothurni, a form of calf-length, open-laced boot worn by officers during this time period.⁶³

Although the emperor's face with its wrinkled brow seems careworn, the fact that the figure once held a heavy lance or standard upright suggests that as a military commander he was victorious in battle and perhaps by implication that as an emperor he had also triumphed over non-military obstacles as well. Placed as it was on a high pedestal, where its outline was etched against the sky, the huge statue undoubtedly once represented a fitting tribute to a revered soldier-emperor. Like the dynastic group of Constantine and his sons, the emperor probably wears military dress to suggest his own past and connect him with previous victorious soldier emperors.

In the late fifth century beginning with Arcadius' reign, emperors and their courts became more sedentary and rarely left Constantinople; the emperor was no longer selected by the army.

For example, Anastasios (476-518), a court official, was chosen ruler by Ariadne, the widow of the previous emperor.⁶⁴ Justin I (518-527) designated Justinian (527-565), a nephew, as his successor. After he came to power, Justinian surrounded himself with talented advisors such as Belisarios, John of Cappadocia, and Trebonios; throughout his reign, it has been claimed he consciously strove to create a unified empire and revive the glories of the Roman past, renovatio.⁶⁵

Justinian also commissioned several victory monuments. Prokopios records that he decorated the Chalke Gate, the palace entrance, with a mosaic commemorating his general Belisarios' victory over the Vandals. Justinian also struck a large gold medallion in which he is depicted on the obverse as a bust in military garb; on the reverse, he is shown on horseback being led by a winged Victory triumphantly into the city. Although the identification is disputed, the victorious emperor shown on the Barberini ivory is usually identified as Justinian.⁶⁶ The emperor was also the last to erect a large scale victory monument, his equestrian statue, in the

64. ODB, 1991, 86.

65. Mango, 2002, 46.

66. Weitzmann, 1979, 33.

67. Mango, 200, 189.

Augusteum near Hagia Sophia.⁶⁷

In his Buildings (Bk. I, X, 16 ff.), Prokopios states that Justinian commissioned a ceiling mosaic for the dome of the palace's entrance, the Chalke Gate. It celebrated the victory of his general Belisarios over the Goths and Vandals. In iconography probably reminiscent of similar earlier monuments, the mosaic showed personifications of captured cities and the rulers of the two conquered nations being led before Justinian and Theodora in chains. Since the Chalke was the gate through which diplomats passed as they entered the palace before an audience, these pictures not only advertised Justinian's conquests but acted as a warning to would-be aggressors.⁶⁸ Since Justinian is surrounded by the senate rather than by soldiers, he probably wore civic, rather than military, dress.

Corippus records that Justinian's lavish gold and purple funeral shroud (I, l. 276 ff.) and his silver service (I, l. 120 ff.) also depicted Belisarios' victory over the Vandals. According to the historian, the emperor's shroud was embellished with a picture of Justinian performing the ritualistic trampling of Gelimer, the Vandal chief.⁶⁹ Although Prokopios makes no mention of Justinian's costume, it seems likely that the shroud depicted him performing this ritualistic act in military costume.⁷⁰

68. Canepa, 2009, 134-135, also 171-172.

69. For the identification of the Vandal chief as Gelimer see Cameron, 1970, note to II. 272 ff.

70. Such ritualistic trampling scenes are shown on third and fourth-century bronzes with the inscriptions VIRTUS AVGVSTORUM and VIRTUS EXERCITI. On these small bronzes the emperor always wears military dress. For examples see Carson, 1978, pl. III, 2173 and pl. IV, 1182.

A large gold medallion equal in weight to thirty-two imperial nomismata was found over a century ago in the Cappadocian city of Caesarea (pl. 18).⁷¹ The medallion was acquired by the Cabinet of Medals in Paris but stolen in 1831; today it is known only through casts made by Mionnet. Since the slight turn of Justinian's head on the medal's obverse is found on nomismata struck by Justinian before 538, it probably was also produced to commemorate Belisarios' victory over the Vandals in 534.⁷²

The portrayal of Justinian's military regalia, especially on the obverse, is exceptionally elaborate. On both sides, the emperor wears a toufa helmet, a type decorated with a crest of peacock feathers, a jeweled diadem, a cuirass, and paludamentum fastened by an imperial brooch. Although more detailed, the portrait essentially imitates busts found on the emperor's early nomismata. Justinian is also depicted wearing a toufa in the drawing of his now lost equestrian statue.⁷³ This form of headdress was often worn by emperors celebrating imperial triumphs.⁷⁴

The earlier Ticinium medallion also depicted an imperial

71. The medal is depicted in Weitzmann, 1979, 45; Grabar, 1936, XXVIII; Wroth, 1966, frontispiece.

72. Weitzmann, 1979, 45.

73. A toufa is also shown in a tenth-century silk in Bamberg Cathedral where one of the two Tyches flanking a mounted emperor presents him with a toufa. The Bamberg silk is shown in Grabar, 1936, pl. VII, 1.

74. Grierson, 1968, II, 74.

adventus on its reverse. Although this medal was produced during Constantine's reign, the iconography of both medallions is much the same. On both, an emperor on horseback is being led into a city by a winged Victory holding a trophy and palm branch. Whereas Constantine, like his predecessors in Rome, fought in many battles, Justinian never did so. Instead, he claimed for himself the victories of generals he appointed.⁷⁵ Kitzinger has argued that as part of his programme of reviving the past, Justinian carefully preserved the ceremonies and symbolism of his predecessors, including the portrayal of himself in military costume.⁷⁶

75. See MacCormack, 1981, 73 for a scholarly discussion of Justinian's triumphs.

For a detailed description of the Vandal triumph see Prokopios, IV, 9, 3-12; Dewing,

76. Kitzinger, 1977, 81.

77. For a picture of the Barberini ivory see Weitzmann, 1979, 35. Sources of information include MacCormack, 1981, 72-73; Kitzinger, 1977, 96-98; and Maguire, 1987, 75-76.

78. The other two imperial panels, one in Venice and the second one in Florence, both probably depict the Empress Ariadne: Weitzmann, 1979, 31.

79. Kitzinger, 1977, 96.

Another piece of art often associated with Justinian, as mentioned previously, is the Barberini ivory, which was originally made of four smaller oblong plaques arranged around a larger central one (pl. 19).⁷⁷ The work is one of only three early imperial ivory panels.⁷⁸ Today the right-hand plaque, however, is missing. The three smaller panels are held in place around the larger central one by a tongue and groove method. The practice of framing a larger central panel with four smaller ones became popular at the end of the fifth century and was used for book covers and lavish largitio objects.⁷⁹ The ivory, now in the Louvre, was given to Cardinal Barberini by Claude Fabri de Peiresc in the early seventeenth century. Since a seventh-century list of officials from the kingdom of Austrasia, a Frankish state once located primarily in what is now north-eastern France, is inscribed on its back, the plaque must have been in France from an early date.⁸⁰

80. Louvre Museum, Barberini Diptych [www.Louvre.org].

81. Delbrueck, 1929, 194; MacCormack, 1981, 71.

82. *Codex Justinianus*, ed. Krueger, 1954; *Codex of Justinian*, v. XV, bk. XI, title XL; Scott, 1932, 177. Also see Mango, 2002, 60.

83. The bishop's chair is pictured in Von Simson, 1948, pl. 28.

Although writers such as Delbrueck and MacCormack believed the emperor was Anastasios,⁸¹ scholars now generally identify the ruler depicted on the ivory as Justinian. The panel and his gold medallion share several details. Both horses wear an ornamental harness and bridle embellished with large rosette-shaped jewels encrusted with gems. During his reign, Justinian even issued an edict prohibiting all horses but his own from wearing bridles encrusted with pearls, emeralds or rubies.⁸² Both emperors wear an antique cuirass with double rows of flaps, cloaks which furl out behind, and high laced sandals. The emperor's head in this second work is also slightly tilted, as in the portrait on Justinian's early nomismata. Thus the panel, like the medallion, may even be dated to the early part of Justinian's reign and commemorate Belisarios' victory over the Vandals. The style and subject matter of the Barberini ivory have also been compared to the largest and most outstanding ivory work produced during Justinian's reign, the chair of the Bishop Maximianus (pl. 20).⁸³ The main point of similarity between the two works, as first noted by Delbruck, is the resemblance between the portrayal of the submissive barbarians in the ivory's lower panel and of Joseph's brothers in the plaque on the chair (pl. 21-22).⁸⁴

In the ivory's large central panel, the figure of a cuirassed emperor on horseback is shown planting a spear in the ground. Beneath him is the goddess Terra, personification of the earth; a bearded foreigner, probably a groom, stands behind the spear; and above the emperor to the right is a figure of Victory holding a palm branch in her right hand. In the lower panel, wild beasts and captives offering submission converge from both sides toward a second Victory. On the left a military figure offers the emperor a trophy in the form of a Victory statue. The missing right side probably once showed a second similar figure. In the upper plaque a bust of Christ is shown in a clipeus supported by two angels.

All three levels of the Barberini ivory are full of active figures converging on the triumphant ruler in the central panel. As a victorious general, the emperor wears a belted cuirass, padded tunic, paludamentum clasped with a circular brooch, a crown with a

84. See Kitzinger, 1977, 97.

85. The Emperor Honorios wears similar lion-mouthed sandals in the Probus diptych (circa 400).

centre piece and a pair of lion-mouthed sandals (crepidae).⁸⁵ The fact that all the figures are converging on the emperor in the central plaque helps to unify the composition. The lower panel with its double columns of captives, those from the north clad in caps and trousers and the second group from the south in pantaloons and animal skin headdresses, together with their tribute, is the most densely packed. The barbarians' moving feet with their lowered heads and hunched shoulders create a sort of swaying motion. The arch of their backs is repeated in the arch of the horse's back, the tilt of the emperor's head, and the angels' pulling motion. The figures in the lower panel are further related through the repetition of small details. The crook in the elephant's trunk is also found in the bend in the Victory's elbow and in the closest barbarian's elbow. The tiger's lifted paw parallels the outstretched arm of the nearest barbarian. The lion's bent tail echoes the arch in the nearest barbarian's windswept cloak. Each animal's head suggests the posture and shape of the barbarian's head beside it. Their foreign clothing and the similarity of their gestures to those of their accompanying beasts suggest the barbarians' bestiality.

The open palm of the barbarians in the lower panel and of the groom is probably a gesture indicating their submission. The northerners' caps, beards and decorated trousers, and the bare-breasted dress of individuals from warmer regions, consisting of loose-fitting pantaloons and animal-skin cloaks, seem deliberately selected to emphasize their exoticism and to create a contrast between their dress and that of the one officer and the emperor's military costume. Indeed such clothing as the northerners' boots and trousers and the southerners' pantaloons not only demonstrated their non-Romaness but were also forms of dress prohibited by law. In Constantinople dress codes were tightly controlled as early as the reign of Theodosios II (401-450), whose law code (439) prohibited citizens from wearing boots and trousers within the city limits.⁸⁶ Like the barbarians' open palms, the Victory at the centre with her raised arm directs the viewer's gaze upward toward the figure of the emperor.

The central panel is almost as full of action and as densely packed as the lower one. The emperor, who has just arrived,

86. Theodosios, XIV, 10, 2; Pharr, 1952, 415.

plants his spear in the ground as he reins his horse in so abruptly that the animal rears halfway up. The groom, Terra, and the Victory are no less active. Terra holds fruit in her lap as she supports the emperor's foot. The Victory with her tensed left leg and outstretched arm hovers in the air and seems to have just flown in. The military figure with his trophy seems to advance at a more leisurely pace than the Victory, perhaps to intercept the emperor as he dismounts.

Instead of being related through details in their postures, these two figures are connected by their military costume and facial features. Like the emperor the officer's costume consists of a cuirass, leather shoulder flaps, a padded tunic, paludamentum and sandals. Unlike Justinian's sandals, his are more simply decorated with a cross-hatch pattern which suggests his lower rank.

The officer's hairstyle seems very similar to that of the Consul Basilius, whose diptych was once dated to 480 but is currently dated to 541 (pl. 23).⁸⁷ In both of these ivories the figure's medium length hair has first been combed forward from the crown and then trimmed short into bangs surrounding his face; the figures in both ivories also have stubble beards, slender builds and oblong faces.

Whereas the emperor and military figure are related through such similarities as their costumes, oval eyes, impassive facial expressions and turned heads, the emperor seems even more closely related to the bust of Christ in the clipeus. Although Christ wears a collobium and mantle, both figures have clean shaven faces, short hair which falls in loose curls across the forehead and controlled facial expressions. Both are also located at the centre of adjacent panels. These two groups of similarities, which relate the emperor simultaneously to the military figure and to Christ, draw attention to the fact that although he is God's representative on earth, he is also an earthly ruler. His military costume implied his role as protector of an earthly kingdom.

87. For a detailed discussion of the reasons for redating the ivory see Cameron and Schauer, 1982, 126-145. In her analysis of the Barberini ivory, MacCormack mentions that the military figure was the annual consul but fails to explain why. See MacCormack, 1981, 71. If Basilius is the figure shown in the ivory, the missing panel could never have pictured a second consul. Basilius has the distinction of being the last consul and held the office alone: Cameron and Schauer, 1982, 131.

In the upper panel, there are fewer figures and much less action than in the lower ones. Instead of converging on the centre, the angels support and draw up the clipeus. The frontal bust of Christ gazes out as he signals his approval by making a gesture of blessing. Since the amount of activity diminishes in the upper levels of the Barberini ivory, the panel represents an ascending hierarchy. Although subdued, the barbarians are the most disordered; their dress is foreign and faces resemble those of the beasts accompanying them. By contrast the orderly appearance and more controlled actions of the soldier and especially the emperor relate them to the Christ in the clipeus. The message of the panel, as his costume emphasizes, is that through his recent military victories, the emperor has created an ordered world from the disordered one of the barbarians.

Justinian's now lost equestrian statue is known from two sources: Prokopios' description in his Buildings (I, ii, 5-12) and a sepia drawing in an antiquarian work by the Italian Renaissance humanist, Cyriacus of Ancona (pl. 24).⁸⁸ Although a label written on the statue identifies it as depicting Theodosios I or II, it is probably the one erected by Justinian, since the statue pictured in the manuscript conforms to Prokopios' description.

88. Weitzmann, 1979, 60. The main articles on the statue are a note by Glanville Downey in Prokopios, 1940, 395-398; Downey, 1940, 69-77; Lehmann, 1959, 39-57 and Mango, 1993, XI, 1-16. There is also a drawing of the statue in a twelfth-century manuscript of Job; but the figure of Justinian is so small none of his clothing is visible except the toufa and globe: Papadaki-Oekland, 1990, fig. 1.

In articles written on Justinian's statue, neither Cyril Mango nor Glanville Downey identifies the statue depicted in the drawing as other than the one erected by Justinian and described by Prokopios in his Buildings.⁸⁹ But arguing that it actually shows a lost gold medallion representing Theodosios I on horseback, Phyllis Lehmann concluded that the drawing may have depicted instead a statue of Theodosios I or II. Before Justinian erected his equestrian statue in 542-543, Constantine I had previously erected one on the same site and after him, Arkadios had erected a large silver equestrian statue of his father, Theodosios I, at the same location.⁹⁰ This fact and the scholarly tradition that Justinian's statue was a recycled monument of Theodosios I led a few later historians to identify the statue with that emperor. When the drawing was first discovered in the Seraglio Library by P. A. Dethier in 1864, he immediately assumed that it was the one described by Prokopios and never considered any other possibilities.⁹¹ His initial identification was uncritically accepted by later scholars. At the time the drawing was made, however, an equestrian statue of Theodosios I also stood in his forum. It is possible that the drawing might have depicted that monument.⁹² But after considering all of Phyllis Lehmann's arguments, like P. A. Dethier, Cyril Mango and Glanville Downey, I now accept the contrary view that it depicts Justinian's now lost equestrian statue. The figure in the drawing conforms to Prokopios' description, even though an inscription found on the horse (and perhaps only seen by persons making repairs) identified it as an equestrian statue of Theodosios I or II.⁹³ My reasons for accepting their identification are twofold. Firstly, though Phyllis Lehmann's article was written over half a century ago, her hypothetical medallion depicting an equestrian statue of Theodosios I or II has still not come to light. With the exception of the drawing's label identifying the statue as Theodosios, the rest of the evidence favours identifying the monument as depicting Justinian.

89. Mango, 1993, 2-3; Dewing, 1940, 69.

90. Mango, 1993, 2-3; Dewing, 1940, 69.

91. Lehmann, 1959, 51.

92. Lehmann, 1959, 51

93. Lehmann, 1959, 55.

94. Prokopios, I, ii, 12; Dewing, 1940, 35.

95. Dewing, 1940, Appendix I, 397.

The emperor on the statue is clad in ceremonial military attire including the unusual toufa headdress also found on Justinian's gold medallion. According to Prokopios, the statue represents Justinian's proficio, or departure from Constantinople, rather than the more common scene of an adventus, or entrance into the city, the ceremony also found on Constantine's and Justinian's earlier gold medallions.⁹⁴ The historian also comments that Justinian is dressed like Achilles. Although Prokopios' statement seems difficult to accept on the basis of the depiction shown in the sepia drawing, he probably simply meant that Justinian's dress was appropriate for a heroic military leader.⁹⁵

The statue's greatest departure in iconography from Justinian's medallion is that, rather than holding a spear and his horse's reins, the emperor is shown raising his right hand. As Prokopios explains, Justinian is "admonishing the barbarians not to advance"⁹⁶ and holding a globe surmounted by a cross in his left. Both the globe and raised right hand are standard attributes of the god Sol Invictus, which late Roman emperors including Constantine appropriated.⁹⁷ In art the gesture of the emperor's raised right hand, especially when the fingers are spread apart, as found in the statue, was believed to have the power to ward off evil.⁹⁸ For Prokopios a small cross on the globe symbolized the fact that the emperor owed his kingdom and military victories, not to his own efforts, but to God.⁹⁹ The monument marks the end of a long and complex artistic tradition, according to which semi-deified emperors were credited with achieving victories through their own efforts. Future emperors, in contrast, would be criticized for celebrating lavish triumphs and dedicating large-scale monuments to themselves. Instead, their military successes would be attributed to divine intervention.¹⁰⁰

96. Prokopios, I, ii, 12; Downey, 1940, 33.

97. Weitzmann, 1979, 522.

98. L'Orange, 1940, 140.

99. Prokopios, I, ii, 12; Downey, 1940, 35.

100. Cameron, 1979, 15.

101. Weitzmann, 1979, 35. See the section in the later Empress in Roman Dress.

Although the Barberini ivory may have been one of the last large ivory objects, the earliest surviving manuscript representation of a cuirassed emperor is found on the last page of a fragment of the Old Testament from a Coptic Bible (MS. I B18, in the Biblioteca Nazionale in Naples) (pl. 25).¹⁰¹ The fragment, dated as early as the fifth century, slightly before Justinian's reign, but usually to between the seventh and ninth century, is written in Sahidic Coptic and probably came from the White Monastery near Sohig in Upper Egypt; it contains the final three chapters of Job (40:8-42:18) and the first three of Proverbs (1,1-3:19).¹⁰²

On the lower half of f. 4v at the end of Job is a line drawing of four full figures, a man and three women, in imperial dress. The bearded ruler located on the left wears a halo, diadem with trefoil ornament, paludamentum fastened with a circular brooch, cuirass, short tunic with two patches, and boots. He holds a large globe in his left hand and a lance in the right one. It has been suggested that since the Coptic text contains a final chapter identifying Job as the King Jobab of Edom mentioned in Genesis 36:33, the illustration may portray this ruler.¹⁰³ The four figures, however, may be derived from an imperial icon depicting the Emperor Herakleios, who gave it to the monastery as a gift.¹⁰⁴ The most likely identification of the figures is Herakleios, his second wife Martina, mother-in-law Epiphania, and daughter Eudoxia.¹⁰⁵ Although the emperor's crown lacks pendilia, its trefoil ornament lends some support to its identification with Herakleios. On his coins, Herakleios' crown is usually decorated with a cross, but a rare nomisma of him from Constantinople (dated to January 613), as well as folles from the eastern mints of Cyprus and Jersaleum, show his crown decorated with a trefoil ornament (pls. 24-26). Thus the ornament was popular perhaps especially in the east during his lifetime. In the manuscript illustration, the brooch fastening the paludamentum is also of an imperial type with three pendilia. Since

102. Since Herakleios' father was exarch of Alexandria and his revolt from Phokas began there, he was probably especially popular in Egypt. Details on the fragment: Weitzmann, 1979, 35.

103. Weitzmann, 1979, 36

104. As expressions of their piety, emperors often gave icons as gifts to monasteries. Justinian, for example, gave several to the monastery he founded on Mt. Sinai, which still exist today and are among its most revered possessions: Nelson and Collins, 2006, 40-41, 51-52.

105. Weitzmann, 1979, 36.

Herakleios reigned during a period of great turbulence when the Byzantines were constantly under attack, the emperor might have been considered a Job-like figure. That Herakleios is depicted in a form of military attire consistent with the attire of his lifetime may also refer to the fact that he often commanded his own troops.

To sum up, since the early emperors were usually also the field commanders who led their troops in battle, they were shown on contemporary monuments commemorating their victories wearing military dress. The iconography of their monuments depicted them as the latest representative of a long line of earlier heroic soldier generals; but the exact manner in which these soldier emperors were portrayed varied greatly. They had available to them a powerful and highly developed iconography which they often reshaped to their own ends. For example, when Constantine entered Rome in late October of 312 after his victory at Milvian Bridge, the city was full of glittering statuary and the buildings erected by his predecessors. As mentioned at the beginning of the chapter, there existed several large monuments, a bath house, fora and triumphant arch, and at least two medallions which commemorate his victory.¹⁰⁶ On one of the medallions the emperor is depicted in military attire wearing the new Chi-Rho symbol of Christianity on his helmet while the image of the she-wolf of Rome suckling the twins was engraved on his shield. The Chi-Rho symbol is the first example of a new type of symbolism, the intrinsic symbol. On a second medallion, Constantine is shown as a profile bust accompanied by Sol Invictus, one of his patron deities. The family statuary group in his thermal bath appropriated an earlier style which implied that his new dynasty continued the traditions of earlier emperors. In addition the narrative stories found on the upper part of Arkadios' later Column imitated similar ones found on the columns of emperors such as Trajan. But the iconography of the

106. Kleiner discusses the monuments and two medallions: Kleiner, 1992, 434-436.

four sides of the column's base promoted the idea of mutual accord between the emperor and his brother. The colossal statue of Marcian in military dress was a fitting memorial to the successful reign of a revered soldier emperor.

A recurrent theme found on several monuments is that the emperor's victories represented not only the defeat of his enemies but also the vanquishing of disorder on a cosmic scale. For example, one reason the tetrarchs selected Jove as their patron deity was because he overcame the Titans, who represented chaos and the forces of darkness. In a painted panel placed over the Chalke Gate, Constantine was shown piercing the serpent mentioned in Isaiah, which in that context probably represented the forces of evil. In the Barberini panel, a victorious emperor in military attire is shown receiving tribute from barbarians, whose dress was prohibited by law and who therefore may signify anarchy and disorder.

By the later fifth century, few emperors still led armies; although Justinian's monuments appropriated the iconography of earlier soldier generals like Constantine, he reshaped them to his own use. The emperor's monuments depict him as a victorious general, but the victories which these monuments celebrate were achieved, not by Justinian himself, but by generals he appointed. As mentioned near the end of the chapter, a large gold medallion, which is believed to depict Justinian, commemorated an imperial adventus in the same iconography as Constantine's Tricinium Medallion. Though the emperor's equestrian statue imitated earlier ones, the fact that the globe which the emperor holds was surmounted by a cross represented a conscious break with the past. As Prokopios stated,¹⁰⁷ Justinian's victories, like those of other earlier Christian rulers, were now considered the result, not of his own efforts, but of the divine intervention which the cross implied.

107. Procopii Caesariensis opera omnis, ed. J. Haury, 1962-64. Prokopios, I, ii, 12; Dewing, 1940, 35.

Rather than erecting victory monuments, later Byzantine emperors like Justinian himself, the builder of Hagia Sophia, often preferred to build churches or endow monasteries.¹⁰⁸ The propagandistic mosaics which later rulers commissioned show them, not accompanied by pagan gods, but instead offering gifts to the Virgin and Christ child; in these works, the emperor is typically depicted wearing civic dress consisting of a chlamys fastened with an imperial brooch and a diveteson.¹⁰⁹ In other later works, they were shown in consular dress consisting of a ceremonial trabea or loros and a diveteson. There are, of course, a few exceptions. For example, in a Psalter in Venice (Venice, Biblioteca Marciana, Cod. gr. 17, fol IIIr) the emperor Basil II is depicted wearing military dress and on his ceremonial silver coins Leo III is sometimes shown wearing military costume (pl. 27).¹¹⁰ This new interest in religious art is perhaps best expressed by Justinian's successor, Justin II, who built a new throne room, the Chrysotriklinos; over his throne he placed an image of Christ.¹¹¹ Courtiers and foreign envoys now viewed the emperor, not as a semi-divine military hero, but instead as the embodiment of Christ on earth.

108. Mango, 2002, 181.

109. An example of this type of portrait is the mosaic in Hagia Sophia depicting Constantine IX Monomachos (1042-55) and Zoe wearing a loros.

110. Fugé, 2007, 50, 2.1-2.3.

111. Cameron, 1979, 17.

The Emperor in Civic Dress

During the classical period in Greece, the word chlamys was the term used to describe a short cloak worn by young men especially for riding.¹ By the fourth century the term described an ankle-length cloak fastened at the shoulder with a fibula; this

1. Croom, 2000, 52.

2. D'Amato, 2005, 12.

garment, which evolved from the mantle worn by senior military officers in the Roman army, became the dress worn by later Byzantine officials on civic occasions.² Indeed all Byzantine civil servants were part of the militia or military service and therefore wore a form of military dress.³ Although the chlamys did not appear until the tetrarchic period, it eventually replaced the toga, whose popularity had been in decline as early as the second century, and became the main form of civic dress worn by both men and women from the fifth century onward.⁴

3. D'Amato, 2005, 12. Also Harlow, 2004, 61.

4. Harlow, 2004, 67.

5. Harlow, 2004, 60.

Unlike the paludamentum, which had a straight edge, the chlamys was woven with a curved edge so that the fabric at the front fell in graceful curved folds.⁵ The chlamys was also distinguished from the paludamentum by the presence of a coloured patch called the tablion, which was sown on the back and front near the garment's vertical edge.⁶ Occasionally the chlamys was decorated instead with an all-over pattern.⁷ This new cloak was worn over the divetesion, a full length tunic with a fitted neck, long sleeves and pleated cuffs, which was made of a silk fabric and usually belted at the waist. Both of these garments are depicted on the right leaf of the diptych of Probianus, the vicarius of Rome (circa 400) (pl. 1).⁸

On one leaf of a second contemporary diptych dated to about 396, Stilicho, who was magister militum under Theodosios and the guardian of the emperor's son Honorios, is also shown wearing a chlamys fastened with a cross-bow fibula (pl. 2).⁹ Stilicho's other garments, a short tunic and leggings (braccati), as well as the fact that he holds a spear and shield, indicate that the diptych depicts him dressed in the costume of the magister militum, an office which he held from 394.¹⁰ The diptych was probably commissioned to commemorate his son Eucherios' first appointment to the lowest rank of office, "tribune and notary".¹¹ Eucharos, holding his codicil of office, is also displayed on an ivory plaque, standing beside his mother Sabrina on the diptych's second leaf. Like his father he wears a chlamys and divetesion, probably the dress worn by holders of his civic office. Thus during this time period, the chlamys, divetesion and cross-bow fibula costume were worn by both military and civilian officials from the highest to most junior rank.

6. Harlow, 2004, 60; D'Amato, 2005, 12.

7. Harlow, 2004, 60.

8. For a picture of the diptych of Probianus: Mango, 2002, 37; Harlow, 2004, 59.

9. For a discussion of why this date is assigned: Mango, 2002, 37; Harlow, 2004, 59.
For a picture: Mango, 2002, 37; Harlow, 2004, 59.

10. Mango, 2002, 37; Harlow, 2004, 61.

11. Cameron, 1970, 48.

On the Arch of Constantine (312-315) three of the four panels of the 1.2 meter-high frieze trace the emperor's campaign from his departure for battle from Milan to his triumphant entry into Rome. In three panels Constantine is depicted wearing a long cloak fastened at the shoulder with a fibula. In one panel of the frieze on the West face, the Siege of Verona, the emperor also wears a military cuirass; in two remaining friezes, depicting his adventus and adlocutio (East face and North face), he is dressed in a short belted tunic or civic dress (pls. 3-5).¹² Since he was departing for battle the first panel shows him wearing a military cuirass for protection; in the next two panels, the situation dictated civic dress, the most common type. In the final panel, the largitio scene (North face), which commemorated his election to the office of consul in the following January, he wears a banded toga, the highly specialized form of dress worn by high-ranking court officials, members of the senate, and newly elected consuls during ceremonies which celebrated their assumption of consular office (pl. 6).¹³

12. For detailed illustrations of individual sections of the frieze see Holloway, 2004, 38-47; for pictures of the frieze as a continuous strip see Kleiner, 1992, 448- 449, 451.

13. Stone, 2001, 34-35.

In none of the first three panels does Constantine's cloak have a curved edge; moreover his tunic ends just above the knee. His dress therefore continued Roman dress practices shown on the tondos located directly above the emperor's commemorative frieze, which are spolia dated to Hadrian's reign (pls. 7-10).¹⁴ Since the scenes on the frieze are deliberately related to those on the tondos,¹⁵ Constantine's actual dress may not represent a continuation of earlier dress practices. It may instead be a conscious retrospective imitation of previous forms of Roman dress. By depicting Constantine wearing the same dress as such a revered emperor as Hadrian, the frieze associates his new regime with Hadrian's reign and with the military achievements of other earlier Roman rulers.

Although the Arch of Constantine was the last large-scale victory monument of its type erected in Rome,¹⁶ several characteristics of its style, such as the central placement of the emperor in an architectural setting, his enlargement and frontal stance, and the symmetrical placement of the other figures in groups and on different levels looks forward to the art of the Middle Ages.¹⁷ The Arch of Constantine also represents the first mixture of a tetrarchic style of art with earlier forms of Roman art.¹⁸ The crowded figures depicted in the frieze with their oval heads and shortened limbs are in the new tetrarchic style. Some high court officials even wear Pannonian caps like the statue of the tetrarchs in Venice.

14. For pictures of the tondos see Holloway, 2002, 23-26.

15. Kleiner, 1992, 446.

16. Holloway, 2004, 37.

17. Kitzinger, 1977, 14.

18. Kitzinger, 1977, 13.

In the adlocutio and largitio scenes located on the North face, the emperor is depicted frontally in the centre of an architectural setting. Ernest Kitzinger noted that this new mode of presentation was first found as early as the adlocutio scenes and the scenes of the emperor addressing his troops on the column of Marcus Aurelius (180-193).¹⁹ Since the emperor no longer acts within the context of the narrative but faces outwardly toward the viewer, Kitzinger called this stance “a ceremonial presentation”.²⁰ In addition, in the largitio scene, Constantine’s figure is enlarged and court officials are arranged in groups according to their rank. They are also separated from citizens either by architectural elements or by being located on a higher level. These stylistic traits are in contrast to the depiction of Hadrian, who is shown in profile in an adlocutio scene found in one of the tondos where he is also located asymmetrically on the side of the picture.

Although Constantine’s importance is signaled by his placement and size, his tunic, cloak and toga are identical to the garments worn by those surrounding him. His dress, moreover, lacks such possible demarcations of status as an all-over pattern, embroidered tablion or even clavi; in none of the scenes does Constantine wear a diadem, imperial brooch or hold a sceptre. Because the Arch of Constantine was erected by the senate in Rome, which probably still regarded the emperor at least in theory as simply a member of the senate, his superior status is implied, not by his dress, but rather by such oblique modes of representation as the emperor’s central placement, enlargement, and frontal stance.

19. Kitzinger, 1977, 14.

20. Kitzinger, 1977, 14.

In a few of its panels, a slightly earlier monument, the Arch of Galerius (298-303) in Thessaloniki, also depicted tetrarchic rulers in a frontal stance (pl. 11).²¹ The Arch of Galerius was originally constructed as an octopylon surmounted by a dome which was supported on four piers.²² Its arches intersected two streets, one of which was a major thoroughfare, and the second of which connected to the emperor's mausoleum.²³ Although the monument was mainly constructed to commemorate Galerius' victory over the Persian Narses and completed as part of the celebrations for his decennialia in 303, the work was also dedicated in honour of the four tetrarchs who supported the realm like the arch's piers.²⁴ Only two of the arches' four original piers exist today; both of these are covered with figural scenes arranged in horizontal frames. The oblong shape of the frames and the fact that the figures were produced by deeply undercutting the stone suggest that the arch's decoration was executed by local stonemasons, who usually carved stone sarcophagi.²⁵

The scenes found on the remaining piers are of two types: those depicting actual events from Galerius' campaign against Narses and occasional scenes focusing on the symbolic representation of the tetrarchs and their regime.²⁶ One such symbolic scene, located in the third register of the north-eastern side of the southwest pillar, depicts the enthroned tetrarchs facing frontally and placed in the relief's centre (pl. 12).²⁷ Both Augusti are seated and flanked by their standing Caesar. Each of the four figures wears a cloak and ankle-length tunic belted at the waist. The reliefs are so worn, however, that it is difficult to determine whether their cloaks are chlamyses or the earlier paludamentum. Mars and Roma accompanied by other deities stand on both sides of the Caesars. The goddess Tellus and the god Oceanus recline on either side of the scene at the edge and two sky gods support the Augusti's throne.

The presence of the deities and personifications enhances the dignity of the tetrarchic regime and places it in a cosmic or

21. The Arch of Galerius is pictured in Kleiner, 1992, 419, 422-423; Canepa, 2009, 86, 89, 90, 92, 94.

22. Kleiner, 1992, 419; Canepa, 2009, 86, 89-90, 92, 94.

23. Kleiner, 1992, 419.

24. Kleiner, 1992, 419.

25. Kleiner, 1992, 420.

26. Canepa, 2009, 87.

27. Canepa, 2009, 87.

even mythic setting. The presence of Tellus, Oceanus and the sky gods shows that the four tetrarchs held dominion over these three regions. Unlike the adlocutio and largitio scenes on the Arch of Constantine, which were historical and local, attached to a specific place, the scene depicting the tetrarchs enthroned has no historical equivalent. It seems instead more related to the symbolic scenes depicted on contemporary coins. Rather than conforming to Ernest Kitzinger's definition of a "ceremonial" presentation, the relief seems best described as a "mythical" presentation. The fact that the emperors wear cloaks and tunics, the garments of peace, rather than the cuirass, which was worn in times of war, associates them with the prosperity of the emperor's decennalia.

The main figure, the dominus, in another nearly contemporary work, the Great Hunt Mosaic at the Sicilian Villa of Piazza Armerina, also wears a chlamys and divetesion (pl. 13).²⁸ Although the owner of the Villa has never been conclusively identified, he is thought to be either the tetrarchic ruler Maximian or Maxentius.²⁹ In the mosaic, the dominus' white chlamys and unbelted divetesion extend mid-calf; both legs are covered by bracae, trousers, and his feet, by calcei, laced military boots. The most conspicuous difference between his clothing and that of Probianus and Stilicho, however, are the large contrasting woven patches, segmenta, found on his cloak and tunic. All the examples shown in the Great Hunt Mosaic seem to have floral or geometric designs. Other surviving types of patches include figurative scenes with portraits, animal shapes and Christian or pagan symbols. The earliest undisputed large-scale representations of an emperor wearing a chlamys, however, are depictions of Theodosios I found on his Missorium (388)(pl. 14) and on the reliefs at the base of his obelisk in Constantinople (390) (pl. 15).³⁰ Besides the chlamys-divetesion costume early art historians also occasionally identified statues as depicting emperors wearing Greek dress. Perhaps the most famous example of this rare type are

28. Pictures of the Great Hunt Mosaic are found in Harlow, 2004, 57 and Polzer, 1979, pl. 23.

29. Polzer, 1973, 143-144; Weitzmann, 1979, 100-101.

30. For an illustration of the Missorium see Grabar, 1936, pl. 16 or Weitzmann, 1979, 75. For recent analyses of the platter see MacCormack, 1981, 214-220 and Kiilerich, 2000, 273-281. For pictures of the reliefs on the Obelisk base see Grabar, 1936, pls XI-XII and Cameron, 1979, 19-22.

31. Varner, 2012, 187; Harmiaux, Metzger, and Saragoza, 2003, [1].

32. Harmiaux, Metzger, and Saragoza, 2003, [1].

twin statues of Julian the Apostate found in the Louvre and Cluny Museums in Paris.

Almost identical statues of a standing male figure in Greek dress, identified as the Emperor Julian II, were acquired in the first decade of the 19th century by the recently formed Louvre and Cluny Museums, today called the Musee National du Moyen Age (pls. 16-17).³¹ The two statues are similar even in the smallest details. The first example was acquired by the Louvre in 1802 by E. O. Visconti, Conservatore of Antiquities, who first saw the statue at the home of a Parisian sculptor named M. Dumont, identified the work as Julian II, and then purchased the statue for the museum. The Louvre was anxious to purchase a statue of the emperor because when he was governor of Gaul he had lived in Lutetia, the Roman city where Paris now stands.³² The work was immediately exhibited at the Louvre in the room of the Roman emperors as number 16. The Cluny statue was also purchased from M. Dumont at a slightly later date by a private citizen, M. Le comte de la Riboisiere, who donated it to the recently formed Cluny Museum in 1859. The Cluny also wanted to acquire a statue of Julian. When it was established in 1843 the remains of the Roman bath which Julian II built were incorporated into the grounds of the newly formed museum. Both statues, which were part of the Millioti collection, had been imported from Italy then sold to Dumont at auction.

The Louvre statue is 1.75 m. tall, wears a Greek pallium, tunic, open sandals and an elaborate form of headdress. Since the pallium, like the toga, needs to be held in place, the right arm is positioned against the body; the left holds an unidentified object. The closest known headdresses are found on the statue of a Severan priest and of a Hadrianic statue from Cyprus.³³ The headgear is composed of four rolled fillets. Three of the rows are smooth but the second one is decorated with laurel or myrtle leaves. At the back of the statue the upper row is smooth but at the front there was once a scalloped row which is now broken off. The center of the headdress also once had a central ornament but it, too, has been detached. Like the earlier emperors Hadrian and Marcus Aurelius, Julian was known to have admired Greek culture. Since the emperor sometimes wore Greek dress and perhaps officiated at religious

33. Varner, 2012, 190-191.

ceremonies, neither the statues' dress nor unusual headgear disqualified it from being his likeness.

The first to question the double statues' identity was John Jacob Bernoulli, who believed the two works represented a private individual wearing priestly headgear. More recently Klaus Fittschen has rejected the identification of the statues with the emperor; he believes both were made during Hadrian's reign and depict a priest of Serapis.³⁴ The work most similar to date is an unfinished head on Thasos, which wears a layered crown and hairstyle with a row of curved frontal locks. The head may even represent the same individual. In 2004 after a thorough study, the Louvre placed both works on display describing them as "Julien l'Apostat ou la double imposture: les statues du Louvre et des themes de Cluny" (pl. 18).³⁵

34. Bernoulli, 1894, 234; Varner, 2012, 192; Fittschen, 1997, 32-36.

35. Hamiaux, Metzger and Saragoza, 2003, [1-5].

During the exhibition, the museum offered several reasons for believing the statues depicted a priest of Serapis dated to Hadrian's reign. When the Louvre first acquired its version, the museum thought that the statue had been found in Paris. After they realized that it came from Italy, the museum then noted that its Greek dress, sacerdotal crown and hairstyle were all inconsistent with a fourth century date. Although a statue identified as Hadrian wears a pallium and tunic, no fourth century emperor was ever represented wearing Greek dress. Instead of wearing a sacerdotal crown, Julian and all other contemporary rulers are always shown on their coins wearing a simple diadem with a double row of pearls and ties at the back.³⁶ Finally, whereas the statue had a row of frontal curls curved in an s-shape, Julian was always represented on his coins wearing a short, straight row of frontal locks.

The museum also listed several stylistic features first noted by Fittschen which support a date during Hadrian's reign. These were the separate treatment of the s-shaped frontal locks, the sunken almond shaped eyes with their uncarved orbits, the narrow face with its high cheek bones, and finally the appearance of a short beard.

During their careful examination of the two statues, the Louvre also noted that the Cluny version showed weathering and breakage consistent with an ancient statue. It therefore was the ancient original and the Louve's statue, a modern copy. In current scholarship the work is usually dated to Hadrian's reign and identified as a priest of Serapis.

36. Varner, 2012, 190.

In a recent article Eric Varner presents all the evidence favoring an identification with Julian but notes that “the standing palliate statue...is virtually absent from the corpus of imperial portrait sculpture.”³⁶ The only contemporary historian who mentions Julian wearing Greek dress is Ammianus, who records that while Julian was studying in Athens, he was suddenly summoned by Constantios to become a caesar. He arrived in Milan still wearing a pallium, the costume worn by all Greek students.³⁷ In the passage his dress, therefore, emphasizes the haste of his departure from Athens rather than any preference for Greek dress. Although one of the emperor’s offices was pontifex maximus, the emperor’s headgear, as depicted in the famous statue of Augustus, consisted simply of his pulling up the loose folds of his toga to form a hood.

Besides his coins several works including a small bronze bust at Lyon, a weight in Geneva, contorniate medallions in Florence and Berlin, and a portrait on a chalcedony phalera probably depict Julian’s image.³⁸ But no full size statue of the emperor exists for comparative purposes. The closest example is a togate figure from Aphrodisias which initially had a bronze plaque identifying it as Julian but was later reused as a statue of Theodosios I or II (pl. 19). A bust in Rome, which is currently identified as Julian, was first assigned to Pindar but later labeled with Julian’s name (pl. 20). The figure, who wears a simple pallium and bushy beard, seems best identified as a Greek philosopher or literary type. Thus no large scale statue, including the examples at the Louvre and Cluny, has been identified to date as depicting Julian’s likeness. Although more of his writing than that of any other Roman emperor exists today and he undoubtedly had other artistic interests, the shortness of his tumultuous life, which ended at the age of 32 after less than a two year reign, undoubtedly offers an explanation. Therefore there are no examples of contemporary rulers in Greek dress

37. Varner, 2012, 190; Ammianus Marcellinus, XV, 8. 1: Rolfe, 1963, 165.
 38. Alföldi, 1966, 403-405.

Beginning with the reign of Diocletian, Roman court ceremony also developed new forms which distanced the ruler from his subjects and followed carefully prescribed routines. At Trier citizens granted an audience with Constantine probably assembled in a courtyard or vestibule from which they were led by courtiers to a curtained area at the back of the hall. Slowly the drapes would be drawn apart revealing the emperor enthroned like a statue wearing a chlamys and tunic either in an arched niche or under a columned baldachin surrounded by guards and colorfully dressed court officials.³⁹ All in attendance would then fall on their knees and repeat acclamations of praise. In a ceremony called the adoratio purpureae, those attending might approach the ruler and kiss the hem of his cloak;⁴⁰ the emperor used courtiers to speak on his behalf.

A scene of this type is depicted on the Missorium of Theodosios, a silver largitio plate weighing 15.35 kg. and having a width of 74 cm. fashioned to commemorate the ruler's decennalia in 388 (pl. 14). The Missorium was discovered by a labourer in 1847 near Almandralejo in southern Spain⁴¹ and was purchased by the Real Academia de la Historia, Madrid. The picture, which is lightly incised on the plate, is divided into two parts. The upper larger section shows Theodosios seated on a backless throne between two co-rulers and court officials. He is depicted in the centre of the composition on a much larger scale than the other rulers, Valentinian II and Arkadios, with his head projecting into an arched niche which apparently belongs to a palace throne room. A courtier with covered hands is standing slightly to the side of the emperor as he receives an ivory codicil from him. The lower smaller portion of the platter depicts the goddess Tellus reclining and holding a cornucopia. She is accompanied by three tiny winged putti, who like the courtier with covered hands offer the emperor the fruits of the earth.

39. The best description of late Roman court ceremony is found in a panegyric by the poet Mamertinus: *Panegyrici Latini*, X, 3; Latin Text 524; Nixon, 1955, 57-58.

40. Corcoran, 2006, 43; Reinhold, 1970, 60. There is an interesting discussion tracing developments in the ceremony; Canepa, 2009, 150-151. He believes the adoratio was first practiced by client kings as early as Julius Caesar's dictatorship.

41. After the Missorium was restored in 2000, it was put back on display in Madrid. A commemorative volume of essays, *El Disco de Theodosio*, was published at that time. Other lengthy analyses of the largitio platter are found in two works: MacCormack, 1990, 214-220 and Leader-Newby, 2004, 11-14, 27-37.

The two scenes are executed in different styles. The scene in the lower register continues earlier classical traditions which represented mythological figures in a more fluid linear style typically found on late antique silver.⁴² The upper one, which shows the everyday workings of the court, has all the new stylistic features found in the adlocutio and largitio scenes on the Arch of Constantine and in the relief of the enthroned tetrarchs on the Arch of Galerius. The emperor is placed in the centre facing frontally on an enlarged scale surrounded by his co-rulers, palace guards and a court official. Whereas his head is jutting up into an arched niche supported by corinthian columns, those of Valentinian II and Arkadius are framed in contrast by horizontal niches. Two symmetrically arranged groups of two guards each are located on either side of the rulers on a slightly lower level. The main difference, however, between the scenes found on the two earlier monuments and the Missorium is the use of clothing to imply slight differences of rank.⁴³

42. Leader-Newby, 2004, 14.

In the upper scene, the three emperors are seated on backless thrones with their feet resting on foot-stools. All three of them wear chlamyses fastened with rosette-shaped brooches, ankle-length divetesiions, which are belted at the waist and have long, pleated sleeves, and pairs of high-laced boots. Their chlamyses are decorated with broad patterned patches, an early form of tablion, placed just below their knees. These large embroidered squares were located below the knee until the fifth century, as in the Halberstadt diptych (pl. 21), but after that time, probably to make them more visible, they were placed at chest level.⁴³ On the Missorium Theodosios' superior rank is demonstrated by the embroidery on his chlamys and tunic. Both of his garments are embellished with an overall diapered pattern; the junior rulers' tunics, however, have only diapered patterns at their shoulders and knees. The tablions on their cloaks also are decorated with complex geometric shapes similar to those depicted on the dominus' chlamys in the Hunt Mosaic at Piazza Armorina.

All three emperors are nimbed, wear similar diadems decorated with rows of pearls and a rosette-shaped centre piece, and their hair at the front is arranged in tight curls. Their cloaks are clasped with a rosette-shaped brooch with three pendilia held apart by stiff wires and their tunics end just above their ankles. Their haloes, garments and imperial brooches all imply their superior rank. In contrast, the court official lacks a halo and headgear. Although his cloak is full-length, he wears a short tunic and an unadorned crossbow fibula.

Differences of rank among the rulers are shown not only by the embroidery of their chlamyses but also by their attributes. Of the three figures only Valentinian II holds a sceptre to indicate his superiority over Arkadios, as Augustus of the Western Empire, an office which he held from 375 to 392. Both he and Arkadios, who at this time held the rank of Caesar, hold globes, an attribute demonstrating the extent of their rule. Since these two attributes derive from earlier times and are universal symbols of rule today, they

43. Olovsson, 2005, pl. 2. In the upper register of the Halberstadt diptych created three decades later in about 420 the co-rulers Honorios and his son, Theodosius II, are shown seated in the Hippodrome wearing chlamyses with tablions attached at the height of their chests. Pictured in Olovsson: 2005, pl. 2.

are both examples of intrinsic symbols.

Arkadios' right hand is held with two pointed fingers pressed against his thumb; this gesture may indicate that he is publically announcing the new office.⁴⁴ On the rear panel of an ivory depicting a patrician (pl. 22) and on both halves of the Probianus diptych, figures use this identical gesture for a similar purpose.⁴⁵ The scenes on the Missorium and Probianus diptych show the figures fulfilling various duties associated with their offices. Theodosios' superiority over his co-rulers is implied by his size, central placement, subtle differences in dress, and by the fact that he is actively carrying out the dictates of the court. The goddess Tellus also distributes her fruits through intermediaries, her three putti.

The Missorium depicts Theodosios and the junior rulers in a style typically found on large stone monuments such as the victory monuments of Constantine and Galerius. This style is also found in the reliefs on the base of the ruler's obelisk.⁴⁶ Whereas on the Missorium members of the imperial family are posed frontally, almost leaning slightly forward, as they gaze disinterestedly into space, the court official, guards and even Tellus have more natural, animated expressions. The curve of the loose folds especially in Theodosios' cloak seems to be picked up in the arch of his chin and to focus attention on his face with its expression of aloofness.

44. Weitzmann, 1979, 74-75, pl. 64.

Ramsey MacMullan compared such contemporary court ceremonial to a well-rehearsed theatre production.⁴⁷ He argued that features such as the Missorium's elaborate architectural setting and gestures such as Arkadios' pointed fingers were adopted from the contemporary stage. But the emperors' expressions of aloofness have a deeper significance than mere theatricality. Instead their facial expressions probably depict what Averil Cameron calls one of the most highly valued of imperial virtues: that of impassivity or hierarchical calm (i.e. tranquillitas, Lat. or galene, Gr.).⁴⁸ Indeed, slightly later in his article Macmillan suggests that the image of Theodosios seated stiffly dressed in imperial costume and looking aloofly ahead may not be derived from the contemporary theatre but is instead an attempt to depict the emperor as the personification of the imperial virtue tranquillitas.⁴⁹

The most famous description of imperial calm is found in the historian Ammianus Marcellinus, who describes Constantios II's carefully staged entry into Rome in 357 dressed in military attire as a Roman triumphator.⁵⁰ During the entire procession, the emperor stood like a statue looking neither to the left nor right but stiffly staring straight ahead. Among the theatrical elements incorporated into Constantios' adventus, the most striking were probably his golden chariot sparkling with jewels, the imperial standards decorated with dragons woven from purple and gold cloth, and the boldly coloured costumes of members of his retinue, who, as mentioned in the passage quoted above, even wore masks. Thus, if we believe MacMillan, during the Theodosian period and even earlier, court ceremony may have been influenced by the theatre.

45. Weitzmann, 1979, 55-57.

46. Weitzmann, 1979, 108.

47. MacMullen, 1964, 437.

48. Cameron, 1987, 107.

49. MacMullen, 1964, 453-454.

50. Römische Geschichte, ed. W. Seyforth, 1968-1971; Ammianus Marcellinus, XVI, 10, subheading and 4-17; Rolfe, 1963, I, 245-253.

Although the head is severely damaged in the relief of the largitio scene on the Arch of Constantine (315), the large majestic head still remains intact from the colossal acrolithic statue of Constantine (d. 313), which once stood in the western apse of the Forum of Constantine, a building mentioned previously (pl. 23).⁵¹ As in the image engraved on the Missorium, the cult statue probably depicted Constantine on a very enlarged scale enthroned as the Roman Jupiter clad in a round mantle with his deeply set eyes staring directly ahead.⁵² Although the head has been praised for realistically portraying Constantine's hooked nose, its overall intent was probably to convey the feeling of imperial calm. In the marble head this tranquil, self-composed quality is achieved by focusing all movement on the emperor's eyes. His brows are sharply arched and the deeply set eyes focused before him, but the muscles in the rest of his face and especially in the lower part are more relaxed. The emperor's thoughts seem to have transcended this mundane world and to be concentrating on a higher, divine sphere.⁵³ Such an expression of aloofness and composure also seems appropriate for a ruler, who is dressed like Jupiter, the king of the gods.

Although the chlamys and divitesion costume were worn by both men and women in fifth-century society, rank, as we have seen, was defined by slight differences in decoration, such as over-all versus partial patterning on the garments and in different types of woven patches.⁵⁴ Although none of the earliest monuments are coloured, differences in rank were also implied by their colour. Purple in particular and, to a lesser extent, gold (at least in theory) were reserved for court members and the imperial family.⁵⁵ Various insignia

51. The exposed parts of the body, including the head, right arm and hand, the left and right legs and both feet, were made of marble. Since no other parts remain, the rest of the statue may have been wood, stone or even bronze. The work was more than five times life-size. Weitzmann, 1979, 18; Elsner, 2006, 262.

52. The statue was probably not placed in Constantine's Forum until his vicennalia; the head seems most related to portraits found on coins of that time period. Greek statues of Zeus typically wore a himation which reached to the ground; Roman statues of Jupiter wore shorter round mantles which left the feet bare. (Collignon, 1890, 30-31).

53. L'Orange, 1965, 123-124.

54. D'Amato, 2005, 12.

55. Codex Justinianus, Krueger, 1954; Justinian, Bk. IV, 40.1; Scott, 1932, [unpaged]; Canepa, 2009, 192.

56. See Grierson, 1968, 80-88.

57. Grierson, 1968, 77.

58. Grierson, 1968, 77.

of office including the diadem and orb and various types of sceptres were reserved for the emperor and his caesar.⁵⁶ In addition to these attributes, they also wore a special fibula, which consisted of a large rosette-shaped brooch with three pendants.⁵⁷ This fibula is clearly shown not only on the Missorium, but also on folles as early as the reign of Constantine (pl. 24) and at least as late as the mosaic of Justinian at San Vitale and even on coins as late as the nomismata of Basil II and Constantine VIII (976-1025)(pl. 25). Often on coins, the pendilia do not appear to hang loosely; instead, as Theodosios' brooch clearly shows, each strand was separated by stiff wires forming a double V-shape.⁵⁸

Under Diocletian, variously styled brooches with three short pendants were worn by officers with the rank of Caesar or Augustus.⁵⁹ The next development is a small rosette-shaped brooch without pendants, which appears on a gold medallion of Constantine as early as 310 (pl. 26). After his death, his son Constantios II, ruler of the empire from 353-361, is shown on a medallion wearing a cloak clasped by a rosette-shaped brooch with three small jewels projecting above and three below (pl. 27). On a silver bowl from Kerch dated 343 to his vicennalia, Constantine's son, Constantios II, wears a short mantle with a rosette-shaped brooch with three hanging pendants and a small projection at the top (pl. 28). The above evidence suggests that by the mid-fourth century this style of brooch was probably reserved for the emperor and his caesar.⁶⁰ By Theodosios' reign, the brooch had become larger and the pendants were now separated by wires; on the Missorium, the Theodosius' fibula is shown with three large gems above and beneath. At San Vitale, Justinian's fibula is very similar, except the brooch has a foot which projects above his shoulder.

59. Stout, 1994, 88.

60. Stout, 1994, 88-89.

61. For pictures of the four sides: Kiillerich, 1993, figs. 6-12b. There is an analysis of the Obelisk in the section on the toga with a band of stretched folds.

As mentioned earlier, after his victory over the usurper Maximus in 389, Theodosios erected an obelisk in Constantinople on the spina of the Hippodrome.⁶¹ Honorific statues of Theodosios and his three co-rulers were also erected in several cities in Asia Minor including Aphrodisias, Side and Antinoupolis.⁶² The upper section of the monument, an Egyptian obelisk of Tuthmosis III (1490-1436 B.C.), had been transported from Karnak to Constantinople during the reign of Constantios II to commemorate the emperor's vicennalia or 20 year reign in 357.⁶³ But the obelisk cracked during transport and remained in the city harbor. Although the entire obelisk was originally about 28.95 m. (95 ft.) high, the portion erected in the Hippodrome is only about 19.6 m. (64.32 ft.) tall.⁶⁴

62. Kiillerich, 1993, 29-30.

63. Bassett, 2004, 220.

64. Mango's estimate of a loss of two-fifths of the obelisk's height is slightly too high: Mango, 200, 188). A recently published chart listing its estimated height gives the figure as 28.95 m: Wilkinson, 2000, 59. The monument has instead lost a third of its height.

65. Cameron, 1973, 3; Weitzmann, 1979, 352. A second discussion of the Theodosian obelisk appears in the third part of next section on the toga; in that section there is an analysis of the senatorial dress depicted on the monument.

66. Weitzmann, 1979, 107.

The base of the obelisk, a marble block roughly four meters square, is decorated with reliefs on each of its four sides (pls. 29-32). Like the scene on the slightly earlier Missorium, these are divided into two parts. The upper larger section depicts events typically held in the Hippodrome, which at this time was often a focal point for imperial ritual.⁶⁵ These scenes have many of the stylistic features of other Theodosian works. The emperor and his co-rulers are shown seated frontally in the imperial box, the *kathisma* (L. *pulvinor*), on an enlarged scale, and surrounded on both sides by symmetrically arranged groups of court officials.⁶⁶ The events included on the four reliefs are those of Theodosios holding court, the emperor receiving tribute from a foreign embassy, Theodosios awarding a victory crown, and the four rulers and court in state. Two of the four smaller reliefs record public events in the Hippodrome: one scene depicts a chariot race and a second (the northeastern) shows the obelisk on a sledge being pulled forward by a winch, a feat whose accomplishment required considerable technical skill. The two remaining sides are decorated with inscriptions in Greek and Latin explaining that the obelisk was raised in about 30 days.⁶⁷

Although in the reliefs in all four scenes different groups of court members surround the royal box, on two sides of the base, the north-west and south-west, it is occupied exclusively by the four co-rulers: Theodosios I, the Eastern emperor, Valentinian II, the Western emperor, and his two young sons, Arkadios and Honorios.⁶⁸ In their role as the chief administrators, the rulers are clad in the *chlamys-divetesion* costume, the dress required by their office. Since the four never appeared together in Constantinople during this time period and Honorios was created a Caesar only slightly later in 393, these reliefs in particular represent a form of imperial propaganda apparently designed to show the co-rulers' unity in the aftermath of an attempted coup.⁶⁹ The depiction of four rulers, whose heads are shown at the same height and wearing the same dress to imply that they shared power equally, also may have supported Theodosios' claim to have established a new dynasty which was a legitimate successor to Constantine's four sons and to the four tetrarchs. In the remaining two reliefs, Theodosios, wearing the same dress, is shown discharging various imperial duties.

