



Piotr Ł. Grotowski¹

The Lost Cameo, the Vanished Statue of the Emperor and Constantine as a New Alexander

A work of art belongs to the realm of the inanimate, and yet it is notable for its magical power to recall to human memory the world of bygone times, its crowded streets, heroic victories, triumphal entrances and splendid deeds of now long-deceased rulers and military commanders. Therefore, its loss – although it is merely the loss of an inanimate object – is always painful for us. Nonetheless, the disappearance of an artefact does not necessarily lead to oblivion about it and about the memories it had evoked. The art historian's duty is to make every effort to reconstruct – using all available measures and relying on all relevant premises – the missing work of art and the ideas it conveyed. The correctness of the attitude chosen for such reconstruction is attested by the coherence of conclusions and by a convincing interpretation of the lost work of art.

1. The lost cameo

Among the valuables once stored in the treasury of the cathedral in Cammin (Polish: *Kamień Pomorski*), there was an oval sardonyx gem with a full-figure representation of a youth in an aegis, set between the arms of a mid-fourteenth-century gilded silver cross-shaped pax (fig. 1). The frontally shown figure was carved in the lighter layer of the gemstone, thus contrasting with the darker background. Only the aforementioned goatskin

¹ Dr Piotr Ł. Grotowski, Assistant Professor at the Department of History of Ancient and Medieval Art, Institute of History of Art and Culture, Faculty of History and Cultural Heritage, The Pontifical University of John Paul II in Cracow, Poland; e-mail: oxygenium@poczta.fm; ORCID: 0000-0001-8710-3499.

plastron, in the form of an asymmetrical, mid-thigh-long cloak, fastened at the left shoulder (i.e. a Macedonian chlamys), was modelled in the stone's dark layer. The warrior's attire was complemented with cuffed boots, mid-calf in height, and a radiate nimbus around his head. The young man's right arm was raised and bent at a right angle, his right hand resting on the shaft of a spear; in his left hand, he carried the Palladion – whose form resembled that of a tropaeum – with a small oval shield, peplos, helmet and a short javelin pointed obliquely downwards in its raised right hand (fig. 2).

2. The history of the gem

We have no knowledge of when and under what circumstances this small object found its way to Cammin. The cross the gem adorned was first mentioned in the cathedral's oldest inventory from 1499 ('Item cruce de auro cum lapide precioso videlicet canisu') and then it reappeared in a number of consecutive registers from the sixteenth century (at the beginning of the century: 'Cruzifixus argentus et aureus suerius cum lapide precioso chanisu'; in Johann Block's inventory: 'Crux alta argentea inaurata cum lapidibus preciosis [sic]'; in 1535: 'Item ein sulverne Pacifical mit einem Vote'; in 1542: 'Cruze golt mit edlen steinen')². We find no record of the cross in a later account of the cathedral's treasury by Philipp Hainhofer (1578-1647), an antiquarian and a diplomat from Augsburg in the service of Philip II of Pomerania-Stettin (1573-1618), but this omission could have resulted from the nature of his assignment. In 1617, at the Duke's command, Hainhofer visited Cammin with the aim of reviewing local valuables, which were supposed to be transferred to William V of Bavaria (1548-1626). In his account, the Duke's envoy briefly mentions only St. Cordula's head and a few minor relics of uncertain authenticity ('alß in der kirchen zu Camin Sanctae Cordulae haupt, vnd in aim klainen tãfelin etliche klaine stücklen vnd bainlen, aber alles sine testimonijs authenticis')³. Considering the fact that the humanist acted on behalf of the

² The State Archive in Szczecin, Repertory 40 I 9 e, see W. Borchers, *Der Camminer Domschatz*, Stettin 1933, p. 19, 21-23. See also J. Kochanowska, *Skarby katedry w Kamieniu Pomorskim*, Szczecin 2004, p. 21-22. Note that J.L. Jurkiewicz (*Tajemnice skarbcza katedry kamińskiej*, Stargard Szczeciński 2014, p. 15-19) falsely believes that the pax was first entered in the 1535 inventory.

³ Philipp Hainhofers, *Reisetagebuch, enthaltend Schilderungen aus Franklen, Sachsen, der Mark Brandenburg und Pommern im Jahr 1617*, ed F.L. von Medem, Baltische Studien 2/2, Stettin 1834, p. 74.

Duke, who was reluctant to give away the valuables, we can assume that he intentionally underestimated the assets of the cathedral's treasury. For that very reason, he might have omitted a number of objects, including the cross with the cameo.

In the absence of any written evidence for the origin of the gem, we can only put forward some uncertain hypotheses and unresolved questions. We do not know whether and when the pax was purchased for the cathedral by one of the bishops. It is possible that it only arrived at Cammin in the second half of the fifteenth century, along with the other treasures which Eric of Pomerania (1382-1459), expelled from Denmark, brought here in 1449. It is worth noting that they comprised not only the jewels brought from Scandinavia, but also the spoils which Eric had gained as a pirate operating from Visby on the island of Gotland in 1442-1449. The valuables were then inherited by Eric's niece, Sophie of Pomerania (1435-1497). Since they were never found after the Duchess's death – despite her son Bogislaw X's efforts – it is likely that she had donated them to the cathedral in Cammin⁴. On the other hand, we cannot rule out the possibility that the cameo with the emperor's effigy had already been in the cathedral's treasury in the early Middle Ages⁵ and then in the mid-fourteenth century, one of the bishops of Cammin – presumably Johann von Sachsen-Lauenburg (1318-1370) – handed it to a goldsmith and commissioned him to make a silver-gilt cross with the gem set in it⁶. From the inventory records cited above we also

⁴ The hypothesis about Sophia of Pomerania-Stolp's donation to the Cammin cathedral was put forward by J. Kochanowska, *Tajemnice Pomorza. Okolice, Tajemnice, Szlaki*, Szczecin 2004, p. 44. See also Jurkiewicz *Tajemnice skarbcza*, p. 29. In Book Nine of his *Pomerania*, Thomas Kantzow refers to Eric's lost treasure and gives a general idea of its scope, see Des Thomas Kantzow, *Chronik von Pommern in Hochdeutscher Mundart*, v. 1, ed. G. Gaebel, Stettin 1897, p. 274.

⁵ The gem could have come to Cammin either via the German Empire as a gift from one of the local bishoprics (e.g. Bamberg or Cologne) or via Scandinavia, where it might have been brought by members of the Varangian Guard – who had remained in the service of the emperors in Constantinople since the ninth century – and whence it was possibly looted by the Pomeranians during one of their expeditions (e.g. the attack of the troops of Racibor I on Kungahälla on 9 August 1135). The above-mentioned hypotheses were proposed, in the context of the origin of the reliquary of Saint Cordula by Jurkiewicz, *Tajemnice skarbcza*, p. 28-30, 36.

⁶ Johann was a son of Eric I of Saxe-Lauenburg and Elisabeth of Pomerania. Intended for the clergy since his youth, he was appointed bishop of Cammin in 1343 and held the office until his death, see J. Petersohn, *Die Kamminer Bischöfe des Mittelalters*, Schwerin 2015, p. 52-56.

learn that in the late Middle Ages the cameo was no longer associated with the Roman Empire and the emperor's unusual costume was perceived as oriental⁷.

The gem found its way to scholarly literature through a publication about the cathedral in Cammin, written by a local historian Rudolf Spuhrmann in 1915. The author mentions a pax offered to the congregation to kiss during the Holy Communion and encloses a photograph in which the cross is standing among the reliquaries from the Cammin cathedral's sacristy⁸. More information on the cameo can be obtained from the pre-war catalogue of the cathedral's treasury, composed by Walter Borchers (1906-1980). The art historian from Stettin was the first to note the presence of a gemstone with brown-red veining in the pax; in the engraved figure he recognized Emperor Claudius (A.D. 41-54), holding the Palladion of Rome – the statuette of Nike brought to Rome from Troy⁹. Borchers did not specify the gem's size but gave the overall dimensions of the cross (height: 25.5 cm; width of the base: 11.5 cm), which – compared with the surviving photographs of the pax – allow us to estimate the cameo's height at approximately six and its width at three and a half centimetres. The accuracy of this calculation has been attested by the plaster cast of the artefact, kept at the Archaeological Institute of the University of Göttingen, which measures: 6.4 cm by 4.1 cm (including the rim) (fig. 3)¹⁰.

⁷ The meaning of the term *canisu*, used by the author of the 1499 inventory, remains unclear to us. In the next entry, however, the word was corrected to *chanisu*, which may indicate that in the Middle Ages the image on the cameo was interpreted as the image of a khan (Latin: *chanis*).

⁸ R. Spuhrmann, *Der Camminer Dom*, Cammin in Pom. 1915, p. 36, fig. 12.

⁹ Borchers, *Der Camminer Domschatz*, p. 43-44, fig. 21-23 and n. 88, where Borchers expresses his gratefulness to Prof. Zahn from Berlin (certainly identical with archaeologist Robert Zahn, who was an honorary professor at Berlin University in 1928-1936) for helping him to identify the figure. Borchers's own contribution is the dating of the pax and the reading of the inscription on its reverse: 'De lingo Dni (Domini) de spinea corona monomento et tunica Dni de lacte et vestibus beate Marie de sancto Petro apostolo et Paulo Andrea Johanno Jacobo Thoma Marco Bartholomea Matheo Luca Barnaba apostolis de sto (sancto) Stephano Laurentio Vincencio Olavo magno martyribus de hundred Martino Nicholao Dominico Franzisco sancta Maria mag. Caterina K.'

¹⁰ Das Archäologisches Institut der Universität Göttingen, no. 1749, cf. M. Bergmann, *Die Strahlen der Herrscher: theomorphes Herrscherbild und politische Symbolik im Hellenismus und in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Mainz 1998, p. 75 and n. 449; R. Amedick, "Jesus Nazareus Rex Iudaeorum". *Hellenistische Königsikonographie und das Neue Testament*, in: *Picturing the New Testament. Studies in Ancient Visual Images*, ed. A. Weisenrieder – F. Wendt – P. von Gemünden, Tübingen 2005, p. 56, fig. 2.

