

This is an extract from:

Dumbarton Oaks Papers, No. 53

Published by

Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection

Washington, D.C.

Issue year 1999

© 1999 Dumbarton Oaks

Trustees for Harvard University

Washington, D.C.

Printed in the United States of America

www.doaks.org/etexts.html

The Lost Royal Portraits of Gerace and Cefalù Cathedrals

MARK J. JOHNSON

The city of Gerace is a quiet, unassuming collection of buildings atop a table mountain in southern Calabria (Fig. 1). It is dominated by its Norman cathedral, which is the largest church in the region.¹ Constructed with *spolia* from nearby Locri, it has lost the medieval decoration that once graced its walls. Two obscure texts, however, give evidence that this artistic program contained a very significant work of art, a mosaic panel depicting King Roger II and Leontius II, bishop of Gerace. Across the Straits of Messina on the island of Sicily is another Norman jewel, better known among those who study the Byzantine influence in this part of the Mediterranean. The cathedral of Cefalù and its mosaic decoration are celebrated masterpieces of the twelfth-century flowering of art in the Norman kingdom of Sicily and southern Italy. The church was a royal foundation, erected by order of King Roger II and intended eventually to have served as his final resting place.² A little-known part of the decoration of the cathedral was a series of now destroyed panels depicting Roger and his successors, located on the west facade of the building and described in a fourteenth-century text. These descriptions permit a glimpse at what must have been remarkable expressions of royal and episcopal patronage, recognizable at once as part and parcel of the corpus of royal images in the decoration of

For their helpful comments on earlier drafts of this study, I wish to thank Ernst Kitzinger, Dale Kinney, and Slobodan Ćurčić, who brought several Serbian examples and references to my attention. I am also grateful to the Department of Visual Arts and the College of Fine Arts and Communications at Brigham Young University for financial support in paying for photographs and allowing me to conduct research in Sicily and Calabria during the summer of 1996. Some of the ideas found here were presented in “The Lost Porch Decoration of Cefalù Cathedral,” *BSCAbstr* 18 (1992): 40–41, and “A Lost Mosaic Portrait of Roger II and Bishop Leontius II of Gerace,” *BSCAbstr* 23 (1997): 61.

¹In general, see S. Gemelli, ed., *La Cattedrale di Gerace: Il monumento, le funzioni, i corredi* (Cosenza, 1986), with bibliography.

²In general, see O. Demus, *The Mosaics of Norman Sicily* (London, 1949), 3–24 and passim; T. Thieme and I. Beck, *La cattedrale normanna di Cefalù*, *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici*, Suppl. 8 (Odense, 1977); R. Calandra et al., *Materiali per la conoscenza storica e il restauro di una cattedrale: Mostra di documenti e testimonianze figurative della basilica ruggeriana di Cefalù* (Palermo, 1982); G. Aurigemma, ed., *La Basilica Cattedrale di Cefalù: Materiali per la conoscenza storica e il restauro*, 8 vols. (Palermo, 1989); E. Borsook, *Messages in Mosaic: The Royal Programmes of Norman Sicily, 1130–1187* (Oxford, 1990), 6–16; M. J. Johnson, “The Episcopal and Royal Views at Cefalù,” *Gesta* 33 (1994): 118–31.

Norman churches in Sicily, yet unique in their own right.³ Though not unknown, the texts have never been completely analyzed before now, and the full significance of these lost pictures and of their relationship to Byzantine and Western prototypes has gone unrecognized.

I. THE MOSAIC OF ROGER II AND LEONTIUS II IN GERACE

The descriptions of the lost mosaic panel of Roger II and Leontius II, bishop of Gerace, have, to my knowledge, gone entirely unnoticed in discussions of the surviving images of Norman rulers in Sicily.⁴ Neither text is particularly detailed, but enough information is given to offer a tantalizing glimpse of the appearance of this mosaic. The first description is an eyewitness account written in the sixteenth century. After years of service in the Roman curia, Ottaviano Pasqua, a humanist scholar, was appointed by Pope Gregory VII as bishop of Gerace, where he served for a number of years (1574–91).⁵ His historical interests led him to compile a work on his predecessors, the *Vitae episcoporum ecclesiae Hieracensis*, which was published in an obscure book only in 1755.⁶ In discussing the life of Leontius, Pasqua noted that “in the cathedral, near the altar of the Santissimo Salvatore one may still admire a mosaic in which are depicted, in poses of devotion, on the right Leontius and on the left Count Roger. The former [is shown] with a gold miter and cope, the other with a gold crown on his head, the royal scepter in his hand and clothes covered with gold lilies.”⁷

A second, even briefer, description is found in a book written by Giovanni Fiore in the middle of the seventeenth century and published a century later. Confirming the report of Pasqua, Fiore mentions “the chapel of the Savior with its ancient mosaic image,

³For the royal images of Norman Sicily, see S. Steinberg, “I ritratti dei re normanni di Sicilia,” *La Bibliofilia* 39 (1937): 29–57, who does not mention the images under discussion here. On the larger issue of medieval royal and imperial images, no single study has yet been attempted. For Byzantine imperial images, see A. Grabar, *L'empereur dans l'art byzantin* (Paris, 1936); K. Wessel, “Kaiserbild,” *RBK* 3:722–853; T. Velmans, “Le portrait dans l'art des Paléologues,” in *Art et société à Byzance sous les Paléologues: Actes du Colloque organisé par l'Association internationale des études byzantines à Venise en septembre 1968* (Venice, 1971), 91–148; eadem, *La peinture murale byzantine à la fin du Moyen Age* (Paris, 1977), 62–74; P. Magdalino and R. Nelson, “The Emperor in Byzantine Art of the Twelfth Century,” *ByzF* 8 (1982): 123–83, repr. in P. Magdalino, *Tradition and Transformation in Medieval Byzantium* (Brookfield, Vt., 1991), pt. 6; C. Jolivet-Lévy, “L'image du pouvoir dans l'art byzantin à l'époque de la dynastie macédonienne,” *Byzantion* 57 (1987): 441–70; J. Lafontaine-Dosogne, “Les thèmes iconographiques profanes dans la peinture monumentale byzantine du Ve au XVe siècle,” in *Arte profana e arte sacra a Bisanzio*, ed. A. Iacobini and E. Zanini, *Milion* 3 (Rome, 1995), 189–219. For the West, see P. Schramm and F. Mutherich, *Die deutschen Kaiser und Könige in Bildern ihrer Zeit, 751–1190*, 2d ed. (Munich, 1983); W. J. Diebold, “The Ruler Portrait of Charles the Bald in the S. Paolo Bible,” *ArtB* 76 (1994): 6–18; C. A. Willemsen, *Die Bildnisse der Staufer* (Göppingen, 1977).

⁴They have been briefly mentioned in literature concerning the church at Gerace. See, for example, C. Garzya Romano, *La Basilicata: La Calabria*, *Italia romanica* 9 (Milan, 1988), 213.

⁵E. Cochrane, *Historians and Historiography in the Italian Renaissance* (Chicago, 1981), 448.

⁶O. Pasqua, *Vitae episcoporum ecclesiae Hieracensis*, ed. G. A. Parlà, in *Constitutiones et acta Synody Hieracensis ab illustrissimo et reverendissimo domino Caesare Rossi Episcopo celebratae diebus 10, 11 et 12 Novembris 1754* (Naples, 1755).

⁷“Eiusdem Leontii imago opere vermiculato in basilica cathedrali ad altare SS. Salvatori dicato ad dexteram, Rogerii autem Comititis ad laevam pie expresse spectatur adhuc, quorum ille mitra auro intexta ac pluviali indutus visitur, hic auream coronam capiti impositam, manu regale sceptrum gestans, vestitu aureis liliis circumfuso.” *Constitutiones*, 248–49; quoted in E. D'Agostino, “I vescovi,” in *Cattedrale di Gerace*, ed. Gemelli (as in note 1), 209.

with, on the left, King Roger, dressed in royal clothes, and on the right, Bishop Leontius, his relative.”⁸

Pasqua indicates that the mosaic was located near the altar of the Santissimo Salvatore. This altar was, and still is today, located in the north apse of the church, but it is unclear where exactly the panel would have been (Fig. 2). It may have been on the apse wall itself, below or to one or the other side of the window. Perhaps it was actually near the apse, for example, on the pier separating the main and the north apses. As the walls are now covered with plaster, no physical evidence for the placement of the panel is visible.

The date of the mosaic can be roughly determined from the description, which makes it clear that Roger wore a crown. Although he ruled Sicily and southern Italy from 1101, his coronation as king occurred in 1130, while Leontius was bishop from about 1124 until his death in 1144(?). Therefore, the mosaic would have been completed between 1130 and ca. 1144. Its destruction apparently happened during the bishopric of Domenico Diez (1689–1729), in order for a crucifix to be hung in its place.⁹ The editor of Pasqua’s *Vitae*, Giuseppe Parlà, bemoaned its loss and noted that there were still people alive in 1755 who remembered seeing the mosaic.

The descriptions clarify that the mosaic depicted King Roger on the left and Bishop Leontius on the right, presumably standing and identified by inscriptions. Pasqua noted that both were in “poses of devotion.” What was meant by this phrase is open to interpretation—perhaps, their heads were slightly bowed, or maybe their hands were raised, or their arms were outstretched in some manner. Whatever the exact pose was, somehow the two were made to look pious. Leontius wore a gold miter and cope; Roger was shown with his royal regalia of the gold crown, the scepter, and clothes strewn with gold lilies.

The appearance of Roger is, of course, well known from his depiction in the famous investiture mosaic in Santa Maria dell’Ammiraglio, also known as the Martorana, in Palermo, done during the 1140s and therefore a close contemporary to the mosaic at Gerace (Fig. 3).¹⁰ There Roger is shown in the dress of a Byzantine emperor, with his head bowed and arms raised toward Christ in a gesture of prayer. It may be assumed that his facial features would have been similar in the Gerace mosaic, as well as the crown, though his dress was somewhat different. In Santa Maria, Roger wears a loros, a long under-tunic, and a dark blue outer tunic decorated with fleur-de-lis. As for Bishop Leontius, no other image exists of him—or, for that matter, of any other bishop in Norman southern Italy. His dress, however, was likely to be similar to that worn by the bishops depicted in twelfth-century illuminated manuscripts produced in southern Italy.¹¹

The overall composition of the mosaic at Gerace, as described by Pasqua and Fiore, calls to mind that of the enamel plaque from the church of San Nicola in Bari, showing

⁸G. Fiore, *Della Calabria illustrata* (Naples, 1748; repr. Sala Bolognese, 1974), 305.

⁹So says Giuseppe Parlà, the editor of Pasqua’s text: “Has Leontii et Rogerii imagines vivunt adhuc qui spectavere: sed pessum iverunt ipsae, quod est dolendum, Diezio Episcopo, qui ibi magnum crucifixi statuam voluit apponere, ubi illae erant, etsi temporum injuria aliqua parte attritae, at quae tamen possent, et dignum era, restaurari.” See *Constitutiones*, 249 n. 1; quoted in D’Agostino, “Vescovi,” 217.

¹⁰For the Martorana mosaic, see E. Kitzinger, *The Mosaics of St. Mary’s of the Admiral in Palermo*, DOS 27 (Washington, D.C., 1990), 189–97.