67. MacCormack, 1981, 56.

68. Cameron, 48, 1973.

69. MacCormack, 1981, 56.

As the rulers sit presiding over the sacred games, slight differences in rank are implied by the varied heights of their heads. On all sides of the kathisma, the heads of the groups of anonymous court officials, whether guards, senators or bureaucrats, are of equal height and the figures in each group are seated in evenly spaced rows. The soldiers are dressed in military attire; the emperor and officials, in the chlamys and divetesion; and the senators wear togas and hold mappas. These orderly, generalized groups of officials, each wearing the dress appropriate to their office, convey a sense of good order or taxis and add strength to the emperors' claim to a unified government.⁷⁰ The reliefs, filled with figures lacking individualization, convey a sense of the powers of government surpassing those of the individual.⁷¹ The monument implied that instead of succeeding through such possible means as military might or divine intervention, Theodosios has retained power through such non-violent means as a unified front and good order. The depiction of the ordered ranks of government officials might serve as a deterrent to other aggressors.

In the obelisk reliefs the court officials wear a type of late cross-bow fibula decorated with c-volutes. This is also the type worn by Stilicho and Eucherios in the diptych commemorating the receipt of Eucherios' first codicil of office in 396.⁷² There is strong evidence to suggest that during the third and fourth centuries rank in both the military and civil service was indicated by differently coloured and decorated cloaks and different styles of cross-bow fibulas.⁷³ But by the end of the fourth century, the cross-bow fibula with c-volutes was the only type produced (pl. 33).⁷⁴

During Stilicho's lifetime, rank was indicated not so much by a fibula's shape as by its metal. Examples cast in gold, silver, gilt

70. Lim, 2000, 353-354.

71. Lim, 2000, 353.

72. Both fibulae with their c-volutes are visible. Eucherios held the office of "tribune and votary": Mango, 2002, 37.

73. Swift, 2000, 3.

74. Swift, 2000, 3.

75. Swift, 2000, 4.

76. Weitzmann, 1979, 303.

bronze, and bronze have been found in all the regions ruled by the Roman Empire during the fourth century.⁷⁵ Since relatively few gold and silver fibulae have been found in comparison with those cast in bronze, it seems likely that those made from these two metals were issued to civil officials and military officers of the highest rank.⁷⁶ But since none of the gold and silver cross-bow fibulas belonging to officers and dated to this period have inscriptions, it is impossible to ascertain whether any of the existing examples belonged to an emperor or to his family.

One bronze and seven gold cross-bow fibulas dated to the tetrarchic period have imperial inscriptions; but instead of belonging to an emperor these were given by him as gifts (pl. 34).⁷⁷ On special occasions tetrarchic rulers sometimes gave silver and gold gifts, including cross-bow fibulas and bowls, to officers during formal ceremonies.⁷⁸ Although the type of gifts was not specified, Ammianus Marcellinus states that Julian gave gifts of gold and silver valuing five aurei and one pound to each of his officers on his accession in 361.⁷⁹ Since all the existing examples of inscribed gold fibulas are equal in weight to five aurei or a multiple of five, Julian's gifts may have been in the form of cross-bow fibulas.⁸⁰ An example found in Arezzo in northern Italy in 1866 and owned by the Metropolitan Museum of Art is equal in weight to 52.6 g. or ten aurei (pl. 35).⁸¹ A fibula's metal and weight were probably determined by the officer's rank.

77. Deppert-Lipitz, 2000, 46.

78. Weitzmann, 1979, 303.

79. *Römische Geschichte*, ed. Seyfarth, 1968-71; Ammianus Marcellinus, XX, 4, 18; Rolfe, 1940, II, 27.

80. Weitzmann, 1979, 303.

81. Weitzmann, 1979, 303; Deppert-Lippitz, 2000, 46: See translation on next page.

82. Dippert-Lippetz, 2000, 46.

During this time period, each Augustus and his Caesar were protected by a patron deity. The inscriptions usually mentioned the emperor's name or refer to him by name and his patron deity.⁸² As noted earlier, the two Eastern rulers were under Jove's protection and the Western ones under Hercules'. Eastern rulers were referred to as Jovii and Joviani; the western ones as Herculi.⁸³ The cross-bow fibula in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, for example, has the inscription "Herculi Auguste/ Semper vincas" (May Hercules Augustus always win).⁸⁴ About half of the inscriptions, however, mention the individual ruler's names. Included are Licinius, Maxentius and either Constantine Chlorus or Constantine. The inscription on an exceptionally large cross-bow fibula found in Germany, which weighs 75.5 g. or about fourteen aurei or twenty five nomismata, mentions the names of both Constantine and Licinius: "VOTIS X D N CONSTANTINI/ VOTIS X D N LICINI AUG (For vows [fulfilled] by our lord Constantine and our lord Licinius on [their] tenth anniversary)".⁸⁵

83. Dippert-Lippett, 2000, 46.

84. Weitzmann, 1979, 303.

85. Dippert-Lippett, 2000, 46, 50. The inscription announces the fulfillment of vows by Constantine and Licinius for their tenth anniversary. The Latin verb "expleo" takes the genitive when it means to complete but the two names could also be used as possessives. For aureus' weight: Grierson, 1955, 62.

86. I searched at Ancient Coins Archive.com, the internet record for the most recent ancient coin sales for newly found examples, the main reference on this time period the [Roman Imperial Coins](#) and also the [Late Roman Bronze Coinage](#), the only source for bronze coins. For sculpture depicting emperors, I checked Delbruck, 1933.

After checking very carefully through the search engines picturing recent sales, the standard references on gold, silver and bronze coins and also on sculpture,⁸⁶ I found that in none of these works was either the Augustus or Caesar during this time period ever portrayed wearing cross-bow fibulas. Instead they always wore small circular brooches, often with three pendilias and occasionally with a foot which projected above the shoulder. The only exception might be the dominus in the Great Hunt Mosaic at Piazza Armerina. All the figures in that mosaic wear cross-bow fibulas. The dominus' dress suggests that the villa's owner was simply a wealthy private citizen rather than, as mentioned earlier, either of the tetrarchic rulers Maximian or Maxentius.⁸⁷

The next item to depict an emperor wearing a chlamys is the undated Trier ivory, which probably once formed one side of a saint's reliquary (pl. 36). The work depicts a religious procession which from left to right shows a mule cart containing two seated clerics holding a reliquary preceded by four standing figures carrying lighted candles. The leader of the procession has just stopped before the diminutive figure of an empress standing in front of a newly built church which is still under construction.⁸⁸ Behind them is a complex architectural setting which is filled with three rows of standing figures who are either onlookers or perform ritualistic acts. The top row consists of a series of busts looking outward, beneath them is a row of figures censuring the procession and chanting, and a third group at ground level standing at attention

87. MacMullen, 1979, 303.

88. For a picture of the ivory: McClanan, 2002, 23 or Holum, 1982, 106. Recent articles include Holum and Vikan, 1977, 113-133, Wortley, 1980, 381-394, Wilson, 1984, and Brubakerm 1999, 258-285. Also see Section 3 in the empress' dress.

There is general agreement that the translation occurred in the eastern empire but everything else about it including the date of the procession and of the ivory's production, the saint's identity, the names of the emperor and empress, and the city and church has never been conclusively identified. Several translations of saint's relics have been suggested; Suzanne Spain even interprets the scene as portraying the ceremony performed on 21 March 630 in Jerusalem during which Herakleios and Martina restored the true cross to the Holy Sepulchre.⁸⁹ The most widely accepted interpretation to date, however, is that of Kenneth Holum and Gary Vikan, who believe the scene represents the translation of the relics of St. Steven from Jerusalem to Constantinople during the reign of Theodosios II in about 415. Details of the translation are recorded in Theophanes the Confessor and several later histories.⁹⁰ The ivory represents a new type of imperial art work. For the first time instead of showing a triumphant emperor passing through a city gate, a work pictures a religious procession led by an emperor.

89. Spain, 1989, 279–304. McClanan, 2002, 25 discusses other translations.

90. Holum, 1979, 127.

According to Theophanes' history when war with the Persian emperor Vahram V seemed unavoidable, Theodosios II decided to procure the relics of St. Stephen, whose name, derived from the Greek word meaning victory, presaged a successful outcome to the conflict. After the emperor sent a generous donation to the poor of Jerusalem and the lavish gift of a large jewel encrusted cross, the archbishop showed his gratitude by sending an arm of St. Stephen to Constantinople. When the procession reached the outskirts of the capitol, Theodosios and his sister Pulcheria went forth to greet it and then placed the relics in a newly built church dedicated to the saint within the palace precinct.⁹¹

The ruler in the ivory wears a diadem with shoulder-length pendilia which lacks a centre-piece, a chlamys clasped by a rosette shaped brooch with two pendilia, and a long-sleeved divetesion which is belted and ends above the knee. The tunic's hem, wrists and shoulders are all embellished with rosettes. Because it lacks a centre-piece, the emperor's crown differs from those worn by other fifth-century emperors;; his brooch also has only two pendilia instead of the usual three. Although Justinian's diadem in the nearly contemporary panel at San Vitale has been reworked, it also lacks a centre-piece. The brooch may have only two pendilia because the third is concealed beneath his chlamys. In the imperial panel at San Vitale, Theodora's entire brooch is barely visible beneath her massive lunette-shaped necklace. Emperors typically wore a full length tunic during public ceremonies but a length above the knee is probably more suitable for an outdoor ceremony which included a lengthy walk. Therefore the emperor's dress conforms to that of other fifth-century rulers.

As a decorative element, the rosette shape decorating the emperor's tunic was a popular motif. For example on Constantine's triumphal medallion of 313, his helmet is decorated with rosettes (see pt. 1, pl. 1); in the imperial panel at San Vitale, Justinian's slippers are embellished with rosette-shaped embroidery or jewels. The ivory demonstrates that although the emperor had an important role in religious ceremonies, he wore civic dress instead of clerical dress to demonstrate that he performed no priestly

91. Holum and Vikan, 1977, 130-131.

functions. A century later at San Vitale Justinian, who is also shown leading a religious procession, wears civic dress.⁹²

The only depictions of the early sixth-century rulers Anastasios (491-518) and Justin I (518-527) are small frontal medallion portraits of Anastasios found at the top of contemporary consular diptychs (pl. 37) and portraits of the two rulers on their coinage (pls. 38-39). The medallions probably reproduce imperial portraits displayed beside the new consul during games held in his honour at the Hippodrome.⁹³ A pair of such portraits depicting the Emperor Anastasios and Empress Ariadne are shown directly behind the consul Anastasios on one of his diptychs (pl. 40).⁹⁴ Whereas the costume and regalia depicted in these works continue traditions established in the fourth and fifth centuries, Justinian's regalia, as shown on his coinage and especially his mosaic at San Vitale, is even more splendid than that of his predecessors. The imperial panels at San Vitale are also the first surviving Byzantine imperial portraits in colour; although manufactured far from the capital, they may indicate the colours of garments worn by those depicted.

The history of San Vitale's construction reflects the tumultuous political period in which it was built. The church was dedicated by Bishop Ecclesius at the end of Theodoric's reign (d. 525) and built by Bishop Victor (538-545).⁹⁵ Its mosaic programme was completed under Maximianus in 546-548 after Ravenna came under Byzantine rule.⁹⁶ The imperial panels, which face each other on opposite sides of the apse, are conceived as a pair (pls. 41-42).⁹⁷ On the left side a haloed Justinian wearing such insignia of imperial office as a crown and rosette-shaped brooch with pendilia holds a golden paten and is surrounded by guards and church officials. In the right panel a haloed Theodora in full court regalia holding a chalice is accompanied by two male attendants and the ladies of her

92. Also see later discussion in this chapter on Melchizedak's dress at San Vitale.

93. Several diptychs have imperial medallion portraits. With the exception of the Halberstadt diptych, which pictures seated figures of Arkadios and his son Theodosios II, the fact that the emperor's and empress' portraits are always depicted in the form of a small medallion also supports this interpretation.

94. For pictures of the diptych: Olovsson, 2005, 11:1.

95. Andreescu-Treadgold and Treadgold, 1997, 712.

96. Maguire, 1987, 76; Kitzinger, 1977, 81.

97. Coloured pictures of the imperial panels are found in Doig, 2008, pls. 4-5 and Maas, 2005, pls. III-IV. Articles include Andreescu-Treadgold and Treadgold, 1997, 708-723 and Barber, 1990, 19-40; there are also lengthy sections on the panels in Maguire, 1987, 76-80 and Von Simson, 1948, 23-40.

98. Von Simson, 1948, 31.

court.

Although Justinian was never in Ravenna, his portrait was probably included among the mosaics to show his support for the new building and Maximianus, the bishop whom he selected.⁹⁸ The panel also suggests that by the sixth century the emperor had well-established roles in contemporary church ritual. Since Ravenna had just been recaptured from the Ostrogoths, the depiction of the city's new rulers taking part in a peaceful church ceremony may have suggested to parishioners the re-establishment of ordered routines in the rest of the city.⁹⁹

Although the imperial couple in both mosaics and their entourages are depicted facing frontally with the emperor and empress looking impassively beyond themselves, the positions of their hands and feet as well as the liturgical vessels which they carry imply that each group belonged to a separate procession.¹⁰⁰ Whereas Justinian's group had already entered the church as part of the Great Entrance, Theodora and her ladies are waiting in the atrium beside a fountain to enter separately from behind a curtained door.¹⁰¹ Above the panels in the dome of the apse at San Vitale is a third mosaic depicting a youthful Christ seated on a cosmic globe and accompanied by two angels (pl. 43). The four rivers of paradise flow out beneath his feet. These three works, placed above the altar, are part of a larger mosaic programme found in the sanctuary which depicted Old and New Testament figures.

99. Von Simson, 1949, 27-28.

100. Kitzinger, 1977, 87; Doig, 2009, 78.

101. Interpretations of the ceremony: Mathews, 1971, 146-147; Doig, 2008, 79.

Otto von Simson argues that the small mosaics of Abel, Melchizedek and Abraham located in the sanctuary gave additional meaning to the larger one of Justinian in the apse.¹⁰² Like the emperor, these three figures, he believed, not only make offerings but they also appear “as images of the emperor who, as king and priest, represented his subjects in the sacred rite before god”.¹⁰³ This thesis is supported by Andreescu-Treadgold and Treadgold’s meticulous analysis of the phases of the church’s construction. They argue that all the church decoration except the apse mosaics, which were completed under Bishop Victor, belong to the final phase completed under Maximian.¹⁰⁴ Therefore the mosaic of Melchizedek was completed shortly after that of Justinian. If any meaning can be derived from the rulers’ costumes alone, it is that Melchizedek, whose robes are those of a high priest but whose cap, cloak and slippers are, as Von Simson noted, purple, suggest that besides being a priest he was also the King of Salem (pls. 44-45), and that Justinian’s non-liturgical costume of the *chlamys* and *divitesion* implied that each fulfilled different ceremonial roles. Melchizedek’s dress suggested that he was a ruler-priest and Justinian’s, that he was an earthly ruler.

It seems fruitful to analyze a few further similarities between the apse mosaics. There is a parallel between Justinian and Theodora and the wise men from Epiphany. Small figures of these rulers kneeling with their offerings are pictured on the hem of Theodora’s *chlamys*. Since all of these earthly rulers are shown giving gifts to God, they are related. There are parallels between the figures of Christ and Justinian in the apse. Whereas Christ, like an earthly ruler, offers a martyr’s crown to San Vitalis, Justinian makes an offering to God. Justinian like Christ, who had twelve apostles, has a similar number of companions. Portraits of each of Christ’s apostles also appear in the western arch.¹⁰⁵ Although the clothing of both rulers has not changed as a result of their different roles, Christ has a few of the attributes of a triumphant earthly ruler, and Justinian possesses a few of Christ’s.

102. Von Simson, 1948, 31.

103. Von Simson, 1948, 31.

104. Andreescu-Treadgold and Treadgold, 1997, 719.

Henry Maguire analyzed the plant and animal imagery found in the church's small decorative mosaics; he concluded that if this imagery is read in conjunction with the triumphal imagery, they have the same significance as that mentioned by the contemporary historians Prokopios and George of Pisidia, who stated that "the world created by God is to be conquered and ruled by the emperor in association with and in imitation of the Ruler of the universe".¹⁰⁶ But if clothing alone in the apse is compared, the dress closest to Justinian's is not that of Christ; his dress instead is most similar to that of the martyr-saint San Vitalis, to whom the church was dedicated and to whom Christ offers a martyr's crown. Like Justinian's, San Vitalis' main garments are a long gold and white mantle decorated with a tablion and a white, knee-length under tunic with shoulder patches. But unlike Justinian's cloak, which is entirely purple, San Vitalis' mantle is made from patterned silk fabric. In the mosaic he stands resplendently dressed before Christ primarily in white garments like the attendant archangels. In his mosaic the emperor's costume is carefully depicted down to the smallest details. Justinian wears a golden halo, crown with pendilia, a long purple chlamys fastened with an imperial brooch, shorter divetesion with long gathered sleeves trimmed in gold,¹⁰⁷ the imperial periskelides, purple leggings, and a pair of similarly coloured kampagnia, a form of laced boot. Of these garments, the halo, crown, pendilia, purple chlamys with tablion, rosette-shaped brooch, and purple slippers are all items of dress worn exclusively by an emperor.¹⁰⁸ Although not depicted in the mosaic, in his description of Justin II's coronation, Corippus mentions that emperors also wore belts of office.¹⁰⁹ Of Justinian's garments, the golden halo and imperial brooch have already been discussed in the section on the Missorium of Theodosios. The remaining garments, including the emperor's crown, his purple-dyed chlamys, the emperor's purple slippers, and his belt of office, will all be discussed at greater length in

105. For parallels between Justinian's attendants and Christ's apostles: Maguire, 1987, 80.

106. Maguire, 1987, 76-78.

107. Emperors also sometimes wore a second short sleeve tunic, the scaramangion, just visible at Justinian's elbow: ODB 1977, 2128.

108. Grierson mentions the chlamys and brooch: Grierson, 1968, 76-77; Canepa, the remaining four items: Canepa, 2009, 201.

109. Corippus, Bk. II, 115; Cameron, 1976, 51.

the following sections.

Repairs to the mosaic at San Vitale in about 1100 resulted in a slight reduction in the size of Justinian's crown. Justinian's gold medallion and several of his bronzes and gold nomismata, which show him in military dress, depict the emperor wearing a small pearl encrusted fillet in addition to a war helmet, which may derive from the early diadem.¹¹⁰ But the crowns worn by Justinian's predecessors in medallion portraits on diptychs, such as the one worn by Anastasios in the diptych mentioned above, also have a snood with two small peaks.¹¹¹ The snood as shown in these portraits was a stiff piece of fabric covering all of the hair except on the forehead. Since this is also the type of crown found in the portrait medallions of Justinian on the diptych of the Consul Justin (pl. 46), this more elaborate type of crown may also have been the variety originally shown at San Vitale.¹¹²

110. Andreescu-Treadgold, 1997, 716; Stout, 1994, 94.

111. For a detailed discussion of the snood and examples: Stout, 1994, 94.

112. It is difficult to determine which emperor first introduced this more elaborate type of crown. It is first shown on nomismata of Justin II and Tiberios II Constantine.

113. *De Vita Caesarum*, M. Ihm, 1967; Suetonius, "Tiberius," 17, 69; Edwards. 2000, 107. Stout, 1994, 82.

Before Constantine's reign Roman emperors did not usually wear crowns; Suetonius mentions four types, however, which the senate awarded rulers for achievements in battle: the civic crown with oak leaves, the laurel crown, the mural crown, and the naval crown.¹¹³ Three of these crowns are shown in the Cornucopia Cameo at the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna (pl. 47).¹¹⁴ Imperial crowns depicted on fourth-century gold nomismata and medallions, however, developed from the diadem, a crown first worn by rulers during the Hellenistic period. Constantine experimented with several types including the radiate crown of Helios or Sol Invictus, the laureate crown,¹¹⁵ diadems decorated with pearls, a simple band with ties, and even the corona civica, the type of crown shown on the statue of the emperor in his thermal bath in Rome (pls. 48-52).¹¹⁶ Since several types of diadems originating in the Hellenistic period were continued by his successors, they represent a form of intrinsic symbol. On their nomismata, Constantine's sons are shown wearing three types of crowns: the laureate crown, the diadem with rows of pearls and a centre piece, and a crown with jewels alternating with leaf elements and a rosette centre piece (pls. 53-55).¹¹⁷ Their successors are depicted wearing the latter two types of crowns.¹¹⁸

The depiction of an emperor wearing pendilia is first found on the consular diptych of Probus, which pictures the emperor Honorios (pl. 56);¹¹⁹ prominent examples are depicted on the later gold coins of Valentinian III (439-490) and Leo I (457-474) (pls. 57-58).¹²⁰ The pendilia on their diadems are extensions of the double rows of pearls which decorate the diadem. Although later Byzantine rulers never wore only one type of crown, by Tiberios II Constantine's reign crowns had become more substantial and were typically decorated with a centre cross (pl. 59).

114. Stout, 1994, 82.

115. In his history John Malalas states that Constantine first wore a crown in the Hippodrome during ceremonies celebrating the completion of the monument and several others in Constantinople: Malalas, 1986, 175; but on coins Constantine is shown wearing a laurel crown as early as 310: Numismatic Ars Classica, 2002, 132, item 272.

116. For further examples of Constantine's different crowns see Numismatica Ars Classica, 2002, 135-137; also Delbrueck, 1933, tafel 2. An enlargement of the crown in the thermal bath is pictured in Delbrueck, 1933, tafel 34.

117. The crowns of Constantine's sons are shown in Delbrueck, 1933, tafels 6 and 7.

118. Stout, 2001, 88-89.

119. Olovsson, 2005, 14.

Before the third century members of the highest class in Rome, the senate, which included the emperor, were identified by two wide purple bands, the latus clavus, decorating their tunics.¹²¹ But as power shifted from the senate to the emperor, his costume increasingly differed from the dress of senators and other court officials. Among the garments distinguishing the members of this new elite were different types of silk robes with special patches, stripes and colours, accessories such as belts, jewelry and sceptres, headgear and finally footwear.¹²² Especially during banquets and processions, such as the religious procession depicted at San Vitale, each member's precise place in the hierarchy could be identified by his or her dress.¹²³ These new forms of dress and regalia had symbolic meanings associated with the wearer's office.

120. Valentinian III: Delbrueck, table 21; Leo I: Grierson and Mays, 1992, pl. 20, 517.

121. Wilson, 1924, 53-54; Croom, 2002, 53.

122. See Canepa for a description of elaborate court ceremony during Justinian's reign: Canepa, 2009, 133. Cameron often mentions the importance of non-imperial dress during court ceremony: Cameron, 112, 119, 129.

123. For a detailed description of their dress: Andreescu-Treadgold, 1997, 717-718.

In the apse mosaic, Justinian wears three purple garments: a chlamys decorated with the overall pattern of a duck in a pearl roundel medallion¹²⁴ and with a contrasting gold and green tablion, leggings, and finally identically dyed slippers embellished with rosettes. The duck in a roundel pattern also appears as a motif in the tablion and shoulder appliques of the divetesion. The chlamys which Justinian wears was derived from the Roman field marshal's purple paladamentum.¹²⁵ Because of this garment's importance in investiture ceremonies performed during Diocletian's reign, the field marshal's cloak and its purple colour gained an added symbolic significance until purple became the most important colour associated with the emperor.¹²⁶ Since the garment was derived from the purple paladamentum and continued through later reigns, it is a type of intrinsic symbol. As early as Galerius, Byzantine emperors were even sometimes referred to as the purpuratus, the 'clothed in purple'.¹²⁷ Not only the emperor's clothing but even such items as his military standards, paper, ink, funeral shroud and sarcophagus were coloured purple.¹²⁸

The shade of purple found in the emperor's cloak and other garments was made from an extremely expensive purple dye extracted from the murex shellfish. It was called Tyrian purple after the Phoenician city which is most associated with the production of the dye.¹²⁹ Although controls were placed on the amount of purple fabric which individuals other than the emperor could wear, its use was never wholly restricted to him.¹³⁰ In the procession at San Vitale all the court and church officials surrounding the emperor wear predominately white garments decorated with small amounts of purple in the form of bands, tablions, and even Maximianus's purple pallium. The overall effect of this limited use of purple by other officials in the procession is to emphasize Justinian's importance. His pre-eminence is signaled not only by the fact that he is placed at the mosaic's center but also by the contrast between his richly decorated purple robes and the predominately white coloured ones of the other officials.

124. Canepa, 2009, 2006.

125. Reinhold, 1970, 59; Elliott, 2008, 181; Canepa, 2009, 322, 20. Rather than seeing purple as having a symbolic meaning, James believes contemporaries simply associated purple with the emperor: James, 1996, 139.

126. Canepa, 2009, 201.

127. Canepa, 2009, 322, note 19.

128. Canepa, 2009, 192.

From the existing records, it is difficult to distinguish where myth leaves off and history begins, or to identify the exact shade of purple which the ancient writers called “royal purple”.¹²⁹ The first prominent historical ruler to wear the colour about whom detailed records exist is Alexander the Great.¹³⁰ Although it is not known why he began wearing purple clothing at court, it is known that Persian rulers wore this colour, and that the practice dated from the time of Alexander’s defeat of Darios.¹³¹ His decision may have been influenced by the fact that he found “hundreds of talents worth” of Tyrian purple dyed fabrics in the royal treasury at Persepolis.¹³² Alexander’s court costume consisted of a white striped purple tunic, purple robe, and a white flecked purple diadem placed over a broad purple felt hat.¹³³

During his dictatorship Julius Caesar passed special sumptuary laws which stated that purple edged togas could be worn only by senators; the legislation was continued under Augustus Caesar.¹³⁴ The court ceremony called the adoratio purpurae, the kissing of the emperor’s purple cloak, may have originated as early as Julius Caesar’s dictatorship but was certainly part of court ceremony by Diocletian’s reign.¹³⁵ Aurelius Victor records that Diocletian was also the first emperor to wear purple sandals.¹³⁶

129. Elliott, 2008, 177; Jensen, 1963, 104.

130. Elliott, 2008, 183.

131. Jensen, 1963, 104.

132. Elliott, 2008, 180.

133. Reinhold, 1970, 29.

134. Reinhold, 1970, 30; Jensen, 1963, 109.

135. Elliott, 2008, 180.

136. Elliott, 2008, 131.

137. Canepa, 2009, 150.

138. Liber de Caesaribus, ed. F. Pichlmayer, 1966; Aurelius Victor, 39. 1; Bird, 1994, 41. Reinhart, 1970, 60.

139. Jensen, 1963, 113.

140. Jensen provides a detailed description of the types of murex snails used in the dying process and what is known about ancient extraction and dyeing methods: Jensen, 1963, 105-109.

141. Elliott, 2008, 178; Jensen, 1963, 110.

The exact modern equivalent of Tyrian or “royal Purple” will never be known.¹³⁹ The precise methods used for extracting the dye from species of murex shellfish and those used for dyeing the cloth were all closely guarded secrets.¹⁴⁰ But depending upon the type of shellfish and the extraction method, the resultant colour varied from a dull pinkish red to a deep amethyst.¹⁴¹ In their descriptions of purple, the ancient writers generally assign the name to a colour which we would today call a shade of red or crimson.¹⁴² In his Natural History, Pliny the Elder offered several descriptions of Tyrian purple. At one point he compared it to clotted blood, “it is exactly the colour of clotted blood and is of a blackish hue to the sight, but of a shining appearance when held up to the light”.¹⁴³ According to Pliny, the colour’s association with clotted blood also further suggested its association with life and the gore of battle. At another point he compared it to the colour of “a dark rose”.¹⁴⁴ He also added that purple was valued because it made a favourable contrast when combined with gold, “it brightens every garment, and shares with gold the glory of the triumph”.¹⁴⁵ In his description of Justin II’s coronation, the historian Corippus also admired the use of these two colours in the emperor’s coronation robes, “the chlamys, which was adorned with tawny gold and outdid the sun...covered the imperial shoulders in glowing purple”.¹⁴⁶ Because this gave the cloth an added sheen, the most expensive purple garments were double dipped ones.¹⁴⁷

Although gold is mentioned as the second colour found in the emperor’s chlamys, it was never associated with him alone. In descriptions as early as Constantine’s reign, gold was valued because it created a favorable contrast with purple. Like Pliny and Corippus, this is the characteristic which Eusebios praised in the emperor’s cloak as he entered the Council of Nicaea: he walked with “his bright mantle...shining with the fiery radiance of a purple robe, and decorated with the dazzling brilliance of gold and precious stones”.¹⁴⁸ The contrast between these two colours was probably valued because gold brings out purple’s red highlights.

142. Jensen, 1963, 111.

143. Elliott, 2008, 178; Jensen, 1963, 110.

144. Elliott, 2008, 181; Gage, 1993, 25.

145. Elliott, 2008, 181.

146. Corippus, II, 115-120; Cameron, 1975, 51. James also quotes John of Damascus who even believed that a fabric’s colour including purple had no special value until it was made into an emperor’s cloak: James 1996, 123.

147. Elliott, 2008, 178; Gage, 1993, 25.

Although several of the emperor's garments including his robe and crown often had added meaning, the emperor's purple slippers were perhaps the most significant. The principal way to identify an emperor in a group was by his purple slippers.¹⁴⁹ Like other symbols closely associated with the emperor such as the chlamys and diadem, they are also intrinsic symbols signifying his pre-eminence in battle. Although the type of shoe varied, in Byzantine art only emperors, archangels, and women were ever depicted wearing purple or red shoes.¹⁵⁰ In the adoration of the purple during Diocletian's reign, individuals kissed the hem of the emperor's cloak; but during later reigns, including Justinian's, they kissed the emperor's slippers.¹⁵¹ If any person except the emperor were to put on purple footwear, it was interpreted as a sign he was a usurper.¹⁵² Corippus states that the purple colour of the emperor's shoes also represented his enemies' blood: "only emperors, under whose feet is the blood of kings, can adopt this attire".¹⁵³ His allusion is to a ritualistic ceremony in which early rulers publically trampled on their enemies. A scene showing such a trampling was depicted on the Arch of Galerius,¹⁵⁴ and Corippus mentions that a similar example was woven into Justinian's funeral shroud.¹⁵⁵

In his description of Justin II's robes, Corippus praises another colour, the white, "candidus", of the emperor's tunic: "he stepped out...covering himself with a gilded robe in which he shone out, white all over, and gave off light and dispersed the dusky shadows".¹⁵⁶ In early Rome senators traditionally wore dazzling white to suggest their purity.¹⁵⁷ In the mosaic at San Vitale, resplendent white is by far the most notable colour found in the procession.

148. Eusebios, Bk. III, 10, 3; Cameron and Hall, 1999, 125.

149. Canepa, 2009, 201; ODB, 1991, 1759.

150. Canepa, 2009, 201.

151. *Procopii Caesariensis opera omnia*, ed. J. Haury, 1962-64; Prokopios, *Secret History*, XXX, 21-23; Dewing, 1935, 354-355. Canepa, 2009, 150.

152. ODB, 1991, 2146.

153. Corippus, I, 285; Cameron, 1976, 92.

154. Canepa, 2009, 91.

155. Corippus, I, 285; Cameron, 1976, 92.

156. Corippus, II, 95; Cameron, 1976, 96.

157. Croom, 2002, 28.

In Corippus' poem, the colour of Justin's tunic was valued for its purity and brightness. Such a dazzling whiteness was remarkable because it seemed to produce its own radiance. In other sixth-century mosaics, celestial beings, like the angels accompanying Christ in the apse mosaic at San Vitale, are dressed in white. In the mosaic at the church Justinian built on Mt. Sinai, six figures including Christ are clothed primarily in white (pl. 60). The streams of light radiating from Christ to each of these figures recall the description of this event in the Gospels: "his face shone like the sun, and his garments became white as light" (Matthew 17:2). The second-century theologian Origen also compared the white of Christ's robes to pure light in his commentary on the transfiguration.¹⁵⁸ If the purple of Justinian's cloak represented the emperor's secular powers, the white of his robe may have also symbolized his spiritual authority.¹⁵⁹

In "Processional Colors", an essay which analyzes passages in Greek and Roman texts describing the colours worn in processions from the late Hellenistic period to the second century, Christopher Jones notes that the most prominent colours were white and purple.¹⁶⁰ He believed these were preferred because they were the most expensive ones to produce.¹⁶¹ In some processions, the artist's goal was simply to create a visual play between uniformity and variety. But in others, it was to create a contrast between these two colours.¹⁶² Though in the mosaic at San Vitale, both of these principles can be documented, Jones mentions only the second principle, which he believes was illustrated by the contrast between the purple tablions and white chlamyses of the two courtiers to the emperor's left and the emperor's gold tablion and purple chlamys.¹⁶³ His first principle, an attempt to create a visual play between uniformity and variety, is illustrated, however, by the dress of the figures on both sides of Justinian and Maximian. Whereas the costumes

158. *Patrologia Graeca*, Origen, "Commentaria in Evangelium Secundum Mattheum, Bk. XII, 38; Migne, 1862, 1070-1071. Translation: Origen, 12. 38; McGuckin, 1987, 157-158. Gage, 1993, 60.

159. Although the Byzantines believed that several colours had additional symbolic meanings, no one has ever suggested that dazzling white garments might represent an emperor's spiritual authority. James, however, mentions that in addition to purple and gold garments, emperors preferred white ones: James, 2005, 158.

160. Jones, 1999, 251.

161. Jones, 1999, 252.

162. Jones, 1999, 255.

worn by all these figures are uniformly white embellished with small amounts of purple, the garments are varied because the cloaks of the court officials on Justinian's left are decorated with purple tablions and the palliums of the church officials on his right with purple stripes.

In all the existing pictorial examples, the emperor's belt is concealed by the chlamys. Corippus mentions, however, that during Justin II's reign, the emperor typically wore a jewel encrusted belt of office: "a shining girdle, bright with gems and worked gold, encircled the royal loins".¹⁶⁴ Elsewhere in his poem, lesser court officials are described as wearing plain gold belts.¹⁶⁵ Such belts (zone) became an important part of the costume worn by officials not just in court but also throughout the realm as early as Diocletian's reign.¹⁶⁶ A typical example of these elaborate belts is depicted in a wall painting found in a chamber tomb at Durostorum (modern Silistra) dated to the mid-fourth century.¹⁶⁷ In the painting, two processions of servants carrying items of dress converge on a male and female figure, probably the tomb occupants, in the central panel (pl. 61). Two of the attendants converging on the male figure carry a chlamys clasped by a large cross-bow fibula and a pair of leggings, while a third is depicted carrying a heavy metal belt (pls. 62-63). Since these three garments represent the clothing worn by all office holders throughout the realm, the picture seems to indicate that the male tomb occupant was a local official.¹⁶⁸

A second example of dress being used to indicate the wearer's exact place in court hierarchy is the costume client kings received from the emperor. During the fifth and sixth centuries, both the Byzantine and Sassanian rulers awarded such costumes along with other prestige gifts to foreign rulers declaring loyalty to their kingdoms.¹⁶⁹ In exchange client kings were expected to aid the Byzantines when they were under foreign attack. The costume itself demonstrated not only the ruler's loyalty to the

163. Jones, 1999, 254.

164. Corippus, II, 111; Cameron, 1978, 96.

165. Corippus, IV, 230; Cameron, 1976, 114.

166. ODB, 1991, 280.

167. Dimitrov, 1961, 35.

168. Dunbabin, 2003, 461-462.

169. Canepa, 2009, 2004.

emperor but also the fact that the ruler governed a sovereign state. In 521/2 during Justin I's reign, Tzath, the son of the ruler of Laz, a client king of the Sassanians, rejected the traditional Persian religion. When his father died, he journeyed to Constantinople where he was received by Justin I, baptized as a Christian, given a Roman wife Valeriana, changed his costume, and was crowned by the emperor.¹⁷⁰

The costume he received during his coronation ceremony in several ways resembles Roman imperial dress. It consisted of headgear described as a Roman crown, a white silk cloak with a gold border decorated with a purple medallion portrait of Justin, and a white silk tunic, which also had a gold border and portraits of the emperor.¹⁷¹ Tzath, however, retained his own kingdom's purple footwear and pearl encrusted belt of office.¹⁷² Therefore the crown, cloak and tunic which Justin gave him signaled his loyalty to the Romans; but the fact that he retained such potent symbols of kingship as his own kingdom's footwear and belt of office showed that he was an independent ruler.

Although it is difficult to know exactly when the *chlamys-divetesion* costume ended as a form of dress, the court officials in the imperial mosaics at San Vitale (546-548) are practically the last to be shown wearing this form of attire. Current evidence suggests that by this time such garments were worn only by the individuals of the highest rank at court and holders of high honorary titles such as patricius and clarissimus.¹⁷³ This is further confirmed by the fact that all the existing examples of the final form of cross-bow fibula (450-558), a type with a short cross-bow and faceted knobs, exist only in gold.¹⁷⁴

170. Chronographia, L. Dindorf, 1831; Malalas, 17, 9, 413; Jeffreys, 1986, 233; Chronicon Paschale, ed. P. Kreuger, 1954; Chronicon Pascale, 325, 522; Whitby and Whitby, 1989, 105.

171. Chronicon Pascale, P. Kreuger, 1954; Chronicon Pascale, 325, 522; Whitby and Whitby, 1989, 105.

172. Chronicon Pascale, P. Kreuger, 1954; Chronicon Pascale, 325, 522; Whitby and Whitby, 1989, 105.

173. Deppert-Lippitz, 2000, 61.

Although a change in Roman burial customs means that no cross-bow fibulas have been found in Roman graves of this period, several fine gold examples have been excavated from the graves of Germanic chieftains who lived on the periphery of the kingdom.¹⁷⁵ When the grave of the Frankish king Childeric (d. 482) was discovered in modern Tournai, the king was found buried in the garb of a high Roman official wearing a purple chlamys with a gold cross-bow fibula.¹⁷⁶ He probably held the title of protector of the Roman province of Belgica Secunda.¹⁷⁷ But only a generation later his son Clovis seems unable to distinguish between basic types of Roman dress. When he won a victory over the Visigoths in 508, Clovis was awarded the title of consul. But Gregory of Tours reports that he celebrated the event not by putting on a toga but by wearing instead a crown and purple chlamys.¹⁷⁸

174. Deppert-Lippitz, 2000, 56.

175. Deppert-Lippitz, 2000, 54.

176. Deppert-Lippitz, 2000, 57.

177. Deppert-Lippitz, 2000, 62.

178. Deppert-Lippitz, 2000, 62.

179. The nomismata were issued during the joint reign of Basil II and Constantine VIII.

Gold coins depicting an emperor wearing the costume were produced as late as the Middle Byzantine period; the last examples seem to be those of Basil II's reign (976-1025).¹⁷⁹ Either the imperial costume depicted on coins was very conservative, depicting earlier types for several reigns after it had disappeared from use, or else the costume may still have been worn in the capital as a strictly ceremonial form of dress until the end of Basil II's reign.

In conclusion, beginning with Diocletian's reign almost every aspect of contemporary life underwent wide ranging changes. These resulted partially from a shift in power from Rome and the west initially to several tetrarchic capitals and then slightly later under Constantine to Constantinople and the east. But the main cause of change was western exposure to eastern influences. In clothing the principal form of male dress for everyday use, the toga, had been in decline since the second-century, but now it was supplanted by the chlamys, a form of military dress of eastern origin, and the diveteson, an under-tunic with a banded neck and long pleated sleeves.

The emperor now wore purple slippers and a type of chlamys derived from the field marshals' paludamentum; both garments were dyed with a special purple dye, reserved exclusively for his use alone. In addition to dress, court ceremonial was transformed. The emperor now sat enthroned in the centre of the audience hall in an arched niche. Individuals approaching him were required to perform a ceremony called proskynesis, which consisted of their bowing and kissing the hem of his robe or slippers. Court ceremonial also now often took the form of lavish displays.

As early as the reign of Marcus Aurelius, new forms of art had begun to appear to express the emperor's changed role. Rather than always being shown in profile, the emperor was now sometimes depicted facing frontally at the centre of the scene surrounded by his body guard.¹⁸⁰ In such early fourth-century monuments as the Arches of Galerius and Constantine, the emperor's costume differed little from that of other court officials. Instead his superior status was implied by his frontal stance and central placement. In the adlocutio scene on the Arch of Constantine, for example, Constantine's dress is identical to those surrounding him but his enlarged figure appears in the center facing frontally surrounded by his body guard.

By the reign of Theodosios I, a distinctive form of imperial dress had evolved. In the Missorium the emperor is seated at the center in a niche between his co-rulers surrounded by guards. Each ruler wears a diadem, a chlamys decorated with an overall pattern which is fastened with an imperial brooch, a diveteson, and slippers. Differences of rank among the rulers are implied by their attributes. The two junior rulers hold globes; Valentinian II, the western emperor, also holds a sceptre. Theodosios' pre-eminence is signaled by his central placement and the fact that he dispenses the codicil. The three rulers' semi-divine natures are implied by their haloes and aloof facial expressions, a form of tranquilitas or imperial calm. The entire scene implied that the peace and prosperity of the decannlia resulted from the orderly workings of government, a form of taxis which mirrored the orderly workings of the heavenly court. On the Obelisk base, the orderly ranks of government officials communicated a similar message. Since the diadem, purple footwear and the chlamys as well as the orb and sceptre were all continued from earlier time periods and became an integral part of the symbolism associated with the imperial office, they were all also examples of intrinsic symbols.

The ceremony depicted on the Trier ivory, the deposition of a saint's relics in a newly built church, suggested that earlier forms of court ceremonial derived from Rome and the east had now given way to new forms of Christian ceremonial.

180. Kitzynger, 1977, 14.

Although the emperor, as the procession's leader, is still important, he is not the focal point. Other figures such as the empress who built the church and the church officials transporting them are also important. Order is implied by the types of costumes which each participant wears; these communicate his or her rank and role in the ceremony. These characteristics are also found in the two processions depicted on the imperial panels at San Vitale.

— The Emperor in

Senatorial Dress

Forms of the late Roman toga resulted from changes which began in the earliest of times. In early Rome both men and women wore togas; the poet Vergil even called the Romans the gens togata.¹ The first togas were woven from a single piece of woollen fabric measuring about twelve feet.² Originally the garment was wrapped so loosely around the body that the wearer had to hold it in place.³ The toga was, however, a suitable form of dress for a people whose main industry was sheep herding. The Etruscan kings wore early forms of the toga picta, and valued purple togas, the toga purpurea.⁴ By the second century, togas were only worn by men, who also wore tunics as an under garment.⁵

1. Vergil, I, 282; Fairclough, 1916, 260, tr. 261. Kleiner, 1980/81, 125.

2. Kleiner, 1980/81, 126.

3. Kleiner, 1980/81, 127.

4. Stone, 1994, 13.

5. Croom, 2002, 17.

6. De Vita Caesarum, M. Ihm, 1967. Suetonius, "The Deified Augustus," 40; Edwards, 2000, 65; Stone, 1994, 17.

7. Stone, 1994, 15.

By Augustus' reign, the toga's popularity as the universal form of male dress was declining; Suetonius even states that the emperor instructed the aediles to prevent citizens not dressed in togas from conducting business in the forum.⁶ At this time, a variety of forms, however, were worn especially on ceremonial occasions. Senators wore the toga praetexta, a white toga decorated with a purple band, and special low boots with ties.⁷ On ceremonial occasions, the highest ranking Roman officials including the emperor wore a special form of purple toga encrusted with jewels and embroidered rosettes or even scenes called a toga picta or trabea triumphalis.⁸ This garment was worn with a special tunic, the tunica palmata.⁹ At their inaugurations, the consuls-elect wore a decorated trabea during ceremonies and games held in their honour.¹⁰ Since the toga was loose fitting, the section of fabric at the back and the arm on several types could be worn as a hood which was pulled over the head. During religious ceremonies, the emperor wore a special form of hooded toga, the cintus gabinus, which not only covered his head but was also tied at the waist.¹¹

7. Stone, 1994, 15.

8. Olovsson, 2005, 72.

9. Olovsson, 2005, 72.

10. Croom, 2002, 47-48; Wilson, 1924, 38-39; Olovsson, 2005, 3.

11. Stone, 1994, 13.

12. Stone, 1994, 17.

13. Stone, 1994, 17.

The garment's declining popularity during the Empire resulted not so much from its being supplanted by new non-Roman forms of dress but rather from its increased size. In the first century A. D., the garment's length was fifteen to eighteen feet instead of the earlier twelve.¹² It was impossible to put the toga on without assistance. The garment's bulkiness and tendency to slip also made any physical activity difficult.¹³ This enlarged toga had two main features: a roll of loose folds running across the chest called the sinus (also called the balteus) and a clump of drapery made from the lower folds, which ran up the left side, called the umbo.¹⁴ During the reigns of the later Julio-Claudians, the sinus was enlarged to the point that it even dipped beneath the knee.¹⁵

14. Stone, 1994, 17.

15. Stone, 1994, 21.

16. Stone, 1994, 35.

17. Stone, 1994, 34.

16. Stone, 1994, 34.

18. Stone, 1994, 34.

19. This style of toga was popular in Rome from the mid-fourth to early fifth century.

The next major change in style is first depicted on the statuary and reliefs of Septimius Severus. On these monuments, the loose folds of the toga are contained by a broad smooth band of stacked folds derived from the shoulder umbo. This toga, called the toga contrabulata, was the garment's last form in Rome and in the West.¹⁶ Numerous portrait busts found on fourth-century Christian sarcophagi depict this style of toga.¹⁷ On the right side of his diptych, Probianus, a vicarius or commander of troops in Rome, is shown seated between two secretaries wearing the toga contrabulata (pl. 1).¹⁸ Beneath him are two Roman senators also dressed in this type of toga. On the diptych, the three figures gesture in a manner indicating they are speaking while secretaries record their words. Since one senator's back is turned, it is possible to see how both the front and back of the toga were draped.¹⁹ This is also the type worn by the tetrarchs in reliefs found on the base of the Decennalia or Five-Column Monument and by Constantine in the largitio (liberalis) scene on the Arch of Constantine.²⁰

Although the toga contrabulata continued to be worn in the west, a new form of toga with stretched bands which evolved in the east is best exemplified, not by an eastern statue, but by a fourth-century Roman one (pl. 2). The undergarments now consisted of two tunics instead of one. The sinus as depicted on the statue is so long that it needed to be draped over the left arm. The band across the front is not made of carefully pressed folds, as in the toga contrabulata. Instead a long strip of fabric about twelve inches wide was probably attached to the main body of fabric and stretched over the shoulder to hold the toga in place.²¹ The back of the Roman statue also reveals that the bulk of the toga's under section is gathered in loose folds which hang down the middle of the back.²² This toga is probably best regarded as a reduced version of an imperial toga with an attached band.²³ It is the form of toga worn by court officials on the base of the Theodosian Obelisk, by Arkadios and Valentinian II on statues found at Aphroedisias in Asia Minor, and by Arkadios and Honorios on the reliefs forming part of the base of

20. Stone, 1994, 34.

21. Stone, 1994, 35.

22. Stone, 1994, 38.

23. Stone, 1994, 38.

24. Only one of these monuments, the Theodosian Obelisk, is discussed in the secondary literature: Wilson, 1924, 104. For the remaining monuments see my analysis later in this chapter.

Arkadios' column.²⁴

A special type of toga picta, the trabea triumphalis, was worn by senators during ceremonies in early January which celebrated their inaugurations as consuls; this is the form of toga depicted on consular diptychs.²⁵ During their inaugurations, consuls wore an elaborate form of consular toga encrusted with jewels and embellished with purple and gold embroidery. Large, distinctive patterns found in the embroidery sometimes take the form of stars which suggest flowers, rosettes or even astral motifs such as the sun disk.²⁶ On these ivories, the new consul is usually shown seated on the traditional sella curulis holding a folded napkin, the mappa, in his raised right hand; this gesture signaled the start of the games held in his honour.²⁷ The emblem of office in his other hand is usually the eagle-tipped sceptre (scipio eburneus).²⁸ At the bottom of some diptychs, attendants pour coins out of leather sacks; other ivories, however, depict events held at the circus in the consul's honour. At the top, these commemorative ivories usually displayed architectural elements and medallion portraits of the reigning emperor and empress.²⁹

25. Olovdotter, 2005, 1.

26. Olovdotter, 2005, 72.

27. Olovdotter, 2005, 3.

28. Olovdotter, 2005, 3.

29. Olovdotter offers a detailed description of the structure of the diptyches: Olovdotter, 2005, 114-119 and 121-123.

Twelve fragments from eight five-part “imperial” diptychs, which once depicted an emperor or empress on their central panel, also exist today. Neither of the two existing central panels depicts an emperor in consular dress.³⁰ Nomismata and medallions, however, struck to commemorate imperial consulships, usually show the emperor seated on the sella curulis or as a portrait bust holding the mappa and eagle-tipped sceptre. A few large gold multiples from Constantine’s reign depict Constantine on the obverse as a draped bust and two of his sons as consuls on the reverse. Although existing only in Renaissance copies, one manuscript, the Calendar of 354, pictures Constantios II wearing a consular toga.³² Large medallions also exist which show an emperor sprinkling coins either from a six horse chariot or, in one example, from an elephant quadriga.³³

30. For additional information on imperial diptychs see ODB, 1991, 637 and Delbrueck, 1929, 180-208.

31. For examples see NAC, 2002, 158, #324 and 167, #353.

32 The multiples are pictured in Bruhn, 1993, 17, pls. 11-14 and Numismatica Ars Classica, 2002, 136, #279 and #280; 145; for pictures of the illustration see Weitzmann, 1978, 79; Stern, 1953, pls. XIV-XV; Salzman, 1990, figs. 13-14.

33. Kalvrezou-Maxeiner, 1975, 251.

34. Wilson, 1924, 113.

35. Wilson, 1924, 112.

The toga triumphalis consisted of two tunics and an abbreviated form of the older imperial toga. The outer tunic was now richly embroidered, had a banded circular collar and tightly fitted sleeves. What remained of the traditional toga was little more than a narrow band and upper portion, the sinus.³⁴ When the toga was put on, the end of the band was probably first placed in the middle of the chest, then over the left shoulder, diagonally across the back, under the right arm, and then finally across the chest.³⁵ The main portion of the toga was finally brought across the left shoulder and diagonally across the back, then forward to the front and draped over the left arm. On diptychs and consular aigrettes, this portion appears either as a large piece of fabric at the front or as a short tail.³⁶

Although this is the basic form of the late ceremonial toga, diptychs show three slightly different types depending on exactly how the toga was draped (pls. 3-5). The first group was draped exactly as already described. In the second group, which is the most common type found on diptychs, the band was first passed over the right shoulder to the back, then brought forward under the right arm to the front. The bulk of the toga was then first brought across the chest, over the left shoulder, and then across the back, with the remainder re-emerging under the right arm and resting on the left arm.³⁷ In the third type, the band passed over both shoulders. The band was first passed over the left shoulder, then brought across the back, under the right arm to the front of the chest. The second band, which passed over the right shoulder, was either an extension of the first band or a second band attached to the first one, which was then brought over the right shoulder, across the back and attached to the first band at the front. The remainder of the draping is exactly the same as in the toga discussed immediately above. Slight variations in the method of folding, types of accessories, and their colour or decoration would have signaled to contemporaries each official's office and status.³⁸

36. Wilson, 1924, 113.

37. Wilson, 1924, 112.

Although the emperor might wear the consular toga at such events as a religious ceremony, an imperial adventus, a military triumph, or a civic ceremony like public games, it was always worn on the first day of January during week-long ceremonies which marked a ruler's accession to the consulship.³⁹ These consular inaugurations followed rigorously prescribed protocols. The events began with the emperor's distribution of gifts to his followers inside the palace and later outside to the general public; celebrations then included such additional public ceremonies as banquets, parades (pompae), and games (ludi consulares) held in the consul's honour at the Hippodrome.⁴⁰

38. Method of folding: Wilson, 1924, 114; dress delineating statues: Canepa, 2009, 192.

39. Olovsson, 2005, 1.

40. Olovsson, 2005, 1.

41. Cameron, 1976, 195.

In Book IV of his In laudem Iustini Augusti minoris, the poet Corippus provides a detailed description of ceremonies held on 1 January 566 to celebrate Justin II's first consulship. Since the ceremonies Corippus described represented Justin's revival of the consular office after Justinian had abolished it, the celebrations may have been more lavish than usual.⁴¹ According to Corippus, Justin II, dressed in an ornate form of the trabea triumphalis, entered the great hall of the palace before sunrise and mounted the jewel encrusted consular throne and sat down. Then wearing either a trabea or toga according to their exact rank, the senators entered the throne room, did obeisance before him, and chanted the prescribed acclamations. Individual senators' names arranged by rank were then read out; each approached the emperor individually and received a gift from him consisting of a silver vessel filled with gold. After the senators had received their allotments, lesser court officials and friends received similar gifts also from the emperor's hand.⁴²

42. Corippus, Bk. IV, ll. 224-240; Cameron, 1976, 79-80.

43. Corippus, Bk. IV, ll. 224-240; Cameron, 1976, 79-80.

44. Corippus, Bk. IV. Ll. 315-330; Cameron, 1976, 80, 82-83.

When the ceremonies at court had been completed, following earlier custom, the emperor and senate then proceeded to Hagia Sophia for the observance of religious ceremonies associated with the new consul's inauguration.⁴³ Preceded by a herald and followed by church officials, Justin and the senators, all still in their ceremonial trabeas, advanced to Hagia Sophia. Along the route, the people applauded the colourful display while court officials distributed largesse to on-lookers. After the procession's arrival at the church, Justin offered generous gifts to Christ; following the service, he mounted a consular chariot drawn by six horses.⁴⁴ Although the text breaks off at this point, traditionally the emperor was driven around a prescribed route and distributed coins from his chariot with his own hand to the people. Games were then held in honour of the emperor and the five other consuls who assumed office on that day.⁴⁵

After the trabea, the toga's final abbreviated form, came the loros, a long jewel-encrusted scarf or stole which was about five metres long, and which was first mentioned by John the Lydian in his De Magistratibus as the form of dress worn by the Emperor Justinian during an imperial triumph celebrating the defeat of the Vandals.⁴⁶ The most prominent feature of the garment, the name of which derives from the word lorion, a strip of leather, is the X-shape which it formed when worn over the upper part of the body. The first undisputed representation of an emperor wearing the loros is on a nomisma issued by Justinian II during his first reign (685-695), which shows the emperor dressed in the garment as a full-figure (pl. 6).⁴⁷ I will offer a fuller discussion of the loros in a final section on forms of senatorial dress.

45. Cameron, 1976, 202.

46. John the Lydian, Bk. II, 2.4; Carney, 1971, 42.

47. On several coins pre-dating Justinian's first reign, such as the folles of the Revolt of the Heraclii, the emperor's consular robes are very schematized and may represent the loros but the first undisputed representation is the full figure depicted on the reverse of Justinian's nomisma which was first produced in 687: Grierson, 1982, 31 and pl. 17, 298.

The Banded Toga

The earliest surviving work to depict an emperor clad in the banded toga, a form with a band of stacked folds running across the shoulder, is the Five-Column or Decennial Monument which Diocletian dedicated in the Roman forum to the Goddess Concordia during ceremonies celebrating his Decennalia in 303 (pl 1).¹ Only three scenes from one of the reliefs decorating one of the five column bases and parts of the statuary surmounting the columns exist today. In two of the three scenes, unidentified togate figures may represent a tetrarch (pls. 2-3).² Since the Five-Column monument was located behind the rostrum and Constantine is pictured delivering his speech from behind it in the adlocutio relief on the Arch of Constantine, we know the monument's general appearance (pl. 4); its foundation was also excavated in 1959.³

-
1. Kleiner, 1991, 414.
 2. Kleiner, 1991, 414.
 3. Kleiner, 1991, 414.
 4. Kleiner, 1991, 414.
 5. Kleiner, 1991, 414.

On the adlocutio relief four of the five columns are aligned in a row; a fifth taller column stood behind the rest.⁴

Foundation blocks located during the excavations indicate that the columns were arranged in a hemi-cycle whose curvature followed that of a low niched wall.⁵ Each of the four niches, which probably contained togate portrait busts of the tetrarchs, was surmounted by a soffit decorated with an Eros figure. The shafts of the columns were made of rose colored granite supported by white marble capitols carved with female and Medusa heads. The front four columns were surmounted by togate porphyry statues of each tetrarch's genius. The fifth taller column was crowned by a statue of Jupiter, patron god of Diocletian and chief god of the Roman pantheon.⁶

The scene on the right relief of the existing column base represents a procession depicting the three sacrificial animals and four individuals associated with a Roman *suovetaurilia* (pl. 2). The sacrificial pig, sheep and bull, elaborately festooned, are accompanied by four traditional officials. On the right, the *poppa* holds an ax; beside him a togate figure holds a staff, the attribute of the official who leads the procession.⁷ In the relief on the left side of the same base, four male figures accompanied by a small boy wear the late Roman toga contabulata and hold scrolls, an attribute of the senatorial class (pl. 3). They are preceded by a togate figure whose back is turned and seems to be leading the group around the corner toward the sacrifice; the four figures are accompanied by a row of soldiers holding standards. Although the faces of the togate figures have been severely damaged and their scrolls imply the figures are senators, their number suggests that they may represent the tetrarchs.⁸

6. Kleiner, 1992, 414.

7. Kleiner, 1992, 416.

8. Kleiner, 1992, 416.

Since the head of the second figure is slightly turned, he may be conversing with the individual behind him. This may imply that the two central figures represent the Augusti flanked by their Caesars. If so, the portrayal imitates the arrangement of the five columns as identified by their statuary as well as the arrangement of the enthroned tetrarchs in the relief on the Arch of Galerius. Each of the four figures has a similar frontal stance with his toga draped over his right arm. This treatment probably reflects the tetrarchic ideal that a ruler's individuality was subsumed by the collective nature of his office.⁹ The arrangement of the folds in the togas also corroborates such an interpretation. Instead of molding each ruler's body, they create repeating patterns which further connect the figures in a generalized way. Because the facial features have been obliterated and the bottom portion of the relief is broken off, little additional information is available.