Borchers is also credited with organizing in 1938 an exhibition in the Pommersches Landesmuseum in Stettin, entitled *Kammin: Domschatz, Urkunden, Drucke*, where the contents of Cammin's treasury were shown. After the closure of the exhibition, the objects were returned to the cathedral, where they were displayed in the specially adapted scriptorium and archive in the eastern wing of the chapterhouse¹¹. The situation did not change significantly after the outbreak of World War II¹². Only after the Allied carpet bombing of Lübeck on the night of 28/29 March 1942, which inflicted much damage, was an assembly of provincial conservators summoned at the Reich Ministry of Science, Education and Culture in Berlin. At the meeting, a directive was issued to dislocate the most valuable objects from museums and cathedral treasuries. It was decided that the cathedral treasures would be hidden in rural brick or stone churches within a radius of fifteen kilometres from the seat of the diocese¹³.

According to the list of the objects, drawn up on 8 May 1942 and signed by superintendent Johann Scheel, Cammin's treasury was packed into two wooden crates in the presence of the local conservator Gerhard Bronisch (1905-1945). Thirty smaller items, including the reliquary of St. Cordula and the pax, listed under number twelve in the register as *Pacificalkreuz*, were placed in one box, while bishop's vestments with some sculptures from the main altar were contained in the other, bigger box. The valuables secured in this manner were relocated to the Flemming family's estate in Benz (Polish: *Benice*), fifteen kilometres south-east of Cammin, and deposited in the palace. As we can learn from the list, the items of relatively big size – the main altar, gothic crucifix, wooden sacramentary and oil

¹¹ W. Borchers, *Kammin. Domschatz, Urkunden, Drucke, Ausstellungskatalog, Pommersches Landesmuseum Stettin 1.02-31.05.1938*, Stettin 1938, p. 22-23; O. Kunkel, *Urgeschichte, Volkskunde, Landesgeschichte und Stadtkultur, kirchliche Kunst (Mitteilungen aus dem Pommerschen Landes-Museum)* "Baltischen Studien, Neue Folge" 40 (1938) p. 308-309; Kochanowska, *Skarby katedry*, p. 26; M. Łuczak, *Ewakuacja skarbcza kamińskiego w 1945 roku. Próba analizy materiałów dotyczących poszukiwań utraconych zbiorów*, in: *Śłużby w ochronie dziedzictwa sakralnego i archeologicznego Europy Wschodniej*, ed. M. Łuczak, Szczecin 2018, p. 29-30.

¹² Following the recommendation of the provincial conservator, issued on 10 January 1940, the cathedral's superintendent Scheel temporarily deposited the contents of the treasury at the premises of the district bank in Cammin, R. Czejarek, *Sekrety Pomorza Zachodniego*, Łódź 2017, p. 9; Łuczak, *Ewakuacja skarbcza*, p. 31, n. 8.

¹³ Jurkiewicz, *Tajemnice skarbcza*, p. 50; Łuczak, *Ewakuacja skarbcza*, p. 31; M. Łuczak, *The Lost Kamień Treasury: a Catalogue of War Losses from the Cathedral in Kamień Pomorski*, Warszawa 2020, p. 72-78.

paintings – were taken to the new brick church in the village of Benz. Only two chalices, a paten and other utensils necessary for the celebration of the liturgy had been left in the cathedral¹⁴. Klara Scheel, the superintendent's wife, moved to the Flemming's palace too, presumably entrusted with the task of supervising the deposited objects¹⁵.

The contents of the cathedral's treasury remained in Benz until 5 March 1945. On the previous evening, Count Hasso von Flemming, faced with an imminent threat from advancing troops of the First Belorussian Front, held a telephone conversation with the district authorities during which he obtained authorization to evacuate the village. At 5 a.m. a convoy formed of the residents of Benz set off in the direction of Cammin. The smaller case with Cammin valuables, including the pax with the cameo, was carried on a wagon drawn by a Bulldog tractor whose driver was a Serbian prisoner of war, formerly employed at the estate. At the crossroads in Revenow (Polish: *Rzewnow*), the column turned south, heading for the bridge over the Strait of Dievenow (Polish: *Dziwna*) in the town of Wollin. The decision to take the longer southern evacuation route, in addition leading towards the approaching Soviet troops, turned out to be disastrous. Having arrived at Parlowkrug (Polish: *Parłówko*) around noon on the same day, Hasso Fleming left the convoy and went on horseback to the local police station to obtain permission for the wagons to move on in two columns. Meanwhile the evacuees reached the Greifenhagen-Wollin road and headed

¹⁴ Jurkiewicz, *Tajemnice skarbcza*, p. 50-55 (and p. 75-82, where the author published the original inventory, ref. no.: Tgb. IV Nr 3221, together with its Polish translation and a commentary); Łuczak, *Ewakuacja skarbcza*, p. 31, 34; for English translation, cf. Łuczak, *The Lost Kamień Treasury*, p. 84-90. The narratives about the treasury being transported to Benz in 1944, appearing occasionally in the literature, probably derive from the imprecise account presented by Count Hasso von Flemming at the Congress of Evangelical Assemblies of Pomeranian Communes in Heersum near Hildesheim (3-5 June 1955): "Der Pommernschatz von Cammin war in den letzten Kriegsmonaten nach Benz bei Cammin um der größeren Sicherheit willen gebracht worden", see A. Holtz, *Ist der Cordula-Schrein aus dem Domschatz Cammin verloren? Bericht und Dokumentation*, "Baltische Studien, Neue Folge" 52 (1966) p. 133-134, who dates the transfer of the treasury to late 1943 or even to 1944. Any speculations about the time and destination of the treasury's transfer have been dismissed by an inventory document of 5 May 1942, composed at the superintendent's office: in response to the instruction given by the conservation circles on 13 April 1942, the document defined the precise locations of every particular object transferred to Benz.

¹⁵ The speculation that a special function had been assigned to Klara Scheel was brought forward by Jurkiewicz, *Tajemnice skarbcza*, p. 54-55.

west. After they had passed through the village of Tessin (Polish: *Troszyn*) and got to the isthmus between the lakes Martenthiner (Polish: *Ostrowo*) and Paatziger (Polish: *Piaski*), they were shelled by Soviet tanks from the battalion under the command of Captain Sanachev. The convoy was scattered and only those refugees who had crossed the bridge over a local brook before it was detonated by German troops managed to reach Wollin¹⁶.

It is not known what happened to the crate and its content after that. Did it arrive at Wollin with the remainder of the convoy or did it fall a spoil to the Red Army on the road near Tessin?¹⁷ Of the Cammin treasure only

¹⁶ Holtz, *Ist der Cordula-Schrein*, p. 135-136 cites the account by Irena Haufschild, recorded on 20 April 1965. The woman was travelling on a wagon on which there was a box (the size of which she estimated at no more than fifty centimetres by sixty-five centimetres by forty centimetres). When the bridge was destroyed, her wagon was still on the eastern side of the brook, probably the fourth in the column. During the shelling, she abandoned the vehicle and hid behind the embankment. After the Soviet tanks ceased fire, she returned to the undamaged wagon, took a pram and set off on foot towards Wollin. This testimony was confirmed by her aunt Barbara Vierks, who saw – while returning to Benz the next morning (6 March 1945) – an undamaged wagon lying by the road. She could not however say whether the crate was or was not there. See also Jurkiewicz, *Tajemnice skarbca*, p. 59-66, 71; Łuczak, *Ewakuacja skarbca*, p. 35, 38-39.

¹⁷ A rather obvious assumption that the crate with a part of the Cammin treasure was looted by the Soviet army was proposed by K. Harms, *Wo blieb der Cordula-Schrein? Ein kostbares Stück des Camminer Domschatzes – Im Treck 1945 verloren*, “Pommerschen Heimatkirche” 6 (1955) p. 4. Nonetheless, if we assume that its size, as Irena Haufschild had observed, was relatively small, we cannot rule out that valuables were transferred to another means of transport and carried to Wollin and further into Germany. The testimony of a witness who saw Hasso von Flemming in the town of Misdroy (Polish: *Międzyzdroje*) with an oval package whose shape resembled that of the reliquary of St. Cordula makes this version quite plausible. The count himself admitted in an interview with the parish priest of the Cammin cathedral, Rev. Roman Kostynowicz, that during the evacuation, he had had with him a bag which had contained the most valuable items. On the other hand, the small size of the crate loaded on the wagon in Benz may indicate that the remaining valuables were transported in a separate convoy, along with the Flemmings’ belongings, which, according to a forced labourer employed in their estate, were taken from Benz by a Serbian prisoner of war in two trailers hauled by a tractor, see Kochanowska, *Tajemnice Pomorza*, p. 45-47; Jurkiewicz, *Tajemnice skarbca*, p. 67-69, 93, 95-96 (the author does not rule out that despite his own declarations, Hasso von Flemming had opened the crates deposited in the palace, selected the most valuable items and had taken them over time further into Germany). Recently Łuczak, *The Lost Kamień Treasury*, p. 162-164 has published an additional piece of evidence – the letter of Hildegard Kobi from Lübeck in which she informs the Flemming family that the reliquary of St. Cordula was found by a French prisoner of war in a roadside ditch near Cammin. He took it to France and deposited in

a few objects have survived: those left behind in the cathedral and hidden by superintendent Scheel in the old rectory, the Gothic crucifix and the altar with the sculptures deposited in the bigger case, which under vague circumstances found its way to the church in Benz¹⁸.

3. The Cammin cameo in modern scholarship

The history of the Cammin cameo did not end with its disappearance during the war. Despite the absence of the object proper, the gem has entered academic debate and has gradually aroused interest of scholars thanks to the pre-war photographic documentation and the plaster cast preserved in Göttingen. Borchers's identification of the figure carved in the gemstone as Claudius, though still present in publications for the general public (as well as in the caption under the photograph of the pax exhibited in the Cathedral Museum in Kamień Pomorski, reopened after the war in the gallery of the chapterhouse), has not found acceptance among the subsequent generations of scholars of antiquity¹⁹.