¹¹For example, the *Chronicon Vulturense* and the *Liber in honorem Augusti* of Petrus de Ebuli, for which see below.

Roger being crowned by St. Nicholas (Fig. 4).¹² Though its date is uncertain, the period soon after 1139—the year when Roger suppressed a rebellion and asserted control in Bari—seems likely for its manufacture. Though somewhat schematic in its details, it depicts Roger standing on the left with a crown, labarum, and orb, wearing a tunic, mantle, and loros decorated with fleur-de-lis. To the right stands the bishop saint in ecclesiastical garments. Notwithstanding the differing details, the small enamel image is close to what must have been visible in the mosaic at Gerace.

The origins of the cathedral of Gerace are very uncertain, as no documentation for its foundation and construction survives. It seems to have been built either in the late eleventh century under the reign of the Great Count Roger I, who died in 1101, or in the early part of the twelfth, during the reign of his son, Roger II. Though no role in the building of the church is documented for either ruler, the younger Roger is known to have collaborated with Leontius I in the foundation and construction of a Basilian monastery near Gerace.¹³ A mosaic depicting King Roger and Bishop Leontius suggests that the bishop may have been responsible for building the church or decorating its interior, presumably with assistance from the king; if Roger had been the sole patron of the church, he would have likely been shown alone. As the likely founder or donor, Leontius was honored in a monumental mosaic. No evidence exists to support Fiore's claim that Leontius and Roger were relatives. This may or may not be true; if true, it may explain the king's interest in this project. Nevertheless, related or not, Roger's presence in the mosaic certainly conveyed some meaning of royal support for the bishop and his church. The king possessed the right to appoint bishops in his kingdom.¹⁴ Leontius, therefore, owed his position and any temporal powers as vassal to the king; Roger was his benefactor, ecclesiastically and temporally for sure, and possibly financially as well, especially when one considers the great size of this church. One is again reminded of the mosaic at Santa Maria dell'Ammiraglio, the presence of which in that church is understood when it is considered through its pendant, the dedicatory panel of George of Antioch, Roger's minister and founder of the church (Fig. 5). Roger is depicted here in order to show the source of George's authority. Perhaps Roger was depicted at Gerace for a similar reason—to show from whom the bishop, Leontius, derived his position and authority. If this was indeed the case, then the likely patron for the mosaic would be Leontius.

There may have been one other mosaic depicting a bishop in the Norman kingdom of Sicily. The cathedral of Palermo, rebuilt by Bishop Walter at the same time that the cathedral of Monreale was under construction, and dedicated in 1185, apparently had a mosaic in its apse. It was destroyed, with no surviving depictions or descriptions, but its inscription was recorded and seems to indicate that its decoration consisted of a large

¹²E. Bertaux, "L'émail de St. Nicholas de Bari," *Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres, Commission de la Fondation Piot: Monuments et mémoires* 6 (1899): 61–90 and pl. vi; P. Belli D'Elia, *La Puglia*, Italia romanica 8 (Milan, 1986), 172–73; M. Andaloro, ed., *Splendori di Bisanzio* (Milan, 1990), 190–91.

¹³A diploma in the *Syllabus* of Trinchera, written in Greek and dating from 1101, documents this action, for which see E. D'Agostino, "Osservazioni e note su un documento geracese del XII secolo," *BollGrott*, n.s., 36 (1982): 43–59.

¹⁴I. S. Robinson, *The Papacy, 1073–1198: Continuity and Innovation* (Cambridge, 1990), 388.

figure of Christ with a small prostrate Walter at one of his feet.¹⁵ Though a very different work of art from the mosaic at Gerace, the apse decoration of the Palermo cathedral demonstrates that episcopal patronage of mosaic art did indeed exist in the Norman kingdom.

II. THE ROYAL PORTRAITS AT CEFALÙ

The description of the Cefalù panels is preserved in a compilation of documents made in 1329 and known as the *Rollus rubeus*.¹⁶ Thomas de Butera, the bishop of the time, had ordered the collection of evidence concerning the privileges of his see, which for the most part meant the copying of various instruments of donations and privileges granted to the church and the bishopric from their inception. The job was given to Rogerius de Mistretta, a notary, who completed his commission in 1330. Rogerius began his compilation with a recounting of the legendary foundation of the church as a fulfillment of a vow following the deliverance of King Roger from a storm at sea.¹⁷ This was followed by a series of five documents, each describing a single panel of the facade decoration and containing a preface and signatures of several witnesses (see Appendix).¹⁸

According to the source, this decoration consisted of at least six figural panels, five of which depicted rulers who held scrolls containing some of the privileges and donations that they had granted to the church. Concerned about the possible effects of age and water on the panels and wishing to preserve knowledge of them for posterity, Bishop Thomas ordered Rogerius and Primus de Primo, a city judge, to document their appearance and, especially, to record the privileges granted to the cathedral that were depicted in the panels.

The document gives the wall of the Porta Regia—or west facade of the church (“in pariete porte regum”)—as the position of the panels, and adds the phrase “in the bell tower of the same church” (“in ipsius ecclesie campanario”), which sounds confused since the door is not in a tower, but placed in the center of the wall between two towers (Fig. 6).¹⁹ Presumably, the author was using the phrase “in campanario” to refer to the part of the church in which the bell towers are located (i.e., the west facade), rather than to a

¹⁵Demus, *Mosaics*, 188, 190 n. 13. The early-13th-century apse mosaic at San Paolo Fuori le Mura in Rome, showing Pope Honorius III (1216–27) at the foot of Christ and set by mosaicists from Venice, provides a parallel. See W. Oakeshott, *The Mosaics of Rome from the Third to the Fourteenth Centuries* (Greenwich, 1967), 295–96 and fig. 186.

¹⁶*Rollus rubeus, privilegia ecclesie Cephaleditane, a diversis regibus et imperatoribus concessa, recollecta et in hoc volumine scripta*, ed. C. Mirto, Documenti per servire alla storia di Sicilia, ser. 1, 29 (Palermo, 1972).

¹⁷*Ibid.*, 24–26. See Johnson, “Views,” 118, 128–29.

¹⁸*Rollus rubeus*, ed. Mirto, 26–32. Brief comments on the description may be found in Demus, *Mosaics*, 10; R. Salvo di Pietraganzili, *Cefalù: La sua origine e i suoi monumenti* (Palermo, 1888), 130–36; H. Schwarz, “Die Baukunst Kalabriens und Siziliens im Zeitalter der Normannen,” *Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte* 6 (1942–44): 99–102; G. Agnello di Ramata, “I sarcofagi donati da Ruggero II alla chiesa di Cefalù e trasportati a Palermo per ordine di Federico II,” *AStSic*, ser. 3, 7 (1955): 260–65; C. Valenziano and M. Valenziano, “La supplique des chanoines de la cathédrale de Cefalù pour la sépulture du roi Roger,” *CahCM* 21 (1978): 3–30, 137–50, esp. 140–41, 146; trans. and repr. as *La basilica cattedrale di Cefalù nel periodo normanno* (Palermo, 1979), 46–47, 54; D. Potera, *Cefalù: Memorie storiche* (Palermo, 1988), 43.

¹⁹*Rollus rubeus*, ed. Mirto, 26.

single tower. As at the time there was no portico, this being added in 1471/2, the pictures would have indeed been exposed to the elements.²⁰

The panels are described in chronological order, beginning with a dedicatory image of Roger II (1130–54), who founded the church in 1131, and continuing with panels representing his successors: William I (1154–66); William II (1166–89); Constance (1194–98), the daughter of Roger and wife of Henry VI; and her son, Frederick II (1198–1250). There is nothing in the document that indicates their specific arrangement on the wall, though it may be assumed that the earliest panels would have been placed near the portal, and the others added to either side. It is not clear from the document whether these were fresco paintings or mosaics, as they are referred to simply as “pictures” or “images.” Given the known parallels from the period, however, mosaic seems likely at least for the earliest panels.

The precise dating of the individual panels is largely a matter of conjecture, though it seems likely that the first two panels would have been placed there during the reign of Roger, with the others being added later. The date of their destruction is unknown, but it may have occurred during the construction of the portico and its roof, and certainly by the end of the sixteenth century.²¹

Before I turn to an examination of the panels, a few other observations are pertinent. It will be seen that the descriptions of the figures are not particularly detailed. However, the text of the document assures the reader that the inscriptions have been faithfully copied, with nothing added to or subtracted from what was depicted in the pictures. This is a strong indication that the primary reason for creating the descriptions was not to document the works of art but to record the inscriptions. No mention is even made in the *Rollus rubeus* of the other decoration of the church, and if these panels had no texts with privileges, the bishop and Rogerius would have ignored them as well. The images are described in a minimal way—just enough to lend authority to the texts. Each description is followed by the signatures of Primus and Rogerius, along with a variety of other witnesses.

The first panel is described by the notary Rogerius and the judge Primus in this manner:

Our Savior sitting in his majesty, with his left hand receiving the depicted church [i.e., model], and with his other, right, hand he makes the sign of the cross; the church is held by Roger, the builder of this church, with his right hand. He wears royal vestments and is crowned. And above the head of said king is written, “King Roger.” And with his left hand he holds a written scroll. The writing on this is, “Accept, Savior, the church and the city of Cefalù with all of its rights and liberties; to ourselves and our successors we reserve [the right of] punishing felonies, seditions, and homicides.”

This description brings to mind the three famous surviving royal mosaics of Norman Sicily, namely, the panel of Roger crowned by Christ in the church of Santa Maria dell’Ammiraglio in Palermo (Fig. 3) and the two dedicatory panels of William II in the cathedral of Monreale, one showing him crowned by an enthroned Christ (Fig. 7) and

²⁰R. Calandra, *Aggiunte, modifiche e restauri degli ultimi sette secoli*, vol. 2 of *Basilica*, ed. Aurigemma (as in note 2), 29–40.

²¹B. Carandino, *Descriptio totius Ecclesiae Cephaleditanae* (Mantua, 1592), 23, states that there was nothing left to see of the decoration in his time.

the other with him offering a model of the church to a seated Mary (Fig. 8).²² The Cefalù panel would seem to have included elements found in these mosaics—those of a standing figure of the king dressed in his fine silk robes, with one hand extended to offer a model of the church to an enthroned Christ. The basic composition must have been similar to that of the Monreale panels, with the major difference being the pose of the king, since in Cefalù he also held an open scroll in his left hand.

As its founder, Roger had particularly strong ties to the cathedral. Having begun construction of the church in 1131, he urged to elevate its status to that of a cathedral and, in 1145, donated two porphyry sarcophagi to the church with the intention that he would eventually be entombed in one, with the other acting somewhat mysteriously as a monument to his memory.²³ The church was equipped with a royal throne in the sanctuary, and its mosaic decoration included elements designed to stress its links with the king.²⁴ Following his death, however, Roger was buried in Palermo, and, although a few years after the death of William I in 1166 Bishop Boso and the canons of the church petitioned William II and his regent mother for the permission to transfer the bodies of the two kings to Cefalù, they were unsuccessful. The last hope that the church would serve its intended function of the royal mausoleum ended when the sarcophagi were removed to Palermo by order of Frederick II, probably in 1215.²⁵

The privileges accorded to the church that were recorded on the scroll held by Roger are documented elsewhere in identical terminology. They are named in a document of Roger of 1132 and reiterated in the donation instrument of 1145.²⁶ This indicates, of course, that the source of the text found on Roger's scroll was the actual diploma issued by the king to the church. The same is most likely true for the texts in the other panels.