9. Kleiner, 1992, 415.

10. Kleiner, 1992, 416.

The most significant relief, however, is the third, the scene of sacrifice, a ceremony performed to celebrate the decennalia and offer prayers for the continuance of the tetrarchic regime (pl. 2). The central figure in the scene, who is also slightly larger than the other figures, is a tetrarch wearing a toga which covers his head. The custom of an emperor draping his head as a sign of respect during religious ceremonies dates from Augustus' reign.¹⁰ The toga shown on his statues is a loose fitting garment, which even covered his feet. Such a large bulky toga would have made all movement difficult. The continuance of this style on statues and reliefs of such second-century emperors as Hadrian and Marcus Aurelius and on the Five-Column monument suggests that this early form of toga was worn by emperors during formal ceremonies because of its associations with a venerated past which began with Augustus, the first emperor.¹¹ In the relief, the tetrarch, probably either Galerius or Constantine Chlorus since the column was dedicated to the Caesars, pours a libation from a patera onto a burning tripod altar, while the Genius of the Senate with his sceptre and Victory at the right crown the unidentified emperor. Other figures include Roma and Sol Invictus on the right, and on the left Mars, the god to whom the sacrifice was made.¹²

11. Kleiner, 1994, 117.

12. Stone, 1994, 34.

13. Kleiner, 1994, 416-417.

The somewhat later largitio scene on the Arch of Constantine also depicts an emperor as well as a number of other figures dressed in banded togas (pl. 5). This scene, located above the Arch's right entrance, shows the emperor's distribution of largesse during his inauguration as consul on 1 January 313.¹³ In the panel Constantine is shown hierarchically enthroned at the center of a two-tiered gallery in an unidentified Roman imperial forum. Beneath the emperor to his right, a senator receives his allotment from Constantine out of a twelve-slotted tray, assisted by four togate court officials. This individual appears to wear a different type of toga, but only because, in his eagerness to receive his coins, the stacked bands of his garment have become disturbed.¹⁴ On either side of Constantine in the upper tier, attendants carry lighted candles.¹⁵

In four upper loggias, two on each side of the emperor, togate officials distribute largesse from large coffers to citizens dressed in tunics, the praenula (a form of cloak), and in trousers. In each chamber a seated official records the distribution on a small scroll as a citizen from among those waiting below protrudes half-way through a hatch in the floor to accept his allotment from a six slotted tray.¹⁶

14. Kleiner, 1992, 452.

15. Kleiner, 1992, 452.

16. Kleiner, 1992, 452.

Whereas all the citizens in the relief are dressed in the praenula, in order to imply their superior social status, Constantine, the senators receiving largesse, and court officials all wear the banded toga contrabulata. The togas depicted in the scene are very short, only knee length; the undergarments, which consist of two tunics, end just above the ankle. The inner tunics have long fitted sleeves and the outer, a fitted neck and loose short rolled-up sleeves. Instead of a band starting at the chest, as in the relief of the tetrarchs found on the Five-Column Monument, the togas depicted on the Arch of Constantine have two bands. The inner one begins at the lower edge of the front between the knees and passes over the left shoulder. Then, as shown by the middle togate figure on the viewer's left, the band falls straight down the back ending at the knee. A second band, which was probably attached under the arm, passes over the right shoulder. As shown by the middle figure, whose back faces the viewer, it then came across the back to re-emerge at the front as the sinus. Finally the tail of the sinus was draped over the left arm.¹⁷

17. Kleiner, 1992, 452.

18. Numismatica Ars Classica, 2005, lot 146; Numismatic Ars Classica, 2002, lot 275.

19. Bruun, 1961, 52.

Two gold coins, the first an aureus produced by the mint of Antioch in 313, the same year as the distribution shown on the Arch of Constantine, and a nomisma struck at the western mint of Ticinium with an inscription dating it to the emperor's fourth consulship in 315, were minted to commemorate Constantine's inaugurations as consul (pl. 6-7).¹⁸ Both gold coins have a laureate head of Constantine facing right on the obverse. On the reverse dressed in a toga as a full figure, Constantine faces an orb held in the right hand (which the inscription states he received from Roma) and holds an eagle tipped sceptre in the left.¹⁹ Although the iconography of both coins is very similar, on the earlier aureus Constantine wears an elaborately decorated consular toga; but on the slightly later nomisma, he wears an undecorated banded one.²⁰ The two mints may have depicted two types of togas because, whereas Antioch was an eastern city and its citizens wore the newer decorative forms of the garment, Trier was located in the west and its citizens, perhaps more conservative, preferred instead a more unadorned form.

Although the loose band which is visible just beneath the emperor's left shoulder on the coin from Trier identifies this toga as a banded one, it is draped so loosely, perhaps to focus attention on the globe, that much of the under-tunic is visible. Without this band, the garment would be interpreted as a form of imperial toga.²¹ A number of these consular gold coins with the same iconography but from various Constantinian mints and consulships have been recorded.²² An unusual feature of both togas is that the sinus crosses underneath the left arm and then folds back over it. On the aureus, the sinus with its elaborate decoration is so long and stiff that it must be supported by both arms. The long sinus shown on both gold consular coins may simply be a style of toga which was popular for a brief time.

20. Constantine introduced the nomisma in 309 at Trier. It was then slowly introduced at other mints until it completely replaced the aureus and became the principle gold coin; ODB, 1991, 1924.

21. Another possibility is the toga praetexta but that form of toga always has a narrow coloured band running along its inner edge.

22. Bruun, 1961, 63.

The Toga with a Band of Stretched Folds

Although the development of the toga in the west ended with the banded toga, a new style with folds stretched across the shoulder became popular in the east.¹ On the reliefs on the base of the Theodosian obelisk, the four rulers wear the chlamys, but several of the court officials surrounding them wear the new type of toga. Since the early third century, all free-born men in the Empire were Roman citizens; they were also theoretically eligible to wear a toga. This created the need for a new form of toga to distinguish high officials from this now widened group of toga-wearers.² The ordered rows of figures according to their offices on the obelisk even suggest how important it was in late antiquity to wear the correct form of dress in the right way. Legislation enacted in Constantinople in 382, less than a decade before the construction of the obelisk (390), dictated the forms of dress which senators might wear on various occasions.³ Honorific statues of Arkadios and Valentinian II excavated at the city of Aphrodisias in Asia Minor depict the two rulers dressed in this style of toga.⁴ Finally drawings of the east side of Arkadios' column show the emperor, his brother and co-ruler Honorios, and the senate clad in togas of the new type.⁵

On two sides of the Theodosian obelisk's base, the southwest and northwest, only a single figure, identified as the city prefect, wears the new toga with a band of folds stretched across the left shoulder (pls. 1-2). On the two remaining sides, the

1. Stone, 1994, 35.

2. Smith, 1999, 179.

3. The Theodosian Code even specified that senators living in the city were barred from wearing military garb. They must instead wear "a civilian cloak" during a meeting of the senate or at a public hearing the toga: Theodosian Code, 14.10,1; Pharr, 1952, 415.

4. Smith, 1999, 162.

5. MacCormack, 1981, pls. 19-21.

6. Kiilerich, 1993, 42, 36-37.

7. Olovdotter suggests that mappas held by individuals other than the consul on consular diptychs simply denote "the status or title of their wearer": Olovdotter, 2005, 70. Cameron assumes that since these individuals on the obelisk base surround the kathisma, they were probably senators: Cameron, 1973, 55.

8. Ariadne may not wear a toga but instead a palla which is worn cross over to resemble a toga.

9. Smith, 1999, 162.

northeast and southeast, the imperial box is surrounded by figures wearing this toga (pls. 3-4).⁶ Since some hold mappas, these individuals have been identified as senators.⁷ Although the four rulers in the kathisma wear the chlamys, emperors may not have routinely worn this form of dress at the Hippodrome. On a relief on the worn and poorly executed Porphyrios base, all but one of the six attending the races in the imperial box, including the Emperor Anastasios and perhaps the Empress Ariadne, wear togas (pl. 5).⁸ Since Theodosios had recently defeated the usurper Maximos in 388 and the obelisk was part of imperial propaganda, he may deliberately have chosen to be depicted in the chlamys, originally a military cloak, to suggest his recent victory.⁹ The chlamys, rather than the toga, was also the form of dress worn on the most important state occasions.

Like the emperors in the kathisma, the togate figures are hierarchically displayed. Since they are depicted as busts, the length of their togas and their footgear is unknown. Each figure wears a long-sleeved under tunic and short-sleeved outer one; the tails of their togas emerge from the right side and are either draped straight across, held on the left side, or draped over the left forearm. Whereas a group of spectators in the lower register on the northeast side of the base wave mappas, on the same relief the senators hold their mappas stiffly in front of them as accessories appropriate to their rank.¹⁰ On the southeast side, the folds depicted in the tails of the togas and stretched shoulder bands create a contrast with the heavy straight folds of Theodosios' chlamys.

The first examples of members of the ruling dynasty wearing the new style of toga were found at Aphrodisias in Asia Minor. Two imperial statues, part of a dynastic group made of finely polished white marble with tall cylindrical bases, were excavated in the west portico of the South Agora (pls. 6-7).¹¹ The statues were identified by their accompanying inscriptions as the young princes Valentinian II and Arkadios and were part of a group of four which once also included Theodosios and Honorios. The accompanying inscriptions indicate that the group was erected by the Praetorian Prefect Fl. Eutolmios Tatianos, who set up similar groups at Side (388/392) and Antinoupolis (389) as part of an imperial propaganda campaign after Theodosios' victory in 388.¹²

10. Olovsson is not certain how to interpret the raised and lowered position of the mappas held by consuls on diptychs: Olovsson, 2005, 70. The most likely explanation for lowered mappa, as mentioned in note, is that it signified rank. raised ones may, however, signify the individual's enthusiasm for the games but this can never be proven.

11. Smith, 1999, 162.

12. Smith, 1999, 162.

Since statues were not erected to commemorate either ruler's consulship, the princes are clad in the new style togas with the band stretched across the left shoulder rather than in consular trabeae. Both princes are identically dressed in long and short sleeved divitesions of mid-calf length. Underneath they wear leggings (bracchia) and their footwear, preserved only in the statue of Valentinian, is the familiar low cross-strapped senatorial boot (calcei patricii), also depicted on consular diptychs.¹³ The most prominent part of the toga is the stretched band and tail which emerges at knee-height on the right side and rests over the right forearm. Since this is also the toga worn by senators on the Theodosian obelisk base, the form seems to be the type worn by members of the imperial family and high ranking senators in the capitol. The cross-strapped boots, a type of footwear worn exclusively by senators, corroborates this interpretation. As Valentinian's marble bust, now in Istanbul, shows, members of the ruling dynasty were further differentiated by their diadems decorated with double rows of pearls and prominent centre pieces.¹⁴

13. Examples of this type of footwear are found on the diptychs of the consuls Areobindus and Anastasios: Olovdotter, 2005, pls. 9:1-9:3, 11:1, 11:2.

14. This is the type of diadem worn by the rulers on the missorium: Weitzmann, 1979, 75.

A third nearly-contemporary monument, Arkadios' column, also depicted rulers clad in the new style toga with the band stretched across the shoulder (pl. 8). Whereas the upper portion of the column once depicted narrative scenes commemorating the defeat of the Ostrogothic general Gainas, the east side of the base shows the co-rulers Arkadios and Honorios side by side in scenes whose iconography celebrated Roman military conquests and the mutual concord between the eastern and western halves of the empire (pl. 9).¹⁵

On the north and south sides, the emperors appear as victorious generals dressed in military garb and holding victoriolas; both are flanked by high-ranking court officials (pl. 10). Directly beneath them, bound captives offer their submission. In the lower registers, personifications of captured cities offer the emperors gifts.¹⁶ On the west side, the co-rulers are depicted as victorious generals surrounded by the military (pl. 11). In the lower register, barbarians plead for clemency before a war trophy.¹⁷ On the eastern side each emperor, wearing the new style of toga, emerges from a separate columned porch accompanied by an arms bearer and seven lectors.¹⁸ In the lower register, personifications of Rome and Constantinople lean against an arch. In front of each personification, groups of similarly clad senators, who represent the senates of the two capital cities, move toward the centre. Each group is headed by a senator carrying a crown at the extreme left and right.¹⁹

15. Weitzmann, 1979, 80.

16. MacCormack, 1981, 59.

17. Weitzmann, 1979, 80.

18. MacCormack, 1981, 57.

19. MacCormack, 1981, 58.

20. Weitzmann, 1978, 79.

Although the original column was destroyed by an earthquake in 1719, evidence of its appearance is based on twenty-one anonymous drawings found on three fold-out vellum sheets.²⁰ In these drawings, the co-rulers are shown wearing the new style of toga with the stretched band and senatorial boots. Each one holds a mappa in his raised right hand and an eagle-tipped sceptre in the left. The crowns offered by the two senators are usually interpreted as the aurum coronarium, a traditional gift offered to emperors by the senate for military achievements in late antiquity.²¹ Although the garments are shorter, the senates of Rome and Constantinople also wear the new-style toga, tunics, and senatorial boots. Besides serving propagandistic ends, the co-operation and orderly ceremonies depicted on the column base may have represented a form of wish fulfillment. The reigns of Arkadios and Honorios were a tumultuous time period when both sides were often fighting for their own survival.²² The elite in Constantinople felt the need for a new form of toga to differentiate them from other toga wearers throughout the empire; the new form probably gave them a slightly greater sense of security.²³

21. MacCormack, 1981, 300, note 225.

22. See especially my discussion of Honorios' early reign in the first part of my later section on imperial bridal dress, 188-189.

Forms of the Consular Toga

1. The Late Roman Consular Trabea

23. For a detailed discussion: Smith, 1999, 179.

Although the early kings and such officials in Rome as augurs wore a coloured trabea on ceremonial occasions, it is not possible from the evidence currently available to ascertain even the general appearance of these early garments. Such evidence as exists consists of tiny pieces of woven fabric, clothing depicted on very worn statuary, and the casual references of contemporary writers.¹ Some of these authors describe the trabea as simply being a coloured version of the more common white togas found in general use; others describe it as being a form of cloak which was held in place with a brooch.² With so little existing pictorial evidence and such diversity of opinion among ancient writers, it seems likely that the name trabea was given to several different types of coloured ceremonial garments worn in different time periods.

1. Wilson, 1924, 34-39.

2. Wilson, 1924, 38.

3. Wilson, 1924, 110.

4. A medallion dated as early as 293 depicts four tetrarchic rulers dressed in ornately decorated trabeas: Weitzmann, 1979, 38.

Scholars such as Lillian Wilson begin the history of the late consular toga with the examples depicted on the ivory diptychs of the fifth and sixth centuries.³ But versions of these richly decorated garments probably made of stiff woven silk damask embellished with segmenta, embroidery, beading, and gems first appeared on consular coins and medallions at least as early as the tetrarchs.⁴ As with so many other innovations, it was during the tetrarchic period and Constantine's reign that, as a result of new weaving methods, garments were first made of damask fabric which was then further embellished.⁵ But because of their small size, the ceremonial trabeas depicted on coins, medals and diptychs are less easy to analyze than the late Roman togas shown on larger objects such as contemporary illustrations, statues, and reliefs.

A comparison of the trabeas worn by the Emperor Constantius II and Gallos Caesar in the Codex Calendar of 354 demonstrates that the gem-encrusted trabea was probably worn by the emperor alone. But in his "Panegyric on the Emperor's Fourth Consulship", the court poet Claudian mentions several additional ways in which the emperor Honorius' robe was embellished:

Indian stones bead the robe and the costly fine-spun stuff is green with emeralds; amethysts are worked in and the brightness of Spanish gold tempers the blue of the hyacinth with its hidden fires...embroidery enhances its worth and the work is vivid with pictures traced in metal threads: portraits throng together in a wealth of jasper and the sea pearl comes to life in many a pattern.⁶

In addition to such precious stones as emeralds, amethysts, jasper and sea pearls, the emperor's trabea was decorated with embroidery and beading in the form of pictures especially of figures from mythology and the portraits of the emperor's ancestors.⁷

5. Wild, 1987, 459.

6. Claudian, 585-92; Barr, 1981, 90.

7. In his panegyric "On Stilicho's Consulship", the poet Claudian describes Stilicho's entire trabea as embellished with portraits which displayed his dynastic pretensions: Claudian, "On Stilicho's Consulship", II, 340-377; Plautner, 197.

Among the earliest examples of ceremonial trabeas depicted on coins are two gold multiples with portraits of Constantine. One coin was minted in Rome and a second in Thessaloniki on the occasion of the emperor's vicennalia in 326 (pls. 1-2).⁸ The reverses of both medals depict the emperor as a full figure in a ceremonial toga praetexta, a form of white toga with an embroidered purple band on the border. But whereas the obverse of the first medallion is one of the earliest to show Constantine as a diademed bust gazing upward, a portrait type adopted from Alexander the Great,⁹ the obverse of the second shows him as a consular bust wearing an elaborately decorated trabea. The toga depicted in this second medallion has six bands of decoration. The broad upper band and embroidered cuffs probably belong to the divetesion;¹⁰ the trabea itself is represented by the four embroidered bands found beneath the upper bands. Thus when the embroidered trabea was first introduced, emperors may have worn earlier forms of ceremonial togas such as the toga praetexta at the same time as the newer embroidered forms.

Another gold medallion minted in 321 to commemorate two of his sons' consulships shows Constantine on the obverse as a cuirassed draped bust wearing the radiate crown of Helios and on the reverse busts of his sons, Crispus and Constantine II (pl. 3).¹¹ Each wears a laureate crown, embroidered divetesion and elaborately decorated consular trabea and holds an eagle tipped sceptre and globe. Rather than being draped according to the usual methods discussed in the introductory section, the bands seem arranged to best fit the two ornately dressed figures into a small space. On the first figure, Crispus, the trabea seems to be draped over the right shoulder first, but then, since the band does not cross in the front, it appears to re-emerge again above his left shoulder, rather than underneath, and is finally draped over the prince's left arm. Thus the toga, as shown on the medallion, seems more like a mantle. For reasons of symmetry or better to fit the space, the draping of Constantine II's toga is reversed; he also holds an orb and sceptre in his hands opposite to those of his brother.

8. Bruun, 1961, pl. VI, 187 and 188.

9. Constantine only adopted this coin type for a brief period: Wright, 1987, 506.

10. The stiff looking gold band and cuffs probably could then have detached from the divetesion

11. Bruun, 1961, pl. V, 49.

These consular gold medallions were comparable to dynastic coinage struck under the Severans over a century earlier and openly announced Constantine's intentions of forming a dynasty.¹² The emperor's appointment of his sons as western consuls for the year led Licinius, his co-ruler, to break off friendly relations and appoint himself and his son as opposing consuls. After Crispus' and Fausta's executions in 326, Constantine minted at least one other example of this type of medallion in Antioch but instead of Crispus' picture, his third son Constantios II's portrait appeared alongside that of Constantine II (pl. 4). Because iconography of the second medallion is very similar to the slightly earlier one, this consular coin will not be further discussed.

A large possibly unique consular medallion (circa 346/47) also minted in Antioch but over a decade after Constantine I's death by Constantios II is of particular interest because it shows the two consuls in their decorated *trabeas* as standing figures (pl. 5).¹³ On the obverse, Constantios II appears as a half-length bust wearing a jewel encrusted diadem with a prominent centre-piece and a decorated trabea; on the reverse, the figures of Constantios and his remaining brother Constans are depicted as full figures facing frontally. Both brothers are nimbed, and wear diadems and elaborately embellished consular robes. On the obverse, Constantios' complicated garment is a form of consular toga. Since the band passes first over the right shoulder and then over the left, it is probably a form of the most common type of consular trabea shown on the later consular diptychs and described in detail previously. A third additional band, which passes straight up the front, is probably part of the under-tunic. On the reverse, the togas are pictured as similar to those on Constantine's earlier dynastic medallion, but the sinuses are so long that the rulers hold them.

12. Bruun, 1961, 63.

13. *Numismatica Ars Classica*, 2002, #304.

This rare medal is significant for a number of reasons. Firstly the portrait on the obverse of Constantios II with its crisp details, which shows the emperor raising his hand in a gesture of blessing, seems deliberately designed to emphasize his semi-divine status.¹⁴ It recalls the famous passage found in Ammianus Marcellinus which describes this same emperor's formal entry, adventus, into Rome: 'He looked so stiffly ahead as if he had an iron band about his neck and he turned his face neither to the right nor to the left, he was not as a living person, but as an image'.¹⁵ The medallion is also important because it may be the prototype for later ones struck by such rulers as Valentinian I, Valentinian III and Leo I.¹⁶ The dress of the two consuls as depicted on the medal is especially rich. Of particular interest are the detailed motifs on their trabeas and their consular footwear, which is a form of low boot decorated with ties. The emperors' similarity of dress, identical stances, and homogeneous facial expressions also suggest their unity of purpose and perhaps even the old tetrarchic ideal that a ruler's individuality was subsumed by the collective nature of his office. Finally the coin is important because it was minted during the same time period as the original Calendar of 354, now surviving only in a Renaissance copy of one of the earliest surviving codices, which contained among a number of illustrations full-page, facing ones of the Emperor Constantios II and his Caesar Gallos. As newly appointed eponymous consuls of the year, they both wear elaborate consular dress (pls. 6-7).¹⁷

14. MacCormack, 1981, 44.

15. Römische Geschichte, W. Seyforth, 1968-74. Ammianus Marcellinus, XVI, 10, 10; Rolfe, 1963, 247.

16. Numismatica Ars Classica, 2002, 145.

17. For a detailed discussion of the portraits: Stern, 1953, 152-168 and Salzman, 1990, 34-35.

18. Salzman, 1990, 3.

19. Salzman, 1990, 3.

Early in 354 during Constantios II's reign, Valentinus, a wealthy aristocrat living in Rome, received a codex, now known as the Calendar-Codex of 354, as a gift.¹⁸ This manuscript contained an illustrated calendar which listed events in Rome that year and several unillustrated lists including the consuls and urban prefects of Rome.¹⁹ The calendar was signed on the dedication page by Furius Dionysius Filocalus, the foremost calligrapher of the century, and is his earliest known work. He is also credited with drawing the originals of the twenty-three full-page illustrations which appeared at the beginning of the manuscript.²⁰ The calendar listed events for the coming year in Rome, including its pagan holidays, imperial anniversaries and even astrological phenomena. Among the illustrations were the Tyches of four major cities, five known planets, and finally the two consuls, Constantios and Gallos.²¹ Since the Roman consul gave his name to the year and his inauguration was in early January, the inclusion of pictures of the two consuls seems especially appropriate.²² This was the last year Gallos served as consul. Late in 354 he was recalled by Constantios from Antioch and executed on charges of cruelty.²³

20. Salzmann, 1990, 3.

21. Weitzmann, 1979, 78.

22. Dating by consular year was universal in the fourth century: Salzman, 1990, 36. In addition, the majority of festivals listed in the *Codex* and celebrated throughout the year were associated with the emperor and his family. Ninety-eight days of festivals were related to the imperial cult. Of these sixty-nine were directly devoted to the living emperor Constantios and his dynasty: Salzman, 1990, 131-132.

23. Ammianus, XIV, 11, 23; Rolfe, 1963, 101. *ODB*, 1991, 820.

24. Salzman, 1990, 4.

Although the original codex was lost during the ninth century, the entire work can be reconstructed from a number of fragmentary copies. The most important of these was the Luxemburgensis made during the Carolingian period.²⁴ The discovery of this manuscript, now also lost, created considerable excitement in the Renaissance and led to the creation of several other copies. The most important of these (the Romanus) was produced under the supervision of the great Renaissance scholar Nicholas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc. The calendar-codex is one of a tiny corpus, probably under twenty, of either actual works or copies of late antique manuscripts, the only surviving work with full-page illustrations, and the only copy of a manuscript from this early time period which can be assigned a secure date. It offers a rare glimpse of urban life in Rome at a time when the pagan world was still intact but in the process of being transformed into a Christian one.²⁵

The portraits of the two consuls, like the other illustrations and lists, are contained within elaborate architectural facades. Out of the twenty-three drawings, however, only the portraits of the two imperial figures, who originally faced each other, are conceived as a pair. Both appear in curtained aediculae, a form derived from theatre architecture, are nimbed, carry consular staffs, and wear decorated trabea and low laced consular boots.

Constantios' superior status as emperor is visually implied by differences in the treatment of the two figures. Constantios wears a diadem and consular toga decorated with jewels and embroidery. He is seated on a backless throne while he dispenses coins from his right hand. Gallos, as Constantios' caesar, is shown standing, lacks a diadem, and wears a toga embellished with beading, embroidery and, since some of the pictures even overlap, perhaps segmenta. Included among these decorations are various mythological figures, geometric shapes and vegetable elements. Instead of dispensing coins like the emperor, a bag of money rests at his feet. Gallos also holds a victoriola, which offers the emperor a victory crown.

25. Salzman, 1990, 5.

Both consuls wear the same type of toga triumphalis, which is also very similar to the togas found on later consular diptychs.

In the middle of the front, each toga has a decorated strip which belongs to the under tunic; the strip begins at the knee and ends at the neck. In draping this type of toga, the band is first placed at the front, then across the left shoulder, is brought across the back, under the right arm, and across the chest. Then the bulk of the toga is brought over the left shoulder, across the back, and finally the tails are brought across to the front. Each consul holds a sceptre tipped with a bearded head wearing a helmet. Although the precise interpretation of these heads has never been established, they probably either represent the helmeted figure of Roma or a Constantinian ancestor with a beard. The most likely identification is the legendary founder of the Constantinian line, Claudius Gothicus.²⁶

The largitio plate of the Consul Ardabur Aspar, elected western consul in 434, shows him, his young son, and clipeate busts of the consul's father and father-in-law, who served as consuls in 427 and 419, dressed in banded togas (pl. 8).²⁷ Not just the consul but even his ancestors hold sceptres decorated with busts. On other diptychs, the consuls hold sceptres with busts of the ruling emperor, eagle-tipped sceptres or composite ones with an eagle and busts of the ruling emperor. On their consular medallions Constantine and his sons hold eagle-tipped sceptres. Extrapolating from the busts of ancestors pictured on the non-imperial sceptres on diptychs, it seems likely that the single bearded bust on Constantios' and Gallos' sceptres is the portrait of a bearded ancestor; the fact that both are shown holding sceptres with the same bust probably implied that both rulers shared this ancestor.

26. Olovsson states that sceptres usually are tipped with the head of the emperor from whom the consul received his consulship. A second type of tipped sceptre, however, depict ancestors. She calls this type a dynastic sceptre (See Olovsson, 2005, 74-76). Since Constantios is emperor, both probably hold this type.

27. For a picture of the plate see Leader-Newby, 2004, p. 46, pl. 1.18 and Olovsson, 2005, pl. 22.

In January of 455 a nomisma was issued which depicts the Empress Licinia Eudoxia as a bust on the obverse and Emperor Valentinian III and Empress Eudoxia as standing figures in consular dress on the reverse (pl. 9).²⁸ On the obverse, the empress is shown wearing what is probably a jeweled mantle crossed over to resemble a trabea, a tunic, a double-strand pearl necklace, and diadem with pendilia which extend to the empress' shoulders. On the reverse, the empress wears either a mantle draped like a toga or a toga, an under-tunic, a diadem with a snood and with pendilia, and an elaborate jeweled collar. Valentinian wears a consular toga and a diadem with pendilia; he also holds a plain tipped sceptre in his left hand and offers a second similar one to the empress. Although encrusted with jewels, his trabea is probably of the most common group found on ivory diptychs, which crosses first over the left shoulder and then over the right shoulder except that the tail of his toga is very short and seems to be fastened against his left side. This probably enabled him to move more freely. Licinia's costume will be discussed in the section on the empress' dress.

28. This nomisma, which is not found in the Dumbarton Oak's collection, is pictured in *Numismatica Ars Classica*, 2002, 166, 349. The empress' dress is discussed in greater detail in a later section.

No garment better illustrates the difference between earlier western forms of dress and the new eastern ones than the ceremonial toga. Two gold consular coins, one minted in Rome and the second in Thessaloniki for Constantine's vicennalia in 326, demonstrate how earlier forms of Roman consular dress differed from the new decorated trabeas. Whereas earlier forms of ceremonial togas shown on the two coins' reverses were made from a simple white fabric, which was then embellished with a decorative border, the trabea on the reverse of the second coin was probably made from patterned silk damask which was further embellished with beads, jewels and woven patches that depicted everything from vegetable and animal motifs to portraits. The small amount of evidence which survives seems to indicate that the ancestral portrait (in the form either of embroidered patches, such as those described by Claudian on Honorios' trabea, or of the small portrait busts of ancestors, which sometimes decorated the tip of the consul's sceptre, as in the illustrations of the two consuls in the Calendar of 354), is the west's only contribution to the trabea.²⁹

The trabeas worn by Constantine's sons on their consular medallions and by Constantios II and his younger brother Constans on the medallion which Constantios struck in 346/347 show highly embellished forms of the new trabea. The slightly later garments worn by the consuls in the Codex-Calender show a version of the trabea which may combine western and eastern features. Both garments have a wide outer band, which has been highly embellished, but the main body of the toga, like early forms of the toga created in the Roman west, was of an undecorated white fabric. The highly embellished consular trabea probably offered the elite a chance to openly display their wealth and high social status.

29. Olovsson also mentions that these small busts are sometimes even accompanied by miniature tablets which probably named the individual and his titles. Like other contemporary art decorated with busts and tablets, such as large funerary busts and the medallion portraits on diptychs, these very small busts probably also served a commemorative purpose: Olovsson, 2005, 75.

2. The Loros

The type of consular trabea shown on the large medallions issued by Constantine and his successors and on consular diptychs was no longer in use by the reign of Justinian II (685-95 and 705-711). In his On the Magistracies (ca. 554), John the Lydian provides a description of the triumphal procession celebrated by Justinian I (527-565) after the defeat of the Vandals; the Emperor Justinian's ornate dress in the triumph consisted of a tunic which was purple on the inside and gold on the outside and of a narrow form of gold scarf called a loros, which Romans, as was mentioned in the introduction to the toga, called "gold shoulder-straps" (2.2).¹

This is the first recorded description of a new ceremonial garment and use of the word loros.² As seen on the coinage of Justinian II (ca. 692), this new form of dress was a long jewel-encrusted stole, which consisted of two bands arranged in an x-shape.³ When putting on the garment, one section of these bands fell straight down the front while the second was brought forward from behind the right shoulder, crossed over the chest and was then placed over the left arm.⁴ The garment's name was derived from the Greek word lorion or strip of leather.⁵ Since John the Lydian observed Justinian I wearing a loros during ceremonies outdoors, it

1. John the Lydian, Bk. II, 2.4; Carney, 1971, 42.

2. ODB, 1991, 1261.

3. Breckenridge, 1959, pl. 1, 5; Head, 1972, 56.

4. Parani, 2003, 19.

5. ODB, 1991, 1261.

perhaps was developed to enable the emperor to move more freely.

During Justin II's first consular inauguration in 566, Corippus described the emperor as wearing a form of trabea, which was purple coloured and encrusted with jewels.⁶ Like the ceremony itself, Justin II's trabea was probably a revival of an earlier form of consular dress. Just as in earlier time periods when older types of togas were worn alongside newer ones, perhaps for several reigns either the consular trabea or the loros may have been worn depending upon which garment seemed more appropriate.

6. Corippus, IV, 125; Cameron, 1976, 77.

7. Although attempts to define this new aesthetic have so far been not been entirely successful, both Gage and Roberts have attempted to define some of its main characteristics: Gage, 1999, 47; Roberts, 1989, 76.

Beginning slightly earlier with the reign of Justin I (518-527), the trabea shown on his unique consular nomisma is depicted in a new, less realistic style than the one found on his predecessors' coins (pl. 1). The figure of the emperor is seated frontally on a throne, a change in stance beginning at least as early as the Arch of Galerius (ca. 300), and Justin's costume is represented for the first time as decorated with patterned rows. Both changes probably reflect the appearance, on the one hand, of a new style in late antiquity which emphasized the importance of the central figure and, on the other, as Michael Roberts argues, the advent of a new aesthetic. Contemporary viewers may have begun to admire the play of light across patterned surfaces such as those on Justin's costume.⁷ But since the consular costume shown on Justin I's nomisma seems made of strips of fabric rather than a single piece, the mode of representation may instead be an attempt to depict the loros instead of the trabea. By Justinian II's first reign, the trabea seems to have entirely vanished. The costume shown on an innovative nomisma issued by him, which relegates the emperor's portrait to the reverse while depicting the first portrait of Christ on its obverse, is definitely a form of loros (pl. 2).⁸

8. Galavaris, 1958, 105-106; Cormack, 1985, 97-98.

9. Corippus, 1976, 195, note 12.

10. Justinian, Novellae, 105; Mears, 2004, [unpaged].

Although Justinian I was elected consul four times, the office, which now consisted only of presiding over games celebrated at the beginning of year, carried very little power.⁹ Because the office could still be used as a means of gaining popular support, the consulship's only important remaining function was the sparsio. But after Belasarios distributed gold and silver during his inauguration in January 535 and Justinian noticed the general's popularity, the emperor passed a novella (Novel 105) in 536 limiting the types of precious metals private citizens could distribute at their inaugurations.¹⁰ According to the novella, the right to distribute gold was now reserved for the emperor; other individuals could, however, still distribute silver. But although the new law might have resulted in making the office accessible to a wider range of individuals, no consuls were named after Basilios in 541 until Justin II revived the office in 565.¹¹

After Justinian's monetary reforms in 538, the unadorned orb held by the emperor on some gold coins was replaced by a new imperial attribute in the form of an orb surmounted by a cross, which is now called the globus cruciger (pl. 3-4).¹² Before Justin I's reign, consular medallions and nomismata showed emperors holding either a simple orb or a globe surmounted by a Victory. Before Justinian's reign, the globus cruciger was held only by personifications of cities depicted on a coin's reverse. On some nomismata predating Justinian's reign, which showed winged Victories on their reverses, that personification also holds this type of orb.

11. Ross, 1976, 254.

12. Grierson, 1969, 85.

During the first eleven years of his reign, Justinian's gold and bronze coins imitated earlier types. Whereas all Justinian's gold coins showed him as a three-quarter facing cuirassed bust with a helmet and holding a spear, his bronzes depicted him as a profile bust wearing a cuirass, helmet, and paludamentum, and holding a spear. But throughout the remainder of his reign, the emperor's nomismata and bronzes showed him as a cuirassed frontal bust wearing a helmet and holding a globus cruciger in his right hand and a shield in the other. This frontal portrait may show that coins had finally adjusted to the new stylistic forms of representation found in larger art at least as early as Constantine. In the description of his equestrian statue found in Buildings, Prokopios provides an interpretation of this new symbol of rule: "In his left hand he holds a globe...yet he has neither sword nor spear nor any other weapon, but a cross stands upon the globe...the emblem by which he had obtained his empire and victory in war."¹³ After Justinian's reign, the emperor's successors were also depicted holding a globus cruciger on their coins.

Beginning with the reign of Theodosios II (402-450), the angel or Victory on his gold coin's reverses is shown holding a gem encrusted cross (pl. 5). This form of cross with its bejeweled edge is probably a reference to the cross which the emperor erected on Golgotha.¹⁴ From Anastasios' reign (491-518) the emperor held either the attribute of a short plain cross, in contrast to the elaborate cross held by the angel on the reverse, or before Justinian's reign a plain globe. The only exception among rulers before Justinian II is Tiberios II Constantine (578-582), whose consular nomismata show him holding an eagle-tipped sceptre (pl. 6). Tiberios also introduced the new reverse type of a cross potent on four steps. This symbol like the earlier jeweled cross also represented Theodosios II's gemmed cross.¹⁵ This new reverse is also found on the gold coins of the emperor Herakleios (610-641) and other members of his dynasty. All rulers before Justinian II hold the consular symbol of a mappa in their left hands; he is the first shown holding the anakakia or akakia, a new insignia of rule, which will be discussed in detail later with several of his other innovations.

13. Procopii Caesariensis opera omnia, J. Haury, 1962-64; Prokopios, Buildings, I.2,11; Dewing, 1940, Bk. VII, 35.

14. Breckenridge, 1959, 35.

15. Breckenridge, 1959, 35.

Consular coins exist for all the early Byzantine emperors from Anastasios up to but not including Herakleios; in two cases, the recently discovered nomisma of Justin I and the miliarensis of Justin II, the existing examples are unique (pl. 1, pls. 7-8). Only two examples of Justinian I's consular nomisma exist (pl. 9).¹⁶ Consular gold coins issued by the later three emperors, Tiberios II Constantine (pl. 6), Maurice Tiberios (582-602), and Phokas (602-610), are much commoner than those of the earlier ones (pls. 10-11). At the same time as their gold coins were issued, these later rulers also struck gold medallions and large numbers of bronzes showing them probably in the new loros.¹⁷ The production of larger numbers of consular coins in different types and medals may result from these emperors' desire to emphasize their largesse.

16. Although one of Justinian's consular nomisma was published in an article by Oeconomides in Museum Notes, information on Justin I's nomisma and Justin II's miliarensis is only available in a recent auction catalogue: Oikonomides, 1966, 75-77; Justin I's nomisma and Justin's miliarensis are discussed in greater detail later.

17. Ross, 1957, 255-256; Grierson, 1982, 52, 61.

Whereas the bronze coins depicting these three emperors in consular costume were produced for general circulation, the gold nomismata of all rulers were minted only in very small numbers, probably for distribution as prestige gifts during the inaugural ceremonies. Corippus described such a ceremony in his panegyric history of Justin II. These consular gold coins may have been preserved for several generations before finally being displayed in heirloom jewelry such as the Kyrenia girdle found on Cyprus.¹⁸ Large gold medallions were probably produced for distribution to foreign embassies and rulers as gifts. Gregory of Tours mentions that the Frankish King Chilperic showed him a large consular medallion which he had been sent by Tiberios II Constantine.¹⁹

Both sides of Anastasios' rare consular nomisma (507) depict him dressed as a consul. He is shown as a bust on the coin's obverse; but on its reverse he is depicted as a full figure seated on a backless throne. All of his successors are also shown wearing consular costume on the obverses of their coins; these depict the emperor either as a frontal bust or seated figure depending perhaps upon which type the ruler preferred. Like the rare nomismata of Justin I, those of four of his successors, Justin I, Justinian, Justin II and Tiberios Constantine, which show the emperor seated, also depict his clothing as consisting of bands. These nomismata therefore may depict the loros instead of a trabea. On the nomismata of Tiberios Constantine and Phokas, which show the ruler as a front facing bust, the simplification of the emperor's garment is carried even further. On these rulers' bronzes, nomismata and medallions, the emperor's costume consisted of two crossed shoulder straps. In the passage from John the Lydian cited in the introductory section, he mentioned that the loros consisted primarily of a set of shoulder straps. As on all coins and medallions of the fifth century to Justinian II's innovative nomismata in the late seventh, the frontal straps are always pictured as being crossed; the emperor's dress on these ruler's coins was also probably the loros.

18. Corippus, Bk. IV, 1-330; Cameron, 1976, 110-116. For an example of this type girdle: Grierson, 1955, 55-70.

19. Gregory of Tours, *The History of the Franks*, II, ed. O. M. Dalton. Oxford: University Press, 1927, 233-234; quoted in Ross, 1957, 254-55.

Whereas the unique silver miliarensis of Justin II depicts him enthroned probably in a loros on its obverse, it shows the ruler as a standing figure in military dress on its reverse, which imitates that of his more common non-consular miliarensis. Justin II may be shown in military dress on the reverse of his consular coins because he lived during turbulent times and the portrait may have implied the emperor's readiness to lead his troops. Alternatively when the new emperor suddenly revived the consular office in 566, the mint may have been pressed for time and used the reverse dies which they had on hand. The discovery of this unique consular miliarensis confirms Corippus' statement that as part of his largesse, Justin II distributed "old silver" which he had recast "into different shapes and forms".²⁰

20. Corippus, IV, 109; Cameron, 1976, 112.

Besides the recently described examples of consular medallions, which Gregory of Tours related King Chilperic had received as gifts from Tiberios II Constantine, the only other known examples are four medallions issued by Maurice Tiberios probably in 583. These four formed part of the Kyrenia Girdle from Cyprus and are now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (pl. 12).²¹ They show a bust of the emperor probably in a loros on its obverse and the emperor riding in a four horse quadriga as he scatters largesse on the reverse. In addition to the medallions of Maurice Tiberios, large one-sided plaques of three additional rulers, Justin II, Phokas and Maurice Tiberios, exist (pls. 13-15).²² These were created by pressing a thin sheet of gold over a real medallion; all three show the emperor as a bust. These large consular medallions were all minted between the reign of Tiberios II Constantine and Herakleios; they seem to have been part of a more general seventh-century revival in the making of large medallions.²³

The existing consular nomismata of the next two rulers, Maurice (582-602) and Phokas (602-610), continue earlier types. Although Herakleios held the consulship twice, the main group of coins depicting him dressed as consul was a small group of gold nomismata and bronzes as well as two large seals which he produced during his revolt against Phokas (pls. 16-18).²⁴ These show him and his father, the exarch of Alexandria, dressed in consular attire, but both lack insignia such as sceptres or mappas. Herakleios' later common gold nomismata were, however, innovative as being the first to show an emperor wearing a chlamys and divetesion (pl. 19).²⁵ Instead of showing the emperor in civic dress, the gold coins produced by his predecessors, probably being more conservative, continued earlier Roman types which showed the emperor in military attire.

21. Ross, 1957, 254-255.

22. Ross, 1957, 255.

23. Grierson, 1957, 258.

24. Grierson, 1950, 77-78; Kaegi, 2003, 41.

25. Herakleios was also innovative because he produced coins with standing figures.

Two rare lead seals of Herakleios also exist which show full-length figures of the Virgin and Christ between two long crosses on the obverse and Herakleios and his father in consular dress separated by a cross on the reverse.²⁶ These two seals and a few issues of Herakleios' gold nomismata and bronze folles depicting them in consular dress from Alexandretta and Cyprus also show Herakleios and his father wearing crowns. Both groups seem to have been minted after his coronation in October of 610.²⁷ Herakleios also minted a follis in Jerusalem probably in 614 which shows him in consular dress (pl. 20).²⁸ Since they were minted after his recent revolt against Phokas, this dress may have been selected to suggest the coins minted during the revolt, which showed him in consular dress. Although Herakleios' son Constans became consul in 642, he did not have a public procession with a sparsio and therefore probably did not produce commemorative coins. A few rare folles of Herakleios and Herakleios Constantine from Ravenna and a minor issue of copper coins from Carthage minted under Constans II show these emperors in either a trabea or loros (pls. 21-22).

26. On one of the seals in Dumbarton Oaks the figures are identified as "consules"; on the second lead seal in a private American collection, the inscription identifies Herakleios as "Domino Heraclio perpetuo augusto": Nesbitt, 2009, 22.

27. Braunlin, 1998, 170.

28. Berk, 1989, 29, 140.

Justinian II minted an entirely new type of gold coin during his first reign in 692-695 which showed the emperor in a loros on its reverse. This innovative coin also had the first portrait of Christ as a frontal bust on its obverse. If the iconography found on the reverse of this gold coin, which showed Justinian II dressed in a loros holding a stepped-cross, can be trusted, the emperor may have been the first one to view himself as having taken up Christ's cross as its protector rather than, as Constantine and other earlier rulers believed, being protected by it.²⁹

If we look more closely at several of the consular nomismata described earlier, we discover that the rare nomisma produced by Anastasios I for his consulship in 507 continued earlier Roman types. But unlike Roman coins, which showed the emperor as a profile bust, Anastasios is depicted on the obverse as a three-quarter bust. His coin therefore represents a unique transitional type between earlier Roman consular coins with their profile busts and later Byzantine ones with frontal ones. The image on the reverse, which also continues earlier types, shows him enthroned in consular robes wearing a diadem and holding a mappa and sceptre surmounted by a cross. On his consular nomisma Anastasios is not only shown in a more realistic style than on that of his successors' coins, but the iconography of his nomisma's obverse also seems consciously to depict fashions popular during the Theodosian dynasty. He wears the same tightly curled hair style and stubble beard found on the gold coins produced by those rulers. This style, deliberately imitative of the Theodosian dynasty, probably was produced to suggest the earlier ruler Marcian, who like Anastasios, was selected by a powerful member of the ruling dynasty when no males survived.

29. Galvaris, 1958, 106; Belting, 1996, 135.

Justin I was consul in 519 and 524; his single existing nomisma might have been struck to commemorate either consulship.³⁰ Its iconography, however, differs from that of all previous consular gold coins. The coin's obverse, which shows the ruler enthroned frontally holding a mappa in the right hand and cruciform sceptre in the other, continues Anastasios' reverse type. Even the backless throne, imperial footrest, and star found on Anastasios' gold nomisma appear on Justin's. The main difference between the two is in the emperor's costume. Whereas on Anastasios' nomisma's obverse, the long frontal band and lower part of the tunic are clearly visible and his trabea follows the contours of his body,³¹ on Justin I's obverse the tunic is visible only at the neck and arms. His loros is also represented as consisting of bands, two prominent crossed upper ones and a lower vertical one. This difference between the two coins' iconography, which emphasized the garment's three bands, may imply a change from the trabea to the loros. As discussed earlier, according to John the Lydian, the garment's two crossed frontal bands, which he described as shoulder straps, are the most prominent feature of the loros.

Justinian was elected consul four times in 521, 528, 533 and 534.³² Although he was not crowned until 527, which was after his first consulship in 521, his two existing consular nomismata could have been issued for any of his consulships. The iconography of this coin is similar to his uncle's consular nomisma. The coin shows the emperor enthroned on its obverse and two angels supporting a long cross on its reverse. The only difference in the iconography between Justin I's consular nomisma and Justinian's is that on the latter emperor's two coins the small star found near the throne has vanished to reappear on the reverse above the angels' heads.

30. Ross, 1957, 253.

31. In the preceding section on the trabea, several examples have a long frontal band. This piece of fabric seems to be part of the tunic instead of the toga.

32. Ross, 1957, 254; Oeconomides, 1966, 75.

33. Ross, 1957, 254.

Justin II was elected consul on two occasions, once in 565 and again in 568.³³ The obverse of his miliarenses imitates the iconography found on Justin I's and Justinian's gold consular coins, which shows the emperor probably in a loros nimbed and enthroned holding a mappa and cruciform sceptre. On the reverse, the figure of the emperor dressed in military garb holds a spear in his right hand and a globus cruciger in the left, imitating the reverses of Justinian's and his own non-consular miliarenses. After producing a consular coin which showed the emperor as a seated and standing figure, Justin II continued throughout his reign to produce bronzes with seated and standing figures of either himself alone or of the emperor and his empress, Sophia. Issued from the first year of Justin's reign and showing both enthroned holding insignia of power, the coins seemed to imply that the couple ruled jointly.³⁴ These probably imitated earlier consular nomismata which depicted the emperor and his caesar seated on a double throne holding insignia of rule.

34. McClanan, 2002, 159.

35. A very rare commemorative nomisma exists which was struck during their brief joint reign, and which showed both rulers as frontal busts. Although existing examples are of two weights, they were all struck from the same die: *Numismatica Ars Classica*, 2002, 381.

36. Ross, 1957, 254.

Shortly before his death Justin II designated Tiberios II Constantine as his caesar and ruled jointly with him for nine days.³⁵

The new emperor assumed office in 578 and celebrated his consular inauguration on January 1 of the following year. The consular nomisma, which Tiberios II minted on that occasion, and much of the bronze coinage produced during his short four-year reign, which show him as a crowned, three-quarter length bust probably wearing a loros with prominent crossed shoulder straps, represent a new coin type.³⁶ On earlier coins the imperial image served as a guarantee that the coins were official issues of the imperial mint; the image therefore simultaneously validated the emperor and the coins he minted. Since the garb which seemed best to epitomize imperial authority was military dress, these coins often depicted emperors in that form of dress.³⁷ Later consular gold coins and medallions depicting the emperor in a loros were produced only in very small numbers to commemorate an imperial inauguration. In contrast, Tiberios Constantine's new bronzes showing him dressed in a loros were distributed throughout the realm. The image on these probably therefore referred to his wealth and largesse, attributes which suggested his peaceful intentions both to foreign rulers and at home.

The large consular medallions, mentioned earlier, weighing a pound each, which Gregory of Tours reported seeing, also probably showed Tiberios II as a frontal bust in a loros on their obverses. The reverses probably depicted him in a quadriga wearing military dress and distributing coins. Typically an emperor distributed largesse at his inauguration and gave lavish gifts to the military and even foreign rulers.³⁸ Tiberios' large medallions, however, were such lavish gifts that this and similar examples of extravagant spending caused the former empress Sophia to accuse him of scattering the entire imperial savings "to the wind as a fan".³⁹

When Tiberios died suddenly in 582, Maurice was chosen emperor. During his long reign, he celebrated only two consulships: in 583 immediately after he assumed power and in 602 shortly before his overthrow. On the two occasions Maurice was

37. Belting makes this point in his discussion of the imperial image: Belting, 1994, 105-106.

38. Olovsson. 2005, 128.

39. John of Ephesus, III, 14; Smith, 1869, 190.

elected consul, he was probably trying to win popular support. He did not celebrate his first consulship until after he had consolidated power on Christmas Day, almost a full year after the usual time. Therefore he was consul only for a week; no coins were minted on that occasion. But on July 6, 602, he became consul for a second time. On that occasion, he minted gold nomismata, bronze coins, and gold medallions showing him in consular dress.

His consular nomismata, like those produced by Justin I and Justinian, show him enthroned, probably wearing a loros and holding a mappa and a cross on the obverse; the coin's reverse, like his non-consular nomismata, depict an angel. Maurice's bronze coins, which show him as a frontal bust wearing probably a loros because of the garment's prominent crossed shoulder straps, were minted in large numbers.⁴⁰ His medallions, the equivalent of six nomismata, also depict him as a frontal bust wearing the same costume on their obverses. But the reverses show him distributing consular largesse from a quadriga and wearing a cuirass with his right hand raised and his other hand holding a globe.

40. Grierson, 1982, 48; Grierson, 1955, 61.

41. Grierson provides a detailed analysis of the girdle: Grierson, 1955, 55-70.

The Kyrenia girdle found in a hoard on Cyprus in 1902 is noteworthy for a number of reasons.⁴¹ It contained the four medallions of Maurice and six of his consular nomismata. Several of the remaining gold pieces belonging to the girdle were also quite rare. Two of the nomismata, one issued by Justin I and Justinian for their joint-reign of four months and a second coin of Justin II and Tiberios II Constantine issued for their joint-reign of only about a week, were undoubtedly produced in very small numbers. The important official who owned the girdle seems not only to have worn it as a means of displaying his wealth and support for the emperor, but also as a way of showing that he belonged to an important family which owned great numismatic rarities that they had passed down for several generations.⁴²

The girdle is also noteworthy for its form. Although medallions and nomismata were often mounted in elaborate gold settings, they always took the form of pectorals. Several other girdles exist but all of these were made by jewelers from medallions made from molds. The Kyrenia girdle is the only existing piece of jewelry of its type which is made of official issues produced by the imperial mint. According to Philip Grierson, the belt also once had a large centre-piece, which was probably made from a gold heirloom medallion, but there is no evidence that one was found in the Cyprus hoard.⁴³ Because most of the coins in the girdle were rare consular ones, the medallion was probably also a consular medal.

The Emperor Phokas (602-610) did not assume the consulship on January after his coronation but like his predecessor, Maurice Tiberios, on the following Christmas Day.⁴⁴ In imitation of Tiberios II Constantine's consular nomismata, these gold coins show Phokas as a frontal three-quarter length bust in a loros on the obverse; the reverses show an angel holding a long staff. Like Tiberios II Constantine and Maurice, Phokas also produced a large issue of bronze coins showing him in what is probably a loros with prominent crossed straps. Since he was a usurper, these coins, which served to circulate his image and suggested the peaceful workings of government, probably were issued to promote his regime.

42. Grierson, 1955, 67.

43. Grierson, 1955, 57.

A gold plaque in the British Museum, which shows a bearded emperor in a quadriga, probably depicts the Emperor Phokas and suggests that he also produced consular medallions.⁴⁵ It is of the type created by pressing a thin sheet of gold over an actual consular medallion. The plaque shows an emperor with a pointed beard standing in a quadriga holding a mappa and globus cruciger. Since Phokas is the only emperor to have a narrow pointed beard, the plaque probably was produced from one of his gold medallions. Two additional medallions, a gold plaque probably produced from a medallion of Justin II and a second one produced from one of Maurice Tiberios, also exist.⁴⁶ Both of these depict an emperor in a six-horse chariot distributing largesse. Since none of these plaques have inscriptions, the ruler's identity can be deduced only by comparing the plaques to the style and iconography of these emperors' consular coins.

The production of large medallions bearing the emperor's image seems to have been part of foreign policy from at least Justin I's to Phokas' reign. But it is impossible to know exactly how these large ceremonial medals were used and their exact relationship to the smaller consular nomismata is unclear. During this time period, the Byzantines, however, used gifts such as titles, clothing and gold in the form of coins, jewelry and also probably medallions either to encourage their allies to remain loyal to them or to defeat their enemies.⁴⁷ These large medallions, which depicted the emperor as a bust on their obverses wearing consular costume, probably, however, like the smaller consular gold coins, showed him clad in a loros.

Herakleios was crowned on 7 October 610 and became consul for the first time on 14 January 611.⁴⁸ No coins, however, were struck to commemorate this or any of his other consulships or for those of his sons. A very unusual group of gold nomismata and bronze coins and two lead seals exists which show the ruler and his father, the exarch of Alexandria, wearing non-imperial consular

44. Ross, 1957, 256.

45. Ross, 1957, 256.

46. Ross, 1957, 256.

47. For a fuller discussion of early Byzantine ceremonial medals and their possible uses: Grierson, 1982, 50-51; for a discussion based on accounts of contemporary historians and of grave goods: Deppert-Lippitz, 2000, 62.

48. Ross, 1957, 256.

dress that may be a loros because of the costume's prominent crossed shoulder straps.⁴⁹ Although several explanations have been offered to explain their choice of this costume, as will be discussed in detail slightly later, none of these to date are entirely adequate.

The bronze coins depicting Herakleios and his father wearing non-imperial consular dress can be divided into two groups: the first is a series of nomismata and folles showing Herakleios and his father and the second a series which includes a 1/4 siliqua and bronze fractions, showing the exarch alone. The coins of the first group were minted in Carthage, Cyprus and Alexandretta (Alexandria ad Issum); the second group was issued only by the mint of Carthage.⁵⁰ Based on hoard evidence and the dates found on a few coins, both groups have been assigned to the period of Herakleios' revolt against Phokas.⁵¹ All of the coins were probably issued to finance the revolt. Herakleios, the elder, had been made exarch by Maurice and may have wanted to avenge his patron's death.⁵²

49. See John the Lydian in the introduction. Grierson, 1950, 71-72.

50. For a detailed discussion of both series: Grierson, 1950, 81-85.

51. Grierson, 1950, 78.

52. Kaegi, 2003, 25.

53. For a detailed discussion of the possible motives of the exarch and young Herakleios' motives in selecting consular costume: Kaegi, 2003, 40-43.

Several explanations have been offered to account for the coin's iconography.⁵³ On the one hand, since Herakleios was in revolt against Phokas, he did not want to produce new coins bearing that ruler's image. He was especially reluctant to issue coins depicting himself wearing a crown before he had reached the capital. This might have offended the Senate and people. Although all the double bust coins show Herakleios on the right, in the senior position, the revolt was undertaken in his father's name. Among the lesser titles conferred on an exarch was that of pro-consul, an office whose costume was consular dress,⁵⁴ so that of the two at least Herakleios' father could legitimately depict himself wearing consular dress. Although there is no record in contemporary accounts of the revolt, both Philip Grierson and Walter Kaegi believe that Herakleios and his father had the title of consul conferred upon them by the Carthaginian senate.⁵⁵ But since only the senates of Rome and Constantinople could create consuls, this conjecture seems unlikely. A simpler explanation is that the two previous emperors had both minted large numbers of bronzes with their portraits as frontal busts in what is probably a loros. Any coinage produced by Herakleios and his father had a better chance of general acceptance if it bore an image already found on large numbers of coins currently in general use. To be depicted on non-official coins in the same dress as the emperor, however, was probably the equivalent of a public announcement that the wearer was a usurper.

54. Kaegi, 2003, 41-42.

55. Kaegi, 2003, 40; Grierson, 1950, 79.

After Phokas was executed on 5 October 612 and Herakleios proclaimed emperor by the Senate and crowned by Patriarch Sergios, a few folles were minted at Cyprus and Alexandretta which show both the exarch and the new emperor in what is probably a loros wearing crowns. Two lead seals also exist which show busts of Herakleios and his father crowned wearing what is probably a loros on their reverses.⁵⁶ Since the seventh-century Egyptian historian John of Nikiu reports that Herakleios' father died in Carthage shortly before his son's victory, these folles and the seals may have been struck to give recognition to the exarch for the support he gave his son during the new emperor's rise to power.⁵⁷ It is also tempting to interpret the image of the Virgin and Christ found on the seals' obverse as representing Herakleios' thank offering to the Virgin for her support of his naval campaign. Herakleios is reported to have displayed her image on his sails as his ships approached the capital.⁵⁸ But the obverse of the lead seal is identical to those of both Maurice Tiberios and Phokas.

56. Braunlin, 1998, 168.

57. *Chronique de Jean, eveque de Nikiou*, Zotenberg, John of Nikiou, CX, 13; Charles, 2007, 178.