The curator of the Hermitage's collection of glyptics, Oleg Neverov, stated that the Cammin cameo depicted Emperor Nero, but this was not

an unspecified chapel on the coast of Normandy or Bretagne. Although the actual place, where, according to the author, the reliquary is housed, remains unknown, the testimony confirms that the crate with the cathedral deposit was abandoned on the road to Wollin. So far, the attempts to find Cammin's treasures have been to no avail.

¹⁸ According to her own testimony, Klara Scheel, having returned to Benz on 17 March 1945, found the items from the second crate – i.e. the liturgical vestments and the sculptures from the main altar – scattered on the floor of the new church. Some of its contents had been stolen by the local population, but the presence of the bigger box in the church was confirmed in 1968, when a fragment of a painted case for bishop's mitre, funded by Martin Karith (1510) and listed in the 1942 register under number 34, was discovered in the sacristy; see Holtz, *Ist der Cordula-Schrein*, p. 137 (who explains that the discrepancy between the actual location of the crate with bishop's robes and the place of destination recorded in the list from 1942 can be accounted for by its later transfer to the church or by a mistake); Jurkiewicz, *Tajemnice skarbcza*, p. 86-89, 94-95 (who notes that among the objects described by the superintendent's wife there were liturgical books, which according to the list – item no. 30 – had been placed in the first box); Łuczak, *Ewakuacja skarbcza*, p. 42-44.

¹⁹ The identification of the figure on the cameo as Claudius, proposed by the German scholar, has been repeated by some authors interested in the history of the Cammin treasury, see for example Kochanowska, *Skarby katedry*, 25; Jurkiewicz, *Tajemnice skarbcza*, 16, 19.

without reservation, as the attributes accompanying the figure were unusual for the representation of this emperor and had never been attested by written sources²⁰. At the same time, a similar attribution was adopted on the basis of the stylistic features by Wolf Rüdiger Megow, who in the carved figure recognized young Nero, although he did not exclude the possibility that it was young Claudius who had been depicted on the jewel²¹. Subsequently, Andrew Stewart saw in the relief an image of Caracalla intentionally imitating Alexander the Great, the founder (κτίστης) of Alexandria²². Marianne Bergmann approaches the question more cautiously: while she agrees that the figure on the lost artefact follows the iconographic type of Alexander-ktistes popular in the Alexandrian circle, she also notes that the traces of modifications done to the model's face and hair, still visible on the plaster cast, make it difficult to date the object with absolute certainty, and thus to connect it with a particular ruler²³.

Although the opinion that the Cammin cameo was created during the Principate prevails in the scholarly discussion on the object's origin, soon after World War II some attempts were made to associate it with the later Roman Empire. The first hypothesis that the emperor depicted in the gem was Constantine the Great was put forward in 1948 by Gerda Bruns. The Berlin archaeologist pointed to the statue portraying the emperor as Apollo,

²⁰ O. Neverov, *Nero-Helios*, in: *Pagan Gods and Shrines of the Roman Empire*, ed. M. Henig – A. King, Oxford 1986, p. 189, fig. 1.

²¹ W.R. Megow, *Kameen von Augustus bis Alexander Severus*, Berlin 1987, p. 244-245, (A 156) tab. 49,1.

²² A. Stewart, *Faces of power: Alexander's image and Hellenistic politics*, *Hellenistic Culture and Society* 11, Berkeley – Los Angeles – Oxford 1993, p. 246, fig. 82; A. Stewart, *Alexander in Greek and Roman Art*, in: *Brill's companion to Alexander the Great*, ed. J. Roisma, Boston 2003, p. 63, fig. 15 (Caracalla dressed up in the costume of Alexander-Aigiochos from Alexandria). Recently to his hypothesis returned A. Trofimova, *Imitatio Alexandri in Hellenistic Art. Portraits of Alexander the Great and Mythological Images*, Roma 2012, p. 135, fig. 148.

²³ Bergmann, *Die Strahlen der Herrscher*, p. 67, 75, tab. 1,4 (her opinions were repeated by Amedick, *Iesus Nazarenus*, p. 56). A. Lichtenberger, *Severus Pius Augustus: Studien zur sakralen Repräsentation und Rezeption der Herrschaft des Septimius Severus und seiner Familie (193-211 n. Chr.)*, *Impact of Empire* 14, Leiden – Boston 2011, p. 249-250, fig. 209 has recently taken a similar stance towards the attempts, unsupported by literary sources, to link the Cammin gem with Caracalla. Neutral in regard to the question of attribution remain authors of the catalogue *Aurea Roma: dalla città pagana alla città cristiana (Roma, Palazzo delle esposizioni, 22 dicembre 2000 – 20 aprile 2001)*, ed. S. Ensoli – E. La Rocca, Roma 2000, p. 68, fig. 7 ('a ruler with the features of Jupiter and Romulus').

erected in 328 on top of a porphyry column in the middle of the emperor's eponymous forum in Constantinople, as a model possibly used by the Cammin cameo's engraver and linked the object with a group of gems which she considered to be official products of Constantine's time²⁴. Admittedly, her work faced severe criticism from the academic community, but her study of the stylistic resemblance between the Cammin cameo and the Hague Cameo (the so-called *gemma Constantiniana*; now at the National Museum of Antiquities in Leiden²⁵) has been acknowledged by scholars of antiquity²⁶.

Brun's stance on the Constantinian origin of the gem won Raissa Calza's approval²⁷, and in the recent years, the number of its supporters has begun to grow²⁸. Sarah Bassett referred to it in the context of her attempts to reconstruct the appearance of the statue of Constantine standing on top of the porphyry column²⁹. In turn, Ignazio Tantillo drew attention to a wooden, gilded statuette of the emperor, which was made to commemorate the dedication of Constantinople on 11 May 330 and paraded in annual proces-

²⁴ G. Bruns, *Staatskameen des 4. Jahrhunderts nach Christi Geburt*, Winkelmannsprogramm der Archäologischen Gesellschaft zu Berlin 104, Berlin 1948, p. 16-17, fig. 11.

²⁵ Het Rijksmuseum van Oudheden, Leiden, inv. no. GS-11096.

²⁶ The first to critically comment on Bruns' findings was H. Möbius, *Römischer Kameo in Kassel*, "Archäologischer Anzeiger" 63/64 (1948/1949) p. 110, who classified the Cammin cameo on the basis of stylistic features among those made in the third century and linked it with Gordian III (225-244). In his later article, the scholar reverted to the traditional attribution proposed by Borchers, identifying the emperor on the gem as Claudius, H. Möbius, *Der Grosse Stuttgarter Kameo (zuseiner Veröffentlichung durch Marie-Louise Vollenweider)*, "Schweizer Münzblätter" 13-17 (1963-1967) p. 123. See also the review of Bruns' paper by J.-J. Hatt, *Review: 'Staatskameen des 4. Jahrhunderts nach Christi Geburt'*, "Latomus" 10 (1951) p. 271-272, who argues that the Licinius cameo from the Cabinet des Médailles in Paris (inv. no. D 2566), considered by Bruns to be the key item for the whole group, is a Renaissance forgery and was in fact made in a workshop in Milan in the late sixteenth century; therefore, he proposes to link the Pomeranian cameo with the Great Cameo of The Hague and the image of Constantinople's Tyche in the Vienna collection. Also J.H. Jongkees, *De "apothéose Van Claudius" in Het Haagsche Penningkabinet*, "Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek" 4 (1952) p. 31-32 accepts late dating of the gems from The Hague and Vienna (but he makes no direct reference to the Cammin cameo).

²⁷ R. Calza, *Iconografia romana imperiale: Da Carausio a Giuliano (287-363 d. C.)*, Quaderni e Guide di Archeologia 3, Roma 1972, p. 146, 235-237, n. 20, tab. LXXXI, fig. 286.

²⁸ See, for example, G. Fowden, *Constantine's porphyry column: the earliest literary allusion*, JRS 81 (1991) p. 126, n. 73.

²⁹ S. Bassett, *The urban image of late antique Constantinople*, Cambridge 2004, p. 202, fig. 22.

sions on the anniversaries of that event³⁰. It should, however, be noted that in referring to the dedication of Constantinople, both Malalas and the anonymous author of the *Chronicon Paschale* mention only a figurine of the city's Tyche (called Anthousa), carried by Constantine in his right hand³¹, while on the lost jewel the emperor held the Palladion in his left hand and resting the right one on the spear.

4. The cameo's Constantinian origin

Judged solely on the basis of the photographs and the plaster cast, the style and costume details of the Cammin cameo at first sight give the impression that the carving was made in accordance with the principles of classical aesthetics. The well-proportioned beardless face of an ephebe, encircled by evenly trimmed hair; the slight counter-posture with some body weight clearly transferred to the spear; the soft modelling of the limbs – all seems to reinforce this impression. Nevertheless, a closer look at this work of art reveals elements typical of the imperial portrait of the late Roman Empire, too: the rigidity of the pose; unnatural proportions; summarily shaped features indicative of a lack of care in carving details³². Most notably, the emperor's massive neck and legs add a hieratic flavour to the figure, giving the impression that we are viewing a monumental statue from below.

Divergences from the style of depicting rulers in Hellenistic art can also be observed in the details of clothing. Although on the whole the image on the gem emulates the iconographic type of Alexander-ktistes in an aegis (fig. 4)³³, tall boots covering calves – as Steward notes – were not part of

³⁰ I. Tantillo, *L'impero della luce. Riflessioni su Costantino e il sole*, "Mélanges de l'école française de Rome" 115 (2003) p. 1043-1045 and n. 159, fig. 11. This hypothesis was accepted by J. Bardill, *Constantine, Divine Emperor of the Christian Golden Age*, New York 2012, p. 157, n 3 (with summarised state of research on this subject).

³¹ *Chronicon Paschale ad exemplar Vaticanum*, v.1, ed. L. Dindorf, Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae 11, Bonn 1832, p. 530; Ioannis Malalae, *Chronographia*, ed. I. Thurn, Corpus Fontium Byzantinae Historiae 35, Berlin 2000, p. 247.