The document then describes what it identifies as the third panel, "cuius tertie figure imago talis est."²⁷ The second panel is not described, presumably for its lack of a depicted legal document. Since the third one showed Roger II's successor and son, William I, it is probable that Roger was pictured once more in the second panel, this time likely in an investiture scene, depicted receiving his crown from Christ in the manner of the Martorana panel or that of William II in Monreale.²⁸ Thus, it appears that the portal was flanked

²²For the Monreale panels, see Demus, *Mosaics*, 123–26; Borsook, *Messages*, 67–68; E. Kitzinger, *The Mosaics of Monreale* (Palermo, 1960), 18.

²³Palermo, Archivio di Stato, Tabulario della chiesa vescovile di Cefalù, perg. no. 44, in *Rollus rubeus*, ed. Mirto, 41–45. See also C. Brühl, ed., *Rogerii II. Regis diplomata Latina*, Codex diplomaticus regni Siciliae, ser. 1, *Diplomata regum et principum e gente Normannorum* 2.1 (Cologne, 1987), 197–200, no. 68. See J. Deér, *The Dynastic Porphyry Tombs of the Norman Period in Sicily*, DOS 5 (Cambridge, Mass., 1959), 1–3.

²⁴Johnson, "Views," 125–29.

²⁵On the petition for the burials of Roger and William I in Cefalù made in 1170 by the canons of the church, see Valenziano and Valenziano, "Supplique," 3–7, 143–50; eidem, *Basilica*, 50–60, 69–76; Deér, *Tombs*, 5–14. For the removal of the sarcophagi, see J. L. A. Huillard-Bréholles, *Historia diplomatica Friderici Secundi* (Paris, 1852), 1:426–27; Deér, *Tombs*, 18–19; Agnello di Ramata, "Sarcophagi."

²⁶For the document, issued in Palermo in March 1132, see Brühl, *Rogerii*, 53, no. 19; for the donation instrument, see *Rollus rubeus*, ed. Mirto, 43, and Brühl, *Rogerii*, 200.

²⁷*Rollus rubeus*, ed. Mirto, 28.

²⁸As suggested by Valenziano and Valenziano, *Basilica*, 47 n. 56. For this type of image, see Grabar, *Empereur*, 112–22; Wessel, "Kaiserbild," 745–51. Professor Slobodan Ćurčić has suggested to me that perhaps it was Roger's father shown in the panel, noting that in a later period King Milutin and his deceased father were depicted on either side of the entrance of the early-14th-century church of the Virgin Ljeviška at Prizren, for which see below. For father-son pairings in Serbian art, see S. Mandić, "Dvojno ktitorstvo," in

by two representations of Roger, one as donor and the other in an image of royal authority, as was later done at the cathedral of Monreale with the images of William II.

The next panel to be described in the document, as has been noted, is the third. Concerning this picture, the notary Rogerius wrote:

Pictured is the king, his face turned wholly to the right toward the people looking on, or to the opposite wall. He wears royal vestments, is crowned, and with his right hand holds the royal scepter, and with his left, a painted and written scroll. The writing on the scroll is, "That which Our Father of divine memory conceded to the church of Cefalù we confirm, ratify, and approve. And by our pious clemency we add to these gifts and we donate the church of Saint Lucia of Syracuse with its villages and all that belongs to it." Above his head is written, "William I King of Sicily."

This panel represented the only known monumental depiction of William I in Norman art. It must have been similar to those of his father and his son, namely, an image of a standing crowned figure in court dress, holding a symbol of his power in his right hand and the proof of his concern for the cathedral of Cefalù in the form of a document in his left. The passage is somewhat perplexing with its references to the "people looking on, or . . . the opposite wall." The people would be those who viewed the image, but, if the image were on the facade, then there would be no "opposite wall"; though, perhaps, the phrase can be taken to mean that the king's head was turned to the right toward the wall of the bell tower.

William I also had personal ties to the cathedral of Cefalù. His interest in the church is cited in the canons' petition of 1170, which states that upon the death of his father he confirmed that Roger should be buried there once the church was consecrated. During a visit to Cefalù, he stopped in front of the sarcophagus intended for his father and stated his desire that both he and his father should be buried in the church and that, as the people of the city worshiped in the church, they should pass by the two sarcophagi and pray for his soul and that of his father.²⁹ In the end, he too was buried in Palermo, though his remains were later transferred to the new dynastic church, the cathedral of Monreale, built by his son.

Although William's confirmation of the church's privileges is alluded to in the canons' petition and in a privilege issued by Constance, no separate document issued by William himself and stating this survives.³⁰ Apparently, no such document was available to Rogerius to be copied into the *Rollus rubeus*, so the pictorial representation must have taken on added significance for him and Bishop Thomas. There is some question about the affirmation of the gift of the church of St. Lucia in Syracuse to the cathedral. A later scribe crossed out "Lucia" and replaced it with "Mary," but, once again, there is no independent confirmation of this gift either. A papal bull of 24 November 1169, issued by Alexander III, was the first to recognize the bishopric of Cefalù and to extend recogni-

Drevnik: Zapisi konzervatora (Belgrade, 1975), 146–54. In either scenario, the message would have been one of royal authority.

²⁹Valenziano and Valenziano, "Supplique," 144–45; eidem, *Basilica*, 57–58; Deér, *Tombs*, 7.

³⁰For the document of Constance (Palermo, Archivio di Stato, Tabulario della chiesa vescovile di Cefalù, perg. no. 34), issued at Palermo in May 1198, see *Rollus rubeus*, ed. Mirto, 56–58; T. Kölzer, ed., *Constantiae imperatricis et reginae Siciliae diplomata (1195–1198)*, Codex diplomaticus regni Siciliae, ser. 2, *Diplomata regum e gente Suevorum* 1.2 (Cologne, 1983), 204.

tion to the cathedral's rights and possessions. Among the possessions are listed the churches of St. Mary at Camarata and St. Lucia in Syracuse, yet no mention is made of any role played by William I.³¹ To further complicate matters, a charter given by Countess Adelicia, the niece of King Roger, in June 1140 presented the monastery of St. Lucia in Syracuse to the cathedral.³² Perhaps, William simply reconfirmed its dependence on Cefalù, and this is what was commemorated in the picture.

The image of the fourth panel is described in this manner:

Pictured here was a king wearing royal vestments and crowned; above his head is written, "William II King of Sicily." He holds in his right hand the royal scepter, and with his left, a scroll depicting writings. The writing was, "By royal clemency we, heirs of our progenitors, concede what they conceded by their benevolence to the church of Cefalù and we confirm it with the present writing."

This figure must have been a virtual mirror image of the third panel, if one assumes that both William I and William II were depicted alone. It is also easy to imagine the figure of William II as being very close to that depicted in his coronation panel at Monreale (Fig. 7), though with his head raised and arms extended to hold the scepter and the scroll.

William II had no strong affinity for the church at Cefalù, and there is no outside evidence for any specific donations made or privileges granted to it on his part other than the brief mentions of his confirmation of the rights of the church in the canons' petition for the burials of Roger and William I at Cefalù and in the privilege of Constance. As noted, the petition was unsuccessful, which is evidence of William II's lack of interest in the church. He soon turned to his own church-mausoleum project, building the new cathedral church at Monreale and seeing to the burial of his father there. Given his lack of interest in seeing Cefalù fulfill its intended function, his panel may well have been placed there as part of the canons' effort to curry favor with the king. Unable to secure the remains of Roger and William I, the canons were nevertheless successful in holding onto the two sarcophagi, at least for the time being.

The fifth panel was unique in the series and in the art of Norman Sicily:

There was depicted here the image of a woman, her face turned toward the observers. She is dressed in royal vestments and with her right hand holds the royal scepter, and with her left, a painted and written scroll. The writing on it was of this tenor: "By our innate benevolence, we, Constance, Empress of the Romans, confirm to the church of Cefalù that which our father, Roger King of Sicily, had confirmed, and in addition we donate in perpetuity to it the village of Odosuer with its men and belongings." This image was crowned and above was written, "Constance, daughter of King Roger, Queen of Sicily and Empress of the Romans."

Constance ruled Sicily with her husband from 1194 until her death in 1198, but the text may provide a means of dating the panel even more precisely. The act of donating

³¹ Valenziano and Valenziano, *Basilica*, 48–49, 54, claim that the text in the *Rollus rubeus* naming the church of St. Lucia was a scribal error. However, Rogerius was simply copying the text that he saw in the picture, so it is more likely that either the text of the painting was in error, or William did have some role in donating the church to the cathedral of Cefalù or perhaps in confirming the donation.

³²L. T. White, Jr., *Latin Monasticism in Norman Sicily* (Cambridge, Mass., 1938), 192, 202–4.

the village of Odosuer is also preserved in a document of May 1198 issued by the queen.³³ The panel may have been added to the facade during the last few months of her life, though the possibility remains that it was added posthumously, during the reign of her son.

This image is the only recorded monumental representation of the queen in Norman Italy. There are a limited number of images of Constance to provide a comparison, or better, an idea of her appearance in the mosaic. A small likeness is found on a wax seal in Palermo, thought to have come from one of the diplomas issued in her name to the Cefalù cathedral.³⁴ On the seal, she is shown seated, dressed in a richly decorated robe, and wearing a crown with pendants, while in her left hand she holds a scepter topped by a lily. Constance is depicted eleven times in the illustrations of Peter of Eboli's *Liber ad honorem Augusti*, written and decorated in 1195/6, which includes the scene of her departure from the palace at Salerno on her way to claim the throne from Tancred (Fig. 9).³⁵ Although the quality of these illustrations leaves much to be desired, they do provide at least a general sense of her appearance and apparel. Here she wears a green tunic with a red trim and a red cloak and shoes. She is crowned and holds a scepter in her right hand; in her covered left hand is a gold "half-moon," part of the imperial regalia.³⁶ One can imagine a similar, if more carefully rendered, image of the queen flanking the portal at Cefalù.

An interesting point is raised by the fact that it was Constance alone who was depicted here, rather than her husband Henry VI or the two of them together. To show the queen only was extremely unusual in either Byzantine or Western art of this period. It may be explained in light of the close connections between the church and members of her family. Her document of donation recalls her father's role as founder and builder of the church and mentions the confirmation of privileges by her brother and her nephew. It is this familial link that is stressed in the document and recorded in the decoration. It is apparent that in making the gift of Odosuer and confirming previous privileges, the queen was continuing to evidence the interest in the church expressed by her father and other family members.

The sixth and final panel is described by the notary Rogerius in this way:

Depicted is a king wearing regalia and crowned seated on a throne, holding a royal scepter in his right hand. He turns to face a bishop wearing pontifical robes and a miter, above whose head is written, "Iohannes Episcopus," and who receives a scroll from the left hand of the king, in which is written, "Go to Babylon [Cairo] and Damascus and seek

³³Palermo, Archivio di Stato, Tabulario della chiesa vescovile di Cefalù, perg. no. 34: "... casale quod dicitur Odosver cum tentimentis et pertinenciis suis libere et absque ullo servicio eidem prefate Cephaludensi ecclesie perpetuo duximus concedendum . . ."