58. George of Pisidia, "Herakleios," B', 9-11; Pertusi, 1959, 251-252.

59. Grierson, 1982, 120.

Herakleios also minted a very interesting follis in Jerusalem which shows him crowned wearing a loros and holding a mappa and eagle-tipped sceptre.⁵⁹ Although the coin is marked II/II (year 4), it is not certain whether this date refers to a regnal or indictional year. Since all Herakleios' other dated bronze coins are dated by regnal year, the follis probably was minted in 613/614 during the siege of Jerusalem. But if this unusual follis was struck during the emperor's fourth indictional year (630/631), it would have been issued for ceremonies commemorating the return of the true cross to the Holy Sepulchre.⁶⁰ The coin's inscription "XC NIKA" (Christ Conquers) might refer to either event.⁶¹ If only clothing is considered, the fact that the emperor is depicted crowned wearing consular dress which is probably a loros, points to the earlier date. He was also shown wearing that form of dress on folles produced by eastern mints during his revolt against Phokas. Since both bronzes depict him as a frontal bust wearing the same dress, the second coin might be interpreted as presaging a similar successful outcome against the Persians.⁶²

Although rendered very schematically, three new varieties of crowns are depicted on Herakleios' gold nomismata (pls. 23-25).⁶³ On those minted shortly after he assumed power, his crown was a type of plumed helmet with pendilia and a centre-piece with a globus cruciger (610-613).⁶⁴ Early examples have pendilia but the plumed helmet on later ones and both his later crowns dispense with them.⁶⁵ The second crown was broad and flat with two rows of pearls (613-619); there was also space between each pearl for additional ornamentation; the crown's centre-piece was a globus cruciger surmounted by a flared arm cross.⁶⁶ Although more convex, his next crown also had two rows of pearls but these were placed in unbroken rows (620-641); the crown's centre-piece now consisted of a semi-circular plaque surmounted by a flared-arm cross.⁶⁷ This was the form of imperial crown used throughout the remainder of the emperor's reign.⁶⁸ Both crowns are very similarly decorated with rows of pearls and a centre-piece with a flared

60. Kaegi, 2003, 206-207.

61. Berk, 2003, 140. 62. Kaegi, 2003, 206; Grierson, 1982, 120.

63. For a schematic line drawing of each type: Grierson, 1968, Table 9, 3, 10-11.

64. Grierson, 1968, Table 9, 3.

65. Grierson, 1968, 81-82.

66. Grierson, 1968, Table 9, 10.

armed cross. The later of the two crowns probably simply reflects a change in personal taste.

The most significant change on Herakleios' later coinage is that the images of the emperor and his sons, especially as shown on his various types of nomismata, seem to age over time. The perception that they are aging is primarily achieved by adding full beards to the portraits found on later coins. On the emperor's fractional gold coins, following earlier Roman traditions, his portrait is always depicted as clean shaven.⁶⁷ Not only Herakleios and his sons but also all other later members of his dynasty are depicted with full beards.⁶⁹ His grandson was even given the nickname Constans II "Pogonatus" (the bearded).⁷⁰ Grierson believed that the portrayal of family members with beards had no further significance than being part of a new realism in portraiture which began, he thinks, under Phokas and was continued by Herakleios and later rulers of his dynasty.⁷¹ As part of this new realism in portraiture, Herakleios and his sons may have been depicted with beards because male members of the family grew full beards, a trait which manifested itself as they grew up.

67. Grierson, 1968, Table 9, 11.

68. Grierson, 1968, 90-92.

69. Grierson, 1968, 91, note 191; *ODB*, 1991, 496.

70. Grierson, 1968, 90-91.

71. Grierson, 1968, 83.

Contemporary historians such as George of Pisidia do not specify which of the latter two crowns was buried with the emperor in accordance with his own wishes; but it was probably the second more elaborate one which was valued at seventy pounds of gold. This was the crown Herakleios wore during most of his reign from 620 until his death in 641.⁷² Although he does not name the emperor, the contemporary writer Leontios, Bishop of Neapolis, records the special reverence which Herakleios' subjects felt for his crown and by extension for their ruler: "...when a good emperor makes with his own hands a shimmering and precious crown, all the loyal subjects of the emperor kiss and honour the crown, not because they honour the gold and pearls, but because they honour...that emperor".⁷³ The crown remained buried with him for only a short length of time. On the advice of his treasurer, Herakleios Constantine, Herakleios' oldest surviving son and successor, had it exhumed. After that emperor's death, Heraklonas, Herakleios' youngest son, gave the crown to Hagia Sophia; it was also used during the coronation of his grandson, Constans II. The crown was then returned to Hagia Sophia and disappears from history.⁷⁴

In a later legend, however, this crown was coveted by Leo IV and credited with causing that emperor's death. According to the legend, when Leo IV noticed it hanging in Hagia Sophia, he insisted on wearing it. But after putting it on, his head broke out in boils and he died. Since Leo IV died of a fever while he was campaigning against the Bulgarians, this story is undoubtedly apocryphal.⁷⁵ Although it is difficult to know whether these crowns resembled those worn by Herakleios, the only ones from this time period are those of the Visigothic King Reccesvinth (653-672) and his wife and that of the Visigothic King Reccared (586-601) (pls. 26-27).⁷⁶ Although these crowns are not decorated with rows of pearls and a centre-piece, like Herakleios' crown, their main components consist of a wide band and central flared-arm cross.

None of the stemmas worn by Herakleios or his sons were continued by later Byzantine rulers. Instead the crown of his

72. Derouche, 1994, 96.

73. Kaegi, 2003, 320.

74. ODB, 1991, 1209.

75. Kaegi, 2003, 320.

76. Breckenridge, 1959, 32.

77. Breckenridge, 1959, 32-33.

grandson Constans II, which consisted of a plain circlet fillet surmounted in front with a semicircular ornament and topped by a plain cross, was continued by his son, Constantine IV and his grandson, Justinian II as well as by all the Isaurians up to Constantine V.⁷⁷ When he was co-ruler with his father, Leo III, he continued the earlier stemma with its semicircular ornament; but later when Constantine V ruled alone, he introduced a new crown that omitted the ornament and was decorated only with an unadorned cross (pl. 28).⁷⁸

After Justinian II (first reign, 685-695) came to the throne at about the age of sixteen, his first two nomismata continued earlier types, which showed the emperor on their obverses as a frontal bust dressed in the chlamys and holding a globus cruciger (pl. 29).⁷⁹ His third gold coin, however, in several ways represented a bold departure from all earlier gold coins (pl. 30).⁸⁰ It relegated the emperor's portrait to the reverse and was the first Byzantine coin to depict a portrait of Christ on its obverse.⁸¹ In addition the emperor is shown as a full figure, instead of a bust, wearing a loros.⁸² In his right hand he holds a stepped cross, a symbol found on the reverses of nomismata as early as Tiberios II Constantine, and in his left a new symbol of rule, the anakakia or akakia.⁸³ A second item dated to Justinian II's first reign, a bronze seal, also shows the emperor in a loros holding a stepped-cross and an akakia on its reverse; a figure of the Virgin holding Christ appears on the seal's obverse. (pl. 31).⁸⁴

78. Breckenridge, 1969, 20-21.

79. Breckenridge, 1969, 21-22.

80. Breckenridge, 1969, 22.

81. Cormack, 1985, 96.

82. He may have chosen to be depicted as a full figure holding a cross to show either that the loros was wrapped around his body to remind him of Christ's winding sheet or that he was the cross' defender. He also replaced such personifications as city tyches or winged victories which were full figures.

83. Grierson also mentions that this is the first representation of the akakia: Grierson, 1968, 87.

84. Nesbitt, 2009, 26.1.

The emperor was probably depicted in this costume because it was the garb he wore at Easter, the closest contemporary equivalent to the consular processions, and other religious services throughout the year.⁸⁵ The new symbol of rule held in Justinian II's left hand, the anakakia or akakia, was a cylindrically shaped object decorated with knobs on both ends which was filled with dust to remind the emperor of his mortality.⁸⁶ Although the akakia replaced the old consular mappa on Justinian II's new coin, its cylindrical form was partially derived from the scroll of office.⁸⁷ Since the object evolved from the earlier mappa, it was a form of intrinsic symbol.

Justinian's exact motivations in producing this innovative nomisma are unknown; but its production has been linked to the Quinisextum Council at Trullo in 691.⁸⁸ The fact that the emperor's portrait is now relegated to the coin's reverse implied his inferior status. The coin's two inscriptions, identifying the blessing Christ as "Rex Regnantium" (the King of Kings), and Justinian as "Servus Christi" (the servant of Christ), further confirm his lower status.⁸⁹ By Justinian II's first reign, Byzantine rulers were no longer elected consuls. Instead as recorded in the tenth-century Book of Ceremonies, the emperor and several other court officials wore this costume during ceremonies celebrated throughout the year but especially at Easter.⁹⁰ The loros, a form of dress derived from the consular trabea, represents a link between pagan ceremonies and several contemporary Christian ones including Easter.

85. Cormack, 1985, 96.

86. Grierson, 1968, 86-87; Breckenridge, 1959, 36; ODB, 1991, 42.

87. Grierson, 1968, 87.

88. Cormack, 1985, 98.

89. Cormack, 1985, 97-98.

90. Breckenridge, 1959, 41.

In the Book of Ceremonies Constantine VII Porphyrogenitos even mentioned that emperors wore the loros at Easter to remind them of Christ's winding sheet. The garment's continuance as a form of dress with such a highly developed iconography also shows that it had become an intrinsic symbol. Among his papers, Constantine VII left an additional note entitled "Why is it that on Easter Sunday, the emperor, the magistri, the proconsuls, and the patricians wear the loros".⁸¹ Since it was both wound about the body like a winding sheet and embroidered with gold and jewels, the costume simultaneously symbolized Christ's death and resurrection.⁹² Two other insignia of office, the akakia and sceptre in the shape of a cross, had a similar significance. According to Constantine VII, because the akakia was filled with dust, it recalled human mortality, and the cross-shaped sceptre was a reminder of Christ's triumph over death.⁹³

The inscriptions on the new coin were important for several additional reasons. Firstly they expressed the widespread assumption, common as early as Justin II, that the emperor was Christ's servant and his earthly equivalent. In his In laudem Iustini, Corippus neatly summarized this idea: "terrarum dominis Christus dedit omnia posse. Ille est omnipotens, hic omnipotentis imago" (Christ gave earthly rulers power over all. He is omnipotent, and the earthly lord is the image of the omnipotent).⁹⁴ A second less likely interpretation of the inscription is that it may be derived from similar ones found on contemporary Muslim coins issued by the Muslim Caliph Abd al Malik, whose own name means "servant of the king," and those of other caliphs who referred to themselves as the "Slaves of Allah".⁹⁵

The parallel between the heavenly ruler, Christ, and his earthly equivalent is made even more explicit by the portraits found on gold nomismata issued at the beginning of Justinian II's second reign (summer 705-November 4, 711) (pl. 32). On these later coins Christ was depicted as a beardless young man with a pointed chin and curly hair.⁹⁶ As was mentioned previously, on the Barberini ivory

91. Constantine VII Porphyrogenitos, Bk. II, 40; Reiske, 1989, 637-639; Moffatt and Tall, 2012, v.2, Bk. II, 637-639

92. Breckenridge, 1959, 36.

93. Breckenridge, 1959, 36.

94. Corippus, II, 427-428; Cameron, 1985, 96.

95. Breckenridge, 1959, 66.

96. Cormack discusses the origin of both types: Cormack, 1985, 98.

97. Bellinger, 1950, 110.

the emperor's portrait on the reverse closely imitates Christ's on the obverse. The parallel between the two figures was further suggested by the fact that the emperor now appeared, not as a standing figure as on his earlier nomisma, but, like Christ, as a frontal bust.⁹⁷ Justinian II still wears the loros costume and holds a stepped cross with the word "Pax" inscribed on it in his right hand and a globus cruciger, instead of the akakia, in the other. Unlike the imperial type of the emperor as a standing figure in a loros, which originated with Justinian II's earlier nomisma, this new type may have been suggested by nomismata of the usurper Leontios (695-698), who is depicted on his coins as a frontal bust wearing a loros.⁹⁸

A third coin depicting a portrait of the curly haired, beardless Christ on the obverse and Justinian and his young son and caesar, Tiberios, dressed, not in a loros, but in a chlamys and divetesion on its reverse, constitutes the emperor's final nomisma issued during his second reign (pl. 33). The two rulers were probably depicted wearing a chlamys because this was the form of dress worn by co-rulers on the obverses of gold nomismata issued during the Herakleian dynasty. The iconography of Justinian II's final nomisma was, however, also innovative. Whereas gold coins issued by the Herakleian dynasty show the co-rulers separated by a cross, as on his first innovative nomisma, the co-rulers are depicted holding one.⁹⁹ As on his first innovative nomisma, this coin's iconography suggested the emperor's role as defender of the cross.

98. Leontios may hold these symbols to suggest he is a patrician: Head, 1972, 92.

99. Breckenridge, 1959, 66.

100. Chronographia, de Boor, 1883-85; Theophanes, 400; Mango, 1997, 552. Breckenridge, 1959, 43.

Although contemporary chroniclers fail to record whether emperors wore the loros regularly during religious processions and at Easter after Justinian II's reign, they mention three later Easter processions. The first ceremony occurred in 718 during the reign of Leo III; it included the baptism of his son, the future emperor Constantine V. After the ceremony, a traditional distribution of largesse was made to the general populace.¹⁰⁰ The second example also happened at Easter in 768 over a two-day period when Constantine V made his wife Eudokia an augusta and then on Easter Sunday crowned his sons, Christopher and Nikephoros, Caesar; after these ceremonies the emperor made a distribution of largesse.¹⁰¹ Finally during an elaborate ceremony at Easter in 799, the Empress Eirene distributed largesse to the people as she approached the church.¹⁰² Thus consular processions during which the loros was worn continued to occur at least sporadically until the reign of Eirene and were accompanied by a distribution of largesse.

If coin evidence alone is considered, forms of the loros continued to be worn throughout the entire history of the Byzantine empire. Even such rulers of the restored Empire as John VI Kantakuzenos (1347-1354) and Andronikos IV Palaiologos (1376-1379) (pls. 34-35) are depicted on their coins wearing forms of the loros. The costume seems eventually to have become so associated with the imperial office that depictions of the emperor wearing a loros became inseparable from it.

In conclusion, during the late Roman period, the toga was slowly being replaced as the main form of male dress by the chlamys, a form of military cloak, the diveteson, a silk tunic with long sleeves, and braccia, a type of fitted leggings. One cause of the late Roman toga's decline was its increased size. Whereas the imperial toga had been twelve feet long, the late Roman one, the toga

101. Chronographia, de Boor, 1883-85; Theophanes, 444; Mango, 1997, 613. Breckenridge, 1959, 43.

102. Chronographia, de Boor, 1883-85; Theophanes, 474; Mango, 1997, 651. Breckenridge, 1959, 43.

contabulata, was fifteen to eighteen feet in length. The garment was also so bulky that its wearer needed assistance in putting it on and all movement was difficult. During this time period, earlier forms such as the imperial toga, the toga praetexta, togas which covered the head, and ceremonial types like the toga picta also continued to be used.

Besides its greater length the toga contabulata differed from earlier types because it had a band of stacked folds running up its left side. Tetrarchic rulers are depicted wearing this type of toga only on monuments dated to the first two decades of the fourth century. This was the form of toga worn by Diocletian in scenes on the Decennalia or Five-Column Monument (303) and by Constantine in the largitio scene on his Arch (about 315). It was also the final form developed in the west before decorated forms like the trabea come into general use later in the century.

Beginning in the early third century, all free-born males throughout the Roman empire were citizens and thus eligible to wear a toga. Therefore a new style of undecorated toga with a band of folds stretched across the shoulder was developed in the east at Constantinople to differentiate the dress of its elite from that of the general citizenry. On the Theodosian obelisk base erected in 390, the members of the imperial family depicted in the *kathisma* wear the *chlamys* and *divetesion*, but several court officials surrounding the imperial box wear the new style of toga. Honorific statues of the rulers Arkadios and Valentinian II found at Aphrodisias in Asia Minor also wear this type of toga. Since the emperors Arkadios and Honorios were shown wearing the toga with a band of stretched folds on Arkadios' column (401), it continued to be worn by the elite until at least the end of the century.

As early as Diocletian's reign, emperors began to be depicted wearing ceremonial trabeas made from stiff woven silk fabrics such as damask, which were then further embellished with beads, embroidery, jewels, and coloured woven patches. Tetrarchic rulers were shown wearing them on large gold medallions issued to commemorate their consulships, vicennalias and decennalias. These usually depict the reigning monarch on their obverses as a crowned bust dressed either in a cuirass or trabea and then on their reverses as a full figure wearing a ceremonial toga.

The practice of striking large medals with depictions of the emperor in a ceremonial trabea were continued by Constantine

and his successors. A large medallion was issued by the emperor for his sons' Crispus and Constantine II's joint consulship in 321. It depicts both his sons wearing decorated trabeas. A gold multiple was also issued by Constantios II to celebrate his joint consulship with his remaining brother Constans in 346/347. This medal was minted slightly before the Calendar of 354. Included among the manuscript's pictures are facing illustrations of Constantios II and Gallos Caesar as the eponymous consuls for the year wearing consular trabeas. The appearance of this early illuminated manuscript is preserved in several Renaissance copies; it is one of the earliest existing codices. The final item depicting an emperor in a consular trabea is the much later nomisma issued by Valentinian III in 455 which shows the empress Licinia Eudoxia on its obverse and the empress either wearing a mantle assimilated to a toga or a trabea and the Emperor Valentinian III dressed in a highly embellished trabea on its reverse.

Contemporary sources do not record when the ceremonial trabea ceased to be worn by the elite; but a new form of ceremonial toga, the loros, a long jewel encrusted stole arranged in an x-shape, is mentioned by John the Lydian as early as Justinian I's reign. Although it is difficult to distinguish between depictions of the trabea and loros on contemporary consular coins, there is a stylistic change between the garments shown on Anastasios' consular nomisma and Justin I's. Beginning with Justin I's unique consular coin, the x-shaped frontal strap becomes more prominent and the garment seems composed of bands of fabric rather than a single piece.

As late as the Herakleian dynasty several types of togas including the loros continued to be worn on ceremonial occasions. Although Herakleios issued no consular coins depicting him in a loros, Constantine VII Porphyrogenitos describes a consular procession in his Book of Ceremonies occurring on 1 January 639 in which the emperor and family members wore forms of the toga.¹⁰³ Since Justinian II was the last member of the dynasty and he is depicted on his innovative nomisma wearing a loros, the costume was worn at least to the end of his reign. After the Herakleian dynasty, as mentioned earlier, emperors probably wore the loros during religious festivals and especially at Easter when the costume was associated with the traditional distribution of largesse. Since the loros was

103. Constantine VII Porphyrogenitos, Bk. II, 27-28; Reiske, 1829, 628-629. Moffatt and Tall, 2012, 627-629

associated both with the Roman trabea and Christ's winding sheet, it probably represents the longest enduring intrinsic symbol associated exclusively with the Byzantine empire. On coins the costume becomes so associated with the imperial office that emperors are depicted wearing forms of the loros almost until the end of the restored Empire.

General Summary of the Emperor's Dress

During the late Roman period early emperors were also the field commanders who led their troops in battle. They were usually shown in contemporary art wearing military dress consisting of a cloak, cuirass and helmet. The short-lived tetrarchic regime introduced a new style of representation to express such ideas as their unity of purpose and mutual concord. During Constantine's reign this style was initially preserved on the metre high frieze on his arch; but elsewhere on this monument and in other later ones, the emperor was depicted in the heroic style of the Roman past as the most recent example in a long-line of victorious soldier-emperors. These later works and those of his successors drew upon the powerful and highly developed iconography which had evolved over several centuries but which they often reshaped to their own use.

Under Constantine several stylistic techniques such as the central placement, frontal stance, and enlargement of the emperor's figure were continued from tetrarchic art. These rulers were sometimes depicted as semi-divine heroes possessing special powers. On the Arch of Galerius the four tetrarchs' semi-divine nature was implied by their being shown enthroned among the gods; on an early

medallion during Constantine's reign, his bust was superimposed on that of Sol Invictus to suggest his possession of that god's powers.

Other special abilities included the enlargement of the emperor's eyes in a porphyry statuary group depicting the four tetrarchs in Venice to suggest the idea that their gazes could root out evil. In a panel on the Arch of Constantine, the Siege of Verona, a figure of the emperor possessing an enlarged right hand implied the idea that special protective powers emanated from it.

As exemplified in an image over the Chalke Gate at Constantine's palace, which showed him overwhelming a serpent, a recurrent theme expressed during his reign was that his victories represented the vanquishing of evil on a cosmic scale. A similar idea was suggested by the first example of what the Victorian essayist Carlyle called an "intrinsic symbol." This new symbol was the Christogram, the chi-rho anagram, which represented Christ's name in an abbreviated form. The emperor believed that if he and his troops wore the Christogram in battle God would protect them and give him a victory. As late as the sixth century the iconography of Justinian's equestrian statue expressed a similar idea. Instead of wearing a Christogram, the emperor holds a globe surmounted by a cross. In the context of the statue the globe also suggested that God was responsible for the emperor's victories.

As court life became more sedentary and was centered around the Great Palace in Constantinople, later emperors were typically depicted wearing civic dress which consisted of a diadem, a special purple cloak called a chlamys, which was decorated with a tablion and fastened with a rosette-shaped brooch with three extensions called pendilia, a long-sleeved silk tunic called a divitesion and finally special purple slippers. Since the chlamys was derived from the field marshal's paludamentum, it was dyed a special purple colour whose use was primarily reserved for the emperor. Emperors were often depicted facing frontally staring aloofly ahead. This facial expression expressed the virtue tranquillitas, imperial calm. Court ceremonial was similarly transformed. The emperor was now shown seated in a niche in the centre of an audience hall. Individuals approaching him performed a special ceremony called proskynesis, which consisted of their bowing and kissing the hem of his cloak. During later reigns ceremonies often took the form of lavish displays.

An example of the emperor's distinctive costume and new court ceremonies is depicted on the Theodosian Missorium, a large silver platter commissioned for the emperor's decennalia in 388. Although rulers as early as Constantine are shown wearing such

garments as the imperial brooch and insignia of rule such as an orb and sceptre, the *Missorium* is the first work to picture all the items which were part of his distinctive costume up to at least Justinian I's reign.

Among these garments several including the emperor's purple *chlamys*, purple footwear, the diadem, the orb and sceptre are examples of intrinsic symbols. Since early emperors were also field commanders, the *chlamys*' purple colour, a hue suggesting the gore of battle, represented a link between the earlier and later offices. Purple slippers are also associated with these early emperors through the ritualistic trampling ceremony. Constantine selected the diadem because it was the crown type worn by Alexander the Great and therefore connected his regime with that Alexander and other Hellenistic soldier-generals. The orb and sceptre were similarly selected because of their origins during the Hellenistic period. The orb's round shape implied the emperor's rule over the terrestrial sphere; the staff, carried on ceremonial occasions, symbolized the powers of kingship. Since these five items were continued from earlier regimes and had retained their original meanings for several centuries, they represent "intrinsic symbols."

Early rulers also wore four types of togas: the banded toga, the toga with band of stretched folds, the trabea and the loros. The first two types were the final forms of dress worn by all Roman males from the earliest of times. Although the toga, a bulky garment which was difficult to put on, was in decline as early as Augustus' reign, the two latter types, which were exclusively ceremonial, evolved after the early forms fell from general use.

The banded toga, which derived its name from an added band of stacked folds, is the garment's last form in the west. It appears on tetrarchic works such as the Five-Column monument in Rome and in the largitio scene on the Arch of Constantine. This type, which was over fifteen feet long, was so bulky that its wearer needed assistance in putting it on. A second type, which evolved in the east, was the toga with a band of stretched folds. It is depicted on such monuments as the Theodosian Obelisk and imperial statuary in Aphrodisias in Asia Minor to differentiate Constantinople's elite from toga wearers found throughout the realm.

Although Roman rulers wore ceremonial types of togas as early as the Etruscan kings, the decorated trabea is first shown on ivory consular diptychs produced during the fifth and sixth centuries and on consular coins as early as the tetrarchs up to and including

at least the reign of Justinian I. It was during the tetrarchic period that stiff damask fabric was first produced by new weaving methods and further embellished. Three distinctive varieties existed depending upon how the garment was wrapped around the body. Especially lavish examples are shown on the consular medallions of Constantine and his sons and in a Renaissance copy of the Codex Calendar of 354, which pictures Constantios II and his caesar Gallos.

The first mention of the loros is by John the Lydian in the De Magistratibus during Justinian I's reign. Although little is known about the garment's early history, this type is probably depicted on consular coins from Justinian I's reign to that of Phokas. A new type of gold coin showing the emperor wearing a garment with crossed straps first came into use during the reign of Maurice. By the end of the Heraklean dynasty, Justinian II is shown on the reverse of an innovative gold coin wearing what is undisputably a loros and holding an akakia in the left hand and stepped cross in the other.

The fact that the emperor holds a stepped cross also implies a further change in ideas. Later rulers no longer believed that they were protected by the cross but had instead become its protector. The remaining two items, the loros and akakia are examples of intrinsic symbols. The new symbol of the akakia, a cylindrical object with knobs on both ends, which was filled with dust, reminded emperors of their mortality. Since the object's unusual shape was derived from the earlier mappa, it conforms to the definition of an intrinsic symbol. In a note in the Emperor Constantine VII's Book of Ceremonies, the emperor states that the loros had a twofold meaning: it was a reminder of the later empire's origins in the Roman past and, because the garment was worn especially at Easter, was wrapped around the body and covered with jewels, it was associated with the resurrection. Therefore both objects originated in the past and retained their meaning for several centuries. As a result of its long history and special symbolism, emperors are often depicted wearing the loros especially on coins up to the end of the empire.

Representations of the Empress

Introduction to the Empress' Dress

With the exception of Livia Drusilla, the first augusta, very little is known about the wives of even such popular and long-reigning emperors as Trajan, Hadrian, and Marcus Aurelius. Except for their names virtually nothing is known about the wives of the often short-reigning emperors who ruled during the period of instability in the early third century and their successors, the tetrarchs. These empresses often shared their husbands' dangers and a few like Prisca and Galeria Valeria, Diocletian's wife and daughter, were even executed. In contrast Livia, who lived during a time of relative stability, was praised by such contemporary writers as Ovid, Horace and Tacitus for qualities like her wit and decorum; she was also considered a model of old-fashioned Roman propriety.¹ Marcus Aurelius' wife, Faustina the Younger, whose husband reigned during less stable times, rarely lived in Rome.

1. For a recent scholarly evaluation of Livia's character see Barrett, 2002, 119-120; for a detailed list of contemporary writers and works which mention Livia see Barrett, 2002, 124-126.

Married at fifteen, she accompanied her husband on campaign and bore him almost a dozen children. Although her loyalty to him was sometimes questioned, he disregarded every criticism and even invented a new title for his wife: “the mother of the camp” (mater castrorum), a name given to several later empresses.²

Just as before Diocletian's reign, the emperor's dress varied little from that of other senators, so too an empress' dress was exactly like that of other noble Roman women. The two main garments which she wore were the palla, a loose-fitting type of cloak, and the stola, a form of short-sleeved tunic with an unbanded neck.³ With the exception of the elaborate hairstyles, which were popular for a brief time in the first century, most Roman noble women condemned the ostentatious display of wealth in all its forms, including all types of physical adornment; but in the early fourth century, these attitudes began to change. For example, when elaborate jewelry of the type shown on second-century grave reliefs at Palmyra became popular (pl. 1), women believed by some to be members of the Emperor Constantine's family were depicted wearing similar jewelry (pl. 2).⁴ These female portraits were displayed in a ceiling fresco excavated from a palatial building at Trier dated to Constantine's reign. An elaborate gold necklace set with consular nomismata and relief portrait heads, which is sometimes associated with the Empress Helena, Constantine's mother, also exists (pl. 3).⁵ Indeed with Helena, not just the empress' dress but her image and role as well all slowly began to change.⁶

In dynastic affairs Helena (248-328) comes into prominence only in 324 at the end of her life after Fausta's death. When Helena made a pilgrimage to the holy land in 326, Eusebios of Caesarea provided a description of her journey in his Life of Constantine.⁷ The primary reason for her trip may have been to oversee the progress on the construction of churches which Constantine had previously ordered to be built. During her trip, she demonstrated her mastery of all the court protocols and ceremonials. She also showed several Christian virtues which were imitated by her successors; these included her piety, generosity,

2. Vagi, 1999, v. I, 245.

3. Croom, 2002, 89, 79.

4. For a grave relief with examples of this type of jewelry see Bruhn, 1993, 18. The primary writers on the Constantinian portraits are Drijvers, 1992, 24-28, Lavin, 1966, 99-1113 and Rose, 2006, 92-109.

5. MacClanan, 2002, 17.

6. Eusebios' description of Helena's journey and later life is found in Eusebios, Bk. III, 42.1-47.3. Drijver's recent monograph (1992) attempts to separate factual information on her life from the mystique surrounding her. For a discussion of her importance as a role model: Brubaker, 1997, 62-63; Holum, 1989, 24 and McClanan, 2002, 15.

7. Eusebios, Bk. III, 42.1-42.3, 44-45; Cameron, 1999, 137-139.

8. For her character see especially Eusebios, Bk. III, 44-45; Cameron, 1999, 138.

9. Eusebios, Bk. III, 45; Cameron, 1999, 139.

compassion for the poor, and loyalty to her son.⁸ In his description of Helena's journey, Eusebios describes her character in glowing terms: "she allowed herself to be seen continually making personal visits to the church of God...One might see the wonderful woman in dignified and modest attire joining the throng and manifesting reverence for the divinity."⁹ As a result of Eusebios' description and other early legends, Helena became a model for later empresses.

When Constantine awarded Helena and Fausta the honorary title of *augusta*, in 324, on commemorative coins they were depicted with their hair arranged in a new style known as the crown tress, a style in which the hair was worn on top of the head in a braid,¹⁰ and wearing an early form of diadem without ties, although their other garments remained those worn by other Roman noblewomen (pls. 4-5). When Theodosios I made his first wife, Aelia Flavia Flaccilla, an *augusta* in 383, she was also shown on coins with her hair arranged in a crown tress and wearing a diadem without ties (pl. 6). But instead of being dressed in the garb of a Roman noble woman, Flaccilla's remaining costume imitated that of her husband. Her new dress, like his, consisted of a *divetesion* and a *chlamys* fastened with an imperial brooch.¹¹

In his funeral oration for Flaccilla in 387, Gregory of Nyssa enumerated four qualities which she possessed and which were very similar to Helena's: her piety, service to the poor of Constantinople, loyalty to her husband and her humility.¹² Thus beginning with Helena and Aelia Flaccilla the terms used for describing all imperial women become conventionalized; later empresses were described, not so much as individuals, but in terms of carefully crafted imagery, so that non-imperial women throughout the empire might emulate their lives. Beginning with Flaccilla, the empress, as well as other contemporary women, wore the *chlamys* and *divetesion* costume, a form of dress which was also identical to that worn by her husband and which closely identified her with him.

10. The emperor could award this honorary title to close female relatives: Holum, 1989, 31-32. To produce the crown tress hairstyle, the empress' hair was first parted down the center, then gathered in the back and braided and finally brought forward on top of her head, where the braid was twisted into a knot. The style is sometimes referred to as "the scheitelzopf." For other descriptions see Holum, 1989, 32-33 and Bruhn, 1993, 63.

11. Holum is the first critic to note this fact: Holum, 1989, 32.

12. Holum, 1989, 27.

Even though the empress ranked highly in the governmental hierarchy, it is difficult to know what actual political powers she possessed. As Gregory of Nyssa mentioned in his oration, Flaccilla, unlike Helena on her pilgrimage, rarely appeared in public. But within the palace, early Byzantine empresses exercised some real political power. Just as the emperor's court mirrored the heavenly one, so the empress' court mirrored that of the emperor; court ceremonial was structured in such a way that most male officials had female counterparts.¹³ This deliberate mirroring was probably part of the court's more general interest in order or taxis. Whenever an emperor received an ambassador, his empress also usually received the ambassador's wife in a similar ceremony.

13. Herrin, 1995, 72, 76.

14. Herrin, 1995, 71.

15. Holum, 1989, 43.

Wearing the correct costume and performing the prescribed acclamations and gestures on each official occasion were essential parts of Byzantine court ceremonial.¹⁴ Representations of empresses in art were also carefully crafted. Although Flaccilla was shown wearing a chlamys and divetesion on coins commemorating her elevation to the title of augusta, the depiction of even later empresses on statuary was more conservative; these empresses were sometimes shown wearing earlier forms of Roman dress.¹⁵ Besides wearing forms of Roman dress and the later chlamys and divetesion, early empresses probably also wore several specialized garments during their wedding ceremony. The main garment of this specialized costume was a yellow cloak called a flammeum, which was worn pulled forward almost covering the bride's face, and an early form of tunic called the tunica recta. Other garments, which were part of this costume, were a veil, yellow slippers, and a belt that was tied in a special knot.¹⁶ In addition to these forms of dress empresses may very occasionally have worn a Roman toga. But typically instead of wearing an actual toga they simply wore their palla wrapped around their body so that its appearance approximated one.¹⁷ This second section on the empress' dress will first discuss art which depicted the empress wearing forms of traditional Roman dress, then the chlamys and divetesion costume, and finally imperial bridal dress.

16. Croom, 2000, 111-112.

The Empress in Forms of Late Roman Dress

In early Rome both men and women wore the toga; but by the second century B.C. the toga was the form of dress primarily worn by adult males. It was also the dress worn by children of both sexes and for some unknown reason by prostitutes.¹ The costume of the chaste married Roman woman, the matrona, at this time consisted of three distinct items: the stola, institia, and the palla.² The stola was a form of sleeveless tunic with thin straps or institia and a deep, v-shaped neckline; the garment was worn in addition to the short-sleeved tunic which other Roman women wore.³ In appearance the stola was much like the modern slip except it was made from a more substantial fabric and was long enough to cover the feet.⁴ The first empress Livia is pictured wearing this garment on several works, including the grand cameo de France (circa 50 AD), a bust from the Fayum (14 AD), and the only imperial depondius struck during her lifetime (22-23 AD)(pls.1-3). In all three of these, the stola with its characteristic thin straps, the institia, and v-shaped neckline are clearly visible.

Unlike the toga, which continued to have a ceremonial use after it fell from general use, the stola was discarded as early as the late first century.⁵ A second feature, which distinguished the matrona from other women, was the thin woolen bands, the vittae, with which she bound her hair. Both were considered symbols of the Roman wife's modesty.⁶

1. Stone, 2001, 13.

2. Olsen, 2008, 25; Houston, 2003, 108-111; Croom, 2002, 75, 89.

3. Croom, 2002, 75-76.

4. Croom, 2002, 76.

5. Croom, 2002, 76.

6. Sebesta, 2001, 48; Olsen, 2008, 36-39.

In addition all Roman women wore a third garment, a form of mantle called the palla, which consisted of a rectangular piece of fabric that ended either at the knee or mid-calf.⁷ This garment could be wrapped around the body in several different ways. No respectable woman ever appeared in public without covering her head with the palla and draping it so that it concealed the shape of her body. Like the toga the palla needed to be held in place with one hand.⁸ In some first-century depictions women are shown with the palla tied in a large knot near their hip.⁹ This enabled them to keep both hands free as they worked.

7. Houston, 2003, 108; Sebesta, 2001, 48; Olsen, 2008, 33-34; Croom, 2002, 89-90.

8. Croom, 2002, 89; Olsen, 2008, 33.

9. Croom, 2002, 78-80.

10. Croom, 2002, 78-80.

11. Croom, 2002, 78-80.

12. Kleiner, 1992, 327.

During the first and second century a new form of tunic of Greek origin, the gap-sleeve, came into general use. At first the stola was worn over the gap-sleeved tunic, but it was soon discarded and the gap-sleeved tunic became the only form worn by all Roman women.¹⁰ The tunic derived its name from the fact that located at intervals along the shoulder edges were small bundles of fabric, which were roughly spherical in shape. These bundles probably resulted from joining evenly-spaced pieces of fabric from the back with the front either by placing a small disk over the bundle and securing it with a bar or else by securing the bundle with stitching.¹¹ The rest of the edge remained open. On a portrait of the empress Julia Domna (circa 193-194 AD) from Gabii, the empress is shown wearing a gap-sleeved tunic and palla (pl.4).¹² But instead of the relatively simple nodus hair style shown in works of Livia, Julia Domna's coiffure consisted of a tall, round, stiff wig which so completely enveloped her head that the style was sometimes referred to as the helmet hair style.¹³

During the third century a final form of female tunic, the dalmaticus, came into general use.¹⁴ The dalmatic was a t-shaped tunic with wide sleeves made either from two pieces of fabric or (if the sleeves were inset) from four. It was often decorated with a set of wide vertical stripes which ran up the back and front and occasionally with a second narrower set which ran around the cuffs of the sleeves.¹⁵ If the tunic was full-length its lower edge was straight; but if it was mid-calf in length, the lower edge was usually curved.¹⁶ The Projecta casket from the Esquiline Treasure (circa 380 AD) depicts the mistress of house, identified by the inscription on the casket as Projecta, wearing a dalmatic tunic in several different ways. In two indoor scenes she is shown wearing a long-sleeved under tunic, an elaborate jeweled collar, and a full-length dalmatic tunic decorated with a three dot pattern (pls. 5-6). Her hair has been arranged in an elaborate top-knot. In the medallion portrait on the casket's lid, this tunic is belted beneath her breasts; on the front of the casket Projecta is shown seated at her toilette wearing the same patterned tunic but with a small mantle decorated with bands draped over her shoulders.¹⁷ In a third scene on the back of the casket she is shown outdoors wearing a bulkier tunic, also decorated with bands, and with a small mantle thrown across her neck as she travels with servants to the bathhouse (pl. 7).

13. Kleiner, 1992, 327.

14. Croom, 2002, 83-84.

15. Croom, 2002, 83; Harlow, 2004, 206.

16. Harlow, 2004, 204.

17. These narrow bands are represented by two small parallel rows of incised dots running the length of the fabric on both the edges of the mantle. The garment is most visible as it passes over Projecta's shoulder past the edge of her collar.

After the heavier dalmatic tunic came into general use in the third century, the mantles worn by Roman women tended to become less bulky and smaller in size.¹⁸ Since the dalmatic tunic concealed the shape of the body, women were able to wear the mantle in a wider variety of ways; mantles also varied more in their sizes and shapes. In the Via Latina catacombs, which include interments from the first to the fourth centuries, several women depicted in the orans position wear mid-calf length dalmatic tunics and short mantles which rest on the top of their heads (pls. 8-9).¹⁹ On the Stilicho Diptych, Serena's large mantle is depicted as first draped over her left shoulder, then drawn across the front with the remainder resting on her left arm (late 4th century). On the Projecta casket, Projecta wears a small mantle draped over her shoulder in the scene on the casket's front where she is shown seated at her toilette; but on the back of the casket she wears a mantle thrown across her front as she travels to the bath house. In several pieces of gold-glass from the late fourth century, which may depict bridal pairs, women are shown wearing a heavy mantle, crossed over in the front, which is decorated with patterned bands (pls. 8-9).²⁰ But since all of the figures on the gold-glasses are only bust length, little else is known about these mantles. Finally in the fifth century the small mantles worn by Theodora's female attendants in the imperial panel at San Vitale are so abbreviated that they are little more than shawls.²¹

18. Croom, 2002, 90.

19. Ferrua, 1990, 86; 120, fig. 108; 146, fig. 140.

20. Croom, 2002, colour pl. 16.

21. Croom, 2002, colour pl. 2

Although none of these works show the costume of an empress, the Stilicho Diptych depicts the dress worn by a member of the imperial family. Serena, whose portrait appears with that of her small son Eucharis on one leaf of the diptych, was not only Stilicho's wife, but also the adopted daughter and niece of Theodosius I (pl. 10).²² In addition to a long-sleeved under-tunic, she is shown wearing a dalmatic tunic, which is belted beneath her breasts, and a mantle made from the same fabric. Her remaining dress consists of a double strand pearl necklace with pearl earrings, an elaborate double tiered hairstyle, probably designed to give her figure added height, and a pair of pointed slippers. As can be seen from Stilicho's portrait on the companion panel, men also wore pointed slippers and a fitted, long-sleeved under-tunic during this time period.

Since no loops are visible on Serena's belt, it probably was held in place by the large brooch in the center of the belt. The ridges in Serena's double tiered hairstyle and its bulky appearance indicate that she is wearing a wig or snood, a type of hairstyle which first became popular at this time. In the ancient world, pearl jewelry was more highly prized than that made either from gold or decorated with gems, which at that time could not be faceted.²³ Serena's double-strand pearl necklace and earrings suggest that she was wealthy and that she could afford the most expensive forms of jewelry.

22. For a picture of the diptych see Mango, 2000, 37.

23. For further information on the snood see Croom, 2002, 115.

24. Harlow, 2004, 207.

The earliest depiction of a woman who may have been an empress in Roman dress is found in a floor mosaic from one of two adjacent small private chambers excavated at the Villa of Piazza Armerina in Sicily (pl. 11).²⁴ In the mosaic a woman usually identified as the domina is shown accompanied by her children and two servants as they travel toward the bath house. The domina's garments are identical to those of Projecta in the outdoor scene on the back of the casket where she is shown traveling to the baths. The domina's main garment is a bulky, full-length dalmatic tunic decorated with wide bands of colourful, vertical stripes. She also wears a small mantle thrown across the front and a jeweled collar with matching earrings. Her hair, like Projecta's, has been gathered into a knot on the top of her head. If the Villa of Piazza Armerina belonged to Maximian, then the empress depicted was his wife Eutropia; if its owner was Maxentius, then the mosaic pictured his wife, Maximilla.²⁵ Since the domina's dress is exactly like Projecta's, an empress' dress at this time would have been identical to that worn by other high born women.

The earliest surviving works of art depicting tetrarchic rulers' wives are a medallion portrait of Diocletian's wife Prisca, which was part of a frieze in his Mausoleum at Split (300-306),²⁶ and gold aurei and billon nummi of Diocletian's daughter, Galeria Valeria, who was married to Galerius in 292 or 293 when he became Diocletian's caesar (pls. 12-13). The frieze, which also contains a medallion portrait of Diocletian (pl. 14), survived because, when the emperor's mausoleum was converted into a church in the early Middle Ages, it was located high up in the dome. The coins showing Galeria Valeria's portrait exist in several slightly different versions depending upon the mint. All of the coins were struck in 307 or 308 when she was made an Augusta.

25. The identity of the owner is discussed near the beginning of the earlier section on the emperor dressed in the chlamys: ODB, 1991, 1321; ODB, 1991, 1321 or Vagi, 1999, 447.

26. For a picture of the frieze and detailed information on the mausoleum see Mackie, 2003, 54.

In the frieze Prisca's portrait shares several stylistic features with those of her husband. She is shown with her hair arranged in the crown tress. Although the portrait's lower part is abraded, the empress, like Diocletian, is clad in a tunic with a mantle thrown over her shoulders. Both are depicted with similarly shaped oval faces, square jaws, and the slightly down-turned mouth, which appears in all of Diocletian's portraits and is the feature which most distinguishes his portraits from those of other tetrarchs. Prisca's remains were never placed in the mausoleum alongside her husband's. Shortly after Diocletian's death in 315, Licinius ordered the execution of Prisca and her daughter; he also had their bodies thrown into the sea.²⁷

The practice of depicting an empress with her husband's features or in dynastic groups with those of other family members, a stylistic technique known as assimilation,²⁸ is found as early as the empress Livia. For example, in the Grand Cameo de France, Livia's portrait with its elongated neck and pointed nose no longer resembles that of her deceased husband but instead that of her son, Tiberius, who is seated on the throne immediately beside her (pl. 1). But in a small sardonyx cameo in Vienna, Livia is shown holding a bust of Augustus and depicted with the attributes of Cybele or as a priestess of the cult of her deified husband (pl. 15).²⁹ Her more mature features and sharply pointed nose in this second cameo are assimilated to those of her deceased husband. The process of assimilation during this time period with one exception never included dress. Livia, however, was occasionally, as on the Grand Cameo, depicted wearing a laurel wreath, a traditional male attribute.³⁰ The technique of assimilation implied that the emperor's wife was closely connected with him not only through the bond of marriage but also through their unity of purpose. Such an implied unity strengthened the ruler's reign. Since Livia was the matriarch of an entire dynasty, art showing her descendants possessing her features or similar ones strengthened the rule of all later members of the Julio-Claudian line. But with the exception of the laurel wreath, Livia's dress was not assimilated to her husband's or Tiberius's.

27. Shortly before the execution of the two women, Licinius also ordered the execution of Diocletian's adopted son, Candidianus, whose mother had been his concubine: Vagi, 1999, 434.

28. Wood, 2000, 95.

29. For a more detailed analysis of these gems: Barrett, 2002, 161.

30. For a detailed analysis of Livia and the laurel wreath: Flory, 1995, 43-68.

All of Galeria Valeria's gold and billon coins were issued during the troubled times between Severus II's death in 307 and the conference of Carnuntum in 308.³¹ When Severus II's death left vacant the office of junior augustus to Galerius, the emperor first tried to convince Diocletian to resume his old office and he did agree to serve as consul in 308.³² Since Diocletian had originally promoted Galerius to the rank of caesar, Galerius probably hoped that his return would end the current political turmoil as well as increase his own prestige. Galerius' plan to promote his wife Valeria Galeria, Diocletian's daughter, to the rank of augusta was also probably designed not only to please Diocletian but also to increase Galerius' own influence.³³ When Diocletian refused the post, Galerius then favoured giving the office to his friend Licinius instead of to his present caesar Maximinus Daza. Daza naturally opposed Galerius' proposal and supported his own candidacy. Eventually Galerius' wishes prevailed. Galeria Valeria was promoted to the rank of augusta; Licinius was confirmed as his junior augustus on December 26, 308. Only two years later Galerius, however, fell gravely ill and died.³⁴

31. The only study of Galeria Valeria's coinage: Bruun, 1979, 255.

32. Vagi, 1999, 421; Brunn, 1979, 274.

33. Bruun, 1979, 274-275.

34. Bruun, 1970, 278.

The portraits of Diocletian's daughter, Galeria Valeria, as depicted on her gold aurei and billon nummi, differ slightly depending upon the mint. The most important difference between the various types is the empress' headgear. She is shown on all her coins' obverses as a profile bust wearing her hair in the crown tress but with two types of hair adornments. The first is the stephanos, a form worn by goddesses (pl. 13); the second is a type of diadem decorated with pearls but without ties, which is also the headgear on coins minted for Helena and Fausta when they became augustae in 324 (pl. 16).³⁵ On Galeria Valeria's coins, this type of hair adornment may be shown because it imitated the diadem which Galerius wears on some of his earlier coins (pl. 17). On Helena's and Fausta's coins Kenneth Holum argues that the diadem without ties was not an insignia of rank but ornamental.³⁶ This probably explains why both types of hair adornment were used interchangeably on Galeria Valeria's coins. The mint of Serdica even produced gold aurei which depict both types.

35. In his detailed analysis of Galeria Valeria's coinage, Bruun mentions a third group of coins, which depict the empress wearing a laurel crown and stephanos: Bruun, 1979, 261.

36. Holum, 1982, 33-34, note 100.

37. For an example of this type of coin see Vagi, 1999, v. II, 500, 2799.

38. According to Kleiner Sol was especially associated with the tetrarchic rulers Galerius and Constantius Chlorus: Kleiner, 1992, 417.

Of the several eastern mints striking coins for Galeria Valeria, the early coins of Siscia and Serdica, the mints closest to Galerius' military encampment, and therefore probably most under his control, depict the empress' bust resting on a crescent moon. At this time this symbol was associated with the goddess Luna-Selene, the female counterpart of Sol Invictus. Galerius had previously struck coins in that god's name.³⁷ According to tetrarchic ideology, Sol Invictus was one of the gods who personally guarded the emperor.³⁸ The depiction of the crescent moon under Galeria Valeria's bust suggests that, as a result of her new rank the empress had become not just an augusta, but a form of female tetrarchic ruler who was under Luna-Selene's protection. The crescent moon is depicted in slightly different ways at each of the two mints. Coins from Serdica show her bust resting on the crescent; but those minted at Siscia show the crescent projecting from her shoulders (pls. 18-19).³⁹

The reverses of all Galeria Valeria's coins depict Venus holding a golden apple. Since after 18 years of marriage, Galeria Valeria had not produced any offspring, the reverses of her coins could not refer to her ability to produce male offspring, like those of Fausta and Helena.⁴⁰ The depiction of Venus on her coins refers instead to her ability to retain Galerius' affection through her beauty and personal charms. The fact that she is shown holding a golden apple is a reference to the beauty contest in which Venus was selected by Paris as the most beautiful goddess. The winner of the contest received the prize of a golden apple. Like the symbol of the crescent moon, the empress' stephanos, traditionally the headgear of a goddess, and the image of Venus on her reverses confer some additional divine status on the empress in her newly appointed office of augusta.⁴¹

A final noteworthy difference between gold aurei minted at Siscia and Serdica is the fact that examples produced at Serdica invariably show the empress' portrait as assimilated to that of her husband, while those produced at Siscia depict what may be a more lifelike portrait. On Serdica's gold aurei the profile bust of the empress is shown with the same short muscular neck, square jaw and small pointed nose found in Galerius' portrait busts and on his coins. This portrait perhaps implied that as a result of her newly invested powers her rank was similar to Galerius'.

On gold aurei minted at Siscia, the empress has a narrow, elongated neck, thin face with high cheekbones, and a long nose. This portrait perhaps more accurately represents her appearance.

Even though the diadem depicted on Galeria Valeria's coins is probably not a symbol of rank, the fact that both she and her husband

39. Bruun, 1979, 261.

40. Unlike the inscriptions on Helena's and Fausta's coins, which refer indirectly to their ability to produce male offspring, the inscription on Galeria Valeria's coins, *VENERI VICTRICE*, is simply a formulaic invocation.

41. Bruun, 1979, 267, 8.

wear slightly different versions of the same headgear demonstrates what later becomes a general rule: changes in the empress' costume drew their inspiration from the emperor's dress. Throughout the next several reigns the empress' costume starts to approximate her husband's. By Theodosios' reign, it largely duplicated the emperor's even in the smallest details. This process might simply be viewed as a new form of assimilation. But perhaps instead it implied that by the fifth century the empress was so identified with her husband that her office was inseparable from his.

By any standard, the next augusta, the Empress Helena, was a remarkable woman. She was not just the wife or more likely the concubine of a tetrarch, but also the mother of the first Christian emperor, the first augusta to go on a pilgrimage and after her death the first to be made a saint. As a result of her popularity during her lifetime, her numerous benefactions and long life, several large monuments and small objects are believed to date to her lifetime and to depict Helena's portrait. The greatest problem facing art historians attempting to evaluate these works is separating contemporary likenesses from those produced after her death. Possible large monuments depicting Helena's portrait include female portraits in a ceiling fresco at Trier, a possible depiction of members of the Constantinian family in a floor mosaic at the cathedral of Aquileia, and at least twenty statues. Among smaller objects several cameos including the Ada cameo, the portrait bust on her reconstructed sarcophagus in the Vatican, and gold inlays in the form of busts on an elaborate necklace are all thought to be contemporary with Helena's lifetime and to depict her portrait. Besides her coins, out of all of these works only one portrait on a small cameo is labeled with her name.⁴² After considering all the available candidates, Drijvers, for example, believes that only two cameos, the Ada cameo in the Stadtbibliothek in Trier and the small cameo labeled with her name, and two statues, one in the Museo Capitolino and a bust in the Palazzo Governatorato, are contemporary likenesses of Helena.⁴³

The fact that very little biographical information about Helena's life exists encouraged the proliferation of legends especially about her early life and the association of places and objects with her name. Although as Constantine Chlorus' concubine, Helena probably lived in his capitol, Trier, the first document to associate her name with that city is the Vita Helenae by Altmann of Hautvillers, which is dated to the 850s.⁴⁴ This work claimed that Helena was born to an aristocratic family of Trier and that late in her life she donated her palace to provide lands to build the cathedral of Trier.⁴⁵

42. Delbruck, 1933, pl. 75, 5.

43. Drijvers, 1992, 194.

44. Drijvers, 1992, 22.

45. Drijvers, 1992, 22.

Although Altmann's Vita and other legends about Helena's early life in Trier were considered to have no basis in fact, excavations undertaken by Th. K. Kempf in 1934 beneath the earliest parts of the cathedral uncovered the remains of a large room measuring approximately 7 m. by 10 m., which dated to the first quarter of the fourth century.⁴⁶ During the excavations the remains of a coffered ceiling decorated with a fresco, which pictured the portraits of four women, putti and philosophers, were found (fig. 20). A new coin depicting Sol Invictus, which was minted at Trier in 315, was embedded in the mortar of the floor of the room.⁴⁷ A further group of coins all dated to 325/326 was found in the floor of early parts of the church, which were built directly above the room.⁴⁸ Therefore the fresco must have been made between 315 and 325/326. The fact that much of the fresco was coloured purple and the portraits of the four women were nimbed, wore crowns, and other costly clothing led some early scholars to identify them as members of the house of Constantine.⁴⁹ Others, however, identified the women as personifications of virtues. Since empresses were often depicted with the attributes of Roman goddesses,⁵⁰ the frescoes might depict both these possibilities. Although there are no records indicating that Helena lived in Trier, it was known that Crispus, Constantine's eldest son, who was executed for some unknown reason in 326, lived in Trier from 316 onward.⁵¹ Since the dates of the building matched Crispus' lifetime, it was thought that this room was part of his palace. After his death, as part of a damnatio memoriae, the house was then demolished and the church built above his former quarters perhaps as a form of atonement. Drijvers speculated that the Helena associated in local legends with the demolished building was, not Constantine's mother, but Crispus' young wife, who was also named Helena.⁵²

It took over a decade during the 1950s and 1960s to reconstruct the various parts of the fresco;⁵³ as the reconstruction progressed, the four women were initially identified as the two augustae Helena and Fausta, Crispus' wife Helena and Constantine's sister Constantia.⁵⁴ The entire

46. The primary publications on the frescos are Drijvers, 1992, 24-28; Lavin, 1966, 99-113 and Rose, 2006, 92-109. There is an illustration of the reconstructed fresco in Rose, 2006, fig. 1.

47. Drijvers, 1992, 24.

48. Drijvers, 1992, 24.

49. Drijvers, 1992, 26-27; Lavin, 1966, 99; Rose, 2006, 94-96.

50. Lavin, 1966, 101.

51. Drijvers, 1992, 25.

52. Rose, 2006, 92.

53. Drijvers, 1992, 26-27; Lavin, 1996, 100-101.

54. Rose, 2006, 99.

55. Rose, 2006, 92.

56. A. Alföldi, "Zur Erklärung der konstantinischen Deckengemälde in Trier," Historia 4 (1955), 131 ff.

57. M. Alföldi, "Helena nobilissima femina. Zur Deutung der Trierer Deckengemälde," Jahrbuch für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte 16 (1960), 79 ff.

restoration was completed in 1980 and is now displayed at the Episcopal Museum of Trier.⁵⁵ Andreas Alföldi interpreted the figure in the central panel, which showed a woman wearing a crown with blue gems and holding a silver kantharos, as a portrait of the empress Helena.⁵⁶ Although part of the face is missing, the woman is nimbed, wears a veil held in place by a small disk-shaped crown, a long-sleeved tunic, and a cloak which is thrown over her shoulder. She also wears jewelry consisting of a bracelet, necklace and added hair adornment in the form of a strand of pearls. Maria Alföldi instead identified a woman holding a jewelry box in another panel as Helena; this figure is similarly dressed except that in addition she wears a leafy crown and as a display of her wealth she withdraws a string of pearls from the box.⁵⁷

58. Lavin, 1966, 100-101.

In his article on the fresco, Irving Lavin pointed out that it was impossible to identify even one of the four women or to prove that any were members of Constantine's family.⁵⁸ None of the women wear such insignia of office associated with an empress as the crown tress hairstyle or a diadem. Lavin makes the point that there are not even any other existing examples of empresses being depicted in such informal poses in a large public room, which probably was used as an audience hall or for dining. It is also more likely that an empress' portrait would be associated with a portrait of her husband or at least identified by a label.⁵⁹ Nor do the figures even have attributes which can be associated with specific personifications or goddesses.⁶⁰ Instead Lavin concluded that the women were simply generalized figures used to demonstrate the owner's wealth and create feelings of well-being and happiness; their crowns, haloes, expensive clothing, and the luxury goods which some displayed, were all evidence he used to support this thesis.⁶¹

59. Lavin, 1966, 101.

60. Lavin, 1966, 101.

61. Lavin, 1966, 102.

62. Rose, 2006, 101.

63. Rose, 2006, 105-106.

64. Rose, 2006, 106.

In a second more recent article Marice Rose interprets the scenes on the fresco as also expressing the owner's identity and high social status.⁶² But he further believed that since the fresco showed three philosophers, it was also designed to demonstrate the owner's education and promote learned conversation. Throughout the Roman empire sons of the elite were taught a shared body of knowledge called paideia.⁶³ The small objects in a room, including its silver or statuary as well as its floor mosaics, wall paintings, and ceiling frescoes could all be decorated with scenes that displayed this type of learning and therefore suggested topics for learned conversation. Since only the educated elite could identify and discuss the sometimes obscure literary or mythological references depicted, this type of decoration identified them as members of the elite.⁶⁴ Rose noted that just as the female portraits cannot be associated with individuals or their attributes with specific goddesses, so none of the three philosophers can be associated with any individual. Like the women's portraits, they evoke general types.⁶⁵ All the figures' clothing and the objects which the women hold, he claims, would, however, have promoted learned conversation.⁶⁶ But, as Irving Lavin believed, the figures probably have no additional meaning except to imply the wealth and social status of the house's owner and create a mood of happiness and well-being; such generalized figures and their expensive dress would have simply been decorative. Although early empresses were sometimes associated with goddesses, even in Constantine's life time, their portraits would have either been labeled or identified by such insignia of rule as a diadem.

65. Rose, 2006, 107.

66. Rose, 2006, 107.

67. The only work to identify the portraits as Constantine's family: Kahler, 1962. Grigg, 1977, note 34. Noga-Banai argues that the mosaics are portraits of Constantine and his family because they were originally part of the palace he built in 325; but the dedicatory inscription incorporated into the original mosaic mentions a date of 314: Noga-Banai, 2009, 112-113.