³² See, for example, H.P. L'Orange, *Studien zur Geschichte des spätantiken Porträts*, Oslo 1933, p. 15-46; E. Kitzinger, *Byzantine Art in the Making. Main Lines of Stylistic Development in Mediterranean Art 3rd-7th Century*, London 1977, p. 7-29.

³³ The Roman statue made in Alexandria (first century A.D.), from D. M. Foquet's collection, currently at the British Museum (inv. no. 1922.0711.1), seems to be particularly close to the Cammin cameo, see Stewart, *Faces of power*, p. 230, fig. 83 and n. 63, where the iconographic patterns of the lost gem are discussed minutely.

the original representation of the Macedonian king and must have been the Roman artist's addition³⁴. Similarly, the motif of a radiate nimbus around the head of the founder of Alexandria did not appear in art before the late Hellenistic period³⁵. Moreover, on the Cammin gem, the nimbus takes an unusual form of a wide wreath with eleven pointed rays. The above-mentioned observations allow us to rule out the Hellenistic origin of the object, pointing at the same time to the fact that the stylistic features reveal its affiliation with late Roman art. Stewart's proposal to identify the emperor as Caracalla should also be rejected, for the figure on the gem was shown without the beard and moustache characteristic of the representations of this emperor. The physiognomic type, which will be discussed later, corresponds to the portraits of Constantine executed during his lifetime. We can therefore consider the hypothesis of the lost cameo's Constantinian origin as plausible.

5. The cameo and the emperor's statue on the column

In searching for iconographic and ideological patterns for the representation of the emperor on the gem, one should return to the identification proposed by Gerda Bruns. Here, however, another problem arises. While the hundred-*palmipes* tall (37 m) porphyry column³⁶, erected by Constan-

³⁴ Stewart, *Faces of power*, p. 246-247 and Amedick, *Iesus Nazareus*, p. 56 describe the figure's shoes as Macedonian high *krepides*. However, the rhomboidal cuts, clearly visible in the photographs, suggest a kind of legwraps tied round with a strap, which in turn allow us to recognise the emperor's shoes as *servoula* (also called *muzakia*). On the other hand, the lack of visible toes and bindings in the forepart prompts the exclusion of *endromides*, popular in the iconography of ancient rulers, see P.Ł. Grotowski, *Arms and Armour of the Warrior Saints: Tradition and Innovation in Byzantine Iconography (843-1261)*, The Medieval Mediterranean 87, Leiden – Boston 2010, p. 198-201, figs. 19a-b, 25c-d, 27, 29, 46a, 46c, 61.

³⁵ The first ruler to be depicted with a radiate crown was Ptolemy III Euergetes, as portrayed on the coins minted by his son Ptolemy IV (222-205 B.C.). Subsequent Hellenistic kings, up to Hermaios Soter of Bactria (ca. 90-70 B.C.), acquired the motif, sometimes together with cognomen Epiphanes (derived from φάω, to shine). In Rome, the motif of a radiate crown was adopted in the time of Tiberius, who had portrayed Octavian in this style since A.D. 15, cf. Stewart, *Faces of power*, p. 246; J. Bardill, *Constantine*, p. 36-57, fig. 28, 34-36, 38-45, 50.

³⁶ The height of the column corresponds precisely to the measure of a hundred Roman feet increased by the width of a palm (*palmipes*, 37 cm), while the height of the

tine in 328 in the centre of his forum linking Septimius Severus' Byzantium with his own city³⁷, still stands in Divan Youlu Street in Istanbul, in the district of Çemberlitaş (the name derived from the Turkish term for the column, literally: a stone in metal hoops), the bronze statue which once crowned it, collapsed during a windstorm in the spring of 1106³⁸ and its detailed description has not been preserved in medieval sources.

All we know is that the figure was holding a spear (λόγχη) in its right hand. The spear fell down as a result of an earthquake on 16 August 554, digging three cubits deep into the ground, and was replaced with a sceptre

seven-drum porphyry shaft (23.4 m) equals eighty Roman feet (29.6 cm) and the diameter of the lowest drum (2.9 m) equals around ten feet, cf. J. Neal, *The structure and function of ancient metrology*, in: *Wonders Lost and Found: A Celebration of the Archaeological Work of Professor Michael Vickers*, ed. N. Sekunda, Oxford 2020, p. 34-35.

³⁷ For the monument's dating, see *Chronicon Paschale*, v. 1, p. 528; Theophanis, *Chronographia*, v. 1, ed. C. de Boor, Leipzig 1883, p. 28 (under the date A. M. 5821, i.e. A.D. 328/9). See also, for example, C. Mango, *Constantinopolitana*, "Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts" 80 (1965) p. 306-313 (reprint in: C. Mango, *Studies on Constantinople*, Aldershot 1993, text II; also for the column's size); M. Karamouzi, *Das Forum und die Säule Constantini in Konstantinopel: Gegebenheiten und Probleme*, "Balkan Studies" 27 (1986) p. 222-231; A. Berger, *Untersuchungen zu den Patria Konstantinupoleos, Poikila Byzantina* 8, Bonn 1988, p. 297-299; F.A. Bauer, *Stadt, Platz und Denkmal in der Spätantike*, Mainz 1996, p. 172; Bardill, *Constantine*, p. 28; R. Ousterhout, *The life and afterlife of Constantine's Column*, "Journal of Roman Archaeology" 27 (2014) p. 305-308; P. Yonca-Arslan, *Towards a new honorific column: The column of Constantine in early Byzantine urban landscape*, "Middle East Technical University Journal of the Faculty of Architecture" 33 (2016) p. 124-126.

³⁸ Annae Comnenae, *Alexias*, XII 4/5, v. 1, ed. D.R. Reinsch – A. Kambylis, *Corpus Fontium Byzantinae Historiae* 40, Berlin – New York 2001, p. 370. John Zonaras reports about numerous victims of the disaster, which according to him happened in the time of Alexius I Comnenus, see Ioannis Zonarae, *Epitome historiarum libri XVIII*, XIII 3/27, v. 3, ed. M. Pinder, *Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae* 49, Bonn 1897, p. 18. An annotation in the *Patria of Constantinople* gives the exact date of the incident (5 April 1106), which, however, contradicts Comnena's statement that the storm took place when the sun was in the sign of Taurus, cf. *Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum*, I 45a, ed. Th. Preger, Leipzig 1901, p. 138. Ousterhout, *The life and afterlife*, p. 310 recognizes a remnant of the colossus in the head of Apollo, attributed to Phidias, which John Tzetzes saw in the Great Palace, cf. Johannes Tzetzes, *Historiarum variarum Chiliades* VIII 192, ed. Th. Kiessling, Leipzig 1827, p. 295. I. Karayannopoulos, *Konstantin der Große und der Kaiserkult*, "Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte" 5 (1956) p. 353 doubts, however, that the statue's head could survive a fall from such a great height.

or a staff (σκῆπτρον)³⁹. In the statue's left hand, a sphere (σφαῖρα) rested, which fell to the ground twice in the time of Emperor Zeno⁴⁰ and again in 869⁴¹, also due to seismic activity. Since the earliest account of the first of these incidents comes from the so-called Great Chronographer, active in the mid-eighth century, who admittedly relied on an earlier source, yet not earlier than the late sixth century⁴², we do not know what the imperial orb originally looked like. Cyril Mango (1928-2021) put forward the hypothesis that in Constantine's time it was topped with a statue of Victory and only the second or even the third orb took the form of *globus cruciger*⁴³. We can assume then

³⁹ Malalas, *Chronographia* XVIII 118, p. 416; Theophanes, *Chronographia*, v. 1, p. 222 (dated A. M. 6034, i.e. 541/2); Georgius Cedrenus, *Compendium Historiarum*, v. 1, ed. I. Bekker, *Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae* 8, Bonn 1838, p. 656. The information about the sceptre in the statue's right hand comes from Anna Comnena, who could have seen the statue and its remains at the age of 23, but the fact that she compiled her description only four decades after the accident might have affected the accuracy of her testimony. Karayannopoulos, *Konstantin der Große*, p. 351 advocates credibility of her account.

⁴⁰ Symeonis Magistri et Logothetae, *Chronicon* CI 8, ed. S. Wahlgren, *Corpus Fontium Byzantinae Historiae* 44/1, Berlin – New York 2006, p. 133; Theophanes, *Chronographia*, v. 1, p. 126 (dated 477/8).

⁴¹ Symeon, Logothete, *Chronicon* CXXXII 4, p. 261.

⁴² The text with an annotation about the Great Chronographer's authorship was inserted in the Parisian manuscript of the *Paschal Chronicle* on pages 241v-243r. The passage containing information about the damage caused by the earthquake is at the very beginning of this insertion, see L.M. Whitby, *The Great Chronographer and Theophanes*, "Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies" 8 (1982) p. 17.

⁴³ C. Mango, *Constantine's Column*, in: C. Mango, *Studies on Constantinople*, Aldershot 1993, text III, p. 3. One could agree in principle with Mango's thesis, nevertheless, it should be corrected in detail. *Globus cruciger* must have replaced the original orb already after the first incident, because it is mentioned (οὐτινος ἐν τῷ μήλω τῆς [δεξιᾶς] χειρὸς πῆξας τὸν τίμιον σταυρὸν ἐπέγραψεν [ἔγραψεν] ἐν αὐτῷ ταῦτα · "σοὶ Χριστὲ ὁ θεὸς παρατίθημι τὴν πόλιν [μου] ταύτην) in the anonymous *Vita Constantini* III, preserved in epitomized form in *menologia* from the eighth and ninth centuries, but with all probability drawing on the text written not later than the beginning of the sixth century, see F. Winkelmann, *Die ältesteerhaltene gr. hagiographische Vita Konstantins und Helenas (BHG 365Z, 366, 366a)*, in: *Texte und Textkritik. Eine Aufsatzsammlung*, ed. J. Dummer, *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* 133, Berlin 1987, p. 634. The description is repeated in another *Life of Constantine* [BHG 364, § 24], dating from the second half of the ninth century, and then again in Nicephorus Callistus' *Ecclesiastical History* (ca. 1320), which however wrongly states that the orb rested in the emperor's right hand, see *Un βίος δι Costantino*, ed. M. Guidi, "Rendiconti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei, Classe di Scienze Morali, Storiche e Filologiche, Serie quinta" 16 (1907) p. 337;

that the attributes presented by the ruler on the Cammin cameo match those, which originally accompanied Constantine on his column.