³⁴C. Damiano Fonseca, ed., *Federico II e l'Italia: Percorsi, luoghi, segni e strumenti*, exhibition catalogue (Rome, 1995), 190, no. II.1, with color illustration.

³⁵Fol. 119r. For editions of this text, both with complete illustrations, see Pietro da Eboli, *Liber ad honorem Augusti, secondo il codice 120 della Biblioteca civica di Berna*, ed. G. B. Siragusa, FStI 39–40 (Rome, 1905–6); E. Rotà, ed., *De rebus Siculis carmen*, RIS, n.s., 31.1 (1904–10). For a new edition with German translation, commentary, and excellent color illustrations, see Petrus de Ebulo, *Liber ad honorem Augusti sive de rebus Siculis: Codex 120 II der Burgerbibliothek Bern*, ed. T. Kölzer and M. Stähli (Sigmaringen, 1994), with additional bibliography. A crude portrait on the fragment of a wooden ambo from Salerno has been identified as Constance. See S. Steinberg, "A Portrait of Constance of Sicily," *JWarb* 1 (1937–38): 249–51, pl. 31d.

³⁶Petrus de Ebulo, *Liber*, ed. Kölzer and Stähli, 129–30.

the sons of Saladin asking of them in my name if they would want to improve the condition of their lands." Above the head of the king is written, "Frederick I, Emperor."

Actually, as Holy Roman Emperor he was Frederick II, the designation we recognize, but to the local artist he was the first Frederick to have ruled in Sicily. Frederick was the king of Sicily from 1198 until his death in 1250, but the reference to the mission of Bishop Johannes de Cicala gives us a more specific time frame for the addition of this panel to the series.³⁷ The Cicala family had provided several allies and counselors to the king, and it is known that the bishop was part of a group sent by Frederick on a mission of peace to Cairo and Damascus in 1213.³⁸ The decoration must have been done between this time and the bishop's death in 1216, perhaps in 1215, when Frederick donated an estate to the cathedral in recompense for having had the sarcophagi removed to Palermo.³⁹

This panel represents the only known monumental depiction of Frederick II in Sicily, though his images in a variety of media, including sculpture, were relatively numerous in southern Italy.⁴⁰ Several images, particularly those on seals, show him seated on a throne, as he was depicted in the panel.⁴¹ The most famous portrait of an enthroned Frederick appears on the frontispiece to the text that he authored in about 1220, *De arte venandi cum avibus*, which was copied and illustrated within a few years after his death (Fig. 10).⁴² In a depiction that is probably based on his images on seals, he is seen sitting in a frontal position, holding a scepter in his right hand, in a manner similar to the picture described by Rogerius. He is shown beardless as he usually is in his portraiture. In fact, having been born in 1194, he would have still been a young man at the time of the creation of the panel at Cefalù.

The scroll is the only one in the group that does not allude to some donation or privilege, though Frederick did confirm the privileges of the cathedral in 1201.⁴³ The nature of this panel is therefore different, as it records a historical event that links the

³⁷ On Johannes de Cicala, see N. Kamp, *Kirche und Monarchie im staufischen Königreich Sizilien*, vol. 1, *Prosopographische Grundlegung: Bistümer und Bischöfe des Königsreichs, 1194–1266*, pt. 3, *Sizilien*, Münsterische Mittelalter-Schriften 10 (Munich, 1975), 1049–55.

³⁸ The date of this mission is disputed, though it could not have been as late as 1226, as argued by Demus, *Mosaics*, 10. Agnello di Ramata, "Sarcophagi," 263–65, does not believe that such a mission could have occurred before 1217, but this would have been too late for Johannes. Perhaps, the mission took place as early as 1209, when Frederick was in Cefalù. See Huillard-Bréholles, *Historia*, 1:156.

³⁹ Huillard-Bréholles, *Historia*, 1:426–27; Deér, *Tombs*, 18.

⁴⁰ See Willemsen, *Bildnisse*, 20–37; M. S. Calò Mariani and R. Cassano, eds., *Federico II, immagine e potere*, exhibition catalogue (Venice, 1995); V. Pace, "Il 'ritratto' e i 'ritratti' di Federico II," in *Federico II e l'Italia*, ed. Fonseca (as in note 34), 5–10.

⁴¹ *Die Zeit der Staufer*, exhibition catalogue (Stuttgart, 1977), 1:29–35, nos. 43–51; 3: figs. 14–20; Willemsen, *Bildnisse*, figs. 45–60.

⁴² C. A. Willemsen, ed., *De arte venandi cum avibus: Ms. Pal. Lat. 1071, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana*, vol. 1, *Kommentar*; vol. 2, *Facsimile* (Graz, 1969); *Zeit der Staufer*, 1:658–59, no. 824; F. Cardini, "Federico II e il *De arte venandi cum avibus*," in *Politica e cultura nell'Italia di Federico II*, ed. S. Gensini (Pisa, 1986), 213–32; M. A. Coppola, "Il *De arte venandi cum avibus* dell'imperatore Federico II di Svevia," *Helikon* 31–32 (1991–92 [1993]): 127–88.

⁴³ June 1201, for which see the *Rollus rubeus*, ed. Mirto, 53–55; Huillard-Bréholles, *Historia*, 1:77; C. Valenziano, *La Basilica ruggeriana di Cefalù nei documenti d'archivio e nella epigrafi*, vol. 4 of *Basilica*, ed. Aurigemma (as in note 2), 11. Frederick would have been, of course, a very young boy at this time, but the privilege was issued in his name.

ruler and the bishop, rather than repeating the usual theme of privileges found in the previous panels. Based on the inclusion of Johannes in the panel, as well as the fact that it is his mission that is commemorated, one may conclude that the bishop rather than the emperor was in all likelihood the patron of this panel. Notwithstanding the divergent nature of this scene, ultimately it fit within the overall decoration of the facade, for, once again, the underlying message was that of the links of the church to royalty.

It has been suggested that all of the decoration actually belonged to the period of Frederick. The arguments include the fact that there are no known Norman parallels of a dynastic assemblage, whereas others are found in the patronage of Frederick, and the fact that it is Constance, not Henry VI, who is depicted here in order to provide the genealogical link between Frederick and his grandfather, Roger II.⁴⁴ Although such a dating may seem attractive to some, there are valid reasons for believing otherwise. Constance was depicted rather than Henry for the simple reason that she, not her husband, issued the privilege to Cefalù. She stands in her own right as an honored donor to the church, irrespective of what her son may have later done. Given the prominence of Bishop Johannes in the last panel, it is unlikely that its patron was Frederick, and, therefore, it is unlikely that the emperor would have been patron of the other representations as well. Returning to the description given in the *Rollus rubeus*, one will recall that the panels were listed in chronological order and that the second panel, placed between the images of Roger II and his successor, William I, was not described. Dating these panels in the Frederican period would not allow for any reasonable interpretation of who would have been represented in that panel. If, however, the first and the second panels are dated to the period of Roger II, then, based on Norman parallels, the logical assumption is that the second panel also depicted Roger II, presumably in an investiture scene. The two dedicatory panels at Santa Maria dell'Ammiraglio provide the clearest idea of the imagery that would have been expected for this period.⁴⁵ Given the emphasis on donations seen in the other panels, and the fact that all other rulers were depicted just once, it is doubtful whether any image of Roger—other than that showing him as donor—would have been added more than a half century later. Furthermore, it is also possible that the images of the two Williams could have been contemporary to their actions in regard to the cathedral, or, perhaps, added in 1170 when Boso and canons of the church were stressing its ties to the ruling family and petitioning to have it fulfill its designated function as royal mausoleum. The image of Constance may have been added late in her life following her own donation to the church, though it could have also been executed as a pendant to the final panel, that of Frederick. In summary, the panels depicting Roger had likely been done during his reign, while the other four could have been added individually or as pairs—or even all at the same time under Bishop Johannes. It is impossible to ascertain the exact date of each part of the decoration.

⁴⁴Demus, *Mosaics*, 10 and 22 n. 36, suggests this as a possibility, excepting the dedicatory panel of Roger. See also H. Schaller, "Il rilievo dell'ambone della cattedrale di Bitonto," *ASIPugl* 13 (1960): 55; for German trans. see *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 45 (1963): 295–312; repr. in *Stupor Mundi: Zur Geschichte Friedrichs II. von Hohenstaufen*, ed. G. Wolf (Darmstadt, 1966), 591–616.

⁴⁵Kitzinger, *Mosaics of St. Mary's*, 197–206, for the dedicatory panel of George; 206–21, for the panels as a pair.

III. ANALYSIS

The image of Roger and Leontius at Gerace and the collection of royal and imperial portraits near the entrance of Cefalù cathedral were rich and meaningful displays for the medieval visitor to these churches. Moreover, these pictures held a unique place in the art of this period, for there was nothing exactly like these decorations—an image of the ruler and the bishop, and a series of individual royal portraits holding scrolls with texts of privileges, which was located on the west facade of a church—to be found in the other churches of Norman Sicily or, apparently, anywhere else in twelfth-century Europe. Although this decoration in its totality appears to have been unique, in its particular details precise parallels may be found. In order to gain a clearer picture of the appearance of the decorations at Gerace and Cefalù and their place in the art of the period, several aspects must be examined, such as the tradition and use of royal donor portraits; the royal family or group portrait type; the inclusion of scrolls with privileges; and the location of such decoration in the church. As is well known, the art and culture of Norman Sicily resulted from the mixture of various cultures. The same is true for the panels of Gerace and Cefalù, which included elements from both the Latin and the Byzantine traditions. Nevertheless, the combination of all these elements in a single program was unique to Cefalù.

As noted, the series at Cefalù began with the portrait(s?) of Roger, with the first one described by Rogerius as showing the king holding a church model that he presents to Christ. This type of image had already had a long tradition in art before Roger's time.⁴⁶ From at least the sixth century on, the donor holding a model of his foundation is a common theme in the church art of both the East and the West. In Norman Sicily the only extant examples of this type are found in Monreale, where there are two: the mosaic panel of William II, discussed previously, and a sculpted capital in the cloister that shows the king presenting a model to the enthroned Virgin and the child.⁴⁷

The placement of the dedicatory panels on the facade of the church at Cefalù also has Byzantine parallels from this period. The earliest dedicatory images often were to be found in the sanctuary of the church, which was a practice continued in later papal foundations in Rome.⁴⁸ In Byzantine art from the tenth century on, however, it is common to find donor portraits in the narthex in the west part of the church. The donor images in the narthex of Hagios Nikolaos tou Kasnitzi in Kastoria may be cited as examples from the twelfth century.⁴⁹ In Sicily, the dedicatory panels of Roger and George of Antioch in Santa Maria dell'Ammiraglio in Palermo, which are contemporary with the first decoration at Cefalù, were originally located in the now destroyed narthex of the church.⁵⁰

⁴⁶See E. Lipsmeyer, "The Donor and His Church Model in Medieval Art from Early Christian Times to the Late Romanesque Period" (Ph.D. diss., Rutgers University, 1981). For imperial donors in Byzantine art, see Grabar, *Empereur*, 106–11; Velmans, "Portrait," 121–23; Wessel, "Kaiserbild," 818–21.