68. Dunbabin, 1999, 71.

An even less convincing case can be made for identifying portraits in an early floor mosaic at the cathedral of Aquileia in northern Italy as the emperor Constantine and other family members including his mother Helena (fig. 21). This fourth-century floor mosaic, which once belonged to the double-nave church built by Archbishop Theodore in about 314 at Aquileia, was discovered lying beneath a few feet of debris.⁶⁷ Mosaics belonging to both sides of the double nave have been preserved. These are divided into sections filled with several different designs which were also used in the secular buildings of the region at this time.⁶⁸ Unlike the compartments in the northern hall, a few of the compartments in the southern hall have biblical allusions. These include Jonah being swallowed by the whale, the Good Shepherd, and an early symbol for the eucharist. This same mosaic also contains what appears to be a series of busts which were probably portraits of the church's donors.⁶⁹

One scholar, Heinz Kahler, identified the figures as members of the Constantinian family including Helena.⁷⁰ Unlike the dress of the women in the ceiling fresco at Trier, the figure which he believed was Helena is very simply dressed. She wears a dalmatic tunic, identified by its two broad frontal strips, and a palla which is pulled over the back of the woman's head. Further, the figure's hair is not arranged in a crown tress nor does she wear a diadem or for that matter any jewelry. Constantine did live in Aquileia and built a lavish palace there.⁷¹ Although there are no historical records indicating that he made donations to finance building the cathedral,⁷² he might still have done so. In a review of Kahler's book, Andre Grabar made several criticisms of his thesis and no other later scholar has agreed with Kahler.⁷³ For example, Grabar did not think that the imperial family would have their portraits placed on a floor, where they would be walked on, and none of the figures are identified by a label, have imperial attributes, or even a family resemblance. Further, since Crispus and Fausta were executed and their portraits were disfigured elsewhere as part of a general damnatio memoriae, each of their supposed portraits in the mosaic should have been disfigured as well but were not. Rather than belonging to Constantine's family, the portraits are probably those of the donors.

69. Dunbabin, 1999, 71; Grigg, 1977, 7-8.

70. Kahler, 1962, figs. 1-7.

71. ODB, 1991, 145.

72. Grigg, 1977, 8.

73. Grigg, 1977, note 41.

Of the over twenty statues which have been identified as contemporary likenesses of Helena, Drijvers believes that only two, the seated figure of an empress in the Museo Capitolino in Rome and a bust in the Palazzo Governatorato, whose features closely resemble those of the statue, are contemporary likenesses of Helena.⁷⁴ Eric Varner believes a second seated statue in the Uffizi Gallery in Florence is also a contemporary likeness.⁷⁵ Both seated works have been identified as Helena's portrait and dated to 326, the year Constantine celebrated his vicennalia in Rome and shortly after he had made his mother an augusta in 324.⁷⁶ The statues are dated on the basis of their hairstyles, which match the empress' hairstyle as depicted on coins and medallions produced during this time period.⁷⁷ Several inscriptions were also found in the south-eastern part of Rome, a part of the city where Helena is known to have lived.⁷⁸ Though these inscriptions belonged to statue bases bearing her name, none have been found with an accompanying statue.

74. In a note Drijvers lists a few of the statues which critics believe are contemporary likenesses of Helena: Drijvers, 190, 7; 199.

75. There are several differences between the two statues. Although the scalp of the Uffizi statue also has deep carvings, these were probably to attach a hair adornment. Unlike the statue in the Capitoline Museum, this second statue' hair falls down its back and it wears a gap-sleeve tunic. These characteristics point to an empress reigning during the first or second centuries.

76. Drijvers, 1992, 190.

77. Drijvers, 1992, 45-52.

78. Drijvers, 1992, 45.

79. There is only one article on the seated statue: Arata, 1993, 185-200. The statue is depicted in Varner, 2004, figs. 105a-b.

The seated statue of Helena in the Capitoline Museum, once identified as Agrippina the Younger, Nero's mother, shows the empress seated on a high backed chair (pl. 22).⁷⁹ Her left arm rests lightly on the back of the chair and the right lies in her lap with her legs crossed. The statue probably once had painted sandals but is now bare-footed. Indentations which are visible on the sides of the statue's face and deep-cuttings in the scalp indicate that the head was probably once adorned with additional headgear (pl. 23). The deep ridges in the statue's scalp have led Varner to conclude that it once originally depicted Lucilla, Commodus' sister, who was exiled for conspiring to assassinate him in 180. After her condemnation in 182, her statues, Varner believes, were warehoused only to re-emerge over a century later and be re-used, presumably with Constantine's consent, as the statue of his mother.⁸⁰ The deep grooves in the scalp resulted when the statue's original hairstyle was re-cut to resemble Helena's hairstyle. But these ridges may have simply been carved to accommodate a hair-piece and *stephanos*. In his article on the statue, Arata has reconstructed the work with a more elaborate coiffure and hair adornment (pl. 23).⁸¹ Such a reconstruction might also explain Diane Kleiner's belief that the body and head, which she felt was slightly too small for the body, were mismatched.⁸² The head would appear larger with the addition of a hair-piece and *stephanos*.

80. Varner, 2001, 76; Varner, 2004, 150-151.

81. Arata, 1993, figs. 1-3.

82. Kleiner, 1992, 442.

83. Florey, 1993, 291.

The face of the statue is smooth with a broad forehead, high cheek bones and delicately modeled features. The nose is long and narrow, the lips slightly pursed, and the statue's eyebrows gently arched. Instead, however, of wearing contemporary Roman dress, the empress is clothed in a himation and high belted, Doric chiton, the garb of a Greek goddess. Although the statue does not have any attributes, it may belong to a long tradition of seated statues of Roman women modeled on a single Greek original of Aphrodite.⁸³ According to both Plutarch and Pliny the Elder these statues were derived from a single Hellenistic marble original of the goddess by the sculpture Phidias, which was located in Rome.⁸⁴

Although few statues of Roman women were produced before the end of the Republic, one of the earliest was a seated bronze statue of Cornelia, the mother of the Gracchi, which was voted for by the people in about 100 BC and erected in the porticus of Metellus.⁸⁵ The statue's original inscription simply identified the figure as the mother of the Gracchi. This same work was later expropriated by Augustus in about AD 33 to serve his own propagandistic programme of promoting the Roman family and family values, given a new inscription praising Cornelia as an ideal mother, and then re-located in the recently built porticus of Octavia.⁸⁶

In his Natural History, Pliny the Elder mentions that he first saw the statue of Cornelia, which he identified by its seated posture and distinctive rustic sandals, in the Porticus of Metellus and then later in the near-by Porticus of Octavia.⁸⁷ Although no other statues are mentioned, it may have been one of a group honoring Roman mothers arranged in the porticus, which Augustus built in honor of his sister, Octavia, whom at that time the emperor was promoting as an ideal mother.⁸⁸ Unfortunately the porticus was seriously damaged by two fires, the first in 80 and the second in 191⁸⁹ and there are no further records of Cornelia's statue except the work's damaged statue base, which is now located in the Capitoline Museum.⁹⁰ Thus besides being related to Venus, the foundress of the Julio-Claudian line, there was a tradition in Rome which associated seated statues with ideal mothers like Cornelia. Since Helena probably came from the lower classes but produced an ideal son in the Emperor Constantine, the seated statue seems an appropriate type for the augusta.

84. Florey, 1993, note 8; also see Florey, 1993, note 11 and Dixon, 2007, 62.

85. Florey, 1993, 292; Dixon, 2006, 56.

86. Dixon, 2006, 57.

87. Dixon, 2006, 56.

88. Dixon, 1993, 292.

89. Dixon, 2006, 62.

90. Dixon, 2006, 62.

Among the inscriptions listed in Drijvers, which mention Helena's name, three found in Rome are dated to Constantine's vicennalia.⁹¹ All three inscriptions were also originally affixed to the bases of statues dedicated to her; they praise Helena either for being the GENETRICI or PROCREATRICI D N CONSTANTINI MAXIMI; that is for being Constantine's mother.⁹² As such, to Roman viewers during the vicennalia, because of her humble origins and the fact that she was the emperor's mother, Helena provided a link between the public and domestic spheres.

The statue's recumbent posture and Greek dress have several implications. They connect Helena's statue with the earlier marble one of Aphrodite by Phidias and also the bronze statue of Cornelia, the exemplary mother of the Gracchi.⁹³ Because Aphrodite was Aeneas' mother, ancestress of the gens Iulii and founder of the Roman race, she was especially venerated in Rome, the city Helena is most associated with. This connection further implied that Helena belonged to a select group of earlier empresses, including Livia, Faustina the Younger and Julia Domina, who produced sons and founded dynasties. But whereas the statue's Greek dress and stephanos in particular connect the empress with Aphrodite, the ancestress of the Roman race, and with all past empresses who founded dynasties, its posture connects her with Cornelia, the exemplary mother of the Gracchi, and through her with the Roman family and the public sphere. At the time of the vicennalia, the statue's Greek dress in particular probably suggested Constantine's dynastic hopes.

91. Drijvers, 1992, 49.

92. For a summary of all the inscriptions see Drijvers, 1992, 45-52.

93. Dixon, 2007, 62; Florey, 1993, 291; Varner, 2001, 76.

The first and most important of the two cameos which Drijvers believed were contemporary with Helena's lifetime is the Ada cameo (pl. 24).⁹⁴ The large cameo gets its name from the fact that it forms the centrepiece of a lavish fifteenth-century book cover which is part of the binding of an eighth- or ninth-century Carolingian manuscript called the *Ada Gospels* (Trier, Stadtbibliothek, Codex 22).⁹⁵ This vellum manuscript receives its name from a poem found in the work which indicates it was dedicated to an Ada, traditionally identified as Charlemagne's sister.⁹⁶ Although the cameo has been dated by different scholars from as early as the reign of Claudius to as late as the reign of Theodosios I, it is now generally believed to have been produced during Constantine's reign and to be a dynastic portrait of the emperor and four family members.⁹⁷ These have been identified from left to right as Helena, Constantine, Constantine II, Fausta and Crispus. Since the cameo depicts only two of Constantine's four sons and the second and third were born between August of 316 and August of 317, it best fits the narrow time period after Constantine II's birth at Arles in August of 316 to before Constantinos II's birth in Illyria in August of 317.⁹⁸

94. No publication is devoted exclusively to the cameo. A detailed summary of past analyses is found in Pohlsander, 1984, 93-95. A reproduction of the cameo is in Pohlsander, 1984, 111.9.

95. Drijvers, 1992, 191.

96. The identification is probably incorrect. Charlemagne's only sister was named Gisela: Beckwith, 1969, 381.

97. Elsner, 2006, 269.

98. Until recently it was believed that Constantine's second son might be by a concubine; scholars now generally believe that his mother was Fausta. Constantine's second and third sons were born in the same month a year apart: Vagi, 1999, I. 480; Stephenson, 2009, 126.

This time period was an important one for Constantine for several reasons. Besides celebrating the birth of two of his four sons, the emperor defeated his only remaining tetrarchic rival, Licinius, in several battles including the decisive Battle of Campus Ardiensis in late 316.⁹⁹ After this victory the two Augusti held a peace conference at Serdica. By early March of 317 they had negotiated that Constantine's two sons, Crispus and Constantine II, only ten and just over a year old, with Licinius' son, Licinius II, be elected Caesars.¹⁰⁰ This was also the month in which Constantine's father had first been made a caesar.¹⁰¹ They also agreed that Crispus would share the consulship with Licinius and Licinius II would share the office with Constantine.¹⁰² From this date Constantine resided in Serdica and became the uncontested senior Augustus.

The iconography of the large sardynx cameo fits well into this narrow time frame. It depicts the five family members facing frontally, probably seated in a box at a hippodrome, perhaps at Trier. They are protected by two eagles, symbols of Zeus, patron god of the senior augustus, whose outspread wings protectively surround the five-figure group. The work was probably commissioned to commemorate Constantine's two sons' election to the office of Caesar.¹⁰³ Unlike the emperors on the Theodosian obelisk base, whose unity is implied by their similar sizes, unity in the Ada cameo is suggested by the figures' similar outlines. Fausta's features and dress are so assimilated to her husband's, perhaps to suggest the couple's unity of purpose, that at first glance she appears to be a male. The only exception is Helena, whose outline differs because she wears her mantle pulled over her head perhaps simply to suggest her age or the fact she is attending a ceremony outdoors.

99. Lenski, 2006, 74.

100. Lenski, 2006, 74.

101. Pohlsander, 1984, 86.

102. Pohlsander, 1984, 86.

103. In his recent biography of Constantine, Stephenson agrees on the date of 317 but believes that it commemorated Constantine II's birth. Since in dynastic affairs the sons' joint elevation to the rank of caesar was more important than a single one's birth, it probably represents their joint elevation: Stephenson, 2009, 126-127.

Beginning with the tetrarchs, emperors claimed that they were semi-divine rulers appointed by the most powerful deities. On the earlier Arch of Constantine in such scenes as the largitio relief the emperor's semi-divine status was implied by his central placement and isolation. There Constantine is depicted facing frontally and looking aloofly off into space. But on the cameo the emperor, no longer alone, is depicted as part of a five-figure group, whose members are treated, not as individuals, but rather as a block acting together, as a new form of collective leadership. The figures' similar outlines also imply the sharing of power that occurred between Constantine and his sons when they became his caesars. On the cameo Helena's placement at the end on the left in a position of importance with her palla drawn over her head emphasizes not just that she is the older female, but perhaps also that she, like Livia and several other early augusta, may be the foundress of a new dynasty.¹⁰⁴

104. Draping the palla over the head outdoors also implied the woman's modesty and that she probably was a Roman citizen. For a fuller discussion see the paragraph on "the palla" in the introduction to this section.

105. The most recent publications on the necklace are by Bruhn, 1993, 16-24; Deppert-Lippitz, 1996, 30-71; and Boyd, 2005, 141-166. The entire necklace is pictured in Deppert-Lippitz, 1996, fig. 22. For pictures of the five pendants with enlargements of the tondo heads see Boyd, 1996, 58.

106. Deppert-Lippitz, 1996, 58.

107. McClanan, 2002, 17.

The final item associated with the empress Helena is a magnificent gold pectoral composed of five coin-set pendants placed in medallions (pls. 25-29).¹⁰⁵ The necklace has been called the “largest and most splendid coin pendant from antiquity”.¹⁰⁶ Critics have associated this lavish piece of jewelry with Helena in two ways: they have speculated that the necklace may have belonged to her¹⁰⁷ and also that at least one of the 32 tondo heads, which decorate the work, may be her portrait.¹⁰⁸ Whereas most coin-set necklaces made with heirloom gold coins contain examples from several reigns, at the centre of each of the five medallions is the same type of double sized consular nomisma depicting Constantine wearing a rayed crown and military garb on the obverse and his two eldest sons Crispus and Constantine II in consular dress on the reverse.¹⁰⁹

108. Deppert-Lippitz, 1996, 38.

109. Deppert-Lippitz, 1996, 42;

110. Deppert-Lippitz and Boyd erroneously state that Crispus and Constantine II shared three joint consulships. Crispus was consul three times but he shared his first consulship with Licinius: Deppert-Lippitz, 1996, 58; Boyd, 2005, 147. For the correct information: Pohlsander, 1984, 86.

111. Deppert-Lippitz, 1996, 87.

112. These three shapes are the only ones used in coin-set jewelry: Yeroulanou, 1999, 31.

These commemorative nomismata were minted on the occasion of one of the caesars' two joint consulships either at Sirmium in AD 321 or 324 or in Nikomedia in AD 324.¹¹⁰ Since Crispus was condemned in 326 and his execution was followed by a general *damnatio memoriae*, the necklace probably was completed within this narrow time frame.¹¹¹ Each coin forms the centre of a large interlace gold frame surrounded by small tondo busts. All the heads are evenly spaced and direct their gazes inwardly toward Constantine's portrait at the centre. Although very small, all are carefully modeled and several can be identified as pagan gods by their attributes. Two of the four smaller pendants are hexagonal in shape and the two remaining are circular; all four of the smaller pendants have six tondo heads. A fifth, which once formed the pectoral's center-piece, is octagonal in shape with eight heads.¹¹² Although the provenance of the necklace is unknown, the four smaller pendants together with a bracelet and necklace elements and thirteen gold nomismata, all of which probably belonged to the same hoard, were sold by Christie's in London on October 19, 1970.¹¹³ Two of the pendants, a circular and hexagonal one, the bracelet and necklace elements were purchased by Dumbarton Oaks in Washington D. C. The remaining hexagonal pendant belongs to the British Museum in London and the remaining circular one was purchased by the Louvre Museum in Paris. The octagonal pendant, which was purchased by the Cleveland Art Museum, and three other objects from the same hoard did not appear on the art market until 1994.¹¹⁴

Because of the necklace's artistry, its costliness, and the fact that double gold nomismata of Constantine and two of his sons form the centre-pieces of each pendant, the work has often been associated with members of Constantine's family and especially with the augusta Helena. Art historians like Anne McClanan have speculated that the piece of jewelry once belonged to the empress.¹¹⁵ Others like Barbara Deppert-Lippitz, who have tried to identify each of the tondo heads, have suggested that Helena's portrait might be included among the group.¹¹⁶ The two greatest challenges facing contemporary art historians are attempting to determine the pendant necklace's date and identifying each of the tondo heads and the relation of the figures.

113. Christies, 1970, 61-66.

114. Deppert-Lippitz, 1996, 32; Boyd, 2005, 141-142.

115. McClanan, 2002, 17.

116. Deppert-Lippitz, 1996, 38.

117. In her recent exhaustive study of the necklace, Yaroulanou dates the necklace to the sons' joint reign: Yaroulanou, 1999, 34.

Recent art historians like Jutta-Annette Bruhn, Barbara Deppert-Lippitz and Aimilia Yeroulanou have assumed that the necklace was made during Constantine's reign at about the time of his sons' second joint consulship in 324.¹¹⁷ All three arrive at this conclusion after a careful study of the types of interlace forming the background of the medallions. During Constantine's reign there was an attempt to revive earlier Hellenistic models; one result of this revival was that jewelry mounts increased in size.¹¹⁸ Such lavish mounts probably contributed to the emperor's prestige. During Constantine's reign commemorative nomismata were often given as gifts to high ranking court officials.¹¹⁹ Because of the necklace's size and weight it probably belonged, not to Helena, but to a man.¹²⁰ Since heirloom necklaces usually contain the coins of several rulers, the fact that all the nomismata in the necklace commemorate the same event emphasizes the importance of the sons' joint consulships to the necklace's owner and his loyalty to Constantine and his family.¹²¹

118. Yeroulanou, 1999, 34.

119. Deppert-Lippitz, 1996, 42; Boyd, 2005, 152.

120. Deppert-Lippitz, 1996, 56; Boyd, 2005, 152.

121. Deppert-Lippitz, 1996, 58.

122. Boyd, 2005, 147-152.

123. For pictures of the thirteen nomismata: Christie, 1970, 61-63; For the dates of the gold coins: Boyd, 2006, 143.

124. Boyd, 2005, 148.

125. Leader, 2003, 104.

Recently, in an addendum to the second edition of the *Dumbarton Oaks Catalogue* (v. 2), Susan A. Boyd and Stephen R. Zwirn have argued in favour of a date of composition for the necklace during the reign of Theodosios I (379-395) based mainly on their analysis of the style of the tondo heads.¹²² The thirteen gold nomismata found with the necklace include coins from Constantine's reign to that of Arcadius (324-388).¹²³ In their addendum, the art historians compare the style of the tondo heads to those of relief figures on the silver reliquary of San Nazaro Maggiore in Milan (pl. 30).¹²⁴ Although the actual date of the reliquary is unknown, it is generally dated to the foundation of the basilica by St. Ambrose in 382; it may once have held relics of the apostles Peter and Paul.¹²⁵ The reliquary, however, is not mentioned in early church records and one early art historian, C. R. Morey, has even dated it, not to the Theodosian period, but as late as to the fifteenth-century Renaissance.¹²⁶

It is difficult to see a resemblance between the elongated figures of the reliquary with their expressionless faces and the carefully modeled, animated ones of the tondo heads. Indeed a much better comparison would be between the biblical figures on the reliquary and those found on other contemporary sarcophagus-shaped caskets such as the one from Nea Herakleia or even the figural decorations of fourth-century sarcophagi and of the catacombs.¹²⁷ On the necklace the tondo heads with their almost jubilant expressions may even express the feelings of individuals loyal to the court at the time of the joint consulships. The tondo heads may serve as surrogates for contemporaries and especially the pectoral's owner. Although the reliquary is the principal work which the two critics offer in support of their arguments, they also mention that the guards' heads on the *Missorium* of Theodosios, dated to about the same period (388), are somewhat elongated and that they direct their gazes inwardly.¹²⁸ But unlike the necklace, where the tondo heads' gazes are directed toward Constantine's portrait at the centre, on the *Missorium* the guards' gazes are directed toward Theodosios and the magistrate as the emperor awards him the codicil.

126. Morey, 1919, 112-120.

127. Noga-Banai, 2008, 37-38.

128. Boyd, 2005, 148.

Interpreting the overall meaning of the tondo heads is an even more daunting task than establishing the date of the necklace. Based on their accompanying attributes several of the 32 tondo heads can be interpreted as mythological figures. These include Attis, Cybele, Dionysis, Ariade, Athena and Alexander the Great.¹²⁹ Based on their hairstyles and headgear, others have been interpreted as female and male members of Constantine's court.¹³⁰ Since most of the necklace has been preserved, the entire work can be accurately reconstructed (Introduction, pl. 3). A head interpreted as that of a Constantinian prince and several heads of mythological figures are repeated on different medallions. Both Jutta-Annette Bruhn and Barbara Deppert-Lippitz believe that the series of tondo heads once related a well-known story to contemporary viewers.¹³¹ Therefore the necklace, like the ceiling fresco in Trier, represented a form of paideia. No art historian, however, has been able to discover a contemporary story which once included such a diverse group of figures as Cybele, Dionysis, Alexander the Great and members of Constantine's court. Because several medallions are either hexagonal or octagonal and include six-pointed and eight-pointed stars in their lattice work, an astrological meaning has also been suggested.¹³² The figures have also been interpreted as an eclectic mythological group or even, as in the ceiling fresco in Trier, as simply decorative.

129. Brunn, 1993, 20-23; Deppert-Lippitz, 1996, 38-39.

130. Bruhn, 1993, 19; Deppert-Lippitz, 1996, 38.

131. Bruhn, 1993, 20-21; Deppert-Lippitz, 1996, 38.

132. Bruhn, 1993, 22-24.

Although no art historian openly identifies any of the heads as a specific member of Constantine's court, Barbara Deppert-Lippitz notes that portrait number 6 on the central octagonal medallion, which is owned by the Cleveland Art Museum, has a crown tress hairstyle similar to that shown on Helena's coins from Trier dated to the joint consulship (pls. 31-32). The tiny head, located in front of Constantine's portrait on the gold double nomisma, faces inwardly, directing its gaze toward the emperor. But unlike several of the other tondo heads with crown tresses, which seem to depict younger women, this portrait may show an older one. This results from the fact that in comparison to the other tondo heads, its eyes are somewhat larger and the eyes and chin seem slightly recessed. Like Helena's portrait on the bronze, it also wears a plain tunic and mantle. But unlike the bronze's portrait, the tondo head does not wear a diadem, as such a hair adornment could not be seen from front because of an intervening row of small curls. Further, whereas Helena's features on the bronze seem assimilated to Constantine's on the double nomisma or at least in the same style, the small tondo head seems through its similarities of style to be related only to the other tondo heads. Through its association with the various deities and mythological figures on the necklace and its similar treatment, the tondo head identified as Helena together with others interpreted as belonging to court members partake of the powers of the mythological figures and gods.¹³³

133. In the earlier section on Galeria Valeria, the empress similarly strengthened her position by depicting her portrait on coins alongside the attributes of Luna-Selene and the figure of Venus. Since all the jubilant heads gaze inwardly at Constantine, the necklace may simply be an attempt to create in gold jewelry the equivalent of a panegyric poem, a poetic form popular during Constantine's reign and appropriate for the celebration of such a joyous event as his sons' joint consulship.

Whereas the iconography of Helena's seated statue associated her with the Roman past and earlier empresses, who like Livia had founded dynasties, that of the next empress, a half life-sized marble statuette found on the island of Cyprus, represented a new imperial type. The statuette's changed stance and costume show that the empress was now perhaps recognized for her contributions to the daily workings of the court. Beginning with the Theodosian dynasty, empresses may no longer have been valued only for their ability to produce male off-spring but also for their role in the life of the palace.¹³⁴ This change is perhaps best reflected by the depiction of Theodosios' first wife, Flaccilla. On her gold nomismata, instead of just wearing a diadem, the empress is shown wearing a new form of court dress whose main garments were the chlamys and divetesion. This costume was identical to her husband's and that of all other government officials (pl. 33).¹³⁵ On another level Flaccilla's costume may simply reflect changes in dress found throughout society as a whole. Beginning with this time period, the main garments worn by both sexes were the chlamys and divetesion.¹³⁶

The small white marble statuette found on Cyprus with a height of only 78 cm (30 3/4 in.) was donated to the French state in 1846 and is now found in the Cabinet of Medals at the Bibliotheque National in Paris (pl. 34).¹³⁷ Although the statue's original location on the island and the inscription on its base are unknown, the work can be identified as an empress of the Theodosian dynasty on the basis of its diadem. Among the depictions of empresses of that dynasty on coins, the one whose portrait most closely resembles that of the statuette is Aelia Flaccilla, the first wife of Theodosios I and mother of the emperors Arcadios and Honorios (378-386, augusta in 383).¹³⁸

134. Holum, 1982, 34.

135. Holum, 1982, 34.

136. For a more detailed discussion of these two garments see the introductory section on the emperor in everyday dress.

137. Holum, 1982, 43; Weitzmann, pls. 1 and 27; Kiilerich, 1993, pl. 44.

138. Kiilerich, 1993, 97.

139. For a detailed description of the statue: Kiilerich, 1993, 96.

The statuette's main garments are a full-length under-tunic, outer dalmatic tunic, and a palla, which has been tightly wrapped around her body. The figure's right forearm, part of the hair on the right side of the statue's head, and a part of the nose are all missing.¹³⁹ Once broken off, the head has been clumsily re-attached; the back of the figure, which may have been displayed in front of or in an alcove or the corner of a building, is unfinished. A wide band, which once formed the tunic's clavi, down the front and areas at the base of the neck, which were once probably covered by a separately applied necklace, are also roughly worked. Four tiny holes around the neck and small holes beneath either ear were probably drilled for the insertion of a necklace and earrings. The left foot, now missing, was probably also separately attached. The left arm was once positioned close to the figure's side at the front; in her right hand, the statuette still holds an attached diptych. The empress' voluminous hair, which is carefully worked on both the back and front, is arranged in a form of the crown tress style. The statuette's diadem consists of a double row of pearls with a centre-piece. Lightly etched on the central jewel are traces of what was once probably a Christogram.¹⁴⁰ A side view of the marble statue shows that its basic shape is tall and columnar and that it leans slightly forward, perhaps indicating that it was viewed from beneath.¹⁴¹

Like the three emperors on the Theodosian obelisk base, the empress stares aloofly off into space. Her almost mask-like facial expression demonstrates the same imperial calm found on the statues of emperors of the Theodosian dynasty. Her palla, which has been wrapped tightly across her right shoulder, is probably assimilated to resemble the toga with the stretched bands, a type which became popular in Constantinople during the reign of Theodosios I.¹⁴² This is the style worn by senators and high-ranking government officials on the Theodosian obelisk base.

140. For a diagram of the Christogram: Delbrueck, 1933, 164.

141. For the best picture of the side view: Delbrueck, 1933, pl. 63.

142. For a discussion of this type toga and its origins in Constantinople see the second part of my thesis on the emperor in ceremonial dress.

Bente Kiilerich and Kurt Weitzmann have both noted similarities between the statuette of the empress and statues of the emperor Valentinian II. The first example, noted by Bente Kiilerich, is a bust found in Beyazit, Turkey and dated to about 400. The second one, mentioned by Kurt Weitzmann, is a much smaller bust found in Constantinople and dated to 388 (pls. 35-36).¹⁴³ Thus both art historians seem to corroborate the statue's date as belonging at the end of the fourth century. Both also mention that the statue holds a diptych and that Flaccilla was created an augusta at the end of the fourth century shortly before her death in 386. Similarities between the statuette and the busts of Valentinian II led both scholars to conclude that it may have commemorated her elevation to the rank of augusta and that it might have been made either during her lifetime or shortly after her death. They also suggest that the work might be a copy of a larger one.¹⁴⁴

The contemporary orator Themistius records that Theodosios I dedicated a statue to Flaccilla to commemorate her elevation to the office of augusta and the statute was placed in the Augusteum, the senate house, which already contained a small collection of antique statues.¹⁴⁵ Perhaps the statuette is a copy of the one which Theodosios I commissioned. Small bronze coins were also issued between 383 and 388 by several eastern mints to commemorate Flaccilla's elevation to the rank of augusta (pl. 37).¹⁴⁶ On their obverses they show busts of the empress in full court dress consisting of a chlamys and divetesion. But, as on the statuette, the empress wears a diadem consisting of a double strand of pearls with a prominent centre-piece. On the obverses of the bronzes is depicted a statue of Flaccilla wearing traditional Roman dress consisting of a full-length tunic and a bulky palla, which completely envelops her body. The iconography varies slightly depending upon the mint. On bronzes from Antioch she holds the palla in place with her left hand; but on those from Alexandria her hand rests on the end of a scroll, perhaps reflecting slight differences in the modes of representation used by the two mints or even more simply the personal preferences of the die makers. On all examples of the bronzes the palla has been draped over her right arm, probably signifying that the garment has been assimilated to resemble a traditional toga, and Flaccilla holds a scroll which probably represented her codical of office. Whereas the statuette from Cyprus with its tightly wrapped palla and small diptych probably replicates a larger one displayed in Constantinople, the iconography found on the small bronzes with their standing figures of the empress wearing

143. Kiilerich, 1993, 97, fig. 40; Weitzmann, 1978, 25.

144. Kiilerich, 1993, 98.

145. For the fact that Theodosios commissioned the commemorative statue: Themistios, "On the Philanthropy of Theodosios", *Or.* v. 19, 228b. Zosimos records that the senate housed a collection of statues: Zos. 5, 24, 6. This fact is noted in C. Mango, "Antique Statuary and the Byzantine Beholder," *DOP* 17 (1963), 56-57. The above is also noted in Holum, *Theodosian Empresses*, 1989, 41, especially, note 107.

146. Vagi, 1999, 608.

Roman dress display more traditional images.

Although the statuette's costume and diptych suggest that it was erected on Cyprus to commemorate Flaccilla's elevation to the rank of augusta, its thin columnar shape and to a lesser extent its reduced size imply that the work may have been placed in a context where it even received homage (pl. 38). Tiny, finely carved bone statuettes of empresses found in the east dated to the same time period by their diadems also have tall columnar shapes (pl. 39).¹⁴⁷ One such example, a skillfully modeled one acquired in 1989 by the Princeton University Art Museum depicts a female figure identified as an empress by her diadem, who wears platform sandals, a tunic, and a mantle that was first wrapped tightly around her body and then drawn over her head. The figure's pose with one hand resting on her hip and the other holding the mantle tightly against her upper chest has been identified as similar to that of a Hellenistic personification called "Pudicitia."¹⁴⁸ The statue's stance therefore seems selected to promote the idea of female modesty, an appropriate virtue for an empress to promote. Such bone statues were believed to have originally belonged to larger groups of carved bone figures located in family shrines or lararias.¹⁴⁹ The Roman dress of the statuette holding the diptych from Cyprus indicates that the work was probably commemorative. But its columnar shape and small size suggest that it may have been venerated either in its own right or as part of a family group. The tiny bone statuettes were probably part of a larger more eclectic group found in a private setting, and the figurines' dress and stance indicate that it promoted female modesty.

147. St. Clair, 1996, 151-152.

148. St. Clair, 1996, 157.

149. St. Clair, 1996, 149.

150. No articles deal exclusively with the medallion. Harden, 1987, 265.

The next object believed to depict a Theodosian empress is a portrait group showing two women and a youth found on a gold-glass medallion mounted on the base of the seventh-century cross of Desiderius in the Santa Giulia Museum at Brescia in Italy (pl. 40).¹⁵⁰ Although the medallion is thought to be authentic, practically everything else about it is subject to debate. The work's date, place of origin, the interpretation of its two-word inscription, and the identities of its three figures have never been fully explained. An eighteenth-century historian was the first to suggest that the portraits might depict the young empress Galla Placidia (388-450), the daughter of Theodosios I and Flaccilla, and her two children, Valentinian III and Justa Grata Honoria; a few contemporary writers have also identified the three individuals as the empress and her two children.¹⁵¹

Because the three figures resemble one another, the gold glass medallion probably depicts a family group.¹⁵² The woman in the foreground is dressed in a richly embroidered mantle and, as in portraits on the coins of Theodosian empresses, wears a pearl necklace and earrings. But instead of being arranged in the crown tress, the unidentified woman's hair is parted down the center. The woman in the medallion also lacks any insignia of rule, unlike the official portraits of Galla on her one surviving medallion in the Louvre Museum (pl. 41) and on her gold nomisma (pl. 42), where she is shown wearing full court dress. Although portraits often provide an inaccurate picture of the individual, neither of Galla's official portraits resembles the richly dressed woman in the Brescia medallion. Instead scholars interpreted her hairstyle as most similar to that of the high born women depicted on Fayum mummy portraits from Egypt dated to the Roman period from 30 BC-AD 395.¹⁵³ The three figures' direct, almost penetrating gazes, the delicacy of their treatment, and the creating artist's attention to small details are also all characteristics of Fayum mummy portraits and indeed of third-century Roman portraiture in general.¹⁵⁴

151. Breck, 1926/1927, 352; Hanfmann, 1975, 318 note. Recent writers who identify the figures as Galla and her children: Gies, c1987, 26; Moorhead, 2010, 69; Byfield, c. 2003, 133.

152. Harden, 1987, 265.

153. Harden, 1987, 265.

154. Strudwick, 2006, 334-335.

In the introduction to this section crossed-over, richly embroidered mantles, such as the one the woman on the Brescia medallion wears, and simple hairstyles with a central part, are both associated with the third century, a time period that accords well with the Fayum mummy portraits rather than with Galla Placidia's time period of the late fourth and early fifth centuries. The two-word Greek inscription on the medallion with its iota terminations has also been identified as a characteristic of the Greek dialect of Alexandrian Egypt.¹⁵⁵ Several additional features of the medallion further associate the work with this date and city. An entire early group of gold glass medallions are dated to this time period and the artists producing them are believed to have come from that city. Like the gold glass one from Brescia, which is sometimes considered the best example in this group, all these works are noted for their delicate treatment of the figures, a delicacy which was achieved by the use of a fine brush technique that resulted in modeled figures with the slightest suggestion of depth and shading.¹⁵⁶

Since there is a strong family resemblance among the three figures, it seems most likely that the medallion is simply the portrait of an unknown family group. Because early empresses wore the same dress as other wealthy Roman women, the woman in the foreground might be an empress. But such characteristics as the figures' direct, almost penetrating gazes and the work's fine details suggest a date in the century preceding Galla's lifetime. Other characteristics of the medallion also discredit an identification of the portraits as Galla and her children. The woman in the foreground does not resemble Galla Placidia's two official portraits, and she wears no imperial attributes. Despite the fact that the medallion decorates the cross of the last Lombard king Desiderius and therefore might depict an important family group, its style and fine brush strokes seem most similar to medallions produced in Egypt in the third or fourth century. The woman in the foreground with her richly embroidered mantle and pearl jewelry is probably not Galla Placidia but simply a wealthy Egyptian woman, perhaps from Alexandria.

As a direct descendant of Theodosios I, the next empress, Licinia Eudoxia (439-490), daughter of Theodosios II and Eudoxia, was potentially one of the most powerful individuals of her day. Although antique portraits can be unreliable, all three depictions of the empress found on her extremely rare nomismata issued during her lifetime suggest that she was strikingly beautiful. Besides being one of three standing figures on a commemorative nomisma issued for her marriage to Valentinian III in 437 (pl. 43), Licinia Eudoxia's portrait is found on a second extremely rare undated nomisma probably created when she became an augusta in 439 (pl. 44) as well as on a third one issued either in connection with the

155. Breck, 1926/1927, 353; Harden, 1987, 265.
156. Harden, 1987, 265-266.

celebration of her husband's tricennalia in late 454 or his eighth consulship in January of 455 (pl. 45). Both of these events occurred shortly before Valentinian III was assassinated on March 16, 455.

The first of the two extremely rare nomismata minted after the marriage nomisma, which was discussed previously in the section on bridal dress, shows the empress on its obverse as a frontally facing bust wearing full court regalia consisting of a chlamys, imperial brooch, diadem and diveteson. The gold coin's remarkable reverse, however, shows Licinia Eudoxia nimbed, facing frontally, and enthroned. She wears Roman dress consisting of a high belted tunic, probably similar to the dalmatic worn by Serena on the Stilicho diptych, a mantle, and a diadem with unusually long double rows of pendilia, which are represented as extensions of the rows of pearls on the diadem. The empress' diadem also is rayed and embellished with a central cross. In addition, Licinia Eudoxia holds in both hands insignia of rule consisting of a globe surmounted by a cross in the right one and a cruciform scepter in the left. Although female personifications of Constantinople¹⁵⁷ are sometimes shown holding these insignia on coins, this is the earliest example of a nomisma depicting an enthroned empress holding such powerful symbols of rule.¹⁵⁸ But unlike contemporary coins which show Constantinopolis looking to the left, the figure of the frontally facing empress, like those minted by her husband for his consulships,¹⁵⁸ is shown looking aloofly before her in a display of imperial calm. Although the coin's inscription simply identifies the figure as Licinia Eudoxia and is undated, Grierson and May believe that the nomisma was a commemorative one issued in 439, the year the empress became an augusta. The coin's iconography of an augusta seated on a throne holding insignia of rule may suggest that this powerful empress may have even shared some power with her husbands and that they were considered most similar to a city tyche.¹⁵⁹

157. For an example of this rare nomisma: Grierson, 1992, pl. 34, 860.

158. For examples of Valentinian III's nomismata commemorating his consulships: Grierson, 1992, pl. 33, 836 and 856.

159. James discusses the association of the empress with personifications: James, 2001, 141.

The third nomisma with Licinia Eudoxia's portrait depicts the empress as a frontal bust wearing a crossed over trabea and diadem on its obverse. On its unusual reverse the empress is shown standing beside her husband as one of two front facing figures wearing dress consisting of a jeweled collar, tunic, and a diadem with a snood. She also wears what is probably a mantle because it is fringed that has been assimilated to a her husband's trabea or perhaps even a toga. She is depicted receiving a plain tipped sceptre from her husband's right hand. The emperor wears a diadem, trabea and holds a plain-tipped sceptre in his left hand. Two other slightly different versions of this coin exist. In the second example, Licinia Eudoxia holds a sceptre and Valentinian III, a globus cruciger; in the third, Licinia Eudoxia holds a cross-tipped sceptre and Valentinian III, a mappa and cross-tipped sceptre.¹⁶⁰

160. For a more precise description of these very rare nomismata including slight differences between the various ones: *Numismatica Ars Classica*, 2002, item 349.

161. During the fifth century very few emperors have caesars. For a complete list of both the eastern and western caesars: Grierson, 1992, 8.

162. Weitzmann, 1978, 75.

Each of these three extremely rare nomisma seems to record a ceremony during which the empress and emperor are each depicted holding slightly different insignia of office. Of the two possible events which the coin might commemorate, the celebration of the emperor's thirtieth year of rule, being the most important, seems the more likely. The fact that Valentinian III did not have a co-ruler also may have meant that his empress assumed a more active role in ceremonies held during his tricennalia.¹⁶¹ The closest equivalent to the nomisma is probably the scene depicted on the earlier Theodosian Missorium, which commemorated Theodosios I's decennalia in 388. On the largitio plate he is shown enthroned between his two caesars awarding a codicil office.¹⁶² The ceremony depicted on Licinia Eudoxia's gold nomisma may record a similar event or a ceremony during the tricennalia. Unfortunately, shortly after this coin was minted, Valentinian III was murdered. Later in the year Licinia Eudoxia was imprisoned by the Vandal leader Gaiseric, who had also sacked Rome. She and her two daughters were then taken by the Vandal leader as hostages to Carthage, where she remained imprisoned for seven years until Leo I obtained her release. She lived the remainder of her life in Constantinople.¹⁶³

On the first nomisma, which was probably issued to commemorate Licinia Eudoxia's elevation to the rank of augusta, the empress is depicted enthroned wearing Roman dress and holding a globe surmounted by a cross and a cross-tipped sceptre. These insignia suggest affinities between herself and the city tyche Constantinopolis, the protectress of the eastern capitol Constantinople and the city of Eudoxia's birth. The second nomisma showed the imperial couple participating in a ceremony during Valentinian III's tricennalia. Since Valentinian III did not have a caesar, the empress may instead be assisting her husband. On the coin the empress's mantle has probably been assimilated to resemble her husband's trabea or else she is also wearing a trabea. This not only may suggest that as an empress she is closely connected to her husband but also that in the absence of a caesar she formally participated in the tricennalia alongside her husband.

163. Grierson, 1992, 244; Vagi, 1999, 562-563.

164. Ross, 1962, 62; for a different interpretation of the weight: James, 2003, 51-55.

165. McClanan, 2002, 29.

The next portrait of Licinia Eudoxia is the first example of a new type of object, one depicting empresses in a domestic context. Martin Ross has identified a steelyard counterweight, a form of crossbeam weight invented by the Romans for weighing bulk goods, at Dumbarton Oaks as cast to resemble the empress Licinia Eudoxia (pl. 46).¹⁶⁴ In the late Roman period, portraits of individual emperors appear on a wide range of objects in the domestic sphere. Besides coins, their pictures were found on such everyday items as banners, silver stamps, seals, flat market weights, and coin weights.¹⁶⁵ On these objects, the emperor's image implied his approval as the head of the central authority. Occasionally these portraits even served the propagandistic ends of the ruling regime. Objects with the emperor's image on jewelry, silverplate, clothing and even on cases for storing writing implements¹⁶⁶ usually served a more decorative function.

The bronze weight at Dumbarton Oaks identified as Licinia Eudokia is in the form of a bust. Although none of these weights have been securely dated, early researchers interpreted them as representing empresses mainly because all the busts wore diadems.¹⁶⁷ At Dumbarton Oaks, the hair of the bust is arranged in a form of the crown tress; the figure also wears a diadem, tunic, mantle, earrings and holds a scroll in her left hand.¹⁶⁸ The inside of the bust is filled with lead; there is also a hook at the top of the weight's head for suspending it from a cross beam calibrated precisely to an established weight. Although Byzantine steelyard weights exist in several forms, the most common Byzantine types were those of emperors, personifications including city tyches, the goddess Athena, and empresses.¹⁶⁹

166. These cases, called *thecae*, are depicted on the consular diptychs of Astyrius (AD 449) and Probianus (about AD 400): Olovosdotter, 2005, 25-26; Weitzmann, 1978, 55-56.

167. McClanan, 2002, 45.

168. A contemporary non-imperial bust at the Metropolitan Museum of Art depicts a woman holding a scroll: McClanan, 2002, fig. 2.14.

169. McClanan, 2002, 47.

170. Bendall, 1996, 17-20; W. F. Volbach, *Geschichte des Kunstgewerbes*, ed. H. T. Bossert, 6 vols. Berlin; Wasmuth, 1932, 5, 75. McClanan, 2002, 47.

Because the empress weights seem to be dressed as Theodosian empresses, and flat fourth- and fifth-century fine weights used for making measurements on balance scales are sometimes decorated with labeled portraits of emperors (pl. 47), early researchers like Volbach believed that they could identify the empresses depicted on steelyard weights. But the portraits are so generalized that it has even been suggested all the figures are city tyches.¹⁷⁰ Moreover, unlike the fine weights embellished with individual emperor's portraits and sometimes even labeled with a ruler's names, none of the steelyard weights identify an empress by name. As a result, contemporary art historians have found these early attempts at identification of the weights as individual empresses far from convincing.¹⁷¹ Instead, steelyard weights are now interpreted as generalized portraits of empresses which in some cases share attributes with a wide range of personifications, including city tyches.¹⁷²

By far the most common types of Byzantine steelyard weights are those cast in the shape of either an empress or Athena. Since, on the whole, the Athena weights are considerably heavier than the empress weights, the varieties of each type may either have belonged to two different weight standards or else the Athena weights may simply have been used for weighing heavier objects than the empress weights. Athena weights range in size from 1070 g to 11200 g; examples in the shape of empresses range from 1402 g to 5945 g.¹⁷³ A large Athena weight like one found in the Yassi Ada shipwreck, which was 7750 g., could weigh goods up to 400 Roman lbs. (pl. 48).¹⁷⁴

171. McClanan, 2002, 45; James, 2003, 31.

172. McClanan, 2002, 47; James, 2003, 54-55.

173. McClanan, 2002, 35.

174. For pictures of the weights see Bass, 1982, 216-217. The Roman pound was about 284 g. For a chart of the Roman weight system: Bass, 1982, 224. The Byzantine weight system is pictured in Bendall, 1996, 8.

175. McClanan, 2002, 50.

Since in the Roman period in addition to the weights cast in the shape of an empress, steelyard weights were cast in a wide range of mythological forms, including Apollo, Attis, Hercules, Jupiter, Mercury and occasionally Minerva,¹⁷⁵ it is difficult to account for the predominance of only two types of weights in the later Byzantine period. Anne McClanan offers a possible explanation for the selection of Athena as a shape for weights. As the goddess of wisdom, Athena also represented good balance and accurate measure.¹⁷⁶ Contemporary flat weights for weighing coins, called *exagia*, often show the goddess *Moneta* on their reverses holding a balance scale in her right hand and cornucopia in the left (pl. 49).¹⁷⁷ This image implied that abundance and prosperity resulted from the use of accurately weighed coinage.

176. McClanan, 2002, 57.

177. Bendall, 1996, 19, 7–12.

178. For a more detailed discussion of how the weights might have been interpreted by contemporaries: McClanan, 2002, 60.

In the pagan past the goddesses Moneta and Athena had been worshiped as deities representing just measurement. During the Christian era, their images on weights, shorn of most of their original pagan associations, still retained a residue of their earlier meaning.¹⁷⁸ Both had become generalized symbols of the issuing authority and of just measurement. Since the empress was closely associated with her husband, weights cast in her image, like the Athena weights and fine weights of emperors, probably also suggested imperial authority and just measurement. Because the empress weights were used in the marketplace, they were probably cast depicting the empress in Roman dress as this was the imperial costume most associated with everyday life and the workings of the market. The empress weights may also wear Roman dress because their bust shape evolved during that time period. The bust shape of the empress weights, which results in a hollow in the bottom from casting, also made it easy to add the lead needed to calibrate each weight.

Several other domestic objects have been identified as representing Theodosian empresses including four silver pepper pots from the Hoxne treasure, a Roman bronze lamp in the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, and a brooch found in Tenes, Algeria.¹⁷⁹ Of these, the most convincing is the Tenes brooch found in a jewelry hoard in Tenes in 1936 but now in the Musée des Beaux-Arts d'Algier (pl. 50). The brooch has been identified as a portrait of several empresses including Galla Placidia, Aelia Flacilla, Galla and Licinia Eudoxia.¹⁸⁰ Because the portrait resembles the emperors on the Theodosian Missorium and the woman wears a diadem with her hair arranged in a crown tress, it seems likely that the brooch depicts an empress of that dynasty. Like the empress weights, the figure is shown as a frontal bust. Besides her head gear, the woman's dress consists of a necklace, tunic and a mantle, which is swathed around her body with her right hand protruding from beneath the cloak. Although the portrait's features on the gold pin are more finely delineated than on the weights, they nevertheless closely resemble portraits found on the empress weights. But since the figure, like the weights, has no specific attributes and is not labelled, the brooch probably is also just a generalized portrait of an empress. Besides being decorative, the brooch might at most have implied the wearer's support of the Theodosian dynasty.

179. For a discussion of the pepper pots and bronze lamp: McClanan, 2002, 60.

180. Heurgon identifies the empress as Licinia Eudoxia: Heurgon, 1958, 63-69; Ross mentions Galla Placidia, Aelia Flacilla and Galla: Ross, 2005, 149.

181. Facsimile and commentary H. Gerstringer, *Dioscorides: Codex Vindobonensis med.gr.1 der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek*, 2 vols., and idem, *Kommentarband zu der Faksimileausgabe*, Graz, 1970. The main works on the illustration are Harrison, 1989, especially, 137-138; Brubaker, 2002, 209-213. For the illustration: Weitzmann, 1977, 60.

The next object to depict a female member of the Theodosian dynasty is a miniature on the dedication page of a lavishly illustrated herbal, the Vienna Dioscurides (Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, Cod. Vind. Med. Gr. 1, folio 6 verso) (pl. 51).¹⁸¹ The illustration dated to 512 AD depicts, not an empress, but the powerful, wealthy patrician, Anicia Juliana. On the dedication page she is shown seated on a throne stiffly posed between personifications of Magnanimity and Prudence. A third personification "Gratitude of the Arts" kneels at her feet. An abraded acrostic within the octagonal ornament on this page states that the citizens of Honoratai, a town near Constantinople, gave the herbal to Anicia Juliana as a sign of their gratitude to her for building a church in their city.¹⁸²

On the dedication page the four figures are shown within an eight-pointed star enclosed by a circle of intertwined rope. The Anicia Juliana is dressed in a long-sleeved blue tunic, an orange mantle which resembles a trabea, and an orange head-dress, which rests high on her head. In the miniature Anicia Juliana's generosity is demonstrated by the fact that she is depicted distributing coins with her right hand. She holds a codicillus in her left hand to show that she was a member of the patriciate.¹⁸³ Anicia Juliana was the only child of Anicius Olybrius and Placidia the Younger. Her father reigned briefly as one of the last emperors of the western empire and traced his ancestry through seven centuries of high ranking court officials. Her mother was a descendant of Theodosios I through both of her grandparents.¹⁸⁴

182. Weitzmann, 1977, 205; *ODB*, 1991, 632.

183. Weitzmann, 1977, 61.

184. For a discussion of her ancestry: McClanan, 2002, 94; Brubaker, 2002, 210. For a genealogy: Harrison, 1989, 149.

The patricia's generosity and illustrious ancestry are implied by the fact that Anicia Juliana's mantle resembles a consular *trabea* and she is shown distributing largesse. Her generosity is further suggested by the fact that she is accompanied by personifications of Magnanimity and "Gratitude of the Arts." A third figure Prudence, who holds a codex on her lap, implies the princess' erudition. Although the appearance of the church she built at Honoratai is unknown, excavations of the ruins of Hagios Polyeuktos, the church she built near her palace, reveals that it was probably modelled on Solomon's temple.¹⁸⁵ This and the subject matter of the manuscript, a catalogue of medicinal plants, may demonstrate her learning. Since the miniature combines such earlier classical elements as personifications and tiny putti in the spandrels with formal ones associated with contemporary court life, it further suggests her erudition and refined tastes.¹⁸⁶

In the manuscript Anicia Juliana is also identified as a patrikia by the fact that she wears a mantle resembling a *trabea* while she distributes largesse.¹⁸⁷ Since the illustration appears on the white ground of a vellum manuscript, it is tempting to speculate that its creator either consciously or unconsciously modelled the illustration on the star-shaped patterns found in contemporary segmenta. These brightly coloured fabric patches, which first appeared during the tetrachic period, remained popular at least until the seventh century. As was mentioned in the section on the emperor in a *chlamys*, examples decorate the tunics of figures as early as the third-century Hunt Mosaic from Piazza Armerina to as late as the cloaks of Justinian and Theodora in the imperial panels at San Vitale.

185. The fact that Hagios Polyeuktos was possibly modeled on Solomon's Temple is not only demonstrated by a reference to his temple inscribed in the church but also to the fact that its measurements are based on the royal cubit: Harrison, 1989, 136-137.

186. McClanan, 2002, 98; Weitzmann, 1977, 61.

187. Brubaker, 2002, 210.

188. Trilling, 1982, 1040108; for an example: pl, 7, fig. 102.

In his monograph, James Trilling shows several examples of segmenta, which he calls tunic roundels, that are found within star-shaped figures enclosed by circles of intertwined rope (pl. 52-53).¹⁸⁸ Although the centres of the segmenta vary, several show portraits. Most of the examples which he pictures retain part of the fabric of the white backgrounds and therefore probably decorated tunics. The fact that the dedication miniature may have been suggested by contemporary segmenta may also be a subtle reference to Anicia Juliana's domestic skills.¹⁸⁹ Besides, as the subject matter of the manuscript implied, caring for the sick, she probably also supervised such tasks on the estate as cooking and the weaving of fabric. The star-shape was very popular in the late Roman period. For example, two of the five sections of the gold pectoral decorated with consular nomisma from Constantine's reign are in the shape of a six-pointed star; the central medallion is in the shape of an eight-pointed one. Connected with contemporary cosmological and astrological beliefs, the star shape was considered a powerful one with protective powers.¹⁹⁰ Clothing decorated with a star shape or star-shaped jewelry were believed to simultaneously protect the wearers from evil and to bring them good luck.¹⁹¹

The final representation of an empress in Roman dress appears in a black and white brush drawing dated from the seventh- to the ninth-century on a parchment sheet from a fragmentary Old Testament written in Sahidic Coptic (pl. 54).¹⁹² The manuscript was part of a larger group of Coptic manuscripts from the White Cloister at Sohaz in Upper Egypt, which Cardinal Cesare Borgia purchased in the eighteenth century.¹⁹³ Today the manuscript is Coptic Bible MS. IB18 in the Biblioteca Nazionale in Naples.¹⁹⁴

189. Brubaker, 2002, 211-212.

190. Bruhn, 1993, 22-24.

191. Bruhn, 1993, 23-24. For a more general discussion of the star shape: Maguire, 1990, 215.

192. Weitzmann, 1979, 35-36; for an illustration: Weitzmann, 1979, 35. Also see earlier discussion in the section on the emperor in military dress.

193. Weitzmann, 1979, 36.

194. Weitzmann, 1979, 35.

The illustration is found on the last page of Job beneath the end title and depicts Job and his three daughters. All four figures wear imperial dress. Although Job is not identified as a ruler in any early western biblical texts, including the Vulgate, he is equated with Jobab, the king of Edom, who was mentioned in Genesis 36.33, which forms the final chapter of Job in the Septuagint.¹⁹⁵ Therefore the illustration seems properly placed beneath the end title of Job. Although the illustration which the drawing is based upon and the exact name of the emperor are unknown, it has been suggested that it was derived from an imperial icon of the Emperor Herakleios and his family.¹⁹⁶ The analysis of Herakleios' dress from the illustration appears at the end of the dissertation's first chapter, which discusses the emperor in a cuirass.

Delbruck first suggested through a comparison of imperial regalia that the most likely identities of the four figures were the emperor Herakleios, his second wife and niece, Martina (m. 614), mother-in-law and sister Epiphania, and daughter Eudoxia (b. 611).¹⁹⁷ Herakleios' marriage to his niece Martina was regarded as incestuous and therefore criticized.¹⁹⁸ Herakleios' reign also occurred during a period of great political turmoil. Constantinople was besieged several times and much of the eastern empire was under attack from the Arabs. Herakleios therefore might have been viewed by contemporaries as a Job-like figure.

195. Weitzmann, 1979, 36.

196. Weitzmann, 1979, 36.

197. Weitzmann, 1979, 36.

198. Fausta's parents were the tetrarchic ruler Maximian and Eutropia, a woman of Syrian origins. Coins were minted to Helena and Fausta when they became augusta. No other women received the title. Kaegi, 2003, 106.

All three of the women wear a long-sleeved under tunic, dalmatic outer tunic, which is belted beneath their breasts, jewelled collar, earrings, a crown with the hair of the two older women gathered beneath ovoid shaped snoods, and long mantles which fall behind their heads and are visible at their forearms. The woman tentatively identified as Martina demonstrates her superior rank by her slightly more elaborate headgear. The portrait group is similar to dynastic groups of standing figures on Herakleios' coins, a type found on the coins of his predecessors as early as Justin II's reign. Since the illustration also probably shows Herakleios' daughter Eudoxia from his first marriage standing near his second wife Martina, it depicts a mixed family group. Because family members from his two marriages were sometimes in conflict, such a grouping may have implied family unity.¹⁹⁹ The fact that the three women wear Roman dress probably reflects contemporary court ceremonial, whose dress and rituals were deliberately retrospective.²⁰⁰ This aspect of court ceremony attempted to imply a stability and continuity with the past during a time period which Walter Kaegi described as a "doleful era".²⁰¹

In conclusion, depictions of empresses in Roman dress initially continued earlier traditions, whose iconography was established as early as the first empress Livia. But beginning with Theodosios' reign new types of imperial portraiture with a broader range of meanings began to emerge. During the tetrarchs' and Constantine's reigns depictions showed the empress in dress which differed little from that of other high born Roman women. As with Livia's statues and cameos, the features on Prisca's medallion portrait and her daughter Galleria Valeria's coins were often assimilated to features of their husbands' portraits. Since empresses could not be identified by dress alone, early art historians argued that several works of art, including a wall painting in Trier, a floor mosaic at Aquileia, and gold tondo heads found on a large gold pectoral, all depicted female members of Constantine's family, including his mother Helena. Since none of these works were labeled with the augusta's name, portrayed a woman wearing a diadem, or with the (with the exception of the gold pectoral) were even associated with Constantine's family, identifying them as contemporary likenesses of Helena could never be conclusively proven or refuted.

199. Kaegi, 2003, 266.

200. Kaegi, 2003, 266.

201. Kaegi, 2003, 266.

Beginning with Theodosios I's reign, new coin types and statuary of empresses wearing new types of dress began to emerge; this dress, Holum argued, probably indicated that the empress was now part of the government hierarchy; on these coins and works of art, her costume closely imitated her husband's. The first such coins, which were probably produced from 383-387 after Flaccilla was made an augusta, show her wearing a diadem without ties and a type of costume consisting of a chlamys and divitesion which was similar to her husband's. But a small statue found on Cyprus, which probably also depicted Flaccilla, shows the empress wearing a diadem and Roman dress consisting of a tunic and a mantle assimilated to a form of toga called the toga with a stretched band; this type was worn exclusively by the elite of Constantinople.