Besides, the sources consistently report about the radiate crown on the statue's head; John Malalas mentions – and George Hamartolos repeats after him – the exact number of seven rays⁴⁴. In this detail, the statue varied the most from the image on the Cammin cameo, where – as already mentioned – the emperor is portrayed in a crown with eleven broad spikes. This difference does not necessarily rule out the emperor's figure on the Constantinople column as a model used by the Cammin gem's engraver, whose intention might only have been to roughly render the iconographic details of the statue, as seen from the forum's ground level.

Nicephori Callisti Xanthopuli, *Ecclesiasticae historiae libri XVIII*, VII 49, PG 145, 1325. Nevertheless, the lack of similar representations in the art of the fourth century belies the idea that there was a cross present on the statue of Constantine. The imperial orb topped with a cross first time appears on coins minted by Theodosius II in 420 in order to commemorate the crucifix placed by the emperor on Golgotha. The motif of Victoria, popular in ancient times, gradually disappeared replaced by the cross, although the image of the winged goddess standing on the orb held by the ruler occasionally appears in coinage until the time of Heraclius (610-641), cf. E. Stepanova, *Victoria-Nike, on Early Byzantine Seals*, “Studies in byzantine Sigillography” 10 (2010) p. 17, fig. 5. Also the inscription stating that Constantine has dedicated his city to Christ, carved according to a legend into the cross on the orb and known in various versions from the accounts by Constantinus Rhodius, *Descriptio Urbis Constantinopolitanae* [v. 71-74] and Georgius Cedrenus, indirectly indicates that the *globus cruciger* was made only after Christianity had solidified and become the only religion accepted by the state, see, Constantine of Rhodes, *On Constantinople and the Church of the Holy Apostles*, v. 1, ed. L. James – I. Vassiss, Surrey – Burlington 2017, p. 22; Cedrenus, *Compendium Historiarum*, p. 565.

⁴⁴ Malalas, *Chronographia* XIII 7, p. 245-246: ἔχοντα ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ αὐτοῦ ἀκτῖνας ἐπτὰ; Georgios Monachos, *Chronicon*, v. 2, ed. C. de Boor, Leipzig 1904, p. 500: ἔχοντα ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀκτῖνας ἕπτ. *Chronicon Paschale*, v. 1, p. 528 makes a mention of rays of light around the head of the figure, while Symeon, Logothete, *Chronicon* LXXXVIII, 7, p. 109 recalls an inscription indicating that the sculpture had a radiate nimbus: διὰ τὰς ἐν αὐτῷ ἀκτῖνας Κωνσταντίνῳ λάμπουντι ἡλίουθ δίκην. *Scriptores originum*, II 45, p. 174 and Zonaras, *Compendium Historiarum* XIII 3/26, v. 3, p. 18 claim that among the rays on the head of the statue, Constantine fixed also the nails with which Christ was crucified. Also Nicephorus, presbyter at Hagia Sophia, refers in *Vita Sancti Andreae Sali* [BHG 115z] to the legend of the nails from the Holy Cross hidden in the column, cf. *The Life of St. Andrew the Fool*, v. 2, tr. et ed. L. Rydén, Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Byzantina Upsaliensia 4/2, Uppsala 1995, p. 276. Considering the presence of a vertically arranged crown on Constantine's coins minted between 310 and 326, Bardill, *Constantine*, p. 30, 34, 42, fig. 23, 46-47 assumes that the *corona radiata* on the statue might have had such a shape too, which would have made it very close to the crown carved in the cameo.

None of the texts of the period provides information about the clothes in which the emperor shown on the column was clad. Indirect and ambiguous clues on this matter can only be found in a few pictures of the column, executed hundreds of years after the statue's collapse and based on older representations. In reconstructing the original form of the statue, scholars most often refer to a vignette on the medieval copy of an ancient map (the so-called *Tabula Peutingeriana*; *Codex Vindobonensis 324*, segment VIII B1) schematically depicting the network of public roads (*cursus publicus*) of the late Roman Empire (ca. 375)⁴⁵. The vignette shows the personification of Constantinople, seated on a throne and pointing at a pillar with a double shaft of three segments, sketched in black ink next to her. Standing on top of the pillar is a naked figure with its arms spread wide, holding an orb and a spear (fig. 5). This image gave rise to an opinion, widespread among scholars, that Constantine had been shown on the column as a naked Helios, thus referring in form to the colossal statue of Nero, visually

⁴⁵ The map, originally in the form of a parchment scroll 34 cm × 674 cm (divided in 1875 into twelve sheets), was discovered in 1507 by the Viennese humanist Konrad Celtis, who handed it over to Konrad Peutinger. Purchased in 1717 by Prince Eugene of Savoy, it was transferred after his death (1736) to the Habsburgs' private library in the Hofburg, which was incorporated into the Austrian National Library in Vienna in 1920, see R.J.A. Talbert, *Rome's World: the Peutinger map reconsidered*, Cambridge 2010, p. 10-30, 73-76 (see also Martin Steinmann's comments on the palaeography and dating of the map, Talbert, *Rome's World: the Peutinger map reconsidered*, p. 76-84). The *terminus post quem* for the Roman archetype is determined by the presence of Constantinople (described as *Constantinopolis*) on the map, although Pompeii and Stabia (destroyed by the eruption of Mount Vesuvius in A.D. 79) have also been marked and Jerusalem bears the name *Aelia Capitolina* ('antea dicta Herveusalem mo[do] Helya Capitolina'), referring to the Roman colony built by Hadrian after A.D. 132 on the site of the capital city of Judea, demolished in A.D. 70. These discrepancies can be explained by the hypothesis that the Viennese map, made between 1175 and 1225 – as one can deduce from the typeface of the early Gothic script – was modelled not directly on the ancient original but on a Carolingian copy, which in turn undermines the veracity of the vignette with the image of Constantinople, see B. Salway, *The Nature and Genesis of the Peutinger Map*, "Imago Mundi" 57 (2005) p. 120, 123-129; E. Albu, *Imperial Geography and the Medieval Peutinger Map*, "Imago Mundi" 57 (2005) p. 143; E. Albu, *The Medieval Peutinger Map. Imperial Roman Revival in a German Empire*, Cambridge 2014, p. 13-17, 48-58, 76-78, 95-103; Talbert, *Rome's World*, p. 124 (on the Constantinople vignette being added by the copyist). The state of research of the monument and the analysis of the image of Constantinople are discussed in detail by P. Kochanek, *Vignette of Constantinople on the Tabula Peutingeriana. The Column of Constantine or the Lighthouse*, "Studia Ceranea" 9 (2019) p. 475-521.

closing the axis of the arch erected in Rome (312-315) to commemorate the victory over Maxentius⁴⁶.

However, the image on the map, probably dating from the first quarter of the thirteenth century, differs considerably from the known descriptions of the statue on the porphyry column. Apart from the lack of the radiate crown, usually accounted for by the small size of the drawing, and the absence of a cross on the orb, the image of which could be expected on a medieval copy of the vignette, another fact – so far unnoticed – is worth highlighting: the naked figure on the map holds the attributes in the reverse manner to that in Anna Comnena's description: the orb in the outstretched right hand and the spear in the left⁴⁷. All these differences imply that the author of the vignette (or its archetype) – if his intention was to show the Constantine column (as the structure of the double shaft divided into segments seems to suggest) – had a rather vague idea of the monument's appearance. Therefore, without rejecting the interpretation of the column's image on the map as a symbolic representation of the statue from the Constantine Forum, it should be concluded that the picture differs significantly from the model and cannot be used as a reliable source for visual reconstruction of the statue.

The question of the costume in which Constantine was portrayed on the porphyry column becomes even more complicated when we take into account another image of the monument, not preserved in its original form either and known only from an Early Modern sketch. On the spiral frieze

⁴⁶ See, for example, M. Bergmann, *Der römische Sonnenkoloss, der Konstantinsbogen und die Ktistes-statue von Konstantinopel*, "Jahrbuch Braunschweigische Wissenschaftliche Gesellschaft" 14 (1997) p. 125-126, fig. 19; Basset, *The urban image*, p. 202-203 (who notes, however, the lack of a radiate crown in the picture on the map); Bardill, *Constantine*, p. 29, 33-34, 108, fig. 17-19, 24; Ousterhout, *The life and after-life*, p. 311-312, fig. 6; Yoncaci-Arslan, *Towards a new honorific column*, p. 136, fig. 15; P. Yoncaci-Arslan, *Registrars of Urban Movement in Constantinople: Monumental Columns and the Mese*, "Annual of Istanbul Studies" 7 (2018) p. 7, 12, 18, fig. 2, 5; A. Berger, *Constantine's City: the Early Days of a Christian Capital*, "Studia Ceranea" 10 (2020) p. 16-17 (who mistakenly considers the vignette to be the sole image of the column dating from the Constantine era); A. Berger, *The Statues of Constantinople*, Cambridge 2021, p. 8-9, fig. 1-2.