⁴⁷R. Salvini, *The Cloister of Monreale and Romanesque Sculpture in Sicily* (Palermo, 1962), 135–39.

⁴⁸For the papal donor images, see G. B. Ladner, *Die Papstbildnisse des Altertums und des Mittelalters*, 3 vols. (Vatican City, 1941–70); H. Belting, "Papal Artistic Commissions as Definitions of the Medieval Church in Rome," in *Light on the Eternal City*, ed. H. Hager and S. Munshower (University Park, Pa., 1987), 13–30.

⁴⁹S. Pelekanidis and M. Chatzidakis, *Kastoria* (Athens, 1985), 50–65.

⁵⁰Kitzinger, *Mosaics of St. Mary's*, 189, 208–11; S. Čurčić, "The Architecture," in *ibid.*, 43.

The cathedral of Cefalù is a basilica without a narthex or an atrium, so its panels were placed on the west facade, near the entrance, as an alternative. Similar solutions were used in other Byzantine churches that had no narthex.⁵¹ A contemporary example may be seen in the small basilica church of St. George at Kurbinovo, where dedicatory imperial images were placed high on the west facade.⁵²

It is also true that royal imperial images during the twelfth century were not limited to facades and narthexes. The Gerace mosaic was in the north apse of its church, while the two royal mosaic panels at Monreale were located at the entrance to the sanctuary. Imperial portraits in Byzantine churches appear on facades and in narthexes but also elsewhere in churches. The fresco decoration of the rock-cut church known as the Great Pigeon House at Çavuşin in Cappadocia includes standing figures of the emperor Nikephoros Phokas (963–969), his wife Theophano, and other members of his family—who were not donors to this church—placed on the wall of the north apse.⁵³ The imperial images at Hagia Sophia are scattered about the galleries and in the narthex, while Justinian's image at San Vitale in Ravenna appears in the sanctuary. In short, there seems to have been no set policy regarding the placement of such images in the Byzantine world, and none in the Norman kingdom either.

The mosaic at Gerace included two figures, a ruler and a bishop, which was an uncommon combination in the Byzantine or Western traditions, though not entirely unknown. The earliest surviving example of such a work of art is the Justinian panel in the mosaic decoration of San Vitale in Ravenna, datable to the period of 540–548.⁵⁴ The emperor is shown together with a bishop (whose head was changed into the portrait of Maximianus after 546) as participants in a procession with several other men. Here, too, the messages of imperial support and authority are linked with, most likely, episcopal patronage.

In nearby Classe a similar mosaic was installed in the apse of Sant'Apollinare sometime after 666. Shown are Constantine IV Pogonatus (668–685), his brothers Heraclius and Tiberius, and his son Justinian II, together with Archbishop Maurus of Ravenna, who has a nimbus, with his successor, Reparatus, and three deacons. All stand formally as Constantine hands a closed scroll, inscribed “privilegia,” to Reparatus.⁵⁵ An example of a picture showing a ruler and an ecclesiastical leader together in Constantinople is

⁵¹See L. Hadermann-Misguich, “Une longue tradition byzantine: La décoration extérieure des églises,” *Zograf* 7 (1976): 5–10.

⁵²L. Hadermann-Misguich, *Kurbinovo: Les fresques de Saint-Georges et la peinture byzantine du XIIe siècle* (Brussels, 1975), 267–75, figs. 2, 138–41, 146; C. Grozdanov and D. Bardzieva, “Sur les portraits des personnages historiques à Kurbinovo,” *ZRVI* 33 (1994): 61–84.

⁵³L. Rodley, “The Pigeon House Church, Çavuşin,” *JÖB* 33 (1983): 301–39; C. Jolivet-Lévy, *Les églises byzantines de Cappadoce* (Paris, 1991), 20–21, pl. 23, who also notes imperial images in sanctuaries in the chapel of St. Erasmus at Ohrid and in the cathedral at Faras. I wish to thank Sarah Brooks for calling the Pigeon House church to my attention.

⁵⁴The literature on the mosaics of San Vitale is vast. An important recent contribution is made by I. Andreescu-Treadgold and W. Treadgold, “Procopius and the Imperial Panels of San Vitale,” *ArtB* 79 (1997): 708–23.

⁵⁵O. von Simson, *Sacred Fortress: Byzantine Art and Statecraft in Ravenna* (Chicago, 1948; repr. Princeton, N.J., 1987), 59–60; M. C. Pelà, *La decorazione musiva di S. Apollinare in Classe* (Bologna, 1970), 160–68; F. Deichmann, *Ravenna: Hauptstadt des spätantiken Abendlandes. Kommentar* (Wiesbaden, 1976), 2:273–79; J. Beckwith, *Byzantine Art*, 2d ed. (Harmondsworth, 1979), 119–20.

provided by a description of the decoration of the destroyed Chrysotriklinos in the Great Palace. Near its door was an image of the emperor Michael III (842–867) and Patriarch Photios.⁵⁶

Two examples that are closer in date to the mosaic at Gerace may be cited. Isaac II Angelos (1185–95) is the emperor depicted in both. The first is a contemporary epigram of Theodore Balsamon that describes an icon in possession of the bishop of Sidon having portraits of the emperor, the patriarch (probably Dositheos), and the bishop himself.⁵⁷ The second example is found on the west facade of the church of St. George in Kurbinovo. The upper part of the facade is decorated with damaged frescoes of four figures (Fig. 11). The two on the left are probably Isaac II Angelos and his wife, Empress Margherita, while those on the right are a cleric, most likely the archbishop of Ohrid in whose jurisdiction Kurbinovo was, and a nobleman, presumably the donor.⁵⁸

Although secular and ecclesiastical leaders appearing together in Western art can be seen in such early medieval examples as the Vivian Bible of Charles the Bald and the Gospel Book of Otto III, in neither case can it be said that the ruler and the ecclesiastic are equals.⁵⁹ In both, the ruler is depicted on a much larger scale, with the bishop shown smaller and off to one side. The Byzantine examples, on the other hand, stress the unity of church and state, as manifested in the persons of the emperor and the bishop depicted on the same scale. Clearly, the mosaic at Gerace is to be seen as part of the Byzantine tradition—limited as this tradition may have been—in which the secular and the religious powers are linked in an image of united authority and shared prestige.

Although the earliest decoration of the facade of the Cefalù cathedral consisted of the image(s) of the founder, the subsequent addition of the other images, whether by 1170 or 1215, resulted in a group of individual figures that collectively formed a dynastic group portrait. For this aspect of the decoration, too, parallels may be found in the Byzantine and the Western artistic traditions.⁶⁰

Imperial Byzantine group portraiture can be divided into two types: images of individual rulers linked by proximity, as at Cefalù, and images of couples or families, sometimes in the presence of Christ, Mary, or some other saint. Two examples of the first type may be noted in Constantinople. Anthony of Novgorod visited the capital in 1200 and stated that in the gallery at Hagia Sophia “are painted all the patriarchs and emperors, as many of them as there have been at Constantinople. . . .”⁶¹ It is not clear, however, if he had truly seen portraits of “all” the emperors, which is a series now lost, or if he was simply referring to the series of mosaic panels that decorated the gallery and were exe-

⁵⁶*Anthologia graeca* 1.106, trans. C. Mango, *The Art of the Byzantine Empire, 312–1453* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1972), 184.

⁵⁷Epigram 17, in K. Horna, ed., “Die Epigramme des Theodoros Balsamon,” *WSt* 25 (1903): 184–85; trans. Magdalino and Nelson, “Emperor,” 152–53.

⁵⁸See note 52.

⁵⁹See Diebold, “Ruler Portrait”; Schramm and Mütterich, *Kaiser*. None of the known ruler images in the West is monumental; instead, most are found in manuscripts.

⁶⁰Grabar, *Empereur*, 26–30; idem, “Une pyxide en ivoire à Dumbarton Oaks: Quelques notes sur l’art profane pendant les derniers siècles de l’Empire byzantin,” *DOP* 14 (1960): 121–46, esp. 127–34, repr. in idem, *Art de la fin de l’antiquité et du Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1968), 229–49; I. Spatharakis, *The Portrait in Byzantine Illuminated Manuscripts* (Leiden, 1976), 251–53.

⁶¹Trans. Mango, *Art of the Byzantine Empire*, 237.

cuted in different periods, of which a few remain extant. These include the portrait of a standing, frontal emperor Alexander in the north gallery, done in 912–913; the panel of Constantine IX Monomachos (1042–55) and Zoe flanking an enthroned Christ (Fig. 12); and a panel depicting the Virgin and the child flanked by John II Komnenos (1118–43) and Irene, with their son Alexios, named co-emperor in 1122, shown on the return of a buttress at a right angle to the rest of the panel (Fig. 13).⁶² The other series was found in the church of St. George Mangana founded by Constantine IX Monomachos. According to the Russian Anonymous, who visited the church in about 1390, its decoration included an icon painted with portraits of eighty emperors and placed in the northern part of the narthex.⁶³

There were few imperial group portraits in churches during the early centuries of Christianity, but during the eleventh and twelfth centuries imperial family portraits became an important part of church decoration in the Byzantine world. The emperors and members of their families are normally shown in the role of donors, either as founders or to commemorate gifts that they made to churches. This is the function of the family panels in Hagia Sophia, in which the emperors hold bags containing gifts of gold, while the empresses hold closed scrolls of donation.

The emperor Manuel I Komnenos (1143–80), King Roger's contemporary and rival, seems to have especially favored the practice of having himself depicted in his foundations, and embellished the idea by adding portraits of his ancestors. Such was the case in the monastery of St. Mokios in Constantinople, to which he added a hall to serve as a refectory. In it were representations of himself, his grandfather Alexios I, his father John II, and Basil II (976–1025), all of whom had been patrons of the monastery. The decoration no longer survives but is described in a thirteenth-century text.⁶⁴ The same text contains a description of a similar series of imperial representations that were once found in the monastery church of the Virgin Hodegetria built by Manuel in the capital. In the narthex were depicted Manuel's deeds and a group of seven emperors and ancestors: Manuel, Constantine X Doukas (1059–67), Romanos IV Diogenes (1068–71), Michael

⁶²C. Mango, *Materials for the Study of the Mosaics of St. Sophia at Istanbul*, DOS 8 (Washington, D.C., 1962), 27–29, 46–47; idem, "The Mosaics of Hagia Sophia," in H. Kähler, *Hagia Sophia*, trans. E. Childs (New York, 1967), 55–58; P. A. Underwood and E. Hawkins, "The Mosaics of Hagia Sophia at Istanbul, 1959–60: The Portrait of the Emperor Alexander," *DOP* 15 (1961): 187–217; T. Whittemore, *The Mosaics of Hagia Sophia at Istanbul: Third Preliminary Report. Work Done in 1935–1938: The Imperial Portraits of the South Gallery* (Oxford, 1942); R. Cormack, "Interpreting the Mosaics of S. Sophia at Istanbul," *Art History* 4 (1981): 131–49, repr. in idem, *The Byzantine Eye: Studies in Art and Patronage* (London, 1989), pt. 8, "Additional Notes and Comments," 13–14; idem, "The Emperor at St. Sophia: Viewer and Viewed," in *Byzance et les images*, ed. A. Guillou and J. Durand (Paris, 1994), 223–53. The panel of Constantine and Zoe has elicited the most scholarly interest; see, most recently, I. Kalavrezou, "Irregular Marriages in the Eleventh Century and the Zoe and Constantine Mosaic in Hagia Sophia," in *Law and Society in Byzantium, Ninth–Twelfth Centuries*, ed. A. Laiou and D. Simon (Washington, D.C., 1994), 241–57.