The next developments seen in the empress' costume are first found on two of Licinia Eudoxia's gold nomismata. One coin, which was probably produced when she was made an augusta in 439, showed her enthroned on its obverse holding a globus cruciger and cross-tipped sceptre. These insignia of rule were previously held only by city tyches. A second coin probably produced in early 455 to celebrate her husband's tricennalia show Valentinian III, giving either plain or cross-tipped sceptres to the empress, who wears a mantle which is either assimilated to a consular trabea or is one.

A few additional works, including a gold glass medallion, bronze steelyard weights and the Tenes brooch, also seem to depict Theodosian empresses. The gold glass, which shows a three member family group, decorates the front of the cross of Desiderius, the last Lombard king, and has been identified as a youthful portrait of the empress Galla Placidia and her two children. But stylistically it belongs to a type of gold glass produced in Egypt over a century before the empress' lifetime and simply shows a wealthy woman from Alexandria. Although the steelyard weights wear diadems, their features are so generalized that no individual empress can be identified. Instead they seem to symbolize such ideas as centralized authority and just measure. The Tenes brooch seems to show the generalized portrait of an empress and is purely decorative.

The final examples analyzed in this chapter consists of two illustrations. The first forms the frontispiece of an illustrated herbal and depicts an important female member of the aristocracy, Juliana Anicia. In the illustration the patricia wears her mantle wrapped around her body so that it suggests a trabea and she is distributing largesse. The second illustration appears at the end of Job in a Coptic Bible. This seems to show standing figures of the emperor Herakleios, his niece and second wife Martina, his sister and mother-in-law Epiphania, and his daughter from his first marriage, Eudoxia. Their Roman dress probably suggested that Herakleios' dynasty was connected with that of earlier time periods. Although initially empresses still wore earlier forms of Roman dress, these forms were eventually replaced by a new costume which imitated her husband's in every detail. During the late fourth and fifth centuries, both sexes wore a costume whose main garments were the chlamys and divitesion.

The Empress in Forms of the Chlamys

From the fourth to the seventh centuries, depictions of empresses in forms of Roman dress often continued modes of representation which originated as early as Livia, the first augusta. A common artistic technique used to indicate an empress' close relation to her husband was the assimilation of her facial features to his. Beginning with Theodosios I's reign, the empress was also represented on coins in iconography which was very similar to the image on her husband's coinage. Not only were her facial features, like her husband's, depicted as perpetually youthful but her dress was also assimilated to his.¹ Like her husband, the empress was now depicted as a profile bust wearing a diadem with pendilia, a long-sleeved silk tunic called the divetesion, a form of long cloak with a curved edge often decorated with a tablion called the chlamys, a rosette-shaped brooch with three pendilia, and jeweled slippers (pl. 1).² The chlamys and slippers were probably also dyed a special purple colour associated especially with the emperor and his family.³

1. Holum, 1982, 34.

2. Holum, 1982, 34.

3. Canepa, 2009, 192.

4. Holum, 1982, 28.

5. Holum, 1982, 32.

This new image of the empress first appeared on undated gold nomismata of Flaccilla, probably issued shortly after her oldest son Arkadios was created an augustus at the age of fifteen in 383 during the year she was also made an augusta.⁴ Flaccilla was the first empress to receive this title since Helena and Fausta in 324.⁵ With the exception of Helena, the empress' elevation occurred at about the same time as her son's. Though it was not necessarily related to the fact that she had produced a son and heir,⁶ the inscriptions on the reverses of their nomisma, which described Helena as the "SECURITAS," Fausta as the "SPEI" and Flaccilla as the "SALVS" of the realm, may suggest that this was the case.⁷ Adopting personifications familiar from the reverses on coins of contemporary augusti, Helena's and Flaccilla's coins depict personifications of "SECURITAS" and "VICTORIA" respectively, but Fausta's reverses refer to her success in producing male off-spring by showing the figure of the empress holding two of her sons.⁸

Before Constantine began building his palace in Constantinople, his court had lived in several tetrarchic capitals, including York, Rome, Trier, Aquileia, and Serdica. But after Constantine moved to Constantinople in about 330, court life remained centred in that city's palace, a precursor of the later complex of buildings known as the Great Palace.⁹ During the reigns of his successors, court life slowly became more sedentary and the complicated ceremonials and protocols, which Constantine VII Prophyrogenitus described in his Book of Ceremonies, slowly began to evolve.¹⁰ Not only did the empress dress like her husband but she also had her own court which essentially replicated her husband's.¹¹ Indeed by Herakleios' reign, the office of empress was so essential to court protocols that when the office became vacant, the emperor felt it necessary to elevate his fifteen month old daughter Epiphaneia to the office in late 612.¹²

6. Holum, 1982, 31.

7. Holum, 1982, 32-33. For a detailed discussion of these personifications: Brubaker, 2000, 576.

8. Holum, 1982, 33, 35, fig. 4.

9. ODB, 1991, 869; Johnson, 2006, 292; Featherstone, 2008, 506.

10. Cameron, 1987, 107.

11. Herrin, 1995, 72-73.

12. Herrin, 1995, 72, note 26.

After Theodosios' reign, the costume of later empresses as depicted on their gold nomisma remained essentially unchanged throughout the whole dynasty and even later. Although the empress' dress had such additional features as jewelry, the crown-tress hairstyle, and a feminine physiognomy, the only real difference between the iconography on her coins and her husband's was that her diadem had three pendilia at the back instead of the two found on the emperor's, perhaps implying that it was tied in a slightly different way. Further, beginning with Arkadios' wife, Eudoxia, the empresses' nomismata were depicted with a dextera Dei above the empress' head (pl. 2).¹³ This new symbolism seemed to be associated with Eudoxia's elevation to the office of augusta. It probably suggested that her elevation, like an emperor's coronation, was sanctioned by God.¹⁴

The next change in the empress' costume is found in the costume of Licinia Eudoxia (augusta 6 August 439-circa 490). On the obverse of nomisma minted to commemorate her elevation to the rank of augusta, she is shown wearing the chlamys and divetesion costume and a new type of diadem with a raised central cross, six rays, and pairs of shoulder-length pendalia (pl. 3). In this frontal bust portrait the pendilia are depicted as extensions of the upper and lower rows of pearls decorating the empress' diadem, although such shoulder-length pendilia were previously shown on Licinia Eudoxia's marriage nomisma (pl. 4).¹⁵ In a second commemorative nomisma minted in 455, the empress wears a different crown on both sides of the coin (pl. 5). On the obverse her diadem still has a raised cross and rows of pearls, but it has only two raised projections instead of the six shown on her earlier nomisma. On the reverse her diadem also has the unusual feature of a tall conically shaped snood. Thus, although two rows of shoulder-length pendilia appear on all her crowns, the empress wore several different types of diadems.

In her frontal bust portrait on the nomisma minted in 439, there is a suggestion of the beginnings of a decorative row of small pearls down the front edge of her chlamys, a feature which becomes more prominent on the empresses' chlamyses in the Trier ivory and in both of the Ariadne ivories. This innovation seems to predate Licinia Eudoxia's reign; a similar row of pearls appears on the outer edge of the empress' chlamys on her bridal costume in her marriage nomisma. Her crown on that earlier commemorative coin was also decorated with shoulder-length pendilia. All of these slight innovations seem designed to distinguish her headgear from her husband's. Because all these slight differences in dress are found on later works of art such as the Trier ivory and Ariadne's ivories, they probably simply reflect changes of style resulting from personal preference.

13. Holum, 1982, 65.

14. Holum, 1982, 66.

15. Licinia Eudoxia's marriage nomisma is analyzed in the earlier section on bridal dress.

Although the portraits of the early Byzantine empresses Flaccilla, Eudoxia and Licinia Eudoxia wearing the chlamys and divitesion are depicted only on coins, several later empresses are shown wearing this form of dress on larger objects including ivories, busts, a church mosaic and a gold processional cross. The enigmatic Trier ivory probably depicts the empress Pulcheria receiving a saint's relics for deposition in a newly built church.¹⁶ The empress Ariadne's portrait is found on several ivory objects including two panels from a five part imperial diptych and five medallion portraits on consular diptychs and on several busts.¹⁷ Only three contemporary portraits of Theodora exist, including a medallion portrait on a consular diptych, a single bust, and the imperial panel at San Vitale.¹⁸ A portrait of the empress Sophia is found on the cross-beam of the Crux Vatican.¹⁹ Beginning with Sophia, the portraits of several later empresses including Maurice's wife Constantina, Phokas' wife Leontia and Herakleios' second wife Martina together with those of their husbands are found on bronze coins.²⁰

The next item to depict a Byzantine empress in full court regalia is the enigmatic Trier ivory found in the Cathedral Treasury in Trier (pl. 6).²¹ The work measures 13.1 x 26.1 cm; it probably originally formed part of a saint's reliquary. The ivory depicts a procession consisting of three figures seated in a mule cart holding the relics of a saint; the wagon is preceded by three male figures holding candles and an emperor who has stopped in front of the diminutive figure of an empress. She stands before the open door of a church which is still under construction. This procession is placed before a complex architectural setting full of active figures performing such ritualistic activities as standing at attention, censuring the procession, and chanting.

16. Holum, 1982, 104.

17. Weitzmann, 1978, 31-32.

18. McClanan, 2002, 121, 140, and 147.

19. McClanan, 2002, 163.

20. Sear, 1987, 137, 603; 144, 639 and 176, 825.

21. For bibliographic information, a discussion of the emperor's dress and illustrations see the earlier analysis in the emperor in everyday dress.

22. Holum and Vikan, 1977, 115; Holum, 1982, 104.

Nothing is known about the work's early history or original context; but it is believed to depict a translation which occurred in the eastern empire probably in about the sixth century.²² Several saints have been suggested, but the most convincing argument to date is that of Gary Vikan and Kenneth Holum, who believe that the scene depicts the translation of the relics of the proto-martyr St. Stephen from Jerusalem to Constantinople under the care of St. Passarion in about 420.²³ Details of this event are found in the history of Theophanes the Confessor as well as other later historians.²⁴

The saint's relics were found outside Jerusalem in December, 415.²⁵ In about 421 when war with the Persian Vahram V seemed imminent, Theodosios II decided to procure the favour of St. Stephen because the martyr's name alone might assure victory for his troops. Therefore he sent a generous donation to Jerusalem for distribution to the poor and a large jewel encrusted gold cross to be placed on the summit of Mt. Golgotha.²⁶ A detailed picture of this lavishly decorated cross still may exist in the background of the contemporary apse mosaic at the church of Santa Pudenziana in Rome (pl. 7).²⁷ In response to these generous gifts the bishop of Jerusalem sent the right arm of the martyr to Constantinople.²⁸ According to Theophanes, when the cortege reached Chalcedon, Theodosios' sister, the empress Pulcheria, who had been instrumental in arranging the exchange, received a vision from St. Stephen notifying her of the arrival of his relics. The empress then arose and went out of the palace with her brother to greet the relics and take them into the church which she had built inside the precincts of the palace.²⁹

23. Holum and Vikan, 1977, 127.

24. Holum and Vikan, 1977, 127.

25. Holum, 1982, 103.

26. Holum and Vikan, 1977, 103; Holum, 1982, 103; Holum, 1977, 163.

27. Kitzinger, 1977, 80.

28. Holum and Vikan, 1977, 127; Holum, 1982, 103.

29. Holum and Vikan, 1977, 127.

In the Trier Ivory, the wagon bearing the relics seems to have just passed through a city gate and is still advancing from left to right. With the exception of the mule cart, which has almost reached its destination, the remainder of the procession has already stopped before the form of the empress, who stretches forth her hand as a sign of greeting and acceptance outside the newly-built church which will hold his relics.³⁰ Because of her small size, frontal stance, central position before the church's front door, and welcoming gesture, the attention of all the figures in the ivory are focused on her.³¹ According to Kenneth Holum, both her position immediately outside the church's door and gesture of acceptance identify the empress as Pulcheria, whom later tradition credits with being a patron of St. Stephen and the builder of his new church.³²

30. Holum offers a detailed interpretation of the empress' gesture: Holum and Vikan, 1977, 31 and Holum, 1982, 107-108.

31. Holum and Vikan, 1977, 122 for a complete interpretation.

32. Holum and Vikan, 1977, 122.

33. Holum and Vikan, 1977, 164.

34. Holum and Vikan, 1977, 165.

35. Holum and Vikan, 1977, 163.

36. Snyder mentions that it is probably the fourth-century cross: Snyder, 1989, 61.

37. McClanan, 2002, 25.

The empress is dressed in an imperial chlamys, whose outer border is decorated with a double row of pearls, a long-sleeved diveteson, rosette-shaped brooch with three pendilia, slippers, and a new type of diadem with double pendilia and a snood with twin peaks. The only accessory which she holds is a large wooden cross. Kenneth Holum identifies the cross as either a form of Constantine's vexilla³³ or as the long-cross held by the Victory on the obverse of Pulcheria's nomisma minted after 420.³⁴ The cross depicted on Pulcheria's nomisma with its distinctive pearl border is thought to refer to the one which Theodosios II erected in that year on the summit of Golgatha (pl. 8).³⁵ Because it also has a pearl border, the cross shown in the fourth-century mosaic at Santa Pudenziana in Rome seems to corroborate this theory.³⁶ Anne McClanan believes that the wooden cross suggested a parallel between the empress and her predecessor St. Helena.³⁷ The wooden cross may simply refer to Christ's victory over death on Golgatha.³⁸ The long cross which the empress holds is not therefore an insignia of rank but rather a religious object with several possible interpretations.

38. Holum and Vikan, 1977, 123, note 54; Holum, 1982, 109.

39. Holum, 1982, 107, note 119.

40. For a large colour reproduction of the mosaic: Wipert, 2007, 11.

41. Weitzmann, 1979, 31, 48.

42. For pictures of both diptychs: Olovsdotter, 2005, pl. 7 and pl. 11.1.

43. Holum, 1982, 105, fig. 13.

Kenneth Holum suggests that the empress' crown is a type which came into general use later than the reign of Theodosios II in the fifth and sixth centuries.³⁹ In all the portraits on nomismata of empresses throughout the Theodosian dynasty, they are depicted with their hair arranged with a central braid on top in forms of the crown tress and wearing a simpler form of diadem. In the mosaic depicting Pharaoh's daughter at Santa Maria Maggiore in Rome (circa 432-440) her attendants are shown all wearing prominent snoods but the princess herself is depicted wearing a diadem with three small plaques and perhaps a low snood (pl. 9).⁴⁰ Forms of the diadem with a snood and two peaks are a later form of headgear worn by the empress on both of the Ariadne ivories and by the same empress in her medallion portrait on the consular diptych of Clementinos (513) (pls. 10-12).⁴¹ In all the remaining medallion portraits on diptychs, the empress either still wears a crown tress as in the diptych of Orestes (530) or a diadem with a lower ovally shaped snood as in a diptych of Anastasios (517) (pls. 13-14).⁴² The fact that the empress wears a type of diadem which first appeared in the sixth century might suggest that the ivory depicted a scene which occurred in the 420s but which was created during this later time period.⁴³ Therefore the crown is not an accurate record of the type used during Pulcheria's lifetime; the type which she would have worn is instead pictured on nomismata minted with her portrait in Constantinople in 420-422 (pl. 15).⁴⁴

The Trier ivory represents a new form of Byzantine art. For the first time an ivory panel depicts not a procession, whose focal point is a triumphant emperor passing through a city gate, but one in which he leads a religious procession honoring a saint. The focal point is now the figure of an empress waiting outside a church. As the saint's patron and builder of his new church, she joyously welcomes and accepts the relics. Like Theodosios II's generous donations to Jerusalem, both the emperor's and empress' pious acts are directed at procuring St. Stephen's favour so that a victory against the Persians will be assured. As the most important members of the procession, whose acts have already indicated their piety, both wear full court regalia.

Several ivory objects, including two panels which once formed the central ivory of a five part imperial diptych, five small medallion portraits on consular diptychs, and several busts have been identified as the empress Ariadne (augusta from about 474-515)(pls. 10-11, 12-17, 18-20). The empress in all the portraits on these objects has an oval head, fleshy face, and slightly bulging eyes with arched brows. Since she shares these features with the portraits found on the diptychs of western consuls, it is believed that all were made in Constantinople at about the same time period.⁴⁵

44. Holum, 1982, fig. 13.

45. Weitzmann, 1975, 31; also McClanan describes the same stylistic features for Ariadne's busts: McClanan, 202, 83.

46. McClanan, 2002, 65.

Ariadne, the elder of the emperor Leo I and Verina's two daughters, reigned during a period of political instability. Since her parents had no male off-spring, their daughter became the transmitter of imperial power to three emperors.⁴⁶ In about 466 she first married Zeno and bore him a son, Leo II, whom Leo I named as his successor. When Leo I died in 474, his grandson ruled briefly for a few months before his death. Zeno, as Ariadne's husband, then became emperor and although he brought the kingdom safely through several foreign military crises, he was unpopular with the people because of his monophysite leanings.⁴⁷ When he died in 491, Ariadne with the support of the senate was then allowed to choose Zeno's successor; she selected the already elderly and rather obscure silentarios Anastasios (491-517), whom she also married.⁴⁸ Despite the fact that he was about sixty when he became emperor, Anastasios outlived his wife and reigned for twenty-seven years.⁴⁹

Each of the two ivory panels, one now found at the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna and a second at the Museo Nazionale del Bargello in Florence, once formed the central panel of a larger five part imperial diptych similar in form to the Barberini panel. Since the fabric, style and treatment as well as the features of the empress and her dress are all very similar, both ivories are generally identified as depicting the empress Ariadne, the long-reigning and popular daughter of Leo I and Verina.⁵⁰ On both panels she is shown in full court dress inside an aedicula underneath a baldachin surrounded by a panoply of insignia of rule. The main difference between the two ivories is that, whereas on the one now found at Kunsthistorisches Museum, the empress is seated on a high-backed throne, on the second one located at the Museo Nazionale del Bargello, she is standing.

On the panel in Vienna, the seated empress' main garments are a chlamys whose edge is decorated with double rows of large pearls, a long-sleeved divitesion, a second short-sleeved dalmatic tunic, and a diadem with shoulder-length pendilia and a double-pointed snood. Prominently displayed on the front of the chlamys is a tablion embellished with an emperor's portrait; the entire garment is decorated with a repetitive geometric pattern. In addition the chlamys is fastened with a rosette-shaped brooch decorated with three pendilia. Ariadne also wears a large jeweled collar, holds a globus cruciger and wears slippers embellished with pearls. She is seated on a high-backed throne with her feet on a footstool which is located in an aedicule between corinthian columns. She peeks out from between drawn curtains and above her head is a hemispherically-shaped baldachin decorated on each side with an imperial eagle.

47. McClanan, 2002, 66.

48. McClanan, 2002, 68; Vagi, 1999, I, 611.

49. McClanan, 2002, 68.

50. McClanan identified the imperial ivories as portraits of the empress Sophia: McClanan, 2002, 168-169.

There are several minor differences between the empress' costume depicted on the panels. In the Vienna one she wears a diadem and snood with two peaks; in the Florence panel her diadem and snood remain the same but it is also decorated with a raised trefoil ornament. In both panels Ariadne holds a globus cruciger in one hand. But in the panel at the Kunsthistorisches Museum her right hand is raised with her palm facing outward in a gesture implying largesse. This gesture is very similar to Anicia Juliana's in the dedication miniature of the Vienna Dioscorides manuscript. On the panel at Museo Nazionale del Bargello the empress holds a plain sceptre in her left hand. The tablions found on the empress' chlamyses on both panels are decorated with busts. On the Florence panel the portrait is clearly that of a crowned emperor in a consular toga; but on the Vienna ivory the picture, which is very abraded, has been interpreted either as an emperor's portrait or as a portrait of Roma.⁵¹ Stilicho's shield and the costumes of client kings were also decorated with the reigning monarch's portrait.⁵² Such portraits implied that the wearers were loyal to the emperor.

The figure of the empress on both ivories is presented in a richly ornate style and hieratic manner.⁵³ Both panels seem designed to communicate a single idea: the majesty and splendour of the imperial office whether belonging to the emperor or his spouse. Such imagery is very different from the statues of Livia, whose primary goal was to imply that the first empress, like her husband, differed little from other members of her class. Her portraits celebrated the fact that she bore male offspring and founded the Julio-Claudian line.⁵⁴ Nor do the panels suggest, like the Trier ivory, that the empress performed pious acts. Instead they imply that the emperor and his spouse were rulers who were invested with the powers of their office.⁵⁵ In Ariadne's case, the images may also have suggested the powers invested in her as the legitimate offspring of Leo I and Verina.⁵⁶ It was these powers and her popularity with the people which allowed Ariadne to transfer the rulership to her son and two spouses.

Although neither of the imperial panels is complete, each of the two central plaques depicting Ariadne may once have formed, as Dilitiana Angelova suggests in the conclusion of her article, half of an imperial diptych.⁵⁷ The second panel would probably have depicted one of Ariadne's two husbands. Such a large diptych with such complex iconography was probably produced for an important event. It may have been created to commemorate Ariadne's elevation to the rank of augusta or her marriage either to Zeno or Anastasios. Since four of Ariadne's medallion portraits on

51. Weitzmann, 1979, 31.

52. Canepa, 2009, 33.

53. Angelova, 2004, 1.

54. Angelova, 2004, 2.

55. Angelova, 2004, 4.

56. McClanan, 2002, 65.

57. Angelova, 2004, 10.

consular diptychs were produced for consulships shortly after her death, the two larger imperial ones may also have been displayed on important public occasions in Anastasios' reign after his wife's death. The deceased empress' image may have acted as a means of bolstering her widowed husband's claims to the throne. Since in both panels the empress is depicted in great detail wearing full court regalia and holding emblems of power, her images probably implied that as the eldest daughter of the previous emperor, she was able to transmit imperial power.

The five medallion portraits of Ariadne are found on the diptychs of three consuls: the earliest one located at the Merseyside County Museum in Liverpool celebrates the consulship of Clementinos (513); the next, once found in Limoge but now destroyed, commemorates the consulship of Anthemios (515); and the final three (located at the Victoria and Albert Museum in London, at the Biblioteca Capitolare in Verona and Bibliotheque Nationale de France in Paris) celebrate the consulships of the emperor's namesake and nephew, Anastasios. These portraits, which are all located in the top section of their diptychs, may represent actual ones displayed beside the new consul at games held in his honour in the Hippodrome.⁵⁷

57. For illustrations of all diptychs: Olovsson, 2005, pls. 11, 1-3; for use of the medallions during games: McClanan, 2002, 71.

In all five of the medallions on consular diptychs the empress' portrait is treated in very similar ways. In the earliest diptych of the eastern consul Clementinos (513), the panel is divided into three parts. The upper section contains the clipeate portraits of Anastasios and Ariadne separated by a cross and an inscription in Latin on a tabula insata stating his name and titles. The main part of the diptych depicts Clementinos in consular dress holding a mappa on his lap and sceptre in his right hand, seated on the sella curulis with his feet resting on two footstools. He is flanked by personifications of Rome and Constantinople. At the bottom of the diptych beneath the consul, two slaves are shown pouring coins and other forms of largesse from large leather sacks. Although these same images are found on several diptychs, they may refer to the fact that Clementinos held the office of imperial finance minister.⁵⁸

As on contemporary coins, Anastasios, the senior ruler, appears first on the left and Ariadne as his wife appears on the right. In the bust-length medallion portrait, Ariadne wears a heavy jewel encrusted collar, earrings and a diadem with a center plaque, a two-pointed snood, and double pendalia. The only unusual features are the empress' pendilia, which are so long that they extend to the bottom of her collar. The placement of Ariadne's portrait in the secondary position on the right wearing imperial costume was appropriate for her position at court as the reigning emperor's spouse.⁵⁹

58. Weitzmann, 1979, 48.

59. McClanan, 1979, 71.

60. McClanan, 1979, 74.

The second diptych of the western consul Antemios (515) once found in Limoges now exists only as a line drawing in a rather flamboyant Rococo style.⁶⁰ Like the earlier one, this diptych was also divided into three zones. In the upper section three portraits instead of two are depicted in an architectural framework. Whereas Anastasios' portrait appears in the centre of the diptych above the remaining two, the medallion on the right shows Ariadne and a third portrait on the left depicting a second crowned ruler. Since this individual wears a diadem, it is probably the consul's ancestor and name-sake, the western emperor Anthemios (467-472).⁶¹ At the top of the diptych is an identifying inscription; the three portraits are separated by two putti holding garlands. In the central section, the consul is shown seated on a backless throne surrounded by an architectural framework which consists of two corinthian columns supporting a gabled pediment. He wears consular dress and holds a raised mappa in his right hand and a sceptre tipped with an imperial eagle and probably a portrait of his ancestor. The bottom section of the diptych, a separate piece of ivory, shows scenes from the games. The empress' dress is very similar to that of the previous panel except her crown is more substantial. This difference probably results simply from the preferences of the diptych carver.

The final medallion portrait of Ariadne appears on three diptychs of the eastern consul Anastasios (517), the great nephew and namesake of the emperor Anastasios; these are located in Verona, London and Paris.⁶² In addition to these three, the lower panel of a fourth diptych, usually attributed to Anastasios, is found in St. Petersburg.⁶³ Since many ivories of Anastasios exist, they probably also represented a form of self-promotion. He became consul in the year his great uncle died and therefore may have hoped to reign after the emperor Anastasios.

61. McClanan, 2002, 74.

62. McClanan, 2002, 74; Olovsson, 2005, 47.

63. Olovsson, 2005, 47.

The three diptychs are very similar in form to that of Anthemios. The upper section has an inscription on a tabula insata and three clipeate portraits of Anastasios in the center, Ariadne on the right, and the portrait of an uncrowned figure on the left. This may represent either Anastasios or more likely Pompeius, a relative who served as consul in 501.⁶⁴ As with the previous diptych, the portraits are separated by two putti holding garlands. In the middle part, the consul is seated on the sella curulis between two columns in an architectural setting. He wears a consular trabea and holds a mappa in his left hand and a scepter tipped with an eagle and tiny portraits of either three ancestors (London) or one (Paris) in the right. The lower section shows scenes from the Hippodrome.

In all three of her medallion portraits, Ariadne wears a diadem decorated with pearls and a centre plaque, a snood, and shoulder-length pendilia.

Although they are very similar, her headgear on each of the three ivories differs. In the diptych from Paris, she wears a low snood and small trefoil frontal plaque. In the second example, in London, her crown is more substantial and the trefoil plaque is slightly raised. In the final ivory from Verona, the snood has twin peaks and the diadem's trefoil ornament is even more pronounced. Although the images are very small, the diptychs from London and Rome, instead of depicting a diadem and snood, may show more substantial forms of headgear which may represent the first examples of crowns similar to the one which Theodora wears in the mosaic at San Vitale.

64. Weitzmann, 1979, 97

65. For an analysis of the busts: McClanan, 2002, 83-90. For pictures of the busts: McClanan, 2002, figs. 3.6, 3.7, and 3.9.

66. For pictures of the bronze bust from Serbia: McClanan, 2002, 83; Weitzmann, 1979, 30.

Three unlabeled marble busts identified as the empress Ariadne also exist: one is located in the Musée du Louvre in Paris and the remaining two in Rome at the Lateran Museum and the Palazzo dei Conservatori Museum.⁶⁵ In addition to these marble sculptures, a bronze bust found in Balajnac, Serbia is also identified as Ariadne.⁶⁶ The marble busts share many stylistic features with the portraits of Ariadne on the ivories, including their fleshy faces, oval heads, and slightly bulging eyes with drilled pupils.⁶⁷ All four busts also have a strong resemblance to the portraits of Ariadne found on the ivories. Although the face of the bronze bust from Serbia is thinner, as with the three marble busts, there is no real attempt to depict individualized portraiture.

All three of the marble busts are shown wearing the stiff snoods popular during the empress' lifetime, a diadem consisting of double rows of pearls with a center-piece to help give the snood its shape. The bronze head from Serbia also wears a snood but its diadem is more substantial with three large pearls projecting above the headgear. There is never any attempt on the part of the sculptor to represent pendilia like those shown on the later marble head usually identified as Theodora (pl. 22). Three of the busts, the ones from Paris, the Lateran in Rome and Serbia, like several of Ariadne's ivories, wear snoods with two peaks. Of the three marble busts, two depict only the empress' head; but the third one from the Lateran Museum in Rome is a three-quarter draped bust which shows the empress clad in a non-imperial tunic and mantle.⁶⁸

67. For other analyses of the busts' style: McClanan, 2002, 83; Weitzmann, 1979, 30.

68. Although the third head has the same features as the other two, both of whose costumes are unknown, it may wear non-imperial dress because the head and bust are mismatched. The head was carved in Constantinople, then sent to a distant city where it was supplied with a bust wearing a generalized mantle and tunic or the empress' dress has been assimilated to that of an unknown goddess, whose attributes are now missing.

Although none of the marble busts depict pendilia, all wear a diadem with a double row of pearls and centre stone, which is similar to those worn by Ariadne on her imperial ivories. Besides having a snood with two peaks and diadem with double rows of pearls, the headgear of the bronze bust from Serbia also has three prominent projections, which seem similar to those found on Ariadne's medallion portrait in the ivory of Clemintinus from Liverpool. Since other upper class women contemporary with Ariadne's lifetime wore stiff snoods,⁶⁹ the fact that the busts wear headgear consisting of a snood with twin peaks and pearl encrusted diadems, similar to those on Ariadne's imperial ivories, suggests that they can be identified as the empress. There is, however, no evidence pointing to their exact use. Since the busts are in the same style as Ariadne's imperial ivories and their dress is similar, they also seem designed to communicate the power invested in her as the eldest daughter of the ruling emperor and suggest her role in the transmission of power.

Because such contemporary historians as Prokopios preserved the details of the next empress' life and she was the wife of the long reigning ruler Justinian, Theodora (augusta from 527-548) is probably the best known of Byzantine empresses.⁷⁰ The future empress was born either in Constantinople or Paphlagonia in 497 of humble origins; her father Akakios was a bear-keeper for the Green faction.⁷¹ As empress Theodora was noted for her monophysite leanings and philanthropic works, which included the endowment of monasteries, churches, orphanages and homes for reformed prostitutes.⁷² But only three contemporary works, a single medallion portrait on a consular diptych, one marble head, and one of the two imperial panels at San Vitale, depict her portrait (pls. 21-23). Because of her humble origins or the fact that she did not produce an heir, her image never appears on coins.

69. Although the Metropolitan Museum of Art dates its portrait bust of a woman holding a scroll to a slightly earlier time period, it is still the best evidence to support wider use of the snood worn. McClanan and Croom date the bust to Ariadne's lifetime: McClanan, 2002, 2.14; Croom, 2002, 106, 49.4. For a picture of the bust: McClanan, 2002, 2.14.

70. According to Constantine VII Porphyrogenitos, Justin I made both Justinian an augustus and Theodora an augusta shortly before his death: Constantine VII Porphyrogenitos, Bk. I, 95; Reiske, 1829, 433. All contemporary historians quote this statement: Croke, 2007, 77, Garland, 1999, 19 and ODB, 1991, 2036.

71. *Procopii Caesariensis Opera Omnia*, Haury, 1962-64; Prokopios, *Secret History*, 9.1; Dewing, 1935, 102-103.

72. For Prokopios' interpretation of her actions: *Secret History*, 10.3, Dewing, 1935, 120-121. For present interpretations: McClanan, 2002, 94; ODB, 1991, 2036.

The first of these items, a medallion portrait which appears on the consular diptych of Justinus in Berlin and is dated to 540, is very similar to the earlier ones of Ariadne.⁷³ The diptych itself is unusual because Justinus was the last eastern consul. After Basilius was elected western consul in 541, Justinian abolished the office of consul. The year 540 was also noteworthy because it was the year in which a plague that Evagrius records lasted for fifty-two years first appeared in Africa.⁷⁴ The advent of the plague may have also caused the end of ivory exportation from Africa. Whereas over one hundred ivory objects exist dated to before this year, only six exist dated from between 540-700.⁷⁵

Although Justinus' ivory, like earlier diptychs, has three sections, its iconography varies from earlier ones in several ways. The upper region still has the consul's name inscribed on a tabula insata; beneath it are medallion portraits of Theodora on the right and of Justinian on the left, with a third one depicting Christ in the centre. In the central section of the ivory is a portrait of Justinus, Justinian's nephew, but instead of being shown seated on the sella curulis, there is instead a bust-length portrait of the consul in a large central medallion wearing a consular trabea and holding a sceptre and mappa. This large medallion is surrounded by a decorative vine which connects the three sections of the diptych; in the third section, at the bottom is a traditional scene of the sparsio.

In her medallion portrait, Theodora's dress varies little from that of her predecessor Ariadne. The empress wears a snood with two peaks, a diadem with shoulder length pendilia, a heavy jeweled collar, and an imperial chlamys. The main difference between the empresses' portraits is that, although Theodora's snood still has two peaks, rather than having her hair pulled back above her brow like Ariadne's, Theodora is depicted with bangs similar to those found on her bust from Milan. Although conservative in its depiction of the imperial couple and the sparsio, the ivory is also innovative in its inclusion of a small medallion of Christ between the portraits of the imperial couple and in its depiction of Justinus as a bust instead of as a seated figure. Theodora's dress is very similar to her predecessor Ariadne's, except her snood with its bangs probably reflects contemporary court tastes.

73. For a picture of the diptych: Weitzmann, 1979 51; Olovsson, 2005, pl. 16. For an analysis of the diptych: McClanan, 2002, 148-149.

74. Ecclesiastical History, J. Bidez, 1898; Evagrius Scholasticus, XXIX; (anonymous), 1846 (reprinted 2010), 223. Rosen, 2007, 195.

75. Rosen, 2007, 195.

The marble head dated to the sixth century and identified as Theodora was found in Milan's Castello Sforzesco during the demolition of a medieval wall. It has been identified as Theodora on the basis of its resemblance to her portrait in the imperial panel at San Vitale and to Prokopios' descriptions of her.⁷⁶ The sculpted face is thin with heavy lidded eyes and a narrow jaw. The empress is shown wearing a high, double-pointed snood with an oval centre piece that has three extensions, and is encircled both horizontally and vertically by a diadem with a double row of pearls, which is tied at the back in a complicated knot. A side view of the head shows a single pendilia ending at the base of the snood.⁷⁷ Anne McClanan suggests that the head once belonged to a statue of the empress that was set up in Milan after an Ostrogothic massacre carried out in the early 540s.⁷⁸

Ann Stout also believes that the statue's frontal bangs depict the empress' hair.⁷⁹ In the earlier mosaic of pharaoh's daughter at S. Maria Maggiore in Rome, the princess and her courtiers all wear snoods which entirely cover their hair but whose colour and texture imitate it. In the later imperial panel at San Vitale in Ravenna, Theodora and her courtiers all wear a form of snood which entirely envelops their hair and has alternating bands of light and dark brown in the front. On the marble head from Milan Theodora's frontal bangs probably imitate bands of this type and are part of her snood rather than her hair, indicating that the style of snood popular during Theodora's lifetime differs from that of earlier time periods.

Since imperial brooches traditionally had a rosette-shape and three pendilia, Ann Stout suggests that the frontal ornament on Theodora's diadem with its three extensions imitates an imperial brooch and that the empress might have worn this type of headgear when her costume did not include a cloak.⁸⁰ The diadems which have trefoil ornaments of such earlier empresses as Ariadne might also have been precursors of this later type of adornment. Statues of the emperor and empress in imperial dress were probably erected after a massacre in Milan to reassure the city's citizens of the emperor's continued support of cities loyal to the Byzantines.⁸¹

76. McClanan, 2002, 140.

77. McClanan, 2002, 140, fig. 6.6.

78. McClanan, 2002, 140.

79. Stout, 2001, 94.

80. Stout, 2001, 94.

81. McClanan, 2002, 143.

82. For a list of articles and illustrations consult the final section of the emperor in everyday dress. McClanan also devotes a section to the panel depicting Theodora: McClanan, 2002, 146-147.

The final depiction of Theodora is found at San Vitale in Ravenna.⁸² The imperial panel, located on the right side in the apse of the church, is generally believed to show the empress and her court participating in a part of the liturgy called the Little Entrance when offertory items were first brought into the church.⁸³ Opposite this mosaic is a similar one depicting Justinian and his courtiers, which was discussed earlier in the section on the emperor in a chlamys. These are separated by a third mosaic in the conch of the apse showing Christ in majesty offering a martyr's crown to S. Vitalis on his right. On Christ's left Bishop Ecclesius, who began work on the church in about 522, is shown offering him a model of it. Although four bishops were involved in building San Vitale, work on the mosaics in the apse was probably begun by Bishop Victor only after the Ostrogothic defeat in 540 and dedicated by his successor Maximianus in 545.⁸⁴

In the panel Theodora, accompanied by seven females and two eunuchs, is shown standing in an atrium outside a church beside a fountain. One of the eunuchs has drawn back a curtain so the empress and her courtiers can enter through a darkened doorway.⁸⁵ In Justinian's panel, the arrangement is more formal, with the emperor placed in the centre and all twelve of the figures in the mosaic facing frontally, staring aloofly ahead. In Theodora's mosaic the arrangement is somewhat more relaxed. Although all the figures are facing frontally, the empress flanked by two senior courtiers and her male attendants is placed somewhat off-centre. Whereas five of Theodora's courtiers glance sideways, the five remaining central figures stare blankly ahead. In his panel the emperor is shown holding a paten; in hers Theodora holds a large jewel-encrusted chalice, perhaps either her donation to the newly-built church or an offertory gift for the eucharist. Like Justinian in the panel opposite her, she is haloed and wears full imperial regalia consisting of a snood with two peaks, a substantial crown decorated with pairs of full-length pendilia and a trefoil ornament, an imperial brooch, a heavy jeweled collar, purple mantle, diveteson with fitted cuffs and pointed purple slippers. But unlike Justinian's mantle, which has a tablion, Theodora's cloak has an ornamental border depicting the three wisemen bearing gifts.

83. Matthews, 1971, 146-147; McClanan, 2002, 127.

84. For a list of the bishops and their dates: Andreescu-Treadgold, 1990, 1712. McClanan also discusses the dating of the imperial panels: McClanan, 2002, 135-136.

85. Ringrose identifies this eunuch as the head eunuch: Ringrose, 2003, 166. Under Justinian several court offices were always held by eunuchs: Ringrose, 2003, 166-173.

The chronicler Agnellus records that Juliannus Argentarius, a Greek banker, paid for the building's construction, its decoration and even its dedication to San Vitalis.⁸⁶ The church was constructed over a twenty-year period, which witnessed a dramatic change in Ravenna's rulers and their religion. When San Vitale was begun, the Ostrogoths, who were Arian Christians, ruled Ravenna; when it was completed the city was ruled by the Byzantines, who practiced Orthodox Christianity. Since the two panels depicting Justinian and Theodora were created shortly after the Ostrogothic defeat in 540, they probably reflect the religious and political events of this tumultuous time period.⁸⁷ Because Justinian stands immediately beside the figure of Bishop Maximianus, his panel was probably created to suggest the emperor's support for the new archbishop whom he selected in 546.⁸⁸ A possible secondary reason for creating the imperial panels, which were also made at about the same time as the statues in Milan, is that they gave the imperial couple a presence in the former Ostrogothic capital. Weitzmann and McClanan suggest this possibility as an explanation of why the panels seem designed to create such a strong visual impact.⁸⁹ Like Justinian the empress is resplendently dressed probably in the finest silken fabrics with a heavy jeweled collar and crown which demonstrates all the insignia of her rank and suggest the power of the imperial office.

The next empress, Sophia (augusta from 565-578), Theodora's niece and the wife of Justinian's nephew, Justin II (565-578), wielded actual power for several years after her husband became mentally ill and before his death.⁹⁰ Corippus' poem, *In Laudem Iustini Augusti Minoris*, and the image on bronze coins minted from the first year of Justin's reign, which depicted both seated on a double throne holding insignia of rule, also imply that she may have had some power from the beginning of his reign (pl. 24).⁹¹ Further, since Sophia, who was born before 530 and died after 600, was capable and survived through turbulent times, she acted as a pivotal figure during three later reigns. When Justin II became mentally unstable in 572 and was unable to rule, Sophia acted as her husband's regent, then selected Tiberios II Constantine as his caesar and successor.⁹² Moreover, when Tiberios reigned for only a

86. Agnellus, *Liber Pontificalis Ecclesiae Ravennatis*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores Rerum Langobardicarum et Italicarum*. Hanover, Germany 1878, 318-319. Also Agnellus, ed. A. Testi Rasponi, *Raccolta degli storici italiani dal cinquecento al millecinquecento*, ed. L. A. Muratori, fasc. 200. Bologna, 1924, 198, 167.

87. Andreescu-Treadgold and Treadgold, 1997, 712.

88. Andreescu-Treadgold and Treadgold reports that medieval alterations to Maximianus' head resulted in his head appearing to be tonsured; but the inscription above his head predates the changes and was not affected by them: Andreescu-Treadgold, 1990, 716.

89. Weitzmann, 1978, 78; McClanan, 2002, 135.

90. McClanan, 2002, 153-155.

91. Cameron, 1975, 11.

92. McClanan, 2002, 153-155.

93. McClanan, 2002, 157.

94. McClanan, 2002, 158.

few years, Sophia was instrumental in selecting Maurice.⁹³ The former empress finally survived through most of Maurice's long reign and may even have been executed along with his family when Phokas came to power.⁹⁴

Besides several types of bronze coins, a number of statues of Sophia once existed in Constantinople, including a gold one at the Milion and several statues of the imperial couple as part of a family group at the newly built port of Sophia.⁹⁵ Medallion portraits of Sophia and Justin II are still found on a gilded silver cross in the Vatican Collection in Rome, which the couple donated to Pope John III (561-574) probably in 568 or 569 (pl. 25).⁹⁶

The Cross of Justin II or Crux Vaticana, a jewel encrusted cross which displays wood from the True Cross at its centre in the form of a cross, is found today in the Treasury of St. Peter's in Rome.⁹⁷ It is the Vatican's oldest reliquary cross, and since it was the gift of an early emperor, one of the most revered religious artefacts in the Vatican Collection. The Crux Vaticana is still used at both Easter and Christmas during the church's most important ceremonies.⁹⁸ Over the centuries, it has undergone several restorations, the latest being from 2007-2009 when the cross was cleaned and some of the brightly coloured jewels, which were added later encircling its outer edge, were replaced with pearls.⁹⁹ Although the cross, which today is only about 15.75 inches high and 11.81 inches wide, is still much shorter than it was originally and mounted on a much later stand, it is now closer to its original appearance when the cross was donated in the sixth century.¹⁰⁰

Besides its reliquary capsule, the front of the cross' outer edge is decorated with jewels and large pearls and a Latin inscription which reads:

LIGNO QUO CHRISTUS HUMANUM/ SUBDIDIT HOSTEM DAT ROMAE (Vertical)

IUSTINUM OPEM/ ET SOCIA DECOREM (Horizontal)

(For the wood [of the cross] on which human Christ was overcome by the

95. McClanan, 2002, 152.

96. McClanan, 2002, 152.

97. For a picture of the cross before reconstructions: McClanan, 2002, 167. For a picture after its reconstruction: Vatican Associated News Release, Nov. 2009.

98. McClanan, 2002, 163.

99. Squires, 2002, 1.

100. Squires, 2002, 2.

enemy; Justin [and his consort] give Rome this wealth and decoration).¹⁰¹

Each side of the crossbar is decorated with double pendilia made of large gems. The reverse of the cross is silver worked in repousse with Christ depicted at the center in a large medallion as the Agnus Dei. Portraits of the emperor and empress appear on either end of the crossbar. An image of Christ, as a man, is found at the top of the cross and that of John the Baptist at the bottom. The remaining space is filled with a decorative vine similar to the one on the consular diptych of Justinian's nephew, Justinus (540).

In their medallion portraits both rulers are shown bust length with their hands raised in prayer. Sophia wears a diadem decorated with two rows of pearls and a trefoil ornament, a snood with two peaks, a diveteson with long, pleated sleeves and, like her husband, either a heavy necklace or a chlamys decorated with double rows of pearls. Her crown is most similar to that worn by Ariadne in the now lost diptych of the western consul Anthemios (515).¹⁰² If her chlamys is thought to be decorated with double rows of large pearls, then it is most similar to those worn by Pulcheria on the Trier Ivory and by Ariadne on her two imperial ivories. On Licinia Eudoxia's wedding nomisma (437) and on the obverse of her nomisma dated to 439, that empress' chlamys is decorated only with rows of small pearls.

101. Vatican Associated News Release, Nov. 2009.

102. For a picture of the diptych: McClanan, 2002, 73, 3.2; Olovsson, 2005, pl. 15.

Because the figures are very small and their depiction does not exactly match other contemporary examples, Christa Belting-Ihm speculated that the work might be of "provincial manufacture". Anna McClanan, however, concluded that since the gift was imperial, a provincial origin seems unlikely.¹⁰³ The real problem is that we have a very small number of imperial medallion portraits with which to compare the figures. After small differences in detail are discounted, the two portraits seem closely related to those found in the slightly earlier ones of the emperors and empresses on consular diptychs.

The imperial couple's portraits are depicted on the cross to give the donation their official stamp of approval. The emperor's importance as God's representative on earth is implied by the fact that these portraits are placed at either end of the cross bar, a position usually reserved for figures such as John the Baptist or an apostle. Their piety and subservience to the deity are suggested by the fact that they are shown in a posture of prayer. Because the cross was an official donation intended for use during the most solemn religious festivals, the portraits are shown in full court regalia, the dress dictated by the importance of the donation and by the solemn ceremonies for which such an ornately decorated cross was intended to be used.

Although no coins bearing Theodora's portrait were issued during Justinian's reign, bronze folles from all mints as well as half folles (20 nummi) and even decanummi from a few mints were produced from the first year of Justin II's reign showing Sophia seated beside her husband on a double lyre backed throne (pl. 24)¹⁰⁴ The iconography of these coins may imply that Sophia had some power from the beginning of his reign. Both are nimbed, wear a diadem with pendilia, diveteson and chlamys with an imperial brooch. Justin II usually holds a globus cruciger and Sophia a cruciform sceptre. But despite the coins' strong visual statement of a possible equality of rule, the coin's inscription names only Justin II as emperor.

103. Belting-Ihm, Christa "Das Justinuskreuz in der Schatzkammer der Peterskirche zu Rom," Jahrbuch des Romisch-germanischen Zentralmuseums Mainz, 12 (1965), 147. McClanan, 2002, 167.

104. McClanan, 2002, 159.

The mints of Carthage and Cherson produced two additional types of folles with Sophia's portrait (pls. 26-27). At Carthage a rare folles was issued in years three and five of Justin's reign, depicting the imperial couple as facing busts.¹⁰⁵ This coin was probably suggested either by similar double bust portraits on imperial weights or by a similar folles of Justin I and Justinian issued by the Antioch mint during these rulers' brief joint reign. Unlike the common folles which names only Justin II as ruler, these bronzes include both names in their inscription and in the exergue the word VITA. Because the inscription on the follis was a formulaic acclamation, the imperial couple's names are in the dative case.¹⁰⁶

Although the attribution is sometimes questioned because the coins lack an inscription, a second type of follis from Cherson depicting an imperial couple as standing figures is usually identified as showing Justin II and Sophia on its obverse.¹⁰⁷ Both wear diadems with pendilia, a chlamys with an imperial brooch and a divetesion. As on their more common folles, which portray the figures seated, Justin II holds a globus cruciger and Sophia, a cruciform sceptre. But in addition to the numeral M of value (40 nummi) the coin's obverse shows a third standing figure, probably that of Justin's caesar, Tiberios II, holding a long staff surmounted by a Chi-Rho. Whereas the iconography of the first two folles seems designed to suggest that Sophia shared some power with her husband, the third example from Cherson probably appeared only at the end of his reign in 574 after Tiberios II was named his caesar, and therefore seems to have been issued to promote acceptance of his junior colleague.

105. Grierson, 1982, 70.

106. Grierson, 1982, 70.

107. Grierson, 1982, 73. Grierson believed the coins were part of an insurrectionary coinage designed to put Maurice's son Theodosios on the throne; he offered no evidence to support his belief: Grierson, 1982, 45.

A similar follis was issued by Cherson during Maurice's reign. These show standing figures of Maurice and his wife Constantia on the obverse with their son Theodosios (590-602) on the reverse (pl. 28).¹⁰⁸ Unlike the earlier follis attributed to Justin II, these coins bear Maurice's name. A final related very rare follis was issued by Cherson during Herakleios' reign (pl. 29).¹⁰⁹ These show the emperor and his son Herakleios Constantine as standing figures on the obverse. Both wear diadems, a chlamys, and a divitesion; both rulers hold a globus cruciger in their right hand. On the reverse, Herakleios' empress and cousin, Martina, is depicted without a diadem and holding a shepherd's crook.¹¹⁰ This coin's message is that the male offspring of a ruling emperor take precedence over his empress. Since Tiberios Constantine was Martina's stepson, these bronzes probably were designed firstly to suggest the earlier folles of Justin II and Maurice and secondly to imply, like the manuscript illumination from Job, familial harmony between the family members of both his wives.

108. Grierson, 1982, 73.

109. Grierson, 1982, 120; Sear, 1987, 197, 962. An example of this extremely rare follis is found in the Bibliothèque Nationale.

110. Grierson, 1982, 120.

After Justin II's rule several bronze coins issued from Tiberios II Constantine's reign to Herakleios' also depicted the ruling emperor with his spouse. The earliest of these was a bronze half follis of Tiberios II Constantine, which imitated the iconography of Justin II's bronze half follis by showing the emperor and his wife Anastasia seated on a double throne (pl. 30).¹¹¹ The empress wears a trefoil diadem with pendilia and probably a chlamys and divetesion. The bronze coin was issued only by the Thessalonika mint. Maurice's eldest son Theodosios minted a rare silver half siliqua which depicts his portrait as a bust on the obverse and similar portraits of Maurice and his wife Constantia on its reverse (pl. 31). The empress wears a diadem with pendilia but the rest of her dress on these tiny coins is too poorly defined to decipher.

Several of the emperor Phokas' bronzes depict him and his empress Leontia as standing figures. Folles were issued by Constantinople; half folles by Thessaloniki; folles and half folles by Kyzikos; and finally folles and decanumia by Theoupolis (Antioch) (pls. 32-35).¹¹² On all the bronzes, Leontia is depicted wearing a diadem with pendilia, chlamys decorated with a small row of pearls, and a divetesion. The emperor Phokas holds a globus cruciger; the empress, a plain cross. In all the bronzes except from Theoupolis, Leontia is shown nimbed; this iconographic detail is found on Byzantine bronze coins as early as the seated figures of Justin II and Sophia.¹¹³ On all these bronzes Phokas' crown is decorated by a cross. In the one example minted by Theoupolis, where Leontia's crown is also surmounted by a cross, her portrait is without a halo.

111. Sear, 1987, 107, 439.

112. Grierson, 1982, 65.

113. Sear, 1987, 91, 360.

The last empress whose portrait was depicted on bronze coinage was Martina, Herakleios' second wife and niece. Several types of coins were minted during Herakleios' reign which depict the emperor either standing beside his eldest son Herakleios Constantine or between his two sons, Herakleios Constantine and Heraklonas. These include both gold nomisma and bronze folles which were issued by several mints (pls. 36). A second type of bronze follis with Herakleios standing between Herakleios Constantine and Martina was also produced by several mints, including Thessaloniki, Nikomedia, Kyzikos and Cyprus (pl. 37).¹¹⁴ Although Martina is usually found on her husband's left, the position of less importance, she is sometimes shown on her husband's right on folles from Nikomedia.¹¹⁵ This departure from established conventions may result from no more than the die maker's carelessness or because since only two figures are shown, the position of less importance is on the left. On all of these coins she is depicted holding a globus cruciger and wearing a diadem surmounted by a cross, a chlamys and a divitesion. This type of bronze and those with Herakleios standing between each of the sons produced by his two marriages suggest familial harmony. Early Arabic coins with similar groups of standing figures, which were produced at a slightly later time, were derived from Herakleios' earlier coins.

In conclusion, the first depiction of an empress in a chlamys and divitesion appeared on gold nomismata issued to commemorate the elevation of Theodosios I's first wife, Aelia Flaccilla, to the office of augusta in 383. Since the reign of Constantine, who made his mother Helena and wife Fausta augustae in 324, no empress had received this title. On coins minted at that time Helena and Fausta wore costumes which differed little from those of other high born Roman women. The only significant difference was that both wore diadems without ties. In contrast, Flaccilla is shown wearing a dress which virtually duplicated her husband's costume and consisted of a diadem with ties in the back, a divitesion, a full-length chlamys, and an imperial brooch with three pendilia.

114. Sear, 1987, 176, 825.

115. Sear, 1987, 178, 835,

At the end of Constantine's reign court life centred primarily around the palace he built in Constantinople instead of various tetrarchic capitals. At the palace court ceremony eventually became structured in such a way that the empress' court duplicated her husband's. Her portraits seem designed to achieve two slightly different goals. In such official works of art as the coinage of Flaccilla and Licinia Eudoxia, Ariadne's ivories, Theodora's statue from Milan, and the imperial panel at San Vitale which shows Theodora resplendently dressed surrounded by similarly dressed courtiers, the work seems primarily to communicate the authority and dignity of the imperial office as a whole. In a second group of works such as the Trier Ivory, which shows an emperor leading a procession that stops before an empress, bronzes that depict Sophia seated beside her husband, and the Crux Vaticana, where she appears near him, the work seems designed instead to depict the imperial couple working harmoniously together to fulfil the duties of their office.¹¹⁶

Since the iconography of Flaccilla's gold nomisma duplicated her husband's down to the smallest details, it conveyed the same message as his coins and those of every ruler beginning with Constantine, who first minted gold nomismata of this type. Like her husband, the empress was depicted as idealized and eternally youthful. The first empress whose image was altered was Licinia Eudoxia, wife of Valentinian III. He minted a gold nomisma showing his wife clad in a slightly different version of his costume. On these commemorative nomismata Licinia Eudoxia was depicted as a bust facing frontally wearing a diadem decorated with six rays, a central cross, and pendilia, which were extensions of the rows of pearls decorating her diadem; the edge of the empress' chlamys was further embellished with a row of small pearls.

This type of imagery was developed to its furthest extent in the art of the empress Ariadne. Since Leo I and Verina had no son, their oldest daughter Ariadne was depicted in several works of art (including two imperial diptychs, several medallion portraits on consular diptychs, and busts) wearing a diadem with a snood, a chlamys decorated with large pearls, and holding such insignia of rule as the globus cruciger and a sceptre surmounted by a cross. The use of such imagery and her popularity among the people enabled her to pass the imperium to three rulers. The final empress to communicate this idea was Theodora in her portrait bust from Milan. The imperial panel at San Vitale, which shows the empress resplendently attired surrounded by similarly dressed female courtiers, expresses a similar idea. The panel was probably created to communicate the dignity and authority of the imperial office to foreigners who had never seen Byzantine court ceremonial.

116. Garland especially emphasizes the importance of the imperial couple's collegiality during the reigns of Justinian and Justin II: Garland, 1999, 1, 30, 47.

A second group of works show the imperial couple harmoniously discharging their duties. These include the Trier ivory, which probably shows Theodosios II at the head of a procession transporting a saint's relics and his sister Pulcheria standing beside a newly build church waiting to receive the relics; Sophia's portrait on bronzes, which show her seated beside her husband; and her image beside her husband's on the Crux Vaticana. The later folles, which show Leontia and Phokas or Herakleios and Martina standing together in full court dress, communicate a similar idea.

Imperial Bridal Dress

During a traditional Roman wedding ceremony, aristocratic brides and grooms wore a special form of tunic, derived from an earlier looser fitting type, called the tunica recta (straight tunic).¹ As dictated by earlier traditions, these garments were woven by the bride on an early form of loom, the upright; both wore this type of tunic only on their wedding day. Bridal pairs also wore crowns made of herbs and leaves.² But the bride's dress consisted of several additional garments including a hairnet, veil, marriage belt, and slippers.³ The wedding ceremony itself consisted of the couple's hands being joined by a person called the pronubus in a ritualistic handshake, the dextrarum iunctio, which symbolized the newlyweds' mutual concord.⁴ Rather than being a religious ceremony, Roman marriages had a distinctly legalistic aspect with the couple receiving a marriage contract.⁵ The bridal pair's dress and wedding ceremony continued traditions which began in the Late Republic and remained unchanged until at least the third century.⁶

1. Sebesta, 2001, 48; Follette, 2001, 54; Croom, 2002, 112.

2. Follette, 2001, 56; Croom, 2002, 112.

3. Sebesta, 2001, 48-49; Follette, 2001, 54; Croom, 2002, 112.

4. Follette, 2001, 60.

5. Follette, 2001, 56; Croom, 2002, 111.

6. Follette, 2001, 54.

Imperial brides in the late antique period seem also to have worn the specialized costume of the Roman bride. For example, the bride's headgear depicted on a medallion on a sixth-century marriage imperial marriage belt at Dumbarton Oaks was probably based on an earlier imperial one; it depicts part of an imperial diadem just peeking out from beneath a traditional bridal veil.⁷ Several of the Roman bride's garments, including her veil, shoes and hair-net, were flame coloured in imitation of the dress of the Flaminica Dialis, the priestess of Jupiter.⁸ The court panegyrist Claudian mentions that Serena, the niece and adopted daughter of Theodosios, wore yellow during her wedding ceremony. Both the diademed bride on the medallion and the colour of Serena's costume suggest imperial brides wore the same dress as earlier aristocratic Roman brides.⁹

The large Rothschild Cameo, which probably shows an imperial bridal pair, seems to depict the bride wearing the traditional costume of a Roman bride (pl. 1). The identities of the male and female shown in the cameo, a large sardynx measuring about 150 mm, which is set in a later Renaissance frame, are disputed.¹⁰ The cameo shows shoulder length busts of the bridal pair and may have been carved to commemorate the marriage of Honorios to Maria, the daughter of Serena and Stilicho, in 398.¹¹ Although the cameo's provenance is unknown, the gem was purchased by Robert de Rothschild in 1889 from an antiquarian who believed that it came from Spain.¹² The cameo is still found in the Rothschild collection in Paris. A lightly etched Greek inscription on the gem identifies the pair as Sts. Sergios and Bakkos, indicating that it was once used in a Christian context.¹³

7. Because the bride and groom receive marriage crowns and the groom on the medallion does not wear one, the bride's diadem is probably that of a Byzantine princess. See Kantorowicz, 1960, pls. 1a, b; Vikan, 1990, pl. 31; Ross, 2005, pl. XXXI, no. 38, pl. XXXII, no. 38.