⁴⁷ In the context of this error, worth noting is the coincidence between the mirror image of the statue (in addition to the switched hands, the figure in the vignette is facing west, while the figure in the Constantine Forum looked to the east) and the late account by Nicephorus Callistus (cf. footnote 43 above), who described the *globus cruciger* as resting in the emperor's right hand.

covering the shaft of the column of Arcadius (erected in 401-421), depicted in a convex relief were the emperor's campaigns (399-401) against revolted Gothic mercenaries under the leadership of Gainas, a newly appointed *magister militum*. Although the whole column down to the base of its shaft was dismantled after the 1715 earthquake had undermined the stability of its structure and put the monument at risk of collapse⁴⁸, we know the scenes carved on the frieze from three detailed drawings made by a German-speaking artist – probably the Flemish draughtsman Lambert de Vos – who in 1574 was a member of a diplomatic mission sent by Maximilian II Habsburg to Selim II⁴⁹. In one of de Vos' sketches, in the lower part of the frieze on the eastern side of the column, i.e. at the place where the expulsion of the Goths from Constantinople in 400 was depicted (fol. 11), one can see an image of the Constantine Forum in the form of a circle surrounded by a schematically rendered colonnade (fig. 6). Inside it, a column on a rectangular pedestal is shown, topped with a figure dressed in a toga clinging tightly to the body (*statua togata*)⁵⁰. Because of the small size of the drawing, its conventional and derivative character and the fact that the artist sketched also the crack in the shaft of the column, running through the head and shoulders of the figure, it cannot be determined on the basis of this watercolour whether the statue had a radiate crown on its head and whether it held any attributes in its hands.

This reconstruction of the image on the column showing Constantine in a long tunic has found support in a hypothesis formed by Hans Peter L'Orange, who pointed to a small bronze statuette with a radiate crown, long robe and a cloak pinned with a fibula, kept at the National Museum

⁴⁸ The column of Arcadius was measured in detail by the French scholar Petrus Gyllius [*De Constantinopoleos topographia* IV 7] during his stay in Constantinople (1544-1547), see Pierre Gilles, *The Antiquities of Constantinople*, tr. J. Ball, ed. R.G. Musto, New York 1988, p. 196-199. On the column of Arcadius, see Bauer, *Stadt, Platz und Denkmal*, p. 209-212 (who also provides further bibliography).

⁴⁹ Twenty-one watercolors documenting the monuments of Constantinople have been preserved in the so-called *Freshfield Album*, dated 1574, held at Cambridge (Trinity College Library, Ms. O. 17.2). On folios 11-13, the column of Arcadius is shown from the eastern, southern and western sides. On the significance of the manuscript for studies on Constantinople, see Mango, *Constantinopolitana*, p. 305-315.

⁵⁰ See e.g. Bauer, *Stadt, Platz und Denkmal*, p. 179-182, fig. 20, 2; F.A. Bauer, *Statuen hoher Würdenträger im Stadtbild Konstantinopels*, "Byzantinische Zeitschrift" 96/2 (2003) p. 497, fig. 3; J. Matthews, *Viewing the Column of Arcadius at Constantinople*, in: *Shifting Cultural Frontiers in Late Antiquity*, ed. D. Brakke – D. Deliyannis, London – New York 2012, p. 221, fig. 11, 9.

in Copenhagen (inv. No. 8040), as a possible iconographic formula of the Constantinople colossus⁵¹. This type of costume, however, seems unusual in the official imperial images in the time of the Tetrarchy⁵²; and above all, due to its schematic character, this small fragment of the sketch offers no grounds for a certain and unambiguous interpretation of the original statue or even its representation on the frieze of the column of Arcadius.

In this situation, it seems reasonable to get back to the lost late Roman cameo. The bronze statue of Constantine set on top of the column in the middle of his forum had an official character; there is a consensus among scholars that for such representations of the emperor not only nudity and the form of *statua togata* but also the form of *statua loricata*, portraying the ruler in a military uniform⁵³, was acceptable and – what is more important – particularly popular in the late Roman art. Nonetheless, the aegis and radiate crown on the cameo are part of a specific costume and the assumption that Constantine was depicted in a similar way entails the necessity for the reinterpretation of the meaning of the statue on the Forum.

6. Constantine-founder as a new Alexander

The choice of the iconographic type of Alexander – the founder of the city which bears his name – can be fully understood in regard to a sculpture displayed on the summit of a column standing in the forum linking the old Byzantium of Septimius Severus' time with the new city established upon Constantine's initiative. If the account conveyed in *The Brief Historical Notes* (Παραστάσεις σύντομοι χρονικά) from the eighth century is to be believed, the forum with the porphyry column was the main site for the forty-day-long celebrations to commemorate the dedication of Constantinople, which commenced on 11 May 330. During the festivities, in the

⁵¹ H.P. L'Orange, *Kleine Beiträge zur Ikonographie Konstantins des Großen*, "Opuscula Romana" 4 (1962) p. 102, fig. 2 (reprint in H.P. L'Orange, *Likeness and Icon: Selected Studies in Classical and Early Medieval Art*, Odense 1973, p. 28, fig. 10); H.P. L'Orange, *Das spätantike Herrscherbild von Diokletian bis zu den Konstantin-Söhnen: 284-361 n. Chr.*, Berlin 1984, p. 122.

⁵² Ousterhout, *The life and afterlife*, p. 312 considers L'Orange's thesis not convincing due to the religious connotations of the Copenhagen figurine. Of less consequence for our study is the rejection of the documentary value of the watercolors, made solely on the basis of the non-nudity of the emperor's image by Yoncaci-Arslan, *Towards a new honorific column*, p. 135, fig. 14.

⁵³ Mango, *Constantine's Column*, p. 3; Ousterhout, *The life and afterlife*, p. 311-312.

presence of the citizens gathered in great numbers in a solemn procession, the figure of the emperor was transported along the *Mese* from the Philadelphion and lifted to the top of the column⁵⁴.

During the games in the Hippodrome, Constantine appeared with a new imperial insigne: a diadem (διάδημα) decorated with precious stones and pearls, adopted from his great Macedonian predecessor⁵⁵. Following the emperor's decree, celebrations commemorating the city's 'birthday' (as was the case in Alexandria, officially founded on 7 April 331 B.C.) were repeated every year on the anniversary of the event, and at least until the sixth century the aforementioned smaller copy of the image of the ruler with a figurine of Tyche in his hand was paraded in a festive procession⁵⁶. The associations

⁵⁴ Anonymi, *Narrationes breves chronographicae*, § 55-56, cf. *Constantinople in the early eighth century: the Parastaseis syntomoi chronikai: introduction, translation, and commentary*, ed. Av. Cameron – J. Herrin, Columbia Studies in Classical Tradition 10, Leiden 1984, p. 128-132, 241-246 (commentary). On the significance of the monument in celebrating the consecration of Constantinople, see also Yoncaci-Arslan, *Registrars of Urban Movement*, p. 18; Berger, *Constantine's City*, p. 20; Berger, *The Statues*, p. 8. It is worth noting that as early as the fifth century, Philostrogios, an Arian historian of the Church, accuses Constantinople's Christians of worshiping the image of Constantine on a column, lighting lamps and burning incense for him and praying to him for protection as if he were God, cf. Philostorgius, *Historia ecclesiastica* II 17, Philostorgius, *Kirchengeschichte. Mit dem Leben des Lucian von Antiochien und den Fragmenten des arianischen Historiographen*, ed. J. Bidez – F. Winkelmann, Berlin 1981, p. 28.

⁵⁵ Malalas, *Chronographia* XIII 8, p. 246-247: καὶ φορέσας τότε ἐν πρώτοις ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ αὐτοῦ κορυφῇ διάδημα διὰ μαργαρίτων καὶ λίθων τιμίων, βουλόμενος πληρῶσαι τὴν προφητικὴν φωνὴν τὴν λέγουσαν· “ἔθηκας ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ στέφανον ἐκ λίθου τιμίου” [Ps 20:3] οὐδεὶς γὰρ τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ βασιλευσάντων τοιοῦτόν τι ποτε ἐφόρεσεν. On the diadem as an attribute adopted by Constantine from Alexander, see Bardill, *Constantine*, p. 13-19, 398, fig. 5-8, who suggests that contrary to the chronicler's statement, Constantine had already been depicted in a headband on the coins minted in 324 (and he links this fact with the foundation of Constantinople on 8 November of that year); the imperial diadem, however, had not yet been decorated with jewels. L. Ramskold – N. Lenski, *Constantinople's dedication medallions and the maintenance traditions*, “Numismatische Zeitschrift” 119 (2012) p. 41-43 come to similar conclusions. For the iconography of a diadem in the Hellenistic period, see R.R.R. Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, Oxford 1988, p. 34-37. Amedick, *Jesus Nazarene*, p. 54, 60-66 points out that in the imperial Rome the diadem was used solely as a poetic metaphor and iconographic convention, as it lost its insignia function due to official state doctrine, which avoided any associations with the kingdom.

⁵⁶ Malalas, *Chronographia* XIII 8, 247; *Narrationes breves chronographicae*, § 5, 38, p. 60, 102. Theophanes, *Chronographia*, v. 1, p. 383 under the year 712/13 refers only to the games organized at the Hippodrome on the occasion of the city's anniversary. For the Alexandrian models of the Constantinople procession, see Bardill, *Constantine*, p. 151-157.

between Constantinople and Alexandria were strengthened by the fact that the two cities bearing the names of their founders had not been founded *in cruda radice*, but at the places of older settlements – Byzantium and Rhacotis (Ρακῶτις)⁵⁷. Constantine’s decision to commemorate his own achievement as the founder of Constantinople by adopting the iconography known from the Alexandrian statue of the famous and still venerated founder of many Greek cities would thus have been fully justified and understandable⁵⁸.

The significance of that reference to the great Greek predecessor might have had a local aspect too, as Alexander had been credited with founding the Strategion – a square located about 750 metres to the north-east of the Forum and adjacent to the walls of ancient Byzantium⁵⁹. Also this place Constantine engaged in celebrating the dedication of the city by placing there his equestrian statue and a column with an inscribed edict which secured Constantinople’s status of the New Rome⁶⁰. Moreover, according to

⁵⁷ The foundation of Alexandria on the site of an earlier settlement is reported, for example, by Strabo, *Rerum geographicum* XVII 1, 6 and Plinius, *Historia naturalis* V 11, 62, and among the Byzantine authors, by Malalas, *Chronographia* VIII 1, Ioannis Nikiou, *Chronicon* LIX 1 and Cedrenus, see *The Geography of Strabo*, v. 8, tr. H.L. Jones, London 1967, p. 28; Pliny, *Natural History*, v. 2, ed. H. Rackham, London 1959, p. 266; Malalas, *Chronographia* p. 146; *The Chronicle of John, Bishop of Nikiu, translated from Zotenberg’s Ethiopic Text*, tr. R.H. Charles, London 1916, p. 47; Cedrenus, *Compendium Historiarum*, v. 1, p. 271. On the tradition of naming cities after their founders, which began with multiple Alexandrias founded by Alexander of Macedon, see Bardill, *Constantine*, p. 251-252.