⁶³"The 'Anonymous Description of Constantinople,'" ed. and trans. G. Majeska, *Russian Travelers to Constantinople in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*, DOS 19 (Washington, D.C., 1984), 140–41, 366–71 (commentary). See also C. Mango, "The Legend of Leo the Wise," *ZRVI* 6 (1960): 59–93, esp. 76–78, repr. in idem, *Byzantium and Its Image: History and Culture of the Byzantine Empire and Its Heritage* (London, 1984), pt. 16, with addendum, 3–4, who suggests that the icon should be dated "by the middle of the twelfth century" (p. 76).

⁶⁴S. Lampros, ed., "Ο Μαρκετιανὸς Κώδιξ 524," *Νέος Ἑλλ.* 8 (1911): 127–28; trans. Mango, *Art of the Byzantine Empire*, 226–27. Additional examples are cited in Magdalino and Nelson, "Emperor," 135–47.

VII Doukas (1071–78), Nikephoros III Botaneiates (1078–81), Alexios I Komnenos (1081–1118), and John II.⁶⁵

This type of decoration was also found outside of the capital and became increasingly common in later centuries. The cathedral of St. Sophia in Kiev, which is so dependent upon Byzantine models for its design, construction, and decoration, has as part of its original program of ca. 1043 a series of fresco portraits of Prince Jaroslav the Wise and his family.⁶⁶ The south facade of the Panagia Mavriotissa in Kastoria is covered with frescoes in which the contemporary portrait of Michael VIII Palaiologos (1259–82) is combined with a posthumous image of Alexios I Komnenos, the original founder of the church.⁶⁷ The richest iconographic usage of this tradition is found in the painted decoration, beginning in the thirteenth century, of royal Serbian foundations where donor images are combined with displays of dynastic lineages.⁶⁸ The monastery at Studenica has several such images. Remains of a royal family portrait were recently found in the passageway of the gate tower and dated to 1208–9. In the main church of the Virgin there is a dedicatory fresco of about 1235 that shows King Radoslav holding a model, with two of his predecessors. The small church of SS. Joachim and Anna, also known as the King's Church, was added to the monastery by King Milutin and decorated in 1313/4. On the south wall the king and his wife, Simonis, are led to Christ by the saints; on the opposite wall are two Serbian royal saints, Sava and Simeon, the king's ancestors.⁶⁹ Such pictorial displays were especially favored by King Milutin as part of a conscious attempt to legitimize his rule. Among his other works one may cite the cathedral church of the Virgin Ljeviška at Prizren, which was rebuilt and redecorated between 1307 and 1313. Its narthex contains a collection of images of the king and his royal ancestors.⁷⁰

In Italy, such family images were also found during the thirteenth century in the patronage of Frederick II. A group of figures painted in fresco in the grotto church of Santa Margherita outside of Melfi have recently been dated to about 1237 and identified as portraits of Frederick II; his wife, Isabella of England; and Conrad, the son of his

⁶⁵Cod. Marcianus gr. 524, fol. 108r; ed. Lampros, "Markianos," 148 ff; trans. Mango, *Art of the Byzantine Empire*, 227–28. See also R. Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire byzantin*, vol. 1, *Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat œcuménique*, pt. 3, *Les églises et les monastères*, 2d ed. (Paris, 1969), 199–207, esp. 200.

⁶⁶V. Lazarev, *Old Russian Murals and Mosaics from the XI to the XVI Century* (London, 1966), 47–48, 272; idem, *La pittura bizantina* (Turin, 1967), 154–55.

⁶⁷Pelekanidis and Chatzidakis, *Kastoria*, 50–65. For the identification of the emperors, see S. Kalopissi-Verti, *Dedicatory Inscriptions and Donor Portraits in Thirteenth-Century Churches of Greece*, *Denk Wien* 226 (Vienna, 1992), 28–29, 96–97; T. Papamastorakis, "Ένα εικαστικό Έγκώμιο του Μιχαήλ Η' Παλαιολόγου," *Δελτ.-Χριστ. Αρχ. Έτ.*, ser. 4, 15 (1989–90 [1991]): 221–40.

⁶⁸Wessel, "Kaiserbild," 844–48; Velmans, "Portrait," 106–14; S. Radojčić, *Portreti srpskih vladara u srednjem veku* (Skoplje, 1934). These paintings are also discussed and illustrated in Velmans, *Peinture*; V. Djurić, *Byzantinischen Fresken in Jugoslawien* (Munich, 1976); R. Hamann-MacLean and H. Hallensleben, *Die Monumentalmalerei in Serbien und Makedonien vom 11. bis zum frühen 14. Jahrhundert* (Giessen, 1963).

⁶⁹S. Cirković et al., *Studenica Monastery* (Belgrade, 1986), 82–85, 113. Also S. Ćurčić, "The Nemanjić Family Tree in the Light of the Ancestral Cult in the Church of Joachim and Anna at Studenica," *ZRVI* 14–15 (1973): 191–95.

⁷⁰D. Panić and G. Babić, *Bogorodica Ljeviška*, 2d ed. (Belgrade, 1988), 108–9, 128; B. Živković, *Bogorodica Ljeviška: Crteži freska* (Belgrade, 1991), pls. 51, 53. Another significant example of a royal "portrait gallery" is found in the inner narthex of the *katholikon* of Hilandar monastery on Mt. Athos where figures of Serbian rulers are juxtaposed with Byzantine emperors. See V. Djurić, "Les portraits de souverains dans le narthex de Chilandar: L'histoire et la signification," *Hilandarski zbornik* 7 (1989): 105–32.

second wife, Yolanda of Brienne (d. 1228).⁷¹ Another dynastic Hohenstaufen portrait is found on a side panel of the ambo of Bitonto cathedral, which is dated to 1229. Four figures in imperial regalia are shown there, but the quality of the representation is so crude that the figures' identification is both difficult and disputed, though most interpretations are that Frederick II is depicted here, with at least one ancestor.⁷² This interest in family group portraiture that was exhibited during the reign of Frederick may be evidence that the panels at Cefalù were done during his reign. Conversely, it could be argued that the presence of such portraits there may have influenced these later works of art.

The final aspect of the decoration at Cefalù that merits consideration is the fact that the royal figures all hold scrolls with various privileges and gifts recorded on them. Figures with scrolls are not uncommon in Byzantine and Norman art, with the founder's panel of George the Admiral and Mary at Santa Maria dell'Ammiraglio providing a notable example. There is, however, a major distinction to be made here. The text on the scroll that is held by the Virgin is a prayer of intercession on George's behalf, while all other examples of figures with scrolls in the art of Norman Sicily are saints or prophets who bear scriptural texts. As discussed, the figures at Cefalù, with the exception of Frederick, hold scrolls that are charters of donations or privileges, thus taking on the character of "pictorial legal documents," which is a distinction shared by none of the other royal images of Norman Sicily.

While not completely unknown, the image of a royal or imperial donor holding a scroll was not frequent in Byzantine and Western medieval art, though it became more common in the twelfth century.⁷³ Perhaps the most significant example was found in the papal audience hall that was built and decorated by Calixtus II (1119–24) as part of the Lateran palace complex. In a display of secular powers unequaled in papal art, the hall was decorated with a series of frescoes that showed the deeds of Calixtus. Among these was a painting, known from a sixteenth-century drawing executed for the antiquarian Onofrio Panvinio, that depicted an enthroned Calixtus resting his feet on the back of one of his enemies, Burdinus, and flanked by several clerics who held raised crosses and staffs like so many ancient Roman soldiers with standards. The pope reached his left hand out to receive an open scroll from the standing emperor Henry V (Fig. 14). The text of the scroll bore the opening words of the Concordat of Worms, which had been

⁷¹A. Ciarallo and L. Capaldo, *Federico II a Melfi: Ritrovato il vero volto dell'Imperatore* (Naples, 1994).

⁷²Schaller, "Rilievo," identifies the figures as Frederick I, Henry VI, Frederick II, and Conrad IV. H. Thelen, "Ancora una volta per il rilievo del pulpito di Bitonto," in *Federico II e l'arte del Duecento italiano*, ed. A. M. Romanini, Atti della III settimana di studi di storia dell'arte medievale dell'Università di Roma (Galatina, 1980), 217–25, argues that the first, seated, figure is female and may be a personification of the city of Bitonto. See also E. Paratore, "Lambone di Bitonto e la predica dell'Abate Nicola di Bari," in *ibid.*, 227–35; Belli D'Elia, *Puglia*, 260–63; P. C. Claussen, "Bitonto und Capua: Unterschiedliche Paradigmen in der Darstellung Friedrichs II," in *Staufisches Apulien*, Schriften zur staufischen Geschichte und Kunst 13 (Göppingen, 1993), 77–124.

⁷³In general, see V. Djurić, "Portraits of Byzantine and Serbian Rulers Granting Charters," in *Esfigmenska povelija despota Djurdja: The Esphigmenou Charter of Despot Djurdj* (Belgrade, 1989), 80–105, which is a revision of his earlier study, "Portreti na poveljama vizantijskih i srpskih vladara," *ZbFilozFak* 7.1 (1963): 251–72, with French summary.

the product of a compromise between the pope and the emperor but was depicted here as a triumph for Calixtus.⁷⁴

This fresco may have influenced other art in the twelfth century, particularly in the realm of manuscript illumination, such as in the *Chronicon Vulturense*, which was decorated in 1124–30 and produced in a monastery that was then in Norman territory in southern Italy. It contains more than twenty donation images, which typically show the grantor of a privilege offering an open scroll to either the abbot or St. Vincent, the patron saint of the monastery (Fig. 15).⁷⁵

Other contemporary Western examples of the same period may be cited. The *Codex Traditionis* of the monastery at Formbach has two illustrations of donors and privileges. In one a seated emperor, Lothar III (1133–37), is shown handing a scroll of privileges to a monk, while on the next page Pope Innocent II is depicted with the scroll.⁷⁶ A Norman example is found in the *Chartulary of Mont-Saint-Michel* of 1154–58, in which the donation of Duke Richard II of Normandy is depicted in an image with the seated ruler, an open scroll held by a scribe seated to his left, and, below, a group of monks who receive the gift. In the same book is a similar representation of Duchess Gonnor, the second wife of Richard I, who hands her open scroll of donation to an abbot. Both are posthumous portraits, depicting donations made in the 1020s.⁷⁷

Perhaps the most striking surviving example of a pictorial legal document is to be found in the fresco decoration of the lower church of the Sacro Spello monastery at Subiaco. In 1202 Pope Innocent III spent August and September at the monastery and reformed it. It was perhaps due to his stay that later, on 24 February 1203, he issued a bulla to the monastery, granting it additional income.⁷⁸ To commemorate this honor, an

⁷⁴Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Barb. lat. 2738, fol. 104r. See O. Panvinio, *De praecipuis urbis Romae sancti-oribusque basilicas quas septem ecclesias vulgo vocant* (Rome, 1570), 175–76; G. B. Ladner, “I mosaici e affreschi ecclesiastico-politico nell’antico palazzo lateranense,” *RACr* 12 (1935): 265–92, repr. in idem, *Images and Ideas in the Middle Ages: Selected Studies in History and Art*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1983), 1:347–66, 2:1026–27 (addendum); idem, *Papstbildnisse*, 1:195–201; C. Walter, “Papal Political Imagery in the Medieval Lateran Palace,” *CahArch* 20 (1970): 155–76, esp. 163–65; *ibid.*, 21 (1971), 109–36, esp. 119–23; idem, “Political Imagery: Osmosis between East and West,” *BSI* 54 (1993): 211–17, where Ladner reiterates his earlier study and suggests a Byzantine origin for the iconography of this scene; I. Herklotz, “Die Beratungsräume Calixtus’ II. im Lateranpalast und ihre Fresken: Kunst und Propaganda am Ende des Investiturstreits,” *ZKunstg* 52.2 (1989): 145–214; M. Stroll, *Symbols as Power: The Papacy Following the Investiture Contest* (Leiden, 1991), 16–35.