8. Follette, 2001, 55; Sebesta, 2001, 48.

9. Claudian, "Stilicho," I, ll. 80-84; Platnauer, 1922, 370.

10. An early critic E. Coche de la Ferte identified the emperor as Constans II; but Delbroueck has identified him as Honorios: Delbroueck, 1929, 258-260. In the only recent article on the cameo by Siri Sande, the author argues that the gem depicts Honorios and Maria but that an earlier cameo with images of Claudius and Agrippina the Younger was re-cut: Sande, 2001, 148. The cameo is pictured in Delbroueck, 1933, pl. 105.

11. Delbroueck, 1933, 206-207; Sande, 2001, 148-149.

12. Sande, 2001, 148-149.

13. Sande, 2001, 148-149.

The female's hairstyle in the cameo has been identified by Delbrueck and other writers, including Siri Sande, as a style worn by aristocratic women during the reign of Claudius (10 B.C.-A.D. 54).¹⁴ But the bust pictured in Delbrueck as dating to Claudius' reign shows the hair as simply being gathered in the back (pl. 2).¹⁵ In the cameo the women's hair has first been gathered in the back then brought forward into a braid on top of her head, where it is held in place by a diadem. In the cameo the bride's main garments, which consist of a loose fitting unbanded tunic and mantle might also be those of a Roman bride. By contrast, in the Stilicho Diptych dated to the same time period as Honorios' and Maria's wedding, Serena, Maria's mother wears a long-sleeved dalmatic tunic with a banded neck (pl. 3). Since it is belted beneath her breasts, Serena's second garment, a full-length mantle, also differs from the bride's on the cameo. Even a cursory glance at the dress of the female in the cameo suggests she might be a Roman bride.

14. Sande. 3003, 149.

15. Delbrueck, 1929, 260.

16. Follette, 2001, 56-61

Although the colour of the women's garments in the cameo can never be identified as the yellow worn by a Roman bride, the imperial woman's hairstyle and her crown can be. In conformity with earlier traditions, a Roman bride's hair-style imitated that of the Vestal Virgins, who arranged their hair first by parting it in the middle; next the shorter hair in the front was arranged in small curls, called the seni crines; and finally small amounts of hair before and behind the ears were trimmed (pl. 4).¹⁶ According to tradition a Roman bride's hair was arranged by the use of a real spear, the hasta caelibaris or celibate spear. The spear's use is believed to refer to the fact that the first Roman brides, the Sabine women, were taken by force.¹⁷ The remaining hair in the back was then braided into a bun which was worn on top of the head. The traditional Roman bride and groom also wore crowns shaped like wreaths made from herbs and leaves. Besides their special tunic, crown, and a bridal veil, which was worn covering most of the face, Roman brides also wore a girdle tied around their waists in a special knot called the nodus herculaneus.¹⁸ The groom untied this knot on the couple's wedding night in the bridal chamber.

In contrast, unlike the Roman bride, whose only adornments were a crown and belt, wealthy fourth-century women, as shown in Serena's portrait, often wore pearl necklaces with matching pendant earrings. Whereas the imperial female in the cameo holds no attributes, the male holds a sceptre, a symbol of imperial rule. This is also one of the attributes which Honorios holds on one side of the consular diptych of Anicius Petronius Probus dated to 406 (pl. 5). In the cameo the male figure holds what may be a scroll; this object probably represents the couple's marriage contract, an attribute found in several fourth-century portraits of Roman brides and grooms.¹⁹ For example, fourth-century Roman sarcophagi and the Projects Casket dated to between 330 and 380 show couples holding their marriage contracts (pls. 6-7).²⁰

17. For the use of the spear: Follette, 2001, 60-61; reference to Sabine women: Claudian, 1976, 262, note 1.

18. Sebesta, 2001, 48.

19. Croom, 2001, 111.

20. For a picture of the newlyweds holding a contract on a Roman sarcophagus: Ryberg, pl. LIX, fig. 94; for a picture of the couple on the lid of the Projecta Casket: Weitzmann, 1971, 331.

In the cameo, just visible as a thin line around the bride's face, is shown what is probably her veil. According to earlier customs the woman's hair has been arranged in a style similar to that of the Vestal Virgins'. It is even trimmed like theirs in front of the ears. In contrast, on the Stilicho diptych Serena's hair is hidden beneath a loaf shaped wig. In the cameo the bride's hair, like the Vestal Virgins', was braided, then brought forward where it is held in place by a diadem decorated with laurel leaves.²¹ Instead of wearing crowns of leaves like traditional brides and grooms, the couple's diadems are decorated with them. The male's diadem also has a centre-piece marked with a Christogram, the only symbol identifying the couple as Christians.

The fact that the emperor in the cameo wears military dress, instead of a tunic, might argue against interpreting the couple as an imperial bridal pair. Although written by the court poet Claudian as panegyrics, a type of poetry whose primary goal was to flatter the emperor, Claudian's "Epithalamium" and *Fascennine Verses* still represent eyewitness accounts of the couple's marriage ceremony.²² Though both poems do describe the emperor and his court in glowing terms, they also contain information which may explain the emperor's preference for military dress. In the panels of the diptych of Anicius Petronius Probus, mentioned previously, Honorios wears military costume. A careful examination of the two poems as well as of other contemporary historians may suggest reasons for the emperor's choice of military costume.

21. The couple's crowns most closely resemble the laureate crowns with centre-pieces worn by Constantine's son on some of their coins; but since there are no pictures of early Roman marriage crowns, they may instead be early examples of marriage crowns. See Walter, 1993, 1 especially note 2.

22. Cameron, 1970, 95.

In Claudian's "Epithalamium", Venus accompanied by a large retinue acts as the couple's pronubus. She first arranges for her Nereids to make costly wedding gifts for Maria, including a necklace, diadem and marriage belt. After giving the bride these gifts, the goddess then parts Maria's hair with a spear, ties on her marriage belt and finally places a veil on her head.²³ Although not a description of Maria and Honorios' actual wedding ceremony, Claudian's poem probably implies that the couple's marriage and dress conformed to Roman practices. Claudian's poem also supports the interpretation that the cameo is a portrait of Maria. Although no portraits of her exist, the poet mentions that Maria closely resembled her mother. The general features of the woman in the cameo are similar to those of Serena, Maria's mother, in the Stilicho diptych.²⁴

Throughout most of Honorios' lengthy reign (384-423), the Western Empire experienced a series of military crises. These were either the result of attacks led by the Visigothic ruler Alaric, who finally sacked Rome in August of 410, or of uneasy relations between the newly separated Eastern and Western capitals.²⁵ The emperor was even forced to move his court from Milan to Ravenna, which then became his primary residence until his death.²⁶

At the time of the wedding which took place in 398 in Milan, the city was expecting an attack from Gildo.²⁷ Indeed the four "Fascennine Verses" and "Epithalamium" were all composed and first read during the crisis. Claudian next poem, the Bellum Gildonicum, then recorded the story of Gildo's defeat.²⁸ At the time of his marriage, Honorios was only fourteen and Maria was twelve, both just barely of marriageable age.²⁹ The fact that the male figure shown in the cameo not only wears military dress but is also depicted as more mature than his age indicates the propagandistic nature of the cameo and of Claudian court poetry. The emperor's military attire demonstrates his preparedness for war and served as a warning for would-be aggressors. The later Probus diptych and contemporary gold coins, which show Honorios in military attire, may have served the same purpose.

23. Claudian, "Epithalamium", 165-170, 282-285; Platnauer, 1922, 251-255, 262-263.

24. Claudian, "Epithalamium", 243-250; Platnauer, 1922, 260-261. On the cameo and diptych the women both have long necks, a small mouth and eyes with straight eyebrows, and a narrow face with tapering chin.

25. Cameron, 1970, 37-38.

26. ODB, 1991, 946.

27. Cameron, 1970, 95.

28. Cameron, 1970, 95.

29. Cameron, 1970, 95.

The next three depictions of an imperial bride are found on three extremely rare commemorative nomismata. These were issued on the occasion of the marriages of three emperors: Valentinian III to Licinia Eudoxia in 437 (pl. 8), Marcian to Pulcheria in 450 (pl. 9), and Anastasios to Ariadne in 491 (pl. 10).³⁰ All the coins were produced by the mint in Constantinople; the iconography of the nomismata is very similar. The obverses show a three-quarter length cuirassed bust of the emperor wearing a military helmet with a shield draped over his left shoulder and a spear held in his right hand. This coin type was first introduced by Arkadios in 395 and became the standard type until Justinian introduced a new one which showed a frontal cuirassed bust holding a small cross in 539.³¹ The opposite side of the commemorative nomisma depicts the imperial couple as full-length standing figures separated by the pronubus; the couple's hands are joined in the dextrarum iunctio. On all three coins the groom appears in the place of prominence on the left. Examples of the first coin are found in four collections: Dumbarton Oaks, Berlin, the British Museum, and an unidentified private collection. The second nomisma of Marcian and Pulcheria, which is unique, is in the Hunterian Collection in Glasgow. The third gold coin in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection, which commemorated Anastasios' marriage to Ariadne, is also unique.³²

Theodosios II appears twice on the earliest of the three nomismata struck in October of 437 at Constantinople on the occasion of the marriage of Valentinian III, the western emperor, to Licinia Eudoxia, the daughter of Theodosios II, the eastern emperor. The cuirassed bust on the obverse is identified as Theodosios' portrait by the inscription on the coin and, because the pronubus also wears a diadem, that figure must also be the emperor. All three of the figures are nimbed and wear full court regalia, the costume which they wore on formal occasions. Their dress consists of a chlamys with a tablion, divitesion, imperial brooch with three extensions and

30. Brubaker and Tobler, 2000, 580-582; Kantorowicz, 1960, 7-8; McClanan, 2002, 27, 90-91. Pulcheria's choice: Theophanes, Chronographia, 102, 12; Mango and Scott, 1997, 159.

31. Grierson, 1992, 67 note 3; Weitmann, 1979, 45.

32. Bateson and Campbell, Byzantine and Early medieval Coins in the Hunter Coin Cabinet University of Glasgow. London: Spink, 1998; Grierson and Mays. Catalogue of Late Roman Coins in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection and in the Whittemore Collection. Washington, D. C., 1992, pl. 15, 395; Bellinger and Grierson, P. A Catalogue of Byzantine Coins in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection and in the Whittemore Collection, v. 1. Washington D. C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1966, pl. 1, 2.

a diadem with pendilia. Whereas the bridal pair's chlamyses are full length, the groom's tunic ends above the knee and he wears leggings. His dress is similar to the groom's on the sixth-century Dumbarton Oaks marriage belt, which, as was mentioned previously, may have been derived from an imperial one.

Licinaia Eudoxia's costume is more resplendent than that of the two emperors. She wears jewelry consisting of a pearl necklace and pendent earrings, a full-length divetesion, and a chlamys whose edge is decorated with pearls. Her hair is arranged in tight curls and adorned with a substantial diadem. None of her garments are those of a Roman bride; nor does she wear any forms of dress, such as the veil or marriage crown, used in later imperial Byzantine marriages. Both garments are mentioned as part of an imperial bride's costume by Constantine VII Porphyrogenitos in the Book of Ceremonies.³³ At the end of the Theodosian dynasty, imperial brides and grooms in the eastern part of the empire simply wore full court regalia. This decision reflected the fact that as a newly created empress, the bride was not only the emperor's wife, but also a part of the imperial hierarchy. Her primary role was probably to provide male offspring and like Livia and Helena perhaps create a dynasty.

In his article on "Marriage Belts and Rings at Dumbarton Oaks", Ernst Kantorowicz proposes that Theodosios II is depicted as the pronubus (instead of such usual figures as Venus, Juno, or Concordia) because oaths, including the marriage contract, were signed before the emperor's image as guardian of contracts and oaths.³⁴ But this special nomisma probably was distributed only to those attending the ceremony and never seen by the public.³⁵

Theodosios II also probably acted as pronubus because he was the bride's father and the marriage took place at his court. The fact that his hands are draped over the couple's shoulders emphasizes his approval as father of the bride. The gesture of encompassing the couple with his arms also suggests the stability which might result from so propitious a union. Through the marriage the ruling

33. Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, Bk. I, 41; Reiske, 1829, 207-216. Moffitt and Tall, 2012, 208.

34. Kantorowicz, 1960, 7-8.

35. Grierson notes the absence of an officina which implies they were produced in small numbers: Grierson, 1992, 145.

families of both halves of the divided empire were now more closely bound together. Few imperial marriages have ever involved so distinguished a bride groom as the western emperor. And even fewer might hope to produce a male off-spring who might reunite the empire without blood-shed. Unfortunately Valentinian III and Licinia Eudoxia produced only two daughters: Eudocia and Placidia.

The two later *nomismata* were struck on occasions when there was no male successor. In the first case Theodosios II had indicated his preference for Marcian; Pulcheria's marriage to Marcian strengthened his claim. Following this earlier precedent, Ariadne selected Anastasios and then also married him. When an emperor died without a son, this practice assured a smooth transition of power. A more detailed discussion of both cases appears below. That these two later *nomismata* are unique is probably explained by the fact that both marriages were arranged in haste and involved a small number of guests.

On the first occasion Theodosios II died unexpectedly on July 28, 450 from injuries sustained during a riding accident. On his deathbed the emperor indicated a preference for Marcian, a high court official, as his successor. Despite an earlier vow of virginity, Pulcheria offered to marry Marcian, a widower, as a means of strengthening his claim to the throne. Marcian was then confirmed by the senate and crowned on 25 August.³⁶ The marriage ceremony occurred after he assumed power on 25 November.³⁷ Valentinian III, to whom the choice of an emperor should have fallen, accepted Marcian, who proved to be an able administrator.³⁸

This second coin's iconography varies in two ways from the first: the emperor's helmet lacks a frontal ornament and Christ, as we mentioned previously, acts as *pronubus*. The figure of Christ is dressed in a *colobium* and a *pallium*. All three figures are nimbed and, as on the earlier *nomisma*, the imperial couple wears full court dress. But on this second coin, Pulcheria's diadem is embellished with a trefoil ornament. Marcian's appointment was confirmed by the senate before their marriage; the fact that both are depicted in full

36. Grierson, 1992, 157. Theophanes, *Chronographia*, 102, 11; Mango and Scott, 1997, 159; *Chronicon Pascale, 284-628 AD*, Whitby and Whitby, 1989, 80-81.

37. Holum, 1982, 208.

38. Grierson, 1992, 157.

39. Grierson, 1992, 2.

court dress probably helped bolster his claim to the throne.

On the second occasion Ariadne, Zeno's widow, was allowed to select Anastasios as the next emperor and then the empress married him to strengthen his claim.³⁹ Since the Emperor Leo I had no sons, he had made his grandson Leo II, the infant son of Zeno and his daughter Ariadne, his co-ruler. After Leo I's death, his grandson ruled briefly as his successor; but when Leo II died, Zeno, his father, then became emperor. Although Zeno dealt successfully with a number of internal and external crises, he was an unpopular ruler because of his monophysite leanings. After his death on 9 April 491, Ariadne then chose a palace silentiarie or marshal named Anastasios, as the new emperor; ironically Anastasios was also a monophysite.⁴⁰ The details surrounding Zeno's death, Anastasios' accession to the throne and marriage to Ariadne in the Church of St. Stephen are recorded in Constantine VII Porphyrogenitos' Book of Ceremonies.⁴¹ The main difference between this third nomisma commemorating Ariadne and Anastasios' marriage and Pulcheria and Marcian's earlier nomisma is the fact that of the three figures on the reverse only Christ's is nimbed. The couple are probably shown on the coin in full court dress to bolster Anastasios' claim to the throne and recall Marcian's previous selection by Pulcheria and the fact that he was a successful ruler.

40. McClanan, 2002, 66.

41. Constantine VII Porphyrogenitos, Bk. I, 92; Reiske, 1829, 417-426. Moffitt and Tall, 2012, 417-426.

The final work depicting an imperial bride is a gold medallion of the type created by hammering a thin sheet of gold foil over a medal and then placing it and a similarly made piece from a second medal into a bezel where both form the sides of a gold medallion (pl. 11).⁴² Several examples of this type of medal were described in the section on consular dress; but whereas all of those derived from the obverse and reverse of the same consular medallions, the two sides of this medallion are from different medals commemorating the same marriage. The marriage medallion, which weighs 40.90 g., is found in the Christian Schmidt Collection in Munich (Inv. No. 378). It was produced in 582 to commemorate the marriage of Tiberios II Constantine's daughter, Charito, to Germanos, the *Magister Utriusque Militae* or general in charge of infantry and cavalry. Germanos and the future emperor Maurice were both acclaimed caesars in August of 582; but after this date no further information is recorded about Germanos. When Tiberios II died on 14 August of the same year, Maurice succeeded him alone and also married one of his predecessor's daughters, Constantia, during week-long ceremonies described by the historian Theophylact Simocatta, by Evagrius and also the Chronicon Pascale.⁴⁴

42. The side of the medallion showing the bridal pair is depicted in Yeroulanou, 1999, 120. Both sides are shown in Vasilaki, 2000, 290 and a recent auction catalogue (Gemini Numismatic Auctions, 2010, 103). The medallion is pictured because the original gold medal from which the reverse is made was offered for sale as lot 593.

43. Besides the note in the auction catalog, the marriage of Germanos and Charito is recorded in Theophanes, Chronographia, 252; Mango and Scott, 1997, 373.

44. *Historia*, C. De Boor, 1972; Theophylact Simocatta, Bk. 1, 10, 1-10; Whiby and Whitby, 1986, 32-34; Ecclesiastical History, J. Beder, 1898; Evagrius, Bk. VI, I; Bidez, 1896, 284-285; Chronicon Pascale, Dindorf, 1832; Chronicon Pascale, 582; Whitby and Whitby, 1989, 139.

The reverse of the Schmidt medallion, which shows events based on the Gospel of St. Luke in synoptic form before Christ's birth, was produced from the obverse of a Byzantine gold medallion weighing 90.52 g., recently offered for sale at the Gemini Numismatic Auction VI on Sunday January 10, 2010 at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City (pl. 12). Because this second medallion's inscription also puns on the bride's name,⁴⁵ it was probably similarly struck for Charito's marriage to Germanos. Further, the same individual who struck this medal also produced a medallion found in the Cyprus Hoard and now in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection; thus these two commemorative medallions are closely related (pl. 13).⁴⁶ The three medallions are linked in the first instance because the one medal served as the original for the Schmidt medallion and in the second because both medallions were made by the same person.

The Dunbarton Oaks Medallion, which weighs 109 grs., was found on Cyprus in 1906; it was part of a hoard called the Lamboussa treasure.⁴⁷ The main scene on the medal's obverse shows the Virgin Mary holding the Christ child enthroned between two angels. Beneath in synoptic form are two scenes from St. Luke (chaps. I and II). The first shows Joseph with a donkey behind him seated in front of Christ; beneath the manger are two shepherds pointing to a star. The next scene shows Mary holding the Christ child and the magi presenting their gifts to her. The reverse depicts Christ's baptism in the River Jordan.

The obverse of the Schmidt medallion, which was created by pressing a sheet of gold foil over a now lost original, depicts standing figures of the imperial bridal pair with their hands joined in the dextrarum iunctio. The couple is separated by Christ pronubus; his arms are around the bride and groom's shoulders. The medallion's iconography is very similar to that found on the earlier marriage nomismata. The dress of the groom is similar to that shown on the nomismata except that he lacks a crown. Charito, the bride, however,

45. The medallion's inscription, Luke 1: 28 "XAIPE KEXAPITOMENH O K[YRIO]C METACOV" (Hail, most favored one, The Lord is with you) begins with the "XAIPE", which is referred to in the inscription of the Schmidt Medallion, "KE[XAPITO]MENH". There is represents and artful allusion to the bride's name, XAPITO. The medallion is not pictured in any of the standard references.

46. For information on the medallion from the Cyprus Hoard: Rose, 1957, 247-261 and Ross, 2005, 33-35, pl. A, no. 36.

47. Also Ross, 1957, 247; Ross, 2005, 34.

is depicted wearing Roman dress consisting of a dalmatic tunic with a neckband which is belted under her breasts, a crown with pendilia and trefoil ornament, a heavy jeweled collar, and cloak. Since she was only the daughter of an emperor, not an empress, her dress seems appropriate for her rank and is very similar to Serena's on the Stilicho diptych. The fact that Germanos does not wear a crown probably indicates that the marriage occurred before he was made a caesar.

Like the contemporary consular medallions produced for Maurice, both medals probably served two functions. They simultaneously commemorated an important public event and acted as a form of court propaganda. Like the three earlier nomismata, the two medallions may have been personal gifts for the newlyweds and those attending their hastily organized marriage. Like Theodosios II, who died suddenly without providing for the succession, Tiberios II Constantine was also expected to survive only a few days without designating an heir. According to Tiberios' wishes, Germanos and Maurice were hastily made caesars and their claim to the throne strengthened by their marriages to the emperor's two daughters. The couple's dress depicted on the medallion served simultaneously as a record of their appearance during their wedding ceremony and as a means of bolstering Germanos's claim to the throne. But instead of the small gold nomismata used to commemorate marriages in the fifth century, these large medallions were probably part of a more generalized revival of the large medallion type in the late sixth and seventh centuries. As mentioned in the section on the loros, several rulers during this time period including Phokas, Tiberios II Constantine, and Maurice, produced large consular medallions. These later medallions in turn were probably suggested by the large medals produced by several earlier rulers including Constantine, his sons, and even Justinian.⁴⁸

48. See Ross, 1957, 258.

In conclusion, among the five examples of imperial bridal dress analyzed in this chapter, only the Rothschild cameo depicting the western emperor Honorios and Maria seems unrelated to the other four. Since it was a gem stone instead of a medal, the cameo was a unique work, probably produced as a commemorative gift for the bride and groom. As the earliest surviving example of a small object depicting an imperial bridal couple in the west, the cameo shows the bride's costume preserving earlier forms of Roman bridal dress. The imperial couple's crowns also seem to be early examples of wedding crowns.⁴⁹

Of the four remaining examples, all produced in the east, the three nomismata show the bridal pairs wearing full court regalia. In the medallion the couple wears costumes appropriate to their rank at court. The three nomismata and gold foil medallion were probably given as gifts to the small number of guests attending the ceremony. In the first example, the marriage of Licinia Eudoxia to Valentinian III, a wedding between the daughter of the eastern emperor Theodosios II and the western emperor, the nomisma seems an appropriate gift for such an important marriage. By giving such a valuable gift minted in Constantinople to the ruling elite of both halves of the kingdom, the coin helped to bring the newly united couple into further prominence. The three remaining marriages between Marcian and Pulcheria, Anastasios and Ariadne, and Germanos and Charito were all organized in haste to provide a smooth transition of power when the ruling emperor died suddenly without previously providing a successor. The two nomismata were not only gifts to the small elite attending these hastily prepared weddings but also might have served to introduce the groom to the court. The image of the new emperor married to a powerful female of the current dynasty, which selected him, undoubtedly served to bolster his claim to the throne.

On all three marriage nomismata, the bride may wear full court costume rather than traditional Roman bridal dress to emphasize the legalistic aspect of the marriage ceremony, which resulted in her becoming a high ranking official in the government hierarchy. Her costume as depicted on the nomismata is the one which she will wear while performing her duties at court. In the latter two nomismata, the fact that the bride wears full court dress also suggests that she was a member of the preceding dynasty and that

49. Also see note 21 in this section.

her marriage to the new emperor strengthens his claim. Charito's dress in the gold foil medallion communicates a slightly different message. Since she never became an empress, the costume that the medallion depicts her wearing simply indicates her importance as a bride in the ruling dynasty.

General Summary of the Empress' Dress

Initially the empress' dress varied little from that of other high born Roman women. On works of art as early as Livia the empress was depicted with features designed to resemble her husband's and she was sometimes shown with the attributes of a goddess. The first augusta was also praised by contemporary writers for her wit and decorum. She was considered a model of Roman propriety. On a small sardynx cameo in Vienna Livia is shown holding a bust of her deceased husband with her features assimilated to his and with the attributes of a priestess of Cybele. Like the costume of other contemporary women her main garments were the palla, a loose fitting cloak, and the stola, a short sleeved tunic with an unbanded neck. But beginning with Helena the empress' dress and image slowly began to change.

During the tetrarchy empresses first wore a new hair style called the crown tress, in which the hair was worn on top of the

head in a single braid, and a form of diadem without ties. On Helena's visit to the Holy Land in 326, Eusebios praised her for possessing such virtues as piety, compassion for the poor, generosity, and loyalty to her son. When Theodosios I made his wife Aelia Flaccilla an augusta in 383, she was depicted on coins with her hair in a crown tress and wearing a diadem with ties like Helena; but instead of wearing the palla and stola, her main garments, like those of her husband, were now the chlamys and divetesion. In his funeral oration for Flaccilla in 387 Gregory of Nyssa praised the empress for possessing qualities very similar to Helena's. Thus as early as Helena and Flaccilla, the terms used to describe late Roman empresses became conventionalized; rather than being seen as individuals they were described in terms of a carefully crafted imagery which other contemporary women could emulate.

Since the dress of early empresses was identical to that of other high born women, the only works conclusively identified as depicting a tetrarch's wife are a medallion portrait of Prisca in her husband's mausoleum and the images of the augusta Galeria Valeria found on her coins. Other works including a wall painting from Trier, a floor mosaic in Aquileia, and tondo heads on a gold pectoral may show female members of Constantine's family. Since none of the portraits are labeled or wear diadems, the identities of these figures can neither be affirmed nor refuted.

Beginning with Theodosios' reign, new coin types and forms of art depicting empresses wearing imperial dress begin to emerge. Since the empress was closely identified with her husband, Theodosios' wife Flaccilla wears dress consisting of a chlamys and divetesion identical to her husband's. On a second work, a small statuette, she wears a diadem and Roman dress consisting of a tunic and a mantle which is wrapped around her body to resemble the toga with a band of stretched folds. A second later development is found on one of two nomismata of the empress Licinia Eudoxia. She is depicted enthroned holding a globe and sceptre, two attributes previously held only by city tyches.

The two final examples of empresses in Roman dress are illustrations found in illuminated manuscripts. The first, which forms the frontispiece of a herbal, shows the high born noblewoman Juliana Anicia. In the illustration, which depicts the patricia seated distributing largesse, her mantle is assimilated to resemble a consular trabea. The second illustration, which includes three standing

figures of imperial women in Roman dress, connects the emperor Herakleios' regime with that of earlier rulers.

The first empress to be depicted wearing a costume which duplicates her husband's was Flaccilla. This portrait is found on nomismata issued when she was made an augusta. Her dress, which consists of an imperial brooch with pendilia, a diadem with ties, a chlamys and divetesion, depicts her wearing the same dress as her husband. Like his portrait on contemporary coins, the empress' features are also idealized and she is shown as eternally youthful. The first emperor to issue coins depicting a new type of iconography was Valentinian III. These nomismata showed his wife Licinia Eudoxia enthroned, facing frontally, and wearing a rayed crown decorated with a cross and shoulder-length pendilia. The edge of her chlamys is decorated with pearls; she also holds a globe and sceptre, two attributes usually associated with city tyches. This imagery was developed to its furthest extent in several types of art including imperial diptychs, marble heads, and medallion portraits associated with the empress Ariadne. The use of this imagery, designed to convey the power and majesty of the imperial office, allowed her to pass the imperium to three husbands. Two other works which suggest the power and dignity of the imperial office are Theodora's portrait in Milan and the imperial panel at San Vitale, which shows her at the head of a procession waiting outside a church resplendently dressed and surrounded by similarly dressed female courtiers. These works were probably designed to demonstrate the dignity and power of the imperial office.

A second group of works shows the imperial couple harmoniously discharging the duties of their office. This group includes the Trier ivory, which shows an emperor leading a procession transporting a saint's relics. It is advancing toward the tiny figure of an empress, who is waiting outside a newly built church to receive the relics. Included in this second group is Sophia's portrait on bronzes, which depict her seated beside Justin II, and her image together with his on the crossbar of the Crux Vaticana. The later folles of Martina and Phokas or Herakleios and Martina as standing figures in full court dress communicate a similar idea.

A final type of costume worn by empresses was imperial bridal dress. Initially on the Rothschild cameo Maria is depicted wearing the specialized costume of the Roman bride, which consisted of a tunic, hairnet, veil, marriage belt and slippers. These items of dress were dyed a flame colour in imitation of the costume of the Flaminica Dialis. Small issues of nomismata for later imperial brides

show them wearing full court dress consisting of a chlamys, divetesion, diadem, imperial brooch and slippers. Commemorative nomisma exist for the marriages of Valentinian III and Licinia Eudoxia, Marcian and Pulcheria, and Anastasios and Ariadne. These were probably issued in very small numbers and given to individuals attending the wedding. They probably served to introduce the groom to members of the court.

In the first case the coins of Valentinian III and Licinia Eudoxia probably served to introduce the western emperor to the eastern court. In the two later instances, the nomismata helped to strengthen the claim to the throne of emperors selected by the ruling family when no male members survived. These emperors were first elected by the senate and then married to popular female members of the dynasty. Although Germanos never ruled with Maurice, the final work, a commemorative marriage medallion depicting Germanos and Charito, the daughter Tiberios II Constantine, as a bridal pair, served a similar function as the earlier marriage nomismata. The fact that Germanos is shown without a diadem probably implied that he had not been made a caesar. In these later works the imperial couple are depicted in full court dress to introduce the new emperor to other court members.

General Conclusions

During the period from Diocletian's reign to the end of the Herakleian dynasty, imperial power became increasingly centered around the emperor. One result of this concentration of power was that the emperor often appeared to contemporaries as being more

godlike than human. The imperial court was also compared to the heavens. Individuals granted an audience even described their reaction as one of reverence, awe, fear, or dread. After death as part of the imperial cult, emperors were even believed to be transported either to a pagan heaven or, beginning with Constantine, to a Christian court.¹

Several techniques were used to promote the emperor and this new centralized form of rule. These included the creation of a poetry of praise, lavish processions and public speeches accompanied by acclamations, the construction of large monuments and statuary, and the development of complex court ceremonial and protocols. All of these were probably as important to retaining power as the issuance of edicts and collection of taxes. Among these techniques, none was closer to the emperor's person or more carefully crafted than his costume.

1. Price, 1987, 57, 101-102.

Two changes especially affected the representation of the emperor in art: firstly, his image was disseminated in a wide variety of forms to insure that “all segments of the population were familiar with it”.² Secondly, the classical canon, the Greco-Roman style, which strove to depict what Maria Parani called the realia of contemporary life and which was found in all official art before the tetrarchs, was initially rejected in favor of the short lived tetrarchic style.³ This style developed in response to the needs of the new tetrarchic form of rule. Though as early as Constantine official monuments were produced in the old style, other elements from the tetrarchic and sub-antique styles were also added. These new forms, which primarily derived from several antique styles, tended to favor symbolic modes of representation at the expense of earlier ones which strove to depict the present visual world, what Parani called “the sensible reality of contemporary secular life”.⁴

The reassertion of earlier Greco-Roman forms during Constantine’s reign suggests that the Roman past remained an important influence on contemporary life. The use of earlier Roman imagery enabled these later rulers to make claims about the legitimacy of their rule. The ceremonies which were most frequently depicted included the emperor’s investiture, his departure for battle, triumphant return, performance of sacrifices, deliverance of speeches, public appearances especially at the hippodrome, enthronement at court, and finally after death his apotheosis.⁵

Since all major literary works produced during this time period were either commissioned by a high ranking official or the emperor, they also supported the new centralized form of rule. A second factor influencing their reliability, however, was the fact that each literary type conformed to well defined classical conventions which affected its meaning. For example, the panegyric, a type of poetry designed to praise individuals, may have exaggerated the virtues of emperors such as Maxentios, Constantine and Honorios. Eusebios and Prokopios also produced histories praising their patrons. Although both present current events accurately, Eusebios universally shows Constantine as living a godly life, as Timothy Barnes notes; Eusebios therefore omits the damaging fact that the

2. Canepa, 2009, 191.

3. Kitzinger, 1977, 9; Parani, 2003, 1.

4. Parani, 2003, 1.

5. Weitzmann, 1979, 60.

emperor ordered his Wife's and eldest son's execution. In the Wars and Buildings, works of history and architecture, Prokopios praises Justinian; but in his Secret History, probably based on the classical genre of invective, he seems bent on magnifying every defect and personal idiosyncrasy.

The emperor's costume also evolved from a few simple utilitarian garments into a complex costume with symbolic meanings attached to each part. Emperors wore three types of dress: military, civic, and ceremonial. Military dress consisted of a helmet, cuirass, and tunic; civic dress of a silk tunic called a *divetesion*, a *chlamys*, which was clasped by a rosette shaped brooch with three extensions, purple slippers, an orb, sceptre, belt of office, and a diadem with *pendilia*. The final form of costume was ceremonial, which consisted of several types of togas.

During this time period, empresses never wore military dress. Initially they wore Roman dress whose main garments were a tunic, the *stola*, and full length mantle, the *palla*. The only difference between their dress and that of other high born women was that they wore their hair arranged in a crown tress, a single braid which was then folded on top of the head, and a simple diadem without ties. By Theodosios I's reign, empresses, however, wore a costume which duplicated their husband's even in the smallest details. Similarly the bridal dress of early empresses conformed to that of the Roman bride, whose main garments were an early form of tunic, a full-length veil, and a wedding belt tied in a special knot. The colour of this costume was a special shade of yellow associated with the *Flaminica Dialis*. During the later Theodosian dynasty, imperial brides wore full court dress.

Technically all late Roman officials were members of the military. As a result their dress had a distinctly military cast. Each official wore the costume associated with his office, which consisted of at least two garments: a heavy military cloak called the *chlamys*, which was often decorated with woven patches called segmenta, and a belt of office, the cingulum. The emperor's costume differed from that of other court officials in that it was not just a form of elite male dress, as Mary Harlow argues, but had several unique symbols of rule associated with it.⁶ In his study of clothing, Sartor Resartus, the English essayist Thomas Carlyle would have called these symbols

6. Canepa, 2009, 190; Harlow, 204, 44.

of rule “intrinsic.”⁷ Carlyle believed that unlike merely “extrinsic symbols,” which were ephemeral because they were bound to a certain time period, “intrinsic symbols” partook of the nature of what they represented and endured over long periods of time. For example, Constantine adopted the orb, sceptre and diadem as part of imperial civic dress from the costume of earlier Hellenistic rulers. These intrinsic symbols associated his regime with that of these earlier rulers. Other intrinsic symbols were the purple coloured chlamys, which was derived from the field marshal’s similarly coloured paludamentum, and purple slippers. To contemporaries, the military cloak’s and slipper’s exact shade imitated that of the blood and gore of battle, by whose means the imperial office was associated with that of the field general.

7. Carlyle, 1970, 204–211.

Of the three types of dress worn by the emperor, the toga underwent the greatest number of changes. The garment had its origins in the simple woolen togas worn by the earliest Romans, whose main industry was sheep herding. During the fourth to the eighth century emperors wore four types: the toga contabulata, a type with a band of stretched folds across the shoulder, the ceremonial trabea, and finally the loros, a highly abbreviated form of the trabea. Emperors wore the toga with a band of stacked folds during the first decade of the fourth century; but its use quickly disappeared after this time period. The type with bands stretched across the shoulder was worn by the elite in Constantinople only from Theodosios' reign through Arkadios' to differentiate the highest classes in the capital from the general citizenry of eligible toga wearers throughout the realm. As the main form of dress, the trabea first appeared under the tetrarchs and continued to at least the reign of Justin II (565-578), who was described by the court poet Corippus as wearing this type of dress during ceremonies which revived the consular office in 566.⁸ The final form of the ceremonial toga, the loros, is first mentioned by John the Lydian during Justinian I's reign (527-565).⁹ It continued as part of the emperor's costume to the end of the Byzantine empire.

At the beginning of the period, several early monuments including that of the four tetrarchs in Venice and a metre high frieze on the Arch of Constantine were in the tetrarchic style. This new style with its crowded groups of squat figures was designed to communicate such tetrarchic ideas as the emperors' mutual concord and unity of purpose. The art on the Arch of Constantine, however, mixed styles. Much of the monument, including the spolia from previous regimes, is in the earlier more realistic Greco-Roman style. Whereas on the metre high frieze in the sparsio scene, the crowded groups of squat figures belong to the tetrarchic style, the treatment of the emperor's figure, which is centrally placed, enlarged, facing outwardly, and surrounded by guards, is derived from sub-antique art.

During Constantine's rule, several monuments including the statue group from his Thermal Bath and gold Ticinum medallion celebrating his victory over Maxentius display the earlier Greco-Roman style. The medallion, which pictured Constantine's portrait

8. Cameron, 1976, 195.

9. John the Lydian, Bk. II, 2.4; Carney, 1971, 42.

beside that of his patron deity Sol Invictus on its obverse and the emperor on horseback being led in a triumphant procession, also continued imagery derived from the Roman past. A second contemporary medallion, however, mixed earlier pagan imagery with Christian symbolism. On this medallion Constantine is pictured with the Chi-Rho symbol, an anagram for Christ's name, on his helmet but with the Roman she-wolf suckling Romulus and Remus emblazoned on his shield. Although never part of imperial military costume, Constantine's new Christian Chi-Rho symbol, the Christogram, which he saw in a dream before the Battle of Milvian Bridge, is the earliest example of what the essayist Thomas Carlyle called an intrinsic symbol.

Reliefs on the slightly earlier Arch of Galerius, which celebrate the tetrarch's victory over the Sasanians, also mix styles. In the mythic scene on the relief depicting the tetrarchs enthroned, the figures are in the Greco-Roman style. But since the rulers regarded their regime as supported by powerful gods and they are shown seated among such deities, the monument communicates a tetrarchic idea. In the relief their rule is depicted as transcending that of other earthly rulers and possessing an additional cosmic dimension.

The Theodosian Missorium, a silver largitio plate produced to commemorate the emperor's decennalia in 388, is divided into two sections. The lower register depicting Tellus continues classical traditions found in late antique silver which depict mythological figures in a fluid linear style. The upper register, which pictures Theodosios seated between his co-rulers holding court, displays many of the features of the new style. For example, Theodosios is shown seated in a niche holding court facing frontally on an enlarged scale looking aloofly ahead, with his co-rulers and symmetrically arranged groups of guards on either side.

The scene also pictures all the garments associated with imperial civic dress. The three rulers wear pearl encrusted diadems, full length chamysas clasped by rosette shaped brooches with three extensions, and imperial footwear. They also hold such symbols of rule as the orb and sceptre. Since their diadems and the globes held by Valentinian II and Arkadius both lack crosses, no Christian symbols have yet become part of court dress. The similarly clad emperors on the base of the Theodosian obelisk dated to 390 are in the Greco-Roman style. The frontal stance of the emperors and the rows of closely seated figures wearing the costumes associated with their offices belong to the new style. In the aftermath of an attempted coup, these closely seated figures suggest that peace and

prosperity result from the orderly workings of government.

Although Christian symbols were never depicted on large monuments as part of imperial costume during the Theodosian dynasty, the cross and Chi-Rho symbols first found on imperial monuments during Constantine's reign begin to appear in smaller works either as part of the emperor's costume or elsewhere in these works. For example, Honorios is pictured on the diptych of Probus holding a banner with the inscription "in Christ's name you will conquer". In the Rothschild cameo, the same emperor is depicted wearing a Chi-Rho symbol on his crown. Angels on the four sides of the base of Arkadios' column support banners displaying either a Chi-Rho symbol or cross. An anagram on the empress Maria's pendant, found in her tomb in St. Peter's in Rome in 1544, is in the shape of a Chi-Rho symbol.¹⁰ In the Trier ivory, the emperor, probably Theodosios II, is depicted leading a religious procession; his sister Pulcheria is shown before a newly built church. The only Christian symbol is a large cross held by the empress. On rare consular nomismata as early as Theodosios II, the emperor is shown holding a cross.¹¹ The same symbol is also faintly etched on the small central plaque of Marcian's diadem in the statue at Barletta; three sides of the statue's base in Constantinople are decorated with Christograms.¹²

On coins produced when Theodosios' wife Flaccilla was made an augusta in 383, her chlamys and divitesion costume are shown as duplicating her husband's even in the smallest details. An undated nomisma, however, issued for Licinia Eudoxia by her husband Valentinian III probably in 439 when she was made an augusta, depicts several innovations which differentiate the empress' dress from her husband's. On the obverse of the coin she is shown wearing a rayed diadem decorated with a central cross and shoulder length pendilia rather than the simple pearl encrusted diadems worn by her predecessors. On the reverse she is depicted seated on a throne wearing Roman dress and holding an orb decorated with a cross, the globus cruciger, in her right hand and a cruciform sceptre in the other. These symbols of rule are similar to those shown held by

10. Weitzmann, 1978, 306.

11. Grierson and May, 1992, pl. 13, 347.

12. Sidini, 1993, 77.

contemporary city tyches. In the Trier Ivory Pulcheria wears a simple diadem; but she carries a long cross, a symbol appropriate for a ceremony in which a saint's relics were transferred. In the imperial ivories depicting the empress Ariadne, she is shown holding an orb decorated with a cross, the *globus cruciger*, a symbol emphasizing the fact that she ruled under Christian authority. The two ivories probably aided the empress in transferring imperial power to her son and two spouses. The cross held by Licinia Eudoxia and those depicted on her crown and orb as well as the long cross carried by Pulcheria identify these empresses as Christian rulers.

After his uncle's death in 527, Justinian I surrounded himself with talented advisors including Trebonios, John of Cappadocia, and Belosarios. The emperor believed that his rule was favored by God and that he was destined to restore God's kingdom on earth.¹³ With the exception of the Nika rebellion, the first decade of his long reign was marked by a series of easy successes which seemed to corroborate this belief. For example, to replace an earlier church destroyed during the Nika revolt he began the ambitious project of building Hagia Sophia in 532. Belosarios' unexpected victory over the Arian Vandals based at Carthage represented a second early success. The general defeated the Vandals in 533 with only 15,000 troops. Four important monuments were produced during Justinian's long reign. The first three, which were probably created to commemorate his victory over the Vandals, continued early Greco-Roman traditions of imperial representation. These works were a large gold medallion, the Barberini ivory, and his equestrian statue. The fourth pair of monuments, the imperial panels at San Vitale in Ravenna, however, suggests that the traditional imagery inherited from the Roman past was being replaced by the newer Christian forms, which predominated throughout the Middle Ages.

A large gold medallion, which was found in Cappadocia in 1751, has been associated with Belosarios' victory over the Vandals. The work pictures the bust of a cuirassed emperor wearing military garb which includes an ornate ceremonial helmet, the *toufa*, on its obverse; the reverse shows the same emperor on horseback being led by a Nike. The portrait is primarily in the old Greco-Roman style except that on both sides the emperor whose head faces frontally is slightly tilted to the right. This slight turn of the head is also found in portrait busts on Justinian's early *nomismata*. Although there is no Christian symbolism, the medallion's iconography demonstrates that

13. Maas, 2004, 7.

the earlier Roman imagery associated with an imperial triumph still had meaning as late as the sixth century. The medallion's main innovation, however, is that it depicts Justinian, who never fought in a battle, as a victorious general, thereby transferring credit for the Vandal victory from Belosarios to him.

The second work associated with Belosarios' victory over the Vandals is the Barberini ivory; it originally consisted of five sections of which only four survive. This type of ivory first came into use during the fifth century. Like the gold medallion, the central panel, rendered in the Greco-Roman style, depicts a victorious emperor celebrating an imperial adventus. Although probably produced in Constantinople, the panel found its way to the West at an early date. It came into Cardinal Barberini's possession in 1625 and was then acquired by the Louvre from his estate.

The ivory's lower panel depicts conquered barbarians offering tribute to a victorious emperor in the panel above them. The work's remaining side panel shows a military officer offering the ruler a victory trophy. In the central panel the emperor, who has just planted a spear in the ground, is depicted mounted on a rearing horse. Behind him a personification of Terra touches his right foot, and a winged victory behind his right shoulder offers him a palm branch. Although he wears a simple diadem without the ceremonial toufa headdress, his remaining military gear is very similar to that of the emperor in the medallion; like the horse in the medal his mount even wears a harness decorated with large medallions and both rulers hold spears. Instead of being tilted slightly to the right, his head, however, is tilted to the left.

The most innovative panel is the upper one, which shows a beardless frontal bust of Christ in a clipeus supported by two angels. The figure of Christ, who holds a staff surmounted by a cross, offers a gesture of blessing to the mounted emperor below to signal his approval of the recent victory. This panel represents the first time that Christian iconography has been interwoven with the imagery of triumphant rulership inherited from the Roman past; the blessing Christ seems to corroborate Justinian's belief during the first decade of his reign that his actions were supported by God. His role was to create an orderly world from the disorderly one of the barbarians.

The final monument dated to this time period identified as depicting Justinian is a colossal bronze statue which once stood in the Augustaeum. The work's general appearance is known only from a short description in Prokopios' Buildings and a sepia drawing in an antiquarian work by the Renaissance humanist, Cyriacus of Ancona. Because a label on the horse identifies the work as depicting either Theodosios I or II, it was probably reused from an earlier monument. The statue depicted a mounted emperor in military gear wearing a toufa headdress, who held a globus cruciger in his left hand and whose right hand was raised with the fingers outstretched.

According to Prokopios, the statue represented an emperor's departure from a city, a proficio, instead of the more commonly depicted type of ceremony, a victorious emperor's entrance into a city, an adventus. This more common type of ceremony is also shown in the medallion and ivory. The historian's most enigmatic statement, however, is that the ruler was dressed in the manner of Achilles. Although this seems difficult to accept on the basis of the ruler's dress in the drawing, whose garb is typical military costume, he probably simply meant that Justinian's costume was appropriate for a heroic military leader.

The main difference between the depictions of the mounted emperor in the statue and the ruler in the medallion and ivory is that whereas in the two previously discussed works the ruler holds a spear in the right hand and a horse's reins in the left, in the statue he holds a globe surmounted by a cross in the right and raises his left hand with the fingers outstretched. Prokopios believed that this unusual gesture indicated that Justinian was "admonishing the barbarians not to advance".¹⁴ The globe and raised right hand, however, were both standard attributes of the god Sol Invictus; the act of an emperor raising his right hand with the fingers outspread was also thought to ward off evil.

14, Prokopios, I, ii, 6; Downey, 1940, 35.

The statue's main departure from earlier iconography is that instead of carrying the unadorned globe inherited from the Roman past, the ruler holds a globe surmounted by a cross, the *globus cruciger*, an example of an intrinsic Christian symbol. Prokopios believed that, in the context of the statue, this symbol meant Justinian owed his military victories, not to his own efforts, but to God.¹⁵ By emphasizing the *globus cruciger*, the statue demonstrates that Justinian secured his dominion and mastery in war through divine intervention. The monument also corroborated Justinian's own belief that his reign was supported by God.

If during the first decade of his long reign, Justinian experienced several easy successes, the remainder was characterized by disappointments. In 540 conflict resumed in the east between the Persians and Byzantines resulting in the loss of several regions. A devastating plague broke out in 542 killing millions in the capitol and surrounding areas. In 543, the emperor became involved in religious disputes which made him unpopular with the people.¹⁶ In 548 Theodora, not just his wife but also a longtime supporter, died. Finally, although Ravenna, the Ostrogothic capitol in Italy, was captured as early as 540, the long and costly war with the Ostrogoths, which began in 535, did not end until 554.

The final monuments associated with Justinian I, the imperial panels at San Vitale, were created during these troubled later years. Work on the church probably began in 525 under Bishop Ecclesius at the end of Theoderic's reign. A portrait of the bishop offering a model of the church to Christ together with that of San Vitalis is still found in the vault of the apse. The building was not, however, completed until 547 when Maximian was bishop after the Byzantines came to power.

15. Prokopios, I, ii, 12; Downey, 1940, 35.

16. Maas, 2004, 8.

The church's architecture based on an octagonal plan, the type which Justinian preferred at Hagia Sophia and in other churches he constructed in Constantinople, included many windows which brought in light that played across the interior's varied surfaces. The building was also embellished throughout with expensive materials including marbles, polychrome stuccoes, and the coloured glass used in the mosaics. At the time of its dedication, the furnishings of gold and silver objects studded with gems together with lighted hanging lamps and candelabra would also have contributed to the dazzling effect which the church has on viewers. In his description of Hagia Sophia in Buildings, Prokopios summarized the similar effect which the earlier building had on onlookers: "On entering the church to pray, one feels at once that this is the work, not of man's efforts or industry but in truth of Divine power".¹⁷ As at Hagia Sophia, the later building's interior was probably designed to astonish viewers and promote a sense of awe.

17. Prokopios, I, I, 27; Downey, 1949, 13.

The diversity of Old and New Testament scenes and figures in the mosaics and decorations found especially in the presbyter and apse not only contributed to the church's overall dazzling effect but the scenes selected also created interrelated strands which could be combined to educate and promote meditation in onlookers.¹⁸ The subject matter of the mosaics can be conveniently divided into three groups depending upon whether they refer to past, present, or future events. The Biblical scenes and decorations in the presbyter belong to the period of the Old and New Testament. The imperial panels above the altar refer to present Byzantine rule; those in the dome of the apse picture the future when Christ returns in glory.¹⁹

The mosaics which seem to refer most directly to the imperial panels are the Old Testament scenes located in the lunettes before the apse and that of Christ in the dome offering a martyr's crown to San Vitalis. The Biblical scenes on the arch before Justinian's panel picture Abraham about to sacrifice Isaac and the same individual offering food and drink to the three angels, a scene often associated with the Trinity.²⁰ Those located on Theodora's side depict Abel and Melchizedek making sacrifices which are received by the hand of God from above. The mosaics on Justinian's side associate the rulers with sacrifice and hospitality as well as reaffirming God's tiune nature; those on Theodora's suggest the idea of sacrifice, which is made more explicit in the imperial panels and by the altar in the apse.

The connection between the lunette mosaics and the imperial panels is further reinforced by the picture of the three wise men offering sacrifices woven into the border of Theodora's chlamys and by affinities between Justinian and Melchizedek, the Old testament king of Salem. Whereas both rulers wear garments which contain purple, Melchizedek's dress with its purple border is that of a priest and Justinian's the purple coloured dress of an emperor, which had its origins in Roman military dress. Indeed in the panel the emperor's costume is almost the only symbolism remaining from earlier Roman times.

Justinian's panel, which is executed in a mixed style, depicts him facing frontally surrounded by courtiers, church officials and

18. MacCormack, 1981, 261.

19. MacCormack, 1981, 265.

20. MacCormack, 1981, 265.

guards. Dressed in garments appropriate to his rank, he holds a golden paten, his offering to the church. Although in the same style, Theodora's panel, which is set outside the church beside a half open doorway, is somewhat more relaxed. The empress surrounded by servants and female attendants, who also faces frontally wearing all the insignia of her office, holds a gold chalice as her gift. In the context of the church, the rulers and other participants in the ceremony are depicted above the altar making sacrifices. In the dome mosaic Justinian is associated with the soldier-saint San Vitalis through his dress. Both wear the chlamys-divetesion costume but whereas San Vitalis' dress is predominately white with a purple border, Justinian's whole chlamys is a royal purple colour.

The idea that Justinian is Christ's representative on earth is further reinforced in the dome mosaic by the fact that Christ and the emperor both wear dress whose predominant colour is purple. The panels not only stand at the end of a long line of imperial monuments which celebrated triumphant rulership, but are also almost the last major works to depict a Byzantine emperor wearing a chlamys and divetesion.²¹ Rather than signifying a decisive break with earlier Roman traditions, the predominance of Christian imagery in imperial art probably represents part of a general reorientation in thought and taste. The emperor had always been seen as Christ's representative on earth, but from the end of Justinian's reign, he was now viewed, as Averil Cameron states, not so much as the heir of Augustus but rather as Christ's servant.²² Beginning with the end of Justinian's reign, court ceremonial also slowly changed and became merged with the religious life of the city.²³

Perhaps the best example of this change occurred during the reign of Justinian's successor, Justin II, who built a new throne room at the Great Palace, the Chrysotriklinos, the golden chamber, which gave this reorientation a new ceremonial setting. When constructing for his throne room an eight sided domed hall, whose octagonal shape was similar to that found in contemporary church architecture, Justin II placed his throne in a niche and directly above it a picture of Christ to remind him of the source of his sovereignty. Other pictorial decoration in the room consisted of religious scenes depicting Christ's life.²⁴ In this ceremonial chamber the emperor was

21. Imagery representing Christ's life as a triumphant victory over death and a form of sovereignty begins to develop as early as the fourth century. This new imagery was first displayed in the apses and domes of churches in the fifth century: Kazhan, 1991, 1462.

seen not so much as Christ's servant but rather as the embodiment of Christ on earth with his court mirroring the heavenly one. Justin II's own bronze coins which depict him enthroned beside the empress Sophia probably suggested a similar idea.

Further proof that Justin II's reign represented a transitional period between Roman and later Byzantine court ceremony is the fact that during his accession ceremony he was first raised on a shield according to Roman practices but later crowned by the patriarch in the palace.²⁵ The accession ceremony of all later emperors consisted of their being crowned in Hagia Sophia.

22. Cameron, 1978, 16.

23. Cameron, 1978, 7.

24. Cameron, 1978, 17.

The troubles that beset Justinian during the final years of his reign continued during those of his successors. As various invaders including tribes from the Balkans, the Persians and later the Arabs advanced into Byzantine territory, the kingdom slowly contracted in size and became more centered around Constantinople. Life also became more interior, the imperial cult was less important, and instead of viewing the emperor as an intermediary between the earthly and the divine, individuals began to communicate with God directly through various icons.²⁶ The fact that medallion portraits of Christ began to appear between those of the emperor and empress on consular diptychs during Justinian's reign lends support to this thesis. As early as 513 a cross appeared between portraits of Ariadne and Anastasios on the diptych of Clementinos. But on that of the later diptych of Justinus in 540 a medallion portrait of Christ instead of a cross was inserted between those of Justinian and Theodora.

The later Avar siege of Constantinople in August 626 during Herakleios' reign in particular demonstrates how important early icons had become. During the siege the emperor was away on campaign in Persia; the defense of the city was probably left to his Vicarius Bonos.²⁷ Throughout the siege Archbishop Sergius paraded icons of the Virgin along the city walls encouraging the populous to continue their resistance. Constantinople, however, was viewed not only as protected by icons of Christ and the Virgin but as also being under their special protection.²⁸

26. Haldon, 1990, 37–39.

27. Haldon states that the city's defense was left to Herakleios's brother Theodore; but Kaegi believes he only arrived at the end of the siege: Haldon, 1990, 46; Kaegi, 2004, 134.

28. Cameron, 1978, 23.

Later sixth and seventh-century rulers continued the gold coin type first introduced by Justinian I of a front facing bust wearing military dress. The bronze coins of these rulers, however, sometimes depicted the emperor wearing civic costume and even the new ceremonial loros first described by John the Lydian. Another indication that earlier Roman iconography was disappearing was the fact that during the Herakleian dynasty emperors were first depicted on gold coins wearing civic dress. The most significant change, however, occurred during the first reign of Justinian II (685-695), who was initially shown on his nomismata according to earlier Roman traditions as a draped bust in civic dress wearing a crown decorated with a cross and holding a globus cruciger. Later in his reign the emperor issued an innovative nomisma which showed a bust of Christ on the obverse and relegated the ruler's portrait to the reverse, the position of lesser importance. On these coins Christ was shown as bushy bearded with a cross behind his head. Justinian's motive in producing this new type is unknown, but its production is probably linked to the adoption of Canon 82 by the Quinisextum Council, a religious council which he convened in 691. The canon encouraged the representation of Christ in human form rather than as a lamb.²⁹

An example of this earlier type of representation is found on the Crux

Vaticana, the processional cross which Justin II and Sophia donated to Pope John III in about 568.

Besides depicting the first portrait of Christ on a coin, Justinian II's innovative nomisma introduced several other Christian symbols. In addition to relegating the emperor's image to its reverse, the inscription on the obverse described Christ as "the King of Kings" and the emperor as Christ's servant. Although the idea that the emperor was Christ's servant was not new, this was the first time it was used as an inscription on a coin. Contemporary Muslim coins issued by several caliphs also bore inscriptions which referred to these rulers as the "Slaves of Allah".³⁰

Justinian's image on the reverse depicted him as a full figure wearing a ceremonial loros, a diadem decorated with a cross and holding a stepped cross in his right hand, a religious symbol found on coin reverses as early as Tiberios II Constantine, and a new symbol

29. Cormack, 1986, 97-98.

30. Breckenridge, 1959, 66.

of rule, the akakia, in his left. The emperor was probably depicted wearing a loros because it was the garb he wore at Easter, the closest contemporary equivalent to a consular procession, and in religious services held in Constantinople throughout the year.

The loros and akakia which Justinian II was depicted wearing are examples of intrinsic symbols. Both had their origins in Roman times and represented a link between pagan ceremonies and contemporary Christian ones. In the Book of Ceremonies Constantine VII Porphyrogenitos mentions that emperors wore the garment, an abbreviated form of the trabea, at Easter because it reminded them of Christ's winding sheet. Since the loros was the toga's final form, it simultaneously reminded them of their origins; but because it was decorated with gold and jewels and wrapped around the body, it also symbolized Christ's death and resurrection. According to Constantine VII, the akakia, a hollow cylinder with knobs on each end which was filled with dust, was designed to remind the emperor of his own mortality and Christ's triumph over death.