⁵⁸ The idea that Alexander was the model which Constantine followed while founding the new capital of the Empire is not new, for it was referred to by Tierney as early as 1934, cf. M. Tierney, *Constantine the Great and His City*, “An Irish Quarterly Review” 23 (1934) p. 59-70. On the social status of *ktistes* and *conditor* in ancient Rome and on the Ptolemaic cult of Alexander-ktistes in Alexandria, see, for example, V. Györi, *The lituus and Augustan provincial coinage*, “Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae” 55 (2015) p. 52-59. On celebrating Alexandria’s anniversaries in the second half of the third century and on the cult of the city’s founder in the fourth century, see A. Wojciechowska – K. Nawotka, *The Reception of Alexander the Great in Roman, Byzantine and Early Modern Egypt*, in: *Brill’s Companion to the Reception of Alexander the Great*, ed. K.R. Moore, Leiden – Boston 2018, p. 427-433.

⁵⁹ Malalas, *Chronographia* VIII 1, p. 146; *Chronicon Paschale*, v. 1, p. 495; Georgios Monachos, *Chronicon*, v. 1, p. 25-26. On Malalas’ sources relating to the foundation of the Strategion and on medieval reception of this passage from Malalas, see C. Jouanno, *Byzantine Views on Alexander the Great*, in: *Brill’s Companion to the Reception of Alexander the Great*, ed. K.R. Moore, Leiden – Boston 2018, p. 464-465.

⁶⁰ Socrates Scholasticus, *Ecclesiastica historia* I 16, 1, cf. Socrate de Constantinople, *Histoire ecclésiastique*, v. 1, ed. P. Périchon – P. Maraval, SCh 477, Paris 2004, p. 172.

the *Patria*, the emperor had fetched from Chrysopolis an ancient statue of Alexander funded by his own soldiers and placed it on the Strategion⁶¹.

Although the patriographic texts written many centuries after the city's foundation are not fully reliable⁶², we have tangible evidence of Constantine's purposeful use of Hellenistic forms: rare tetradrachms with a profile portrait of the emperor in a diadem on the obverse and enthroned Tyche on the reverse. The coins issued in 330 to celebrate the dedication of Constantinople had no analogies in contemporary coinage but they evidently emulated (also in weight) the silver tetradrachms of the times of Alexander and his successors, who ascended Hellenistic thrones after the Diadochian wars⁶³. Modelled on the worshipped image of the founder of Alexandria, the statue of Constantine, towering above his forum, not only fitted perfectly into this Hellenistic narrative but also became its culmination, visible to

See also Berger, *Untersuchungen*, p. 408. For more on Strategion, its genesis and functions, see N. Westbrook, *Notes towards the Reconstruction of the Forum of the Strategion and Its related Roads in Early Byzantine Constantinople*, "Journal of the Australian Early Medieval Association" 9 (2013) p. 3-38, esp. p. 5-6.

⁶¹ *Scriptores originum* [II 59], p. 183. *Narrationes breves chronographicae*, § 69, p. 150 mentions a tripod with an image of Alexander displayed on the Strategion. Berger, *Untersuchungen*, 406-407 considers the legend implausible and suggests that the monument might have been identical with the equestrian statue of Constantine in the Strategion (cf. Cedrenus, *Compendium Historiarum*, v. 1, p. 563), although he is aware of the passage in *Short historical notes* referring to the inscription. Bardill, *Constantine*, p. 26, n. 64 believes that the story about the statue's origin might have been invented to remind of Constantine's warfare, for it was Chrysopolis where he routed Licinius' army.

⁶² On the credibility of early accounts of the foundation of Constantinople, see N. Lenski, *Constantine and the Tyche of Constantinople*, in: *Contested Monarchy: Integrating the Roman Empire in the Fourth Century AD*, ed. J. Wienand, Oxford 2015, p. 339-347; Berger, *Constantine's City*, p. 14-15.

⁶³ Ramskold, Lenski, *Constantinople's dedication*, p. 31-48, fig. 1-2, pl. 1-3; Lenski, *Constantine*, p. 330-338, fig. 16, 2-16, 3; 16, 5; 16, 7. Both scholars note that the imitation might have been intentional and point to the tetradrachms minted by Demetrius I Soter, who ruled Antioch in the years 162-150 B.C., as particularly similar to Constantine's coins. D. Woods, *Constantine's Tetradrachms*, "The Numismatic Chronicle" 176 (2016) p. 207-220 revises their findings, pointing out that the motif of Tyche on coins had no religious connotations, but was adopted from the Hellenistic era for the sake of political propaganda. At the same time, the scholar notes possible reasons for minting the tetradrachms other than the foundation of Constantinople: an antiquarian desire to preserve the imagery present on Hellenistic coins confiscated from temple treasuries and melted down on a massive scale, or an urge to refer to Alexander the Great in the emperor's eastern policy. Neither of them, however, seems entirely convincing. On early references to Alexander's coins in Constantine's monetary policy of the Trier period, see Bardill, *Constantine*, p. 11, fig. 3-4.

everyone and confirmative of the status of the emperor as the new Alexander – the founder of the capital bearing his name⁶⁴.

7. Conclusions

The identification of the figure on the Cammin cameo as the image of Constantine from his forum in Constantinople has some significant implications. Most of all, it changes our previous understanding of the imperial image as referring to pagan cults (Helios, Apollo) and allows us to interpret it mainly as a product of the political propaganda referring to the epitome of a perfect ruler which Alexander of Macedon was considered to be⁶⁵. Using the iconographic formula of Alexander-ktistes with a radiate nimbus around the head and other attributes – an aegis, a spear and perhaps the Palladion – adopted from an undoubtedly Hellenistic iconographic type⁶⁶, but

⁶⁴ The choice of Alexander as a pattern on which Constantine modelled his image of the founder of a new city obviously accords with the emperor's overall propaganda policy. Since a detailed discussion on this matter would go beyond the scope of this article, we will confine ourselves to presenting a few selected examples. In the military context, the two rulers were quite early compared to each other by an anonymous author of a panegyric speech delivered in Trier in 313 after the victory over Maxentius, see *XII Panegyrici Latini* XII 5, ed. R.A.B. Mynors, Oxford 1964, p. 274 (Constantine's good looks, too, are compared – by the author of a *Panegyric* from 310 – to those of a great king and Thesalian hero, undoubtedly Alexander, *XII Panegyrici Latini*, p. 198 [VI 17, 2]). Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, I 7-8 compares the Constantine's military victories to those of Cyrus and Alexander, cf. Eusebius, *Über das Leben Constantins*, ed. F. Winkelmann, in: Eusebius, *Werke*, Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller 7/1, Berlin – New York 1991, p. 17-18. See also Bardill, *Constantine*, p. 19, 87, 144, 293, 359-360, 371-372, 397.

⁶⁵ The use of bronze, instead of marble or chryselephantine, which were typically applied to religious sculptures, indicates the honorific character of the statue, see Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, p. 15-16, n. 6 and also p. 18, 25, 33, followed by Basset, *The urban image*, p. 203-204 and Yoncaci-Arslan, *Towards a new honorific column*, p. 125. Woods, *Constantine's Tetradrachms*, p. 214 emphasizes the propagandist, not religious, aspect of the Hellenizing images on Constantine's coins.

⁶⁶ The statue on which the image on the cameo was modelled – the type of Alexander in an aegis (Aigiochos) associated with the sculpture at his grave in Alexandria – has been preserved to our times in sixteen ancient copies of Egyptian provenience (cf. among others: bronzes at the British Museum, inv. no. 1922,0711.1 and at the Walters Museum in Baltimore, inv. no. 54.1075; marble statues at the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, inv. no. GR.69.1970; at the Louvre, inv. nos MND 947 and MND 1390; at the Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe in Hamburg, inv. no. 1963.74 and at the Musée des Beaux-Arts

over time already faded into oblivion as a model for the imperial statue lead to misunderstanding and misinterpretation⁶⁷. Both the medieval Greeks who wrote about the figure of the emperor on the porphyry column and modern researchers consider the presence of a radiate crown to be proof of the religious nature of the monument showing the emperor as Helios.

Malalas, George the Monk and Zonaras mention that the figure had been brought from Troy (incorrectly located by them in Phrygia), whereas

in Lyon; inv. no. E 501-27), see Stewart, *Faces of power*, p. 243-252, fig. 83; K. Parlasca, *Alexander Aigiochos: Das Kultbild des Stadtgründers von Alexandria in Ägypten*, "Städel-Jahrbuch, Neue Folge" 19 (2004) p. 340-462; C. Reinsberg, *Alexander-Porträts*, in: *Ägypten, Griechenland, Rom: Abwehr und Berührung*, ed. H. Beck – P.C. Bol – M. Bückling, Frankfurt 2005, p. 226-229, fig. 7 and 557-560 with catalogue notes: p. 126-129; A. Kühnen, *Die imitation Alexandri in der römischen Politik (1. Jh. v. Chr. bis 3. Jh. n. Chr.)*, Münster 2008, p. 19-20, 102-106; Trofimova, *Imitatio Alexandri*, p. 134, fig. 146-147. Unfortunately, none of the statues has survived to our times undamaged and the presence of the attributes – the spear and the Palladion – researchers can only presume from the hands' layout and the image on the lost gem from Cammin. On the cult of Alexander as the Egyptian god Ra and on the earliest representations of him as Helios (the metope from the Temple of Athena in Troy, ca. 300 B.C.), see B. Küllerich, *The Head Posture of Alexander the Great*, "Acta ad Archaeologiam et Artium Historiam Pertinentia" 29 (2017) p. 15-19. The question of *corona radiata* as an attribute of Hellenistic rulers, referring to Helios, and of its possible derivation from worshipped images of Alexander is discussed by Stewart, *Faces of power*, p. 197-198, 246-247: with reference to late copies of Alexander's image in the Aigiochos type, 334. E. Schwarzenberg, *The portraiture of Alexander*, in: *Alexandre le Grand*, ed. E. Badian – D.A.B. van Berchem – A.B. Bosworth et al, *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique* 22, Genève 1976, p. 235, n. 5; M. Moreno Dorka, *Imitatio Alexandri? Ähnlichkeitsrelationen zwischen Götter-sowie Heroenbildern und Porträts Alexanders des Großen in der griechisch-römischen Antike*, Rahden 2019, p. 173; M.B. Comstock – C.C. Vermeule, *Sculpture in Stone: the Greek, Roman and Etruscan Collections of the Museum of Fine Arts*, Boston 1976, p. 82, fig. 137A give examples of sculptures of Alexander-Aigiochos, with holes in their heads – the traces of a radiate halo (added in the Hellenistic period).