⁷⁵Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Barb. lat. 2724; *Chronicon Vulturense*, ed. V. Federici, FStI 58–60 (1925–40). For its illuminations, see A. Muñoz, “Le miniature del ‘Chronicon Vulturense’ (Cod. Barb. lat. 2724),” *Bullettino dell’Istituto storico italiano* 30 (1909): 75–90; M. Avery, *The Exultet Rolls of South Italy* (Princeton, N.J., 1936), 2:41–43, pl. CC; Ladner, *Papstbildnisse*, 1:232–40, pl. 23; F. Riccioni, “Un codice da rivalutare: Il *Chronicon Vulturense*,” *Miniatura: Arte dell’illustrazione e decorazione del libro* 3–4 (1990–91): 33–50.

⁷⁶Munich, Bayerisches Hauptsarchiv, Abt. I, Formbach KL 1, 4–5. See Schramm and Mütterich, *Kaiser*, 257–58; C. Sauer, *Fundatio und Memoria: Stifter und Klostergründer im Bild 1100 bis 1350*, Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte 109 (Göttingen, 1993), 66–88.

⁷⁷Avranches, Bibliothèque Municipale, Ms. 210, fols. 19 and 23, respectively. See A. Boinet, “L’illustration du Cartulaire du Mont-Saint-Michel,” *BEC* 70 (1909): 335–43; M. Dosdat, *Lenluminure romane au Mont Saint-Michel, Xe–XIIe siècles* (Rennes, 1991), 71–75, figs. 3–4.

⁷⁸For the pope’s stay at the monastery, see *Chronicon Sublacense (A.A. 593–1369)*, ed. R. Morghen, RIS, n.s., 24.6 (1927): 34. For the text of the privilege, see C. Margarini, *Bullarium Casinense seu constitutiones summorum Pontificum, imperatorum, regum, principum . . .* (Venice, 1650–70), 2:232–33; also V. Federici, “La biblioteca e l’archivio,” in *I monasteri di Subiaco* (Rome, 1904), 2:51, no. CCLII.

artist was commissioned to paint the text of the privilege on an open scroll. Holding the scroll are Innocent to the right and Romanos, the then abbot (1192–1216), to the left, next to a seated St. Benedict who helps to hold the scroll (Fig. 16). For some unknown reason, a bust painting of the pope was added above the scroll during the third quarter of the century.⁷⁹ This later figure also appears to be holding the scroll, and is so large that it dominates the painting.

In Byzantine art, several examples of combining portraits of donors with documents may be cited, including two of the imperial panels of Hagia Sophia. The panel of Constantine IX Monomachos and Zoe is offertory in nature, with the emperor holding a moneybag, and Zoe a scroll that seems to be a charter of donation, but is unopened.⁸⁰ The inscription simply identifies the emperor but has the function of giving authority to the charter. In the panel of John II Komnenos and Irene, it is again the empress who holds a closed scroll of donation.

Very similar to the decoration at Cefalù is a fresco found in the exonarthex of the monastery church of the Virgin in Apollonia, Albania, which contains a family portrait of Michael VIII Palaiologos with his wife, Theodora, their son, Andronikos II (1282–1328), and his son, Michael IX (1294/5–1320) (Fig. 17).⁸¹ The emperor hands a model of the church to the seated Virgin and the child; above and to the sides of the figures is the text of the donation chrysobull, though it is not contained within a scroll. The date of the exonarthex is disputed, leaving the possibility that the dedicatory fresco was originally on the west facade of the church. The parallels with Cefalù are notable: in both cases one finds a dedicatory panel with several family members, the founder who presents a church model, and the pictorial legal document, all depicted near the entrance on the west wall of the church.

A Serbian image, though later in date, also provides a close parallel to the facade decoration of Cefalù. This is a fresco panel of the despot Stefan Lazarević in his foundation, the church of the Holy Trinity at Manasija (Resava) in Serbia, which was consecrated in 1418. The dedicatory picture combines several of the features found in the two panels of Roger at Cefalù, which date two and a half centuries earlier. It shows the despot standing in a frontal position, being crowned by Christ, as angels hand him royal regalia in an investiture scene. In his left hand he holds both a model of the church, which is being presented to the Holy Trinity (depicted as seated angels), and an open scroll of donation with text written on it (Fig. 18).⁸² Although there are no additional panels that show

⁷⁹Ladner, *Papstbildnisse*, 2:68–72; G. Matthiae, *Pittura romana del Medioevo*, 2 vols. (1966; repr. Rome, 1988), 2:112–13, 284; M. T. Cristiani Testi, “Gli affreschi del Sacro Speco,” in *I monasteri benedettini di Subiaco*, ed. C. Giumelli (Milan, 1982), 95 ff, esp. 106, figs. 94–95; pp. 110–11, 130, 237 n. 71; idem, “Consolo: Il maestro del busto di Innocenzo III e i collaboratori negli affreschi del S. Speco di Subiaco,” in *Roma anno 1300: Atti della IV settimana di studi di storia dell’arte medievale dell’Università di Roma “La Sapienza” (19–24 maggio 1980)*, ed. A. M. Romanini (Rome, 1983), 403–7.

⁸⁰Mango, “Mosaics,” in Kähler, *Hagia Sophia*, 56; N. Oikonomides, “The Mosaic Panel of Constantine IX and Zoe in Saint Sophia,” *REB* 36 (1978): 219–32, repr. in idem, *Byzantium from the Ninth Century to the Fourteenth Century* (Brookfield, 1992), art. 15, 224.

⁸¹For Apollonia, see H. and H. Buschhausen, *Die Marienkirche von Apollonia in Albanien: Byzantiner, Normanen und Serben im Kampf um die Via Egnatia*, *ByzVindo* 8 (Vienna, 1976), 143–82.

⁸²V. Lazarev, *Storia della pittura bizantina* (Turin, 1981), 392; Velmans, *Peinture*, 72–73, fig. 33; Djurić, *Fresken*, 150–52; S. Tomić and R. Nikolić, eds., *Manasija: Istorija—živopis*, *Saopštenja* 6 (Belgrade, 1964), 55–56. For additional Serbian examples of rulers with charters, see Djurić, “Portraits of Rulers.”

descendants holding scrolls as well, the similarities between the images of Stefan and Roger are striking and point to the common ultimate origins of all such scenes.

In discussing the similarity between the panel of Roger at Santa Maria dell'Ammiraglio and an ivory relief of a Byzantine emperor, probably Constantine VII, receiving his crown from Christ, Ernst Kitzinger noted that the close resemblance between the two would be inexplicable unless it were assumed that a Byzantine design served as model.⁸³ The same argument may be made here. The panels that once decorated the facade of Cefalù cathedral, the imperial painting in Apollonia, and the royal images of Serbia all had a common ancestor. In all probability, this ancestor was in Constantinople, though no comparable image in the capital now survives. There was, however, a church that possessed a decoration as close to the one at Cefalù as any example. This was the destroyed church of St. Mary Peribleptos, previously mentioned for its exterior decoration.⁸⁴ The church was founded by Romanos III Argyros (1028–34), who was buried there. Nikephoros Botaneiates restored the building, and his tomb was also found in the church. A final restoration was undertaken by Michael VIII Palaiologos.

Two descriptions of imperial images in the church exist, though differences in these accounts have caused some confusion regarding the identity of their figures. On his visit to the church in 1403, Clavijo saw and described in detail an imperial panel:

As one enters the body of the church, on the left-hand side are represented many images, among them one of St. Mary, and next to it, on one side, is an image of an emperor, and on the other side, the image of an empress, and at the feet of the image of St. Mary are represented thirty castles and towns, the name of each one being written in Greek. And they said that these towns and castles belonged to the domain of this church and had been granted to it by an emperor called Romanus. . . . Here are placed certain privileges on leather [parchment?], sealed with wax and lead seals, which are said to be the privileges received by this church over the aforesaid towns and castles.⁸⁵

In the sixteenth century, Johannes Leunclavius wrote that toward the western part of the church was a “picture with Michael Palaiologos, Theodora, and their son, Constantine, placed between them,” with an inscription identifying the members of the family.⁸⁶ There is some confusion as to which imperial couple is represented, with some scholars conflating the two descriptions and suggesting that it was Michael and Theodora who were depicted here.⁸⁷ However, it is clear that the descriptions refer to two different pictures. Leunclavius omits any mention of Mary, the castles and towns, and the privileges, whereas Clavijo says nothing about the son. In fact, the son and Mary impossibly occupy the same position in the two pictures. Therefore, the panel described by Clavijo was

⁸³ Kitzinger, *Mosaics of St. Mary's*, 191.

⁸⁴ On the church, see Majeska, *Russian Travelers*, 276–83; Janin, *Églises*, 218–22; S. Cirac Estopañan, “Tres monasterios de Constantinopla visitados por Españoles en el año 1403,” *REB* 19 (1961): 358–81, esp. 374–77.

⁸⁵ “. . . Estaban figurados treinta castillos e ciudades . . . ; e que estaban colgados unos privilegios de cuero sellados con sellos de cera e de plomo . . .” See Cirac Estopañan, “Monasterios,” 374–75; R. Gonzalez de Clavijo, *Embassy to Tamerlane*, as translated in Mango, *Art of the Byzantine Empire* (as in note 56), 217.

⁸⁶ J. Leunclavius, *Pandectes historiae Turcicae*, chap. 51, PG 159:773 = idem, *Annales sultanorum Othmanidarum*, 2d ed. (Frankfurt, 1596), 137.

⁸⁷ Janin, *Églises*, 218. Mango, *Art of the Byzantine Empire*, 217 n. 164, says that “they may have been” Michael and Theodora. Cirac Estopañan, “Monasterios,” 374, says that Romanos and Zoe were represented.

different, and, since it was a foundation panel, it seems more likely that Romanos and Zoe were depicted there, together with the evidence of their donations. It may be remembered that the panel of Zoe and Constantine IX in Hagia Sophia has been altered, and it is possible that it originally depicted Zoe with Romanos, thus making it a striking pendant to the panel at the Peribleptos monastery.