The third symbol, the stepped cross which Justinian II holds in his hand, is an example of an intrinsic religious symbol, which first appeared on the reverses of nomisma during Tiberios II's reign. The new reverse replaced earlier figures of Victories or angels who also held crosses. This type of cross was believed to represent the jeweled one which Theodosios II gave to Jerusalem in exchange for the relics of the early martyr St. Stephen. The emperor is also depicted holding this symbol on the reverse of two nomismata issued during his second reign (705-711). The first pictured him as a bust wearing a loros, holding a stepped cross in his right hand and globus cruciger in the other. On a third gold coin he and his son Tiberios are pictured as busts wearing civic dress holding a stepped cross between them. These two later coins also displayed portraits of Christ on their obverses; but on these later nomismata instead of being bushy bearded, Christ was shown as beardless with short curly hair. Although it is not known why Justinian II abandoned the earlier bushy bearded portrait type, a form which originated in the west, in preference for a beardless portrait with curly hair, an eastern type, the emperor's depiction on both of the later gold coins is assimilated to resemble Christ.

The time period between the final decades of Justinian I's reign to the end of the Herakleian dynasty represents a period of transition in art during which antique forms of representation began to give way finally to Christian ones. Emperors were no longer seen

as ruling under the protection of powerful gods like Jove and Hercules as they had been under the tetrarchs; instead they were now compared to Old Testament figures like Melchizedek, the king of Salem, who owed his rule to God. At San Vitale, rather than making sacrifices to pagan deities as did the tetrarchs on the five column monument during their decennial, Justinian and Theodora present their offerings on an altar before Christ's image in the apse. The fact that both Christ and the emperor wear garments whose predominate colour is purple suggests that the two are closely related.

Slightly after Justinian I's reign emperors no longer wore the *chlamys-divetesion* costume, which had evolved from the Roman field commander's purple paludamentum. Instead they wore the loros, an example of what Carlyle would call an intrinsic symbol in dress because it was simultaneously the last form of the Roman trabea and a reminder of Christ's shroud and his triumph over death. During the reign of Justinian's successor, imperial ceremony received a new Christian setting whose decoration further suggested that Roman imagery was being supplanted by Christian. In the Chrysotriklinos, the emperor's new throne room, Justin II placed Christ's image over the throne and scenes from his life around the walls. During Justinian II's reign, the emperor was so closely associated with Christ, as his servant, that he is depicted on his two final *nomismata* with facial features associated with Christ's. On all three of his innovative *nomismata*, Justinian II is also shown holding a stepped cross. This symbol may refer to the crosses held by winged Victories on the reverses of earlier gold coins, to the emperor's close association with Christ, or even suggest that the emperor was now the cross's defender. By Justinian II's reign, present Byzantine history was seen, not so much as related to the Roman past, but as a continuation of New Testament history, which looked forward to the Second Coming.

During the period from the tetrarchs to the end of the Herakleian dynasty, the Greco-Roman style of art with its highly developed iconography, which had predominated in Roman imperial art before Diocletian's reign, was rejected in favour of several new styles. These better expressed the changing social, political, religious and intellectual needs of successive regimes during a period of transition. Initially the tetrarchs developed a style which expressed the needs of their form of shared rulership. During Constantine's

reign, the old style predominated but elements of several new styles, including the tetrarchic, sub-antique ones, and even an indigenous Roman style, were shown on monumental art. With the adoption of Christianity under Constantine, symbols such as the cross and Christogram also began to appear on imperial monuments. A parallel process probably occurred in other forms of contemporary art. It was found, for example, in the early Roman catacombs, which were decorated with symbols such as the cross, the good shepherd, and the Christogram.³¹ The occasional use of Christian symbolism in contemporary art may have a later parallel at the end of the Middle Ages as Christian symbolism began to give way to the forms based on observation favoured during the Renaissance. As I noted at the end of my general introduction, Maria Parani argues that this new art was based on the present visual world, rather than on Christian symbolism, and had its origins in the realia or “sensible reality of contemporary secular life”.³² Early churches were also embellished with scenic depictions of events from the life of Christ and the apostles. By the seventh century the period of mixed styles had ended with the predominance of the new Christian art, not just in churches like San Vitale, but even in the throne room of the Great Palace. This development was a natural outgrowth of the fact that Christianity, not paganism, now determined the patterns of everyday existence, the events which shaped everyday life, and society’s whole frame of reference. Contemporary institutions were based upon Christianity, not paganism.

By Justinian II’s reign, imperial dress also reflected the differing needs of contemporary society. Instead of being depicted in military dress, the *chlamys-diveteson* costume, or the ceremonial trabea, emperors were usually shown wearing the loros, a type of dress which the author Carlyle called an intrinsic symbol.

Though the garment had evolved from the toga, the fact that it was jewel encrusted and wrapped around the body was a reminder of Christ’s death and resurrection. Several other symbols of rule including the diadem, the sceptre and the globe were now decorated with crosses. Since unadorned versions of these symbols had their origins in the Hellenistic period but were adopted by Constantine and later decorated with crosses, they are also examples of intrinsic symbols. The *akakia*, a new symbol, which was first depicted on Justinian II’s

31. Lowrie, 1947, 4–6.

32. Parani, 2003, 1.

innovative *nomisma*, was also an intrinsic symbol. The *akakia*, which replaced the senatorial *mappa*, consisted of a hollow cylinder which had knobs on both ends and which was filled with dust. While its shape resembled the *mappa*, the fact that it was filled with dust reminded the emperor of his mortality. Another important innovation during this time period is the advent of the icon. Beginning with the end of Justinian I's reign, the imperial cult became less important; in times of need individuals sought aid from icons, instead of from the emperor, as in earlier times. The increasing importance of icons is demonstrated by the placement of a medallion of Christ between portraits of Justinian and Theodora on a diptych of the consul Justinus in 540.

In general, the same types of dress were worn by both the emperor and empress throughout the remainder of the empire's history.

The loros, which is first mentioned by John the Lydian during Justinian I's reign, continued as a form of imperial dress to its end. An unexpected clothing innovation during later reigns was the fact that empresses, like their husbands, began wearing the loros. For example, the Isaurian empress Eirene (joint reign 780-797; sole reign 797-802) is pictured on both her gold and bronze coins wearing a loros. Even at the end of the restored empire, Anna of Savoy, mother of John V Palaeologos (joint reign 1341-1347) is shown on gold and silver coins wearing this garment. In addition to the form of loros with crossed straps which John the Lydian mentions in the sixth century, a second type, which for greater convenience was pulled over the head, came into use in the eleventh. Although later emperors also wore civic dress consisting of a tunic and a cloak called a *chlamys*, the name was applied to several types of cloak; but none of these garments had a curved edge, the defining feature of the earlier one. Like the emperor, later empresses also wore a costume consisting of a tunic and cloak called a *chlamys*; but later versions worn by the empress were more fitted than her husband's.

Although such conservatism in imperial dress seems unexpected in a period which experienced such tumultuous and wide-ranging changes as the advent of Christianity, the rise of Islam, and finally the coming of the Crusaders, it had several identifiable causes. As John the Lydian explains, it probably resulted initially from a conscious desire to differentiate the emperor's dress from that

worn by the rulers of neighboring, less civilized kingdoms.³³ In later centuries, as Constantine VII Porphyrogenitos suggests, this conservatism was probably motivated by the two-fold desire to preserve a link with the heroic rulers of the Roman past and to reassert the emperor's unique status as Christ's representative on earth.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Ammianus Marcellinus. The History, ed. and tr. J. C. Rolfe. 3 v, Harvard: Loeb Classical Library, 1963 [reprint].

— Rerum Gestarum Libri qui Supersunt, ed. W. Seyfarth, 2 v, Leipzig, 1978.

— Res Gestae, ed. and tr. J. C. Rolfe. 2 v, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935-1940 [reprint].

33. John the Lydian, II, 2.6; Carney, 1971, 42.

— Römische Geschichte, ed. W. Seyfath. 4 v. Berlin, 1968-71.

Aurelius Victor: De Caesaribus, tr. Bird, H. W. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1994.

— Liber de Caesaribus, ed. F. Pachmayr. Leipzig, 1966.

The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History, AD 284-813, eds. Cyril Mango and Roger Scott. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

— Chronographia, ed. C. De Boor, 2 v. Leipzig, 1883-1885.

Chronicon Pascale, ed. L. Dunderf. Bonn, 1832.

Chronicon Pascale, 284-628 AD, trs. Michael Whitby and Mary Whitby. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2007

Claudian. Panegyric on the Fourth Consulate of Honorius, text and translation. William Barr. Liverpool: Francis Cairns, 1981.

Claudian, ed. and tr. Maurice Platnauer. 2 v, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982 [reprint].

Constantine VII Porphyrogenitos. The Book of Ceremonies, trans. Ann Moffatt and Maxeme Tall. 2 v. Canberra: Australian Association

for Byzantine Studies, 2012.

-- De Cerimoniis Aulae Byzantinae, ed. Reiske, 2 v. Bonn: Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae, 1829-1830.

-- Le Livre des Ceremonies, ed. and tr. Albert Vogt, Paris: Societe d'edition "Les Belles Lettres," 1967.

Corippus. In Laudem Iustini Augusti Minoris, ed. and tr. Averil Cameron. London: Athlone Press, 1976.

Deroche, "Leontios, Apologie contre les Juifs," Travaux et Memoires, 12 (1994). 96.

Egeria. Diary of a Pilgrimage, tr. George E. Gingras. New York: Newman Press, 1970.

Epitome de Caesaribus, eds. F. Pichlmayr and R. Gruendel. Sexti Aureli Victoris Liber de Caesaribus. Teubner, 1970, 133-176.

Eusebios. The History of the Church, ed. Andrew Louth, tr. G. A. Williamson. London: Penguin, 1989.

-- Life of Constantine, tr. Averil Cameron and Stuart Hall. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.

-- Patrologia Graeca, ed. J.-P. Migne, vols. 19-24, 1857-1866.

Evagrios, Ecclesiastical History: A History of the Church from A.D. 431 to A.D. 594. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1856.

-- Ecclesiastical History, eds. J. Bidez and L. Parmentier. London, 1898.

George of Pisidia, Poemi, I. Panegirici Epici, ed. Agostino Pertusi. Freising: Buch-Kunstverlag, Ettal, 1959.

Gregory of Tours. The History of the Franks, tr. O. M. Dalton, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927.

Historiae, ed. C de Boor. Stuttgart, 1972.

John of Ephesos. Ecclesiastical History, ed. and tr. E. W. Brooks. Louvain, 1952.

-- Third Part of the Ecclesiastical History, tr. R. Payne Smith. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1860.

John of Nikiu. Chronicle of John, Bishop of Nikiu, tr. R. H. Charles, Merchantville, N. J.: Evolution Publishing, 2007.

--Chronique de Jean, eveque de Nikiou (Ethiopian text), ed. and tr. H. Zotenberg. Paris, 1883.

John Lydos. De Magistratibus, ed. R. Wunsch. Leipzig. 1903.

-- On the Magistracies of the Roman Constitution, ed. and tr. T. F. Carney. Lawrence, Kansas: Coronada Press, 1971.

Justinian. Annotated Justinian Code, trans. Fred H. Blume, 2nd ed.,

Laramie, Wyoming: University of Wyoming, 2008 [online: [uwacadweb-uwo.edu/blume & justinian](http://uwacadweb-uwo.edu/blume%20&%20justinian)]

— “The Code of Justinian,” ed. and trans. S. P. Scott, v. 15, The Civil Law including the Twelve Tables, The Institutes of Gaius, The Rules of Ulpian, The Opinions of Paulus, The Enactments of Justinian and the Constitutions of Leo, ed. 17 v.. Cincinnati: The Central Trust Company Company, 1932, [unpaged] [online [www. constitution.org](http://www.constitution.org)]

— Codex Justinianus, ed. P. Krueger. Berlin, 1954

— Institutes of Gaius and Justinian, trans. T. Lambert Mears,

Clark, N. J.: Law Book Exchange, 2004.

Labbe, Philippe and Gabriel Cossart. Sacrosancta Concilia ad Regiam Editionem Exacta. Lutetiae Parisiorum, Impensis Societatis Typographicae Librorum Ecclesiasticorum, 1671.

Lactantius. “Of the Manner in Which the Persecutors Died.” The Early Church Fathers and Other Works, tr. Rev. William Fletcher.

Edinburgh, Scotland: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1867. (text from Documentacatholic-omnia.eu)

— Opera Omnia, eds. S. Brandt and G. Laubmann, 3 v. Vienna, 1890-1897.

Les Listes Preseance Byzantines Des IXe et Xe Siecles, tr. by Nicolas Oikonomides. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1972.

Malalas, John. The Chronicle of John Malalas, trs. Elizabeth Jeffreys, Michael Jeffreys, and Roger Scott. Melbourne: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, 1986.

—Chronographia, ed. L. Dindorf. Bonn, 1831.

Maurice. Strategikon: Handbook of Byzantine Military Strategy, ed. George T. Dennis. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1984.

Origin. Origenes Werke, ed. P. Koetschau, 9 v. Leipzig, 1899-1959.

— Patrologia Graeca, ed. J.-P. Migne, vols. 11-13. 1857-1866.

Pliny the Elder. The Natural History, trs. John Bostock and H. T. Riley. 1855.

— Naturalis Historia, eds. R. König and G. Winckler. Munich, 1973.

Priscian. De Laude Imperatoris Anastasii, ed. Stephan L. Endlicher. Vindobona, 1828.

Prokopios of Caesarea. The Anecdota or Secret History, ed. And tr. H. B. Dewing. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935 [reprint].

— Buildings, ed. and tr. H. B. Dewing. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1940 [reprint].

— History of the Wars, ed. And tr. H. B. Dewing. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1924.

— Procopii Caesariensis Opera Omnia, ed. J. Haury, 3 v. Leipzig, 1962-1964.

— The Secret History. London: Penguin Books, 1966.

A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, v. 11, Socrates, Sozomemus: Church Histories. Oxford: Parker, 1891, 20-21.

Suetonius. De Vita Caesarum, ed. M. Ihm, 1907.

— Lives of the Caesars, tr. Catherine Edwards. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Theodosios II. The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmondian

Constitutions: a Translation with Commentary, Glossary and

Bibliography, tr. Clyde Pharr. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952.

Theophylact Simocatta. History, trs. Michael and Mary Whitby. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.

Three Political Voices from the Age of Justinian: Agapetus, Advice to the Emperor, Dialogue on Political Science, Paul the Silentiary, Description of Hagia Sophia, tr. Peter N. Bell. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2009.

Virgil. Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid 1-6. Tr. H. Rushton Fairclough.

2 v. London: William Heinemann, 1916.

Zonaras, John. Epitome Historiarum, ed. L. Dunderf, 6 v. Leipzig, 1868-1875.

— The History of Zonaras: From Alexander Severus to the Death of

Theodosius the Great, trs. Thomas M. Banchich and Eugene N. Lane. London: Routledge, 2009.

Secondary Sources

Alexander, J.J.G. "The Illustrated Manuscripts of the Notitia Dignitatum," in Aspects of the Notitia Dignitatum, eds. R. Goodburn & P.

Bartholomew. Oxford: Archaeological Reports, 1976, 11-51.

Alexander, Suzanne Spain. "Heraclius, Byzantine Imperial Ideology and the David Plates," Speculum, 52, 2 (April, 1977), 217-237.

Alfoldi, A. "Some Portraits of Julianus Apostata", American Journal of Archaeology 66(1962), 403-4-5.

Alfoldi, Maria A. Die Constantinische Goldpung, Untersuchungen zu ihrer Bedeutung fur Kaiserpolitik und Hofkunst. Mainz:

Romisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseum, 1963.

Andreescu-Treadgold, Irina and Warren Treadgold, "Procopius and the

Imperial Panels of S. Vitale," The Art Bulletin, 79, 4 (1997), 708-723.

Angelova, Diliانا, "The Ivories of Ariadne and Ideas about Female Imperial Authority in Rome and Early Byzantium," Gesta, v. 43 (2004), 1-15.

Arata, F. P. "La statua seduta dell'imperatrice Elena nel Museo

Capitolino. Nuove considerazioni conseguenti il

recente

restauro," Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archaeologischen Instituts, Romische Abteilung, 100 (1993), 185-200.

Avery, W. T. "The Adoratio Purpureae and the Importance of the Imperial Purple in the Fourth Century of the Christian Era," Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome, V. 17 (1940), 66-80.

Ball, Jennifer. Byzantine Dress: Representations of Secular Dress in Eighth-to Twelfth-Century Painting. New York: Palgrave-Macmillan,

2005.

Bardill, J. "The Great Palace of the Byzantine Emperors and the Walker Trust Excavations," JRA 12 (1997), 217-230.

Barrett, Anthony A. Livia: First Lady of Imperial Rome. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.

Barker, John W. Justinian and the Late Roman Empire. Milwaukee: University of Wisconsin Press, 1966.

Barnes, Timothy D. Ammianus Marcellinus and the Representation of Historical Reality. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998.

— Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993.

— Constantine: Dynasty, Religion and Power in the Late Roman Rmpire.
Chichester, Est Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.

— Constantine and Eusebius. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981.

Bass, George F. and Frederick H. Van Doorninck. Yassa Ada: A Seventh-Century Byzantine Shipwreck, I, College Station, Texas: Texas A & M University, 1982.

Bassett, Sarah Guberti. "Historiae custos: Sculpture and Tradition in the Baths of Zeuxippos." American Journal of Archaeology. 100 (1996), 491-506.

Bateson, J. D. and Campbell, I. G. Byzantine and Early Medieval Western European Coins in the Hunter Coin Cabinet,
University of Glasgow. London, Spink, 1998.

Bellinger, A. R. "The Gold Coins of Justinian II," Archaeology, 3 (1950), 107-111.

Belting, Hans. The Image and the Public in the Middle Ages. New Rochelle, New York: Aristide D. Caratzas, 1981.

— Likeness and Presence: A History of the Image before the Era of Art. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

Bendall, Simon. Byzantine Weights: An Introduction. London: Lennox Gallery, 1996.

Berk, Harlan J. Eastern Roman Successors of the Sestertius. Chicago: Harlan J. Berk, [n.d.].

— Gemini Numismatic Auction VII. Chicago: Harlan J. Berk, 2011.

Bishop, M. C. and J. C. Coulston. Roman Military Equipment. Aylesbury: Shire Publications, 1989.

Bivar, A. D. H. "Cavalry Tactics and Equipment on the Euphrates,"

Dumbarton Oaks Papers, 26 (1972), 273-291.

Bovini, Guisepppe. Ravenna: Its Mosaics and Monuments. Ravenna: A. Longo Editore, 1977.

Boyd, Susan A. And Stephen R. Zwirn. "Early Byzantine jewelry: Fourth to Eighth Century: Treasure of Gold Openwork Jewelry, Add. Nos.

180-183," in Catalogue of the Byzantine and Early Mediterranean Antiquities in The Dumbarton Oaks Collection. Washington

D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Library and Collection, 2005, 141-226.

Bradley, Mark. Colour and Meaning in Ancient Rome. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Braunlin, Michael, and John Nesbitt. "Selections from a Private Collection of Byzantine Bullae," Byzantion 68(1998), 157-182.

Breck, Joseph. "The Ficoroni Medallion and Some Other Gilded Glasses in the Metropolitan Museum of Art," Art Bulletin 9 (1926-1927),

353-356.

Breckenridge, James D. The Numismatic Iconography of Justinian II (685-695, 705-711 A. D.). New York: The American Numismatic

Society, 1959.

Brett, G. The Great Palace of the Byzantine Emperors. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1947.

Brubaker, Leslie. "The Chalke Gate, the Construction of the Past, and the Trier Ivory," Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies 23 (1999), 258-285.

— "Memories of Helena: Patterns of Imperial Female Matronage in the Fourth and Fifth Centuries," ed. Liz James, Women, Men and Eunuchs: Gender in Byzantium. London: Routledge, 1997, 52-75.

— "The Vienna Dioskorides and Anicia Juliana," Byzantine Garden Culture, eds. Anthony Littlewood, Henry Maguire, and Joachim Wolschke-Bulmahn. Washington, D. C.: Dumbarton Oaks Library and Collection, 2002.

Brubaker, Leslie and Helen Tobler, "The Gender of Money: Byzantine Empresses on Coins (324-808)," Gender and History 12 (2000), 572-594.

Bruhn, Jutta-Annette. Coins and Costume in Late Antiquity. Washington, D. C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1993.

Bruun, Patrick. "The Negotiations of the Conference of Carnuntum," Numismatica e Antichita Classiche. 8 (1979). Lugano: Arti Grafiche Gaggini-Bizzozzero, 255-278.

— "Notes on the Transmission of Imperial Images in Late Antiquity," Studia Romana in Honorem Petri Krarup Septuagenarii. Odense:

Odense University, 1976, 121-131.

— Studies in Constantinian Chronology. New York: The American Numismatic Society, 1961.

Burns, Jasper. Great Women of Imperial Rome: Mothers and Wives of the Caesars. London: Routledge, 2007.

Bury, J. B. History of the Later Roman Empire: from the Death of Theodosius I to Justinian, 2 v. New York: Dover Publications, 1988.

Byfield, Ted. Darkness Descends: AD350 to 565, the Fall of the Western Roman Empire. [Edmonton]: Christian History Project, c. 2003.

Byzance: l'art byzantin dans les collections publiques francaises. Paris: Musee du Louvre, 1992.

Byzantine Court Culture from 829 to 1204, ed. Henry Maguire. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 2004.

Byzantine Diplomacy: Papers from the Twenty-fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge, March 1990, eds. Jonathan Shephard and Simon Franklin. Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Company, 1992.

Byzantium, 330-1453, eds. Robin Cormack and Maria Vassilaki. London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2008.

Cameron, Alan. Circus Factions: Blues and Greens at Rome and Byzantium. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.

— Claudian Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.

— "Orfitus and Constantius: A Note on Roman Gold-Glasses," Journal of Roman Archaeology, 9 (1996), 295-301

— Porphyrius: the Charioteer. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.

— "Theodosius the Great and the Regency of Stilico," Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, 73 (1969), 247-280.

Cameron, Alan and Diane Schauer. "The Last Consul: Basilius and his Diptych." Journal of Roman Studies, 72 (1982), 126-145.

Cameron, Averil. "Corippus' Poem on Justin II: a Terminus of Antique Art?" Continuity and Change in Sixth-Century Byzantium, ed. Averil

Cameron. London: Variorum Reprints, 1981.

— "Images of Authority: Elites and Icons in Late Sixth-Century Byzantium," Past and Present: a Journal of Historical Studies, 84 (1979), 3-35.

— "The Empress Sophia," Byzantium, 45(1975), 5-21.

- "The Construction of Court Ritual: the Byzantine Book of Ceremonies," Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Society, ed. David Carradine and Simon Price. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1987, 106-136.
- Procopius and the Sixth Century. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.
- Canepa, Matthew P. The Two Eyes of the Earth: Art and Ritual Between Rome and Sasanian Iran. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009.
- Carlyle, Thomas. Sartor Resartus and Selected Prose. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.
- Carson, R. A. G., P. V. Hill, and J. C. P. Kent. Late Roman Bronze Coinage, A. D. 324-498. Rockville Centre, N.Y.: Sanford J. Durst, 1978.
- Charlesworth, M. P. "Imperial Depoartment," The Journal of Roman Studies, 37, pts. 1-2 (1947), 34-38.
- Christie, Manson and Woods. Catalogue of Ancient Jewellery, Classical Celtic, Egyptian and Western Asiatic Antiquities, and an Important Group of Early Byzantine Gold Medallions, Coins, and Jewellery. London, Christie's, October 19, 1970.
- Clark, Gillian. Women in Late Antiquity: Pagan and Christian Life-Styles. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Clarke, John R. Art in the Lives of Ordinary Romans: Visual

Representation and Non-Elite Viewers in Italy, 100 B.C.-A.D.

315. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.

Colledge, Malcolm A. R. The Art of Palmyra. London: Thames and Hudson, 1976.

Collignon, Maxime. Manual of Mythology in Relation to Greek Art, tr.

Jane E. Harrison. London: H. Grevel & Co., 1890.

Constantinople and its Hinterland: Papers from the Twenty-Seventh

Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Oxford, April

1993, eds.

Cyril Mango and Gilbert Dagron, Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1995.

Constantinople in the Early Eighth Century: The *Parastaseis Syntomoi*

Chronikai, eds. Averil Cameron and Judith Herrin. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1984.

Corcoran, Simon. "Before Constantine," The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,

2006, 35-59.

Cormack, Robin. "But is it Art?" eds. Jonathan Shephard and Simon Franklin. Byzantine Diplomacy: Papers from the Twenty-fourth

Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge, March 1990. Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Company, 1992.

— Writing in Gold: Byzantine Society and its Icons. London: George Philip, 1985.

Cotsonis, John A. Byzantine Figural Processional Crosses. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1994.

Croom, A. T. Roman Clothing and Fashion. Charleston, North Carolina: Tempus Publishing, 2002.

Curran, John. Pagan City and Christian Capital: Rome in the Fourth Century. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.

Dagron, Gilbert. Emperor and Priest: the Imperial Office in Byzantium. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

— Naissance d'une Capitale: Constantinople: Constantinople et ses Institutions de 330 à 451. Paris: Presses universitaires de France 1974.

D'Amato, Raffaele. Roman Military Clothing (3) from Honorius to Heraclius, AD 400-640. Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 2005.

Dandridge, Pete. "Idiomatic and Mainstream: The Technical Vocabulary of a Late Roman Crossbow Fibula," Metropolitan Museum Journal, 35 (2000), 71-86.

Dawson, Tim. The Forms and Evolution of the Dress and Regalia of the Byzantine Court: c. 900-c. 1400. Ph. D. Thesis,

University of New England, 2003.

Dayagi-Mendeis, Michal. Perfumes and Cosmetics in the Ancient World.

Jerusalem: Israel Museum, c.1989.

Delbrueck, Richard. Die Consulardiptychen und verwandte Denkmäler. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1929.

— Spatantike Kaiserportraits: von Constantinus Magnus bis zum

Ende des Westrichs. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1933.

Depeyrot, Georges. Les Monnaies d'Or de Constantin II a Zenon (337-491). Wetteren, 1996.

— Les Monnaies d'Or de Diocletien a Constantin I (284-337). Wetteren, 1995.

Deppert-Lippitz, Barbara. "A Late Antique Crossbow Fibula in the

Metropolitan Museum of Art," Metropolitan Museum Journal, 35 (2000), 39-70.

Dimitrov, Dimitar. "Le systeme decoratif et la date des peintures murales du tombeau antique de Silistre," Cahiers Archeologiques, 12

(1961), 35-52.

Dixon, Suzanne. Cornelia: Mother of the Gracchi. London: Routledge, 2007.

Downey, Glanville. "Justinian as Achilles," Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association, v. 71 (1940), 68-77.

Drijvers, Jan Willem. Helena Augusta: The Mother of Constantine the Great and the Legend of Finding the True Cross. New York: E. J. Brill, 1992.

Dunbabin, Katherine M. D. Mosaics of the Greek and Roman World. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

— "The Waiting Servant in Later Roman Art." American Journal of Philology, 124 (2003), 443-468.

Edmondson, Jonathan and Alison Keith. Roman Dress and the Fabric of Roman Culture. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007.

Edwards, C. and Woolf, G. Rome: the Cosmopolis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Elliott, Charlene. "Purple Pasts: Color Codification in the Ancient World." Law and Social Inquiry. 33 (2008), 177-194.

Elsner, Jas. "From the Culture of Spolia to the Cult of Relics: The Arch of Constantine and the Genesis of Late Antique Forms," Papers of the

British School at Rome, 68 (2000), 149-184.

-- "Perspectives in Art," The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine, ed. Noel Lenski. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006, 255-278.

England, Victor and Harlan J. Berk. A Public and Mail Bid Sale of Byzantine Coins: A Definitive Offering of Byzantine Copper Coins. Quarryville, Pa.: Victor England, 1989.

Epstein A. "The Rebuilding and Redecoration of the Holy Apostles in Constantinople: Reconsideration," GRBS 23 (1982), 79-92.

Featherstone, Jeffrey. "Emperor and Court," The Oxford handbook of Byzantine Studies, ed. Elizabeth Jeffreys. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008, 505-517.

Fittchen, Klaus. "Privatportraits hadrianischer Zeit," Roman Portraits Artistic and Literary, eds. J. Bouzek and L. Ondrejova, Mainz, 1997, 32-36.

Fittschen, Klaus and Paul Zanker. Katalog der römischen Porträts in der Capitolinischen Museen und den anderen kommunalen Sammlungen der Stadt Rom. I. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern, 1985.

Flory, Marleen B. "Livia and the History of Public Honorific Statues for Women in Rome," Transactions of the American Philological Association. 123 (1993), 287-308.

— "The Symbolism of Laurel in Cameo Portraits of Livia," Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome. 40 (1995), 43-68.

Frakes, Robert M. "The Dynasty of Constantine Down to 363," The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine, ed. Noel Lenski. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006, 91-111.

Gage, John. Color and Culture: Practice and Meaning from Antiquity to Abstraction. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Geysen, John. "Presentations of Victory on the Theodosian Obelisk Base," Byzantion 68 (1988), 47-55.

Gies, Frances and Joseph. Marriage and the Family in the Middle Ages. New York: Harper and Row, c1987.

Gonosova, Anna. "The formation and sources of Early Byzantine Floral Semis and Floral Diaper Patterns," Dumbarton Oaks Papers, 41 (1987), 227-237.

Goyne, Jo. "The Role of the Empress Theodora in the Imperial Panels at the Church of San Vitale in Ravenna," Representations of the Feminine in the Middle Ages, ed. Bonnie Wheeler. Dallas Texas: Academia Press, 1993.

Grabar, Andre. L'Emperor dans l'Art Byzantin. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1936.

Grant, Michael. The Roman Emperors: a Biographical Guide to the Rulers of Imperial Rome, 31 BC - AD 476. London: Weidenfeld and
Nicolson 1985.

Grierson, Philip and Bellinger, A. R. Catalogue of the Byzantine Coins in the Dumbarton Oaks and in the Whittemore Collection, v. 1-2.
Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1968.

— and Melinda Mays. Catalogue of Late Roman Coins in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks,
1992.

— "The Consular Coinage of 'Heraclius' and the Revolt Against Phocas of 608-610," Numismatic Chronicle, Series 7, 10 (1950), 71-93.

— "Dated Solidi of Maurice, Phocas, and Heraclius," Numismatic Chronicle, Series VI, v. 10 (1950), 49-70.

— "The Kyrenia Girdle of Byzantine Medallions and Solidi," Numismatic Chronicle, ser. 6, vol. 15 (1955), 55-70.

Grierson, Philip, Cyril Mango and Ihor Sevcenko. "The Tombs and Obits Of the Byzantine Emperors (337-1042); With an Additional
Note," Dumbarton Oaks Papers, 16 (1962), 10-62.

Grigg, Robert. "Constantine the Great and the Cult without Images." Viator, 8 (1977), 1-32.

— "Portrait-Bearing Codicils in the Illustrations of the Notiti Dignitatum," Journal of Roman Studies, v. 69, 107-124.

— "'Symphonian Aeido tes Basileia': An Image of Imperial Harmony on the Base of the Column of Arcadius," Art Bulletin, v. 59, 4, 470-482.

Haldon, J. F. Byzantium in the Seventh Century: The Transformation of a Culture. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Hales, Shelley, "The Houses of Antioch: A Study of the Domestic Sphere in the Imperial Near East," Roman Imperialism and Provincial Art, ed. Sarah Scott and Jane Webster. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003, 171-191.

— The Roman House and Social Identity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Harden, Donald B. Glass of the Caesars. Milan: Olivetti, 1987.

Harlan J. Berk and Freeman and Sear. Gemini Auction IV. Chicago: Harlan J. Berk, 2008.

— Gemini Auction VI. Chicago: Harlan J. Berk, 2010.

Harlow, Mary, "Clothes Maketh the Man: Power Dressing and Elite Masculinity in the Later Roman World," Gender in the Early Medieval

World. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

—“Females’ Dress, Third-Sixth Century: The Message in the Media,”

Antiquite Tardive, 12 (2004), 203-215.

Harmiaux, M. With Metzger, C., and Saragoza, F. Julien l’Apostat

ou la double imposture: les statues du Louvre et des thremes

de Cluny. Actualite du departement des Antiquities greques,

etrusque et romaines no. 11, du 24 septembre 2003 au 12

janvier 2004, Paris, 2004.

Harries, Jill. Imperial Rome AD 284 to 363: the New Empire. Edinburgh:

University Press, 2012.

Harrison, Martin. The Discovery and Excavation of Anicia Juliana’s

Palace Church in Istanbul. London: Harry Miller, 1989.

Head, Constance. Justinian II of Byzantium. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1972.

Hennessy, Cecily. “Topography of Constantinople,” The Oxford Handbook

of Book of Byzantine Studies, Elizabeth Jeffreys with John Haldon and Robin Cormack. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008, 202-216.

Herrin, Judith. "The Imperial Feminine in Byzantium," Past and Present, 1969 (2000), 3-33.

— "Theophano: Considerations on the Education of a Byzantine Princess," The Empress Theophano: Byzantium and the West at the Turn of the First Millenium, ed. Adelbert Davids. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995, 64-85.

Heurgon, Jacques. Le Tresor de Tenes. Paris: Arts et Metiers Graphiques, 1958.

Holloway, R. Ross. Constantine and Rome. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.

Holum, Kenneth G. "Pulcaria's Crusade, A. D. 421-422 and the Ideology of Imperial Victory," Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 18 (1977), 153-172.

— Theodosian Empresses: Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.

— and Gary Vikan. "The Trier Ivory, Adventus Ceremonial, and the Relics of St. Stephen," Dumbarton Oaks Papers, v. 33, (1977), 113-133.

Holy Image, Hallowed Ground: Icons from Sinai, ed. Nelson, Robert S. and Kristen M. Collins. Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2006.

Hunt, E. D. Holy Land Pilgrimage in the Later Roman Empire AD 312-460. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.

James, Liz. Empresses and Power in Early Byzantium. London: Leicester University Press, 2001.

— Light and Colour in Byzantine Art. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

— and Shaun Tougher. “Get Your Kit On! Some Issues in the Depiction of Clothing in Byzantium,” in The Clothed Body in the Ancient World, eds. Liza Cleland, Mary Harlow and Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2005.

— “Who’s That Girl? Personifications of the Byzantine Empress,” Through a Glass Brightly: Studies in Byzantine and Medieval Art and Archaeology Presented to David Buckton, ed. Chris Entwistle. Oakville, CT: The David Brown Book Company, 2003.

Jensen, Lloyd B. “Royal Purple of Tyre,” Journal of Near Eastern Studies, 22 (1963), 104-118.

Johnson, Mark J. “Architecture of the Empire,” Age of Constantine, ed. Noel Lenski, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Jones, Christopher. “Processional Colors,” in The Art of Ancient

Spectacle, eds. Bettina Bergmann and Christine Kondoleon.

Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1999, 247-259.

Kaegi, Walter E. Heraclius: Emperor of Byzantium. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Kahler, Heinz. Die Stiftermosaiken in der Konstantinischen Siedkirche von Aquileia. Köln: M. DuMont Schauberg, 1962.

Kalavrezou, I. "Irregular Marriages in the Eleventh Century in Byzantium," Law and Society in Byzantium, Ninth-Twelfth Centuries, eds. E.

Laiou and Dieter Simon. Washington, D. C.: Dumbarton Oaks, c.1994.

Kalavrezou-Maxeiner, Ioli. "The Imperial Chamber at Luxor," Dumbarton Oaks Papers, 29 (1975), 225-251.

— "Portraits of Basil I in Paris gr. 510," Jahrbuch der Österreichischen

Byzantinistik, 27 (1978), 19-26.

Kampen, Natalie Boymel. "Between Public and Private: Women as Historical Subjects in Roman Art," Women's History and Ancient

History, ed. Sarah B. Pomeroy. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1991, 218-248.

— Family Fictions in Roman Art. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Kantorowicz, Ernst, "Marriage Belts and Rings in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection," Dumbarton Oaks Papers, 14 (1960), 3-16.

Kelly, Christopher. "Emperors, Government, and Bureaucracy." The Cambridge Ancient History 13 (1998), 138-183.

Kent, J. P. C. "The Antiochene Coinage of Tiberius Constantine and Maurice, 578-602," Numismatic Chronicle, 1959, 99-103.

— A Selection of Byzantine Coins in the Barber Institute of Fine Arts. Birmingham: Barber Institute of Fine Arts, 1985.

Kiilerich, Bente. Late Fourth Century Classicism in the Plastic Arts:

Studies in the So-called Theodisian Renaissance. [Odense]: Odense University Press, 1993.

— "Representing an Emperor: Style and Meaning on the Missorium of Theodosius I," in El Disco de Teodosio, eds. M. Almagro-Gorbea, J. M.

Alvarez Martinez, J. M. Blazquez, Martinez & S. Rovira. Madrid: Real Academia de la Historia, 2000, 273-281.

Kitzinger, Ernst. Byzantine Art in the Making: Main Lines of Stylistic Development in Mediterranean Art, 3rd-7th Century. London: Faber and Faber, 1977.

— "The Cult of Images in the Age before Iconoclasm," Dumbarton Oaks Papers, 8, 1954, 83-150.

— "Some Reflections on Portraiture in Byzantine Art," The Art of Byzantium and the Medieval West, ed. Eugene Kleinbauer. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 256-269.

Kleiner, Diana and Fred Kleiner. "Early Roman Togate Sculpture," — Bullettino della Commissione archeologica comunale de Roma.

87 (1980/81), 125-133.

Kleiner, Diana E. F. "Now You See Them, Now You Don't: The Presence and Absence of Women in Roman Art," From Caligula To Constantine: Tyranny and Transformation in Roman Portraiture, ed. Eric R. Varner. Emory University, Georgia: Michael C. Carlos Museum, 2000, 45-58.

-- Roman Sculpture. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.

Krautheimer, Richard. "The Constantinian Basilica," Dumbarton Oaks Papers, v. 21 (1967), 117-140.

-- Three Christian Capitals: Topography and Politics. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.

La Follette, Laetitia. "The Costume of the Roman Bride," The World of Roman Costume, eds. Judith Sebesta and Larissa Bonfante. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1994, 54-63.

Lavin, Irving. "The Ceiling Frescoes in Trier and Illusionism in Constantinian Painting," Dumbarton Oaks Papers, 21 (1967), 99-113.

Leader-Newby, Ruth E. Silver and Society in Late Antiquity: Functions and Meaning of Silver Plate in the Fourth to Seventh Centuries. Aldershot, Hants: Ashgate Publishing, 2004.

Lehmann, Phyllis Williams. "Theodosius or Justinian? A Renaissance Drawing of a Byzantine Rider," The Art Bulletin, v. 41 (1959), 39-57.

Lewis, Naphtali and Meyer Reinhold. Roman Civilization Sourcebook II: The Empire. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

Lim, Richard. "In the Temple of Laughter: Visual and Literary Representations of Spectators at Roman Games," in The Art of Roman Spectacle, eds. Bettina Bergmann and Christine Kondoleon. Washington: National Gallery of Art, 2000, 343-374.

L'Orange, Hans P. Art Forms and Civic Life in the Late Roman Empire. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972.

-- Studies in the Iconography of Cosmic Kingship in the Ancient World. Oslo: H. Ascheboug, 1953.

L'Orange, H. P. And Wegner, M. Das spätantike Herrscherbild von Diokletian bis zu den Konstantin-Söhnen (1284-361 n. Chr.),

Das Römische Herrscherbild. 3.4, Berlin, 1984.

Lowden, John. Early Christian and Byzantine Art. New York: Phaidon Press, 1997.

Lowrie, Walter. Art in the Early Church. New York: W. W. Norton, 1969.

Maas, Michael. Age of Justinian. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

MacCormack, Sabine G. Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.

-- "Roma, Constantinopolis, the Emperor and His Genius," The Classical Quarterly, v. 25 (1975), 131-150.

MacKay, D. "The Jewellery of Palmyra and its Significance." Iraq 11 (1949), 160-187.

Mackie, Gillian. Early Christian Chapels in the West: Decoration, Function and Patronage. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003.

MacMullen, Ramsey. "The Emperor's Largesses." Latomus 21 (1962), 160 ff.

-- "Imperial Bureaucrats in the Roman Provinces," Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, 68 (1964), 305-316.

-- "Some Pictures in Ammianus Marcellinus," The Art Bulletin, 46, 4 (1964), 435-456.

Magdalino, Paul. "The Emperor in Byzantium: Art of the Twelfth

Century," Tradition and Transformation in Medieval Byzantium, ed. Paul Magdalino. Aldershot, New Hampshire: Ashgate

Publishing Limited, 1991, 123-183.

-- New Constantines: the Rhythm of Imperial Renewal in Byzantium, 4th-13th Centuries. Aldershot, New Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing

Limited, 1996.

Maguire, Henry. Earth and Ocean: The Terrestrial World in Early Byzantine Art. College Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1987.

—“Garments Pleasing to God: The Significance of Domestic Textile Designs in the Early Byzantine Period.” Dumbarton Oaks Papers 44 (1990), 215-224.

Mango, Cyril. The Brazen House: A Study of the Vestibule of the Imperial Palace of Constantinople. Copenhagen, 1959.

— Byzantium and its Image: History and Culture of the Byzantine Empire and its Heritage. London: Variorum Reprints, 1984.

—“Constantine’s Column,” Studies on Constantinople. Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing, 1993, 1-6.

—“Constantine’s Mausoleum and the Translation of Relics,” Byzantinische Zeitschrift, 83 (1990), 51-62.

—“The Columns of Justinian and his Successors,” Studies on Constantinople, Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 1993. 1-20.

— Le Developement urbain de Constantinople (IVe-VIe siecles), 2nd ed., Paris: Boccard, 1990.

— "Justinian's Equestrian Statue," Studies on Constantinople, Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 1993, 1-16.

— "The Triumphal Way of Constantinople and the Golden Gate." Dumbarton Oaks Papers, v. 54 (2000), 173-186.

Mango, Cyril and Marlia Mundell Mango. "Cameos in Byzantium," Cameos in Context: The Benjamin Zucker Lectures, 1990, eds. Martin Henig and Michael Vickers. Oxford: Ashmolean Museum, 1993.

Mathews, Thomas. Byzantium from Antiquity to the Renaissance. New York: Prentice Hall, 1998.

— The Clash of the Gods: A Reinterpretation of Early Christian Art. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971.

— The Early Churches of Constantinople: Architecture and Liturgy. University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1971.

Mattingly, Harold and Edward Sydenham, ed. The Roman Imperial Coinage, 10 v. London: Spink & Son, 1966-1981.

McClanan, Anne. Representations of Early Byzantine Empresses: Images and Empire. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2002.

McCormick, Michael. "Emperors," The Byzantines by Guglielmo Cavallo. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977, 230-254.

-- Eternal Victory: Triumphal Rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium and the Medieval West. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

McGuckin, John Anthony. The Transfiguration of Christ in Scripture and Tradition. Lewiston, New York, Edwin Mellon Press, 1986.

McNally, Sheila. The Architectural Ornament of Diocletian's Palace at Split. Hadrian Books: TEMPUS REPARATUM, 1996.

-- "The Frieze of the Mausoleum at Split," Studies Presented to George Haufmann, eds. David Gordon Mitton, John Griffiths Pedley and Jane Ayer Scott. Mainz: Verlag Philipp Von Zabern, 1971.

Meyendorff, John, "Christian Marriage in Byzantium: The Canonical and Liturgical Traditions," Dumbarton Oaks Papers 44 (1990), 99-107.

Mitchell, Stephen. History of the Later Roman Empire: AD 284-641: the Transformation of the Ancient World. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2007.

Moorhead, John. Theoderic in Italy. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

Morey, C. R. The Gold-Glass Collection of the Vatican Library, with Additional Catalogues of Other Gold-Glass Collections, Catalogo del Museo Sacro della Bibliot Apostolica Vatacana, v. 45. Vatican City: the library.

Moorhead, Sam and David Stuttard. AD 410: the Year that Shook Rome. London: British Museum, 2010.

Muthesius, A. Studies in Byzantine and Islamic Silk Weaving. London: Pindar Press, 1995.

Nathan, Geoffrey. "Pothos tes Philoktistou': Anicia Juliana's Architectural Narratology," Byzantine Narrative Papers in Honour of Roger Scott, ed. J. Burke. Virginia Queensland: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, 2004, 433-443.

Nesbitt, John and Cecile Morrisson. Catalogue of Byzantine Seals at Dumbarton Oaks and in the Fogg Museum of Art Emperors, Patriarchs of Constantinople, Addenda. Washington, D. C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2009.

Newby, Zabra, "Reading Programs in Greco-Roman Art: Reflections on the Spada Reliefs," The Roma Gaze: Vision, Power and the Body, ed. David Frederick. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 2002.

Nixon, C. E. V. and Rogers, B. S. In Praise of Later Roman Emperors: The Panegyri Latini. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

Numismatica Ars Classica. A Highly Important Collection of Roman and Byzantine Gold Coins, Property of an European Nobleman.

Zurich: Numismatica Ars Classica, 2002.

Numismatic Fine Arts. An Auction of Ancient Roman and Byzantine Coins.

Los Angeles: Numismatic Fine Arts, 1987.

— Auction 31: An Important Collection of Roman Gold Coins. Zurich: Numismatica Ars Classica, 2002.

Oeconomides, L. "An Unpublished Consular Solidus of Justinian I." Museum Notes 12 (1966), 75-77.

Olovdotter, Cecilia. The Consular Image: An Iconological Study of the Consular Diptychs. Oxford: Alden, 2005.

Olson, Kelly. Dress and the Roman Woman. London: Routledge, 2008.

Oxford Classical Dictionary, eds. N. G. L. Hammond and H. H. Scullard, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium, ed. A. P. Kazhan, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Oxford History of Byzantium, ed. Cyril Mango. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Papadaki-Oekland, Stella. "The Representation of Justinian's Column in a Byzantine Miniature of the Twelfth Century." Byzantinische Zeitschrift, v. 83 (Jan. 1, 1990), 63-71.

Parani, Maria G. Reconstructing the Reality of Images: Byzantine Material Culture and Religious Iconography 11th-15th Centuries. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Pedley, John. Greek Art and Archaeology. New York: H. N. Abrams, 1993.

Peirce, Philip, "The Arch of Constantine: Propaganda and Ideology in Late Roman Art," Art History, 12 (1989), 387-418.

Pentcheva, Bissera V. Icons and Power: The Mother of God in Byzantium. University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006.

Pfrommer, Michael. Greek Gold from Hellenistic Egypt. Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2001.

Pohlsander, H. A. "Crispus Brilliant Career and Tragic End," Historia, 33, 79-106.

Polzer, Joseph, "The Villa at Piazza Armerina and the Evidence," American Journal of Archaeology 77 (1979), 139-150.

Price, Simon. "The Consecration of Roman Emperors," Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies, eds. David Carradine and Simon Price. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987, 56-105.

-- Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Ramage, Nancy H. and Andrew Ramage. Roman Art: Romulus to Constantine. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1991.

Rees, Roger. Diocletian and the Tetrarchy. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004.

-- "Images and Image: A Re-examination of the Tetrarchic Iconography," Greece and Rome, 40, 2 (October, 1993), 181-200.

Reinhold, Meyer. History of Purple as a Status Symbol in Antiquity. Brussels: Latomus, 1970.

Ringrose, Kathryn. The Perfect Servant: Eunuchs and the Social Construction of Gender in Byzantium. Chicago: University of Chicago, 2003.

Ritzer, Korbinian. Le Mariage dans les Eglises Chretiennes du 1er au Xi Siecle. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1970.

Roberts, Michael. The Jeweled Style: Poetry and Poetics in Late Antiquity. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989.

Robertson, Anne S. Roman Imperial Coins in the Hunter Coin Cabinet, V, Oxford: University of Oxford Press, 1982.

Rogers, Barbara Saylor. "Constantine's Pagan Vision." Byzantion, 50 (1980), 259-278.

The Roman Eastern Frontier and the Persian Wars (AD 226-363): A Documentary History, eds. Michael H. Dodgeon and Samuel N. C. Lieu. London: Rutledge, 1994.

The Roman Imperial Coinage, ed. Harold Mattingly. London: Spink and Son, 1966-1981.

Rose, Marice E. "The Trier Ceiling: Power and Status on Display in Late Antiquity." Greece and Rome, 53 (2006), 92-109.

Rosen, William. Justinian's Flea: Plague, Empire, and the Birth of Europe. New York: Penguin Books, 2007.

Ross, Marvin. "A Byzantine Bronze Weight," American Journal of Archaeology, 50, no. 3 (1946), 368-369.

--- "A Byzantine Gold Medallion at Dumbarton Oaks," Dumbarton Oaks Papers, 11 (1957), 247-261.

--- Catalogue of the Byzantine and Early Mediaeval Antiquities in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection, v. 1 (Metalwork, Ceramics, Glass, Glyptics, Painting), Washington, D. C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1962.

-- Catalogue of the Byzantine and Early Mediaeval Antiquities in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection, v. 2 (Jewelry, Enamels and Art of the Migration Period). Washington, D. C.: The Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, 2005.

Roueché, Charlotte. "Entertainment, Theatre, and Hippodrome," The Oxford Handbook of Byzantine Studies, ed. Elizabeth Jeffreys. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008, 677-684.

Rubery, Eileen. "The 'Ariadne' Ivory and Images of the Western Empresses," 'Wonderful Things': Byzantium Through its Art: Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies. 42, Somerset House, Strand, London, Friday 20-Sunday 22 March 2009.

Ryberg, Inez Scott. Rites of the State Religion in Roman Art. Rome: American Academy, 1955.

Saffron, Linda. "Points of View: the Theodosian obelisk base in context," Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies, 34 (1993), 409-447.

Salzman, Michele. On Roman Time: The Codex-Calendar of 354 and The Rhythms of Urban Life in Antiquity. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.

Sande, Siri. "The Iconography and Style of the Rothschild Cameo," Late Antiquity: Art in Context, eds. Jens Fleischer, John Lund,

Marjatta Nielsen. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2001, 145-157.

Schapiro, Meyer. "The Joseph Scenes on the Maximianus Throne in Ravenna," Late Antique, Early Christian and Medieval Art.

New York: George Braziller, 1979, 34-48.

Schlatter, S. J. "Interpreting the Mosaic at Santa Pudenziana," Vigiliae Christianae 46 (1992), 276-295.

Sear, David R. Byzantine Coins and Their Values. London: Seaby, 1987.

Sebesta, Judith Lynn, "Symbolism in the Costume of the Roman Woman," The World of Roman Costume, eds. Judith Sebesta and

Larissa Bonfante. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1994.

Sevcenko, Ihor, "Re-reading Constantine Porphyrogenitus," Byzantine Diplomacy: Papers from the Twenty-fourth Spring

Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge, March 1990, eds. Jonathan Shepard and Simon Franklin. Aldershot,

Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing, 1992, 167-236.

Shelton, Kathleen J. "Roman Aristocrats, Christian Commissions: The Carrand Diptych," in Tradition and Innovation in Late Antiquity, eds. F. M. Clover and R. S. Humphreys. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989.

Shaw, Ian and Paul Nicholson. The Dictionary of Ancient Egypt. London: British Museum Press, 1995.

Simson, Otto G. von. Sacred Fortress: Byzantine Art and Statecraft in Ravenna. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948.

Sivan, Hagith. Galla Placidia: The Last Roman Empress. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2011.

Smith, R. R. R. "Late Antique Portraits in a Public Context: Honorific Statuary at Aphrodisias in Caria, A. D. 300-600," The Journal of Roman Studies, 89 (1999), 155-189.

— "The Public Image of Licinius I: Portrait Sculpture and Imperial Ideology in the Early Fourth Century," Journal of Roman Studies, 87 (1997), 170-202.

— Roman Portrait Statuary from Aphrodisias II. Results of the Excavations at Aphrodisias in Caria Conducted by New

Yo

Snyder, James, Medieval Art: Painting, Sculpture, Architecture 4th-14th Century. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1988.

Sodini, Jean-Pierre, "Images sculptées et propagande impériale du IV^e au VI^e siècle: recherches récentes sur les colonnes honorifiques et les reliefs politiques à Byzance," Byzance et les images. Paris, La Documentation française, 1994.

Spain, Suzanne, "The Translation of Relics Ivory, Trier," Dumbarton Oaks Papers 31 (1977), 279-304.

Spatharakis, Johannes. The Portrait in Byzantine Manuscripts. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.

Spier, Jeffrey. Late Antique and Early Christian Gems. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 2007.

— "Late Antique Cameos c. A.D. 250-600," Cameos in Context: The Benjamin Zucker Lectures, 1990, eds. Martin Henig and Michael Vickers. Oxford: Ashmolean Museum, 1993.

Spink and Son. Byzantine Seals: The Zakos Collection. 1-3, London: Spink and Son, 1998-1999.

Squires, Nick. "Crux Vaticana Restored to its Former Glory," The Telegraph, 19 Nov. 2009.

Stack's Auction Gallery. Moneta Imperii Romani Byzantini. New York: Stack's Auction Gallery, 2009.

Stephenson, Paul. Constantine: Roman Emperor, Christian Victor. New York: The Overlook Press, 2009.

Stern, Henri. Le Calendrier de 354 Etude sur son Text et ses Illustrations. Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1953.

— "Remarks on the 'Adoratio' under Diocletian," Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institute, 17 (1954), 184-189.

Stone, Shelley. "The Toga: From National to Ceremonial Costume," The World of Roman Costume, ed. Judith Sebesta and Larissa Bonfante. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2001.

Stout, Ann M. "Jewelry as a Symbol of Status in the Roma Empire," The World of Roman Costume, ed. Judith Sebesta and Larissa Bonfante. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2001.

Strudwick, Helen (ed.). The Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt. London: Amber Books, 2006.

Sevcenko, I. "Re-reading Constantine Porphyrogenitus," Byzantine Diplomacy Papers from the Twenty-fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge, March 1990, eds. Jonathan Shephard and Simon Franklin. Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Company, 1992.

Swift, Ellen. Regionality in Dress Accessories in the Late Roman West. Montagnac: Editions Monique Mergoil, 2000.

The Transformation of Urbs Roma in Late Antiquity, ed. W. V. Harris. Portsmouth, Rhode Island: Journal of Roman Archaeology,

1999.

Treadgold, Warren. Byzantium and its Army, 284-1081. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995.

Trilling, James. The Medallion Style: A Study in the Origins of Byzantine Taste. New York: Garland Publishing, 1985.

-- The Roman Heritage: Textiles from Egypt and the Eastern Mediterranean, 300-600 A. D. Washington, D. C.: Textile Museum, 1982.

Van Dam, Raymond. The Roman Revolution of Constantine. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Varner, Eric R. Mutilation and Transformation: *Damnatio Memoriae* and Roman Imperial Portraiture. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

--"Portraits, Plots and Politics: *Damnatio Memoriae* and the Images of Imperial Women." *Memoirs of the American in Rome*. 46 (2001), 41-93.

-- "Roman Authority, Imperial Authority, and Julian's Artistic Program," Emperor and Author: The Writings of Julian the Apostate, eds. Nicholas Baker-Brian and Shaun Tougher. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 2012.

--"Tyranny and the Transformation of the Roman Visual Landscape," From Caligula to Constantine: Tyranny and Transformation in Roman Portraiture, ed. Eric R. Varner. Atlanta, Georgia: Emory University, 2001. 9-27.

Vasilaki, Maria, ed. Images of the Mother of God: Perceptions of the Theotokos in Byzantium. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2005.

--- Mother of God: Representations of the Virgin in Byzantine Art. Milan: Skira Editore, 2000.

Vatican Associated Press, "Vatican's 'Most Important' Cross Gets New Look," November 2009.

Vermeule, C. C. "Hellenistic and Roman Cuirassed Statues," Berytus 13 (1959), 1-82.

Verzone, P. "I due gruppi porfirei di San Marco e il Philadelphion di Constantinopoli," Palladio, n. s. 8, 1958, 8-14.

Vikan, Gary. "Art and Marriage in Early Byzantium," Dumbarton Oaks Papers, 44 (1990), 145-163.

--- "Art, Medicine, and Magic in Early Byzantium," Dumbarton Oaks Papers, 38 (1984), 65-86.

Volback, W. F. Elfenbeinarbeiten der Spätantike und Des frühen Mittelalters. Mainz: Philip von Zebern, 1976.

Walter, Christopher, "Marriage Crowns in Byzantine Iconography," Zograf 10 (1979), 83-91.

Wanscher, Ole. Sella Curulis. The Folding Stool, an Ancient Symbol of Dignity. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1980.

Weitzmann, Kurt. Age of Spirituality in Late Antique and Early Christian Art, Third to Seventh Century. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1979.

— Age of Spirituality: a Symposium. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1979.

— Late Antique and Early Christian Book Illumination. New York: George Braziller, 1977.

Westdal, Stewart J. Dictionary of Roman Coin Inscriptions. Rockville Centre, N. Y.: Sanford J. Durst, 1971.

Wheeler, Bonnie. Representation of the Feminine. Academia Press, 1993.

Whitting, P. D. Byzantine Coins. New York: G. P. Putnam's Son, 1973.

Wightman, Edith Mary. Roman Trier and the Treveri. London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1970.

Wild, John Peter. "The Roman Horizontal Loom," American Journal of Archaeology, 91 (1987), 459-471.

Wilkes, J. J. Diocletian's Palace, Split: Residence of a Retired Roman Emperor. [Oxford]: Ian Sanders Memorial Committee, 1993.

Wilkinson, Richard H. The Complete Temples of Ancient Egypt. New York: Thames and Hudson, 2000.

Wilpert, Joseph. Roman Mosaics over 60 Full-Color Images from the 4th Through the 13th Centuries. Mineola, New York: Dover Publishing, 2007.

Wilson, L. J. "The Trier Procession Ivory: a New Interpretation." Byzantion 54 (1984), 602-614.

Wixom, William D. "A Theodosian Steelyard Weight," Gesta, 15 (1976), 273-278.

Wood, Susan E. Imperial Women: A Study in Public Images, 40 B. C.-A. D. 68. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Wortley, J. "The Trier Ivory Reconsidered." GRBS, 21 (1980), 381-394.

Wright, David H. "The True Face of Constantine the Great," Dumbarton Oaks Papers, 41 (1987), 493-507.

Wroth, Warwick. Imperial Byzantine Coins. Chicago: Argonaut, 1966.

Yeroulanou, Aimilia. Diatrita: Gold Pierced-work Jewellery from the 3rd to the 7th Century. Athens: Bernaki Museum, 1999.