⁶⁷ Paradoxically the reason of abandoning of Alexander's pattern, popular among Roman politicians and emperors, can be explained by its replacement by the new model of the ideal Christian ruler, based actually on Constantine. On imitations and emulations of Alexander in Rome from Pompey the Great through Octavian August till Trajan and Caracalla – aroused in context of their Eastern wars cf. e.g. Kühnen, *Die imitation Alexandri*, p. 55-172. The idea of Byzantine emperors as New Constantines in early stage of its development (Marcian with Pulcheria, Tiberius II) analyses M. Whitby, *Images for emperors in late antiquity: a search for New Constantine*, in: *New Constantines: The Rhythm of Imperial Renewal in Byzantium, 4th-13th Centuries, Papers from the Twenty-sixth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, St Andrews. 1992*, ed. P. Magdalino, Aldershot 1994, p. 83-84, 89-92.

Michael Glycas claims it had originated in Heliopolis in Phrygia⁶⁸. The information about transferring the sculpture from one of the ancient cities, particularly from Ilion, associated with Alexander, or Heliopolis, linked with the cult of the Sun, was probably intended to imply that an older, Hellenistic sculpture had been reused, and as such it is interpreted by some modern scholars⁶⁹. However, the emperor on the cameo was depicted with his hair cropped short above his brow, with smoothly shaven cheeks and with a protruding jaw – the physiognomic features known from the portraits of Constantine on his arch in Rome, from the colossal statue from the Basilica of Maxentius (now in the Capitoline Museum; inv. no. MC0757), from a bronze head which is probably part of the colossus from the House of Fausta, funded to commemorate the emperor's *vicennalia* (Capitoline Museum, inv. no. MC1072), as well as from the bronze head from Niš (National Museum in Belgrade, inv. no. NMB 79 / IV) and from the depictions on coins⁷⁰. Assuming that the gem cutter faithfully rendered the emperor's features observed in the statue in Constantinople, one should reject the hypothesis that Constantine had reused an older *spolium* for his monument: a statue of long-haired Alexander the Great in particular⁷¹.

⁶⁸ Malalas, *Chronographia* XII 7, p. 246; Georgios Monachos, *Chronicon*, v. 2, p. 500; Zonaras, *Compendium Historiarum* XIII 3/25, v. 3, p. 18 (who also notes that it was a figure of Apollo); Michaelis Glycae, *Annales* IV, ed. I. Bekker, *Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae* 24, Bonn 1836, p. 464. *Chronicon Paschale*, v. 1, p. 528 mentions only that the bronze statue was brought from Phrygia, but does not name the exact place of its origin.

⁶⁹ Among those who support the hypothesis that Constantine used a *spolium* can be numbered Bergmann, *Der römische Sonnenkoloss*, p. 125; Bardill, *Constantine*, p. 112; Yoncaci-Arslan, *Registrars of Urban Movement*, p. 18 and Berger, *The Statues*, p. 9 (who however denies the credibility of Malalas' statement that the statue had been brought from Troy). T.D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, Harvard 1981, p. 222 represents a more balanced approach in stating that Constantine had had a statue of Apollo reshaped into his image.

⁷⁰ On portraits of Constantine, see, for example, L'Orange, *Studien zur Geschichte*, p. 15-46; E.B. Harrison, *The Constantinian Portrait*, DOP 21 (1967) p. 82-83, 90-95, fig. 1-4, 34-47; N. Hannestad, *Die Porträtskulptur zur Zeit Konstantins des Grossen*, in: *Konstantin der Grosse: Ausstellungskatalog*, ed. A. Demandt – J. Engemann, Trier – Mainz 2007, p. C-CIV, fig. 2, 7-11, 13, pl. I.8.6, I.8.3; Bardill, *Constantine*, p. 203-217, fig. 13, 25-27, 81-82, 134-135, 149. D.H. Wright, *The True Face of Constantine the Great*, DOP 41 1987, p. 493-507, discusses the question of Constantine's image being deliberately fashioned to serve his propaganda policy. Rather modest tradition of Constantine descriptions in literary sources is analysed by Marina Tortelli in Calza, *Iconografia romana imperiale*, p. 33-51.

⁷¹ As observed by Bardill, *Constantine*, p. 19, Constantine did not in every respect emulate Alexander: one of the examples is the emperor's different short-cut hairstyle.

Attempts to explain more literally the unusual form of the statue appear in Middle Byzantine sources. Symeon Logothete attributes the authorship of the sculpture to Phidias, whereas the *Patria* mention a figure of Apollo – called Helios – which Constantine set on a column as an image of himself⁷². Finally, Anna Comnena writes that although the statue actually represented Apollo, the citizens of the capital called it Anthelios (ἀντήλιος – facing the sun or reflecting the sunshine) and even after the emperor renamed it after himself, the name Anelios or Anthelios was still in general use⁷³. Pierre Gilles, a French envoy sent to Constantinople by King Francis I, combines both traditions when he speaks of an ancient statue of Apollo brought from Troy⁷⁴.

On the other hand, the iconographic form chosen by Constantine, misunderstood by posterity and misinterpreted as an image of the Christian emperor in the costume of a pagan deity, could have conducted to the invention of stories in which the column became an object of half Christian, half magical nature. The legend about the nails of the Holy Cross, which were reportedly set among the rays of the crown, seems to derive from the fifth-century account by Socrates Scholasticus, who makes mention of the relics of the Cross, sent from Jerusalem to Constantine by Helena and then placed inside the statue⁷⁵. Cedrenus and Rodius, in turn, inform us of twelve baskets hidden under the column, filled with the bread multiplied by Jesus in the desert⁷⁶. The *Patria* add to them the crosses on which the

On the Macedonian ruler's hairstyle (long flowing hair with a parting in the middle – ἀναστολή), see Stewart, *Faces of power*, p. 246; Moreno Dorca, *Imitatio*, p. 13, 21, 25, 35, 48-52, 62-64, 77-78, 81-82, 86, 89-90, 132-140, 147, fig. 14, 24, 38, 83, 86-89 et passim; Harrison, *The Constantinian Portrait*, p. 90-91, fig. 36-37 notes the presence of slightly longer hair in the later Constantinian coins from the eastern provinces of the Empire.

⁷² Symeon Logothete, *Chronicon* LXXXVIII 7, p. 109; *Scriptores originum* II 45, p. 174 (cf. also more detailed version preserved in *Cod. Kutlumus N 220 [= Athos 3293]* on fol. 172r, ed. S. Ivanov – V. Zharkaya, *The Unknown Version of "Patria Constantinoupo-leos"*, "Scrinium" 11 (2015) p. 221).

⁷³ See n. 38 above. For the etymology of the term 'Anthelios', see Berger, *Untersuchungen*, p. 299.

⁷⁴ Petrus Gyllius, *De Constantinopoleos topographia* III 3, p. 132.

⁷⁵ Socrates Scholasticus, *Ecclesiastica historia* I 17, 8-9, p. 178-180. On the relics of the Holy Nails, used in Constantine's radiate crown, see n. 43 above. Further in his narrative, Socrates mentions the nails from the Holy Cross, which – as he claims – Constantine used to make a horse's bit and fixed to his helmet. This mention may have inspired later authors to create a story about the Holy Nails placed in the radiate crown.

⁷⁶ Cedrenus, *Compendium Historiarum* v. 1, p. 564; Constantinus Rhodius, *Descriptio Urbis Constantinopolitanae* [v. 75-82], p. 22-24.

two thieves were crucified and a flacon with the oil which was used to anoint the body of Christ, and Nicephorus Callistus, active in the times of the Palaiologoi, adds the axe which Noah used to build his ark⁷⁷. In the accounts about the relics hidden under the monument's base, another legend seems to resound – the one about the Palladion stolen by Constantine from Rome and placed under the column⁷⁸.

The question of the statue's pagan connotations, raised by Byzantine authors, forces modern scholars to confront the task of explaining the reasons why Constantine, who had publicly been showing his devotion to Christianity since at least the year 326, would have had himself portrayed as Helios in such an exposed point of his new capital⁷⁹. Apart from attempts to justify the adoption of the form of a pagan deity in the image of the ruler by stressing the emperor's syncretic approach to religious issues⁸⁰, efforts have been made to Christianize the image itself by denying the presence of the solar attribute – the radiate nimbus⁸¹. Reconstruction based on the presumption that the statue on the column standing in the middle of the

⁷⁷ *Scriptores originum*, II 20, p. 161; Nicephorus Callistus, *Ecclesiastic History* VII 49, PG 145, 1325-1328. A detailed list has been provided by Karamouzi, *Das Forum*, p. 222-223, n. 19.

⁷⁸ The first to mention the Palladion hidden under the porphyry column in the Forum are Malalas, *Chronographia* XIII 7 and Procopius of Caesarea, *De bellis* VI 15, see Malalas, *Chronographia*, p. 246; Procopii Caesariensis, *Opera omnia*, v. 2, ed. J. Haury – G. Wirth, Leipzig 1963 p. 82. The information about the statuette