This panel would then have preceded the images at Cefalù, providing an interesting and important antecedent. It contained a dedicatory image of Mary and the founder, who was accompanied by his wife in a family portrait. The representations of the castles and towns may be likened to the models held by many donors, though here there were too many to be held by one person. The fact that the panel contained a record of the donation of the castles and towns to the church is related to the presence of information about the donation of a town in the inscription in the panel of Constance. The inclusion of the actual documents of donations in the picture at the Peribleptos church is apparently unique, but it helps to explain why some later donor panels would include painted versions of such documents. The original documents could be better preserved and protected elsewhere, but the link between the donor and the privilege remained strong and tangible. The image of the donor in this context was certainly meant to stress the authenticity and authority of the privilege given in the written document. For this same reason, in the fourteenth century the practice evolved of including images of the emperor, sometimes with his family, in chrysobulls.⁸⁸

It is not possible to state, and probably unreasonable to maintain, that the decoration of the Peribleptos church was the only source for the similar scenes at Apollonia, Manasija, and Cefalù. It is important, however, to recognize that this type of decoration did exist in Constantinople in at least one church, and may well have once existed in other imperial foundations in the capital. It is this tradition that was ultimately followed in other Byzantine churches outside the capital, as well as in areas such as Serbia and Sicily where rulers modeled themselves and their concepts of royalty and its expression in art on Byzantine prototypes.

An important distinction must be drawn with regard to the images in the Norman kingdom. While many of the ruler images discussed here were the result of direct imperial patronage, such involvement was not necessarily the case for the mosaic at Gerace or for the facade decoration at Cefalù. Given the importance accorded to Leontius in the mosaic, it was probably the product of episcopal patronage. While it is likely that the image(s?) of Roger at Cefalù was (were) probably part of the original decoration that resulted from patronage of that king, there is no proof that any of the later rulers were involved in the creation of their own images. Rather, it is possible that patrons of the last four images were the bishops of the cathedral. The images of the two Williams might be attributable to Bishop Boso and done at a time when the bishop and his canons were fighting to maintain the ties between the kings and their church and to fulfill the church's function of royal mausoleum. The representation of Frederick and possibly that of Constance could be attributed to Bishop Johannes, being executed at a moment when, although it had become clear that no ruler was going to be buried at Cefalù, the bishop

⁸⁸For these images, see Velmans, "Portrait," 104–6; Spatharakis, *Portrait*, 184–89; Djurić, "Portraits," passim.

and his clergy were still proud of the church's royal foundation and ties and may have been attempting to exploit them. The emphasis given to the texts of donations in the panels is, most likely, evidence of their episcopal rather than royal patronage. Nevertheless, even if the bishops were indeed the patrons of the last four panels, the models for these images were royal. Though certain individual aspects of the program at Cefalù do share similarities with Western, and especially papal, examples, the closest parallels have been seen to be with the Byzantine world.

The recognition and examination of the lost decoration at Gerace and Cefalù broaden our understanding both of Norman art in Sicily and of Byzantine art. While previous discussions about royal images in Norman art have focused exclusively on the three surviving mosaics and one carved capital, it is now clear that there were three, possibly four, monumental images of Roger II in his kingdom, as well as a total of ten monumental images of Norman and Hohenstaufen rulers of southern Italy. The lost panels demonstrate once again the importance that the royal image had in Sicily, and the dependence of such images upon Byzantine models as well as their unique combination of individual elements from that tradition. In this type of decoration, the series of royal images bore witness to the importance of the links between the cathedrals of Gerace and Cefalù and the ruling family, and to the significance attributed to those links by the royal donors and by the bishops and canons of these cities. It was for this reason that the decoration was created, and it was for the same reason that Bishop Thomas commissioned Rogerius to produce the description of the Cefalù panels and the transcription of their pictorial legal documents, thus preserving them in a fashion to the present day.

Brigham Young University

Appendix

Excerpts from the *Rollus rubeus* (ed. Mirto, 26–32)

Cuius picture tenor per me, qui supra, notarium puplicum adnotatus per omnia talis est:

In nomine Domini, amen. Anno dominice incarnationis millesimo tricentesimo vicesimo nono, mensis septembris vicesimo sexto eiusdem tertiedecime indictionis. Nos Primus de Primo iudex civitatis Ceph(alud)i et Rogerius notarii Gulielmi de Mistretta puplicus eiusdem civitatis notarius in presentia infrascriptorum testium ad hoc vocatorum et rogatorum notum facimus et testamur quod rev(er)endus in Christo pater et dominus, dominus Thomas, Dei gratia cephaludensis episcopus electus et confirmatus, fecit nos ad sui presentiam evocari asserans quod timens ne scriptura infrascripta modo aliquo deleatur [aqua vel] antiquitate et memoria regalium donationum factarum [sancte] / cephaludenssi ecclesie depicto albo pariete valeat deperire, ad perpetuam rei memoriam reservanda nobis obnixè requisivit nostrum officium implorando ut talis scriptura in pariete porte regum in ipsius ecclesie campanario picta in publicam deberemus redigere notionem. Nos autem, attendentes iustam esse requisitionem ipsius dicti d(omi)ni episcopi, adimplere curavimus quod quesivit. Et quia ipsam scripturam vidimus et legimus non deletam nec etiam vitiatam, nichil adendo vel minuendo nec etiam inmutando, [set in forma propria seu figura existendo, transcripsimus et in forma publica redegimus].

Cuius figura talis est: Salvator noster in sua maiestate sedens cum sinistra manu recepit ecclesiam pictam et cum alia destra signat cruce, quam ecclesiam rex Rogerius conditor ipsius ecclesie offert cum manu destra eandem ecclesiam, indutus regalibus vestimentis et coronatus. Et super capud dicti regis scriptum est: Rogerius rex. Et cum sinistra cartam tenet in manibus scriptam. Cuius scripture tenor per omnia talis est: Suscipe, Salvator, ecclesiam et civitatem Cephaludi cum omni iure et libertate sua. Nichil in civitate preter felloniam, prodicionem, homicidium nobis et nostris successoribus reservamus.

Unde ad certitudinem presentium et futurorum memoriam presens scriptum testium amminiculo roboramus.

+ Ego Primus de Primo, qui supra, iudex, predictam scripturam in pariete porte regum in ipsius ecclesie campanario depictam seu scriptam vidi, legi, interfui et testor.

+ Ego Nicolaus de iudice Iacobo predictam scripturam in pariete porte regum in ipsius ecclesie campanario depictam seu scriptam vidi, legi, interfui et testor.

+ Ego Franciscus de Bonaquisto predictam scripturam in pariete porte regum depictam vidi, legi, interfui et testor.

+ Ego frater Andreas de Sancto Mauro canonicus cephaludensis ecclesie vidi, legi et testor.

+ Ego Rogerius notarii Gullielmi de Mistretta puplicus civitatis Cephaludi notarius predictam picturam parietis porte regum vidi et legi et in formam puplicam redegì et meo signo signavi.

In nomine Domini, amen. Anno dominice incarnationis millesimo tricentesimo vicesimo nono, mensis septembris vicesimo eiusdem tertiedecime inditionis. Nos Primus de Primo iudex civitatis Cephaludi et Rogerius notarii Gullielmi de Mistretta puplicus eiusdem civitatis notarius in presentia infrascriptorum testium ad hoc vocatorum et rogatorum notum facimus et testamur quod reverendus in Christo pater et dominus, dominus Thomas Dei gratia cephaludensis episcopus electus et confirmatus fecit nos ad sui presentiam evocari asserens quod timens ne scriptura infrascripta modo aliquo deleatur aqua vel antiquitate et memoria regalium donationum factarum sancte cephaludensi ecclesie de picto albo pariete valeat deperire, ad perpetuam rei memoriam reservanda nobis obnixè requisivit nostrum officium inplorando ut talem scripturam in pariete porte regum in ipsius ecclesie campanario pictam in puplicam deberemus redigere notionem. Nos autem, attendentes iustam esse requisitionem ipsius dicti domini episcopi, adimplere curavimus quod quesivit et quia ipsam scripturam vidimus et legimus non delatam nec etiam vitiatum, nichil adendo vel minuendo nec etiam inmutando, set in forma propria seu figura existendo, transcripsimus et in forma puplica redigimus.

Cuius tertie figure imago est: Pictus est ibi quidam rex recta facie et integra v(er)sa ad populum inspectorem seu ad oppositum parietem, indutus vestimentis regalibus, coronatus et cum manu dextra tenet regalem virgam et cum sinistra cartam pictam et scriptam. Cuius scripture tenor talis est: Quod dive memorie pater noster ecclesie cephaludensi concessit confirmamus, ratificamus et approbamus et de pia clementia nostra addicimus predicto dono et donamus ecclesiam sancte Lucie de Seracusia cum casalibus et pertinentiis suis. Super cuius capud scriptum erat: Guillelmus primus Sicilie rex. Et versus scripti sic: Ut rata sit bona res qui sum successor et heres, que prebet genitor pariter dare cum patre nitor.

Unde ad certitudinem presentium et futurorum memoriam presens scriptum testium amminiculo roboramus.

+ Ego Primus de Primo, qui supra, iudex, predictam scripturam in pariete porte regum in ipsius ecclesie campanario seu scriptam vidi, legis, interfui et testor, etc. (as above).

In nomine Domini, etc. (as above).

Cuius quarte figure imago talis est: Pictus erat ibi quidam rex indutus vestimentis regalibus et coronatus, in cuius capite scriptum est: Gulielmus secundus Sicilie rex.

Hic tenet cum manu dextra virgam regalem et cum sinistra cartam depictam scriptam. Cuius scripture tenor talis erat: Regali clementia nos heres progenitorum nostrorum concedimus que concesserunt de solita benignitate cephaludensi ecclesie et presenti scripti robore confirmamus.

Versus vero super capud eius in spatio hii sunt:

Ne successores rapiant que dant genitores firmo patrum mores, nostros superaddo favores.

Unde ad certitudinem presentium et futurorum memoriam presens scriptum testium amminiculo roboramus.

+ Ego Primus de Primo, etc. (as above).

In nomine Domini, etc. (as above).

Cuius imago talis est: Depicta erat ibi quedam imago mulieris, versa et recta facie ad populum inspectorem, induta regalibus vestimentis, cuius manus dextra tenebat virgam regalem et cum sinistra cartam pictam et scriptam. Cuius scripture tenor talis erat: De innata benignitate nos Constantia Romanorum imperatrix, que concessit pater noster Rogerius Sicilie rex confirmamus ecclesie Cephaludi et addicientes donamus perpetuo eidem casale Odosuer cum viribus et pertinentiis suis. Ipsa autem imago coronata erat et epyttaphium desuper tale erat: Constantia, Rogerii regis filia, regina Sicilie et Romanorum imperatrix.

Unde ad certitudinem presentium et futurorum memoriam presens scriptum testium amminiculo roboramus.

+ Ego Primus, etc. (shorter version).

In nomine Domini, etc. (as above).

Cuius imago talis est: Depictus est ibi rex regalibus indutus et coronatus sedens in falidistorio, tenens virgam regiam cum dextra. Cuius facies versa est ad quemdam episcopum mitratum et pontificalibus indutum, in cuius capite scriptum est: "Iohannes episcopus," et recipit cartam de manu sinistra regis in qua scriptum est: vade in Babiloniam et Damascum et filios Saladini quere et verba mea eis audacter loquere ut statum ipsius terre valeas in melius reformare. In capite cuius regis scriptum est: Fredericus primus imperator.

Unde ad certitudinem, etc. (as in previous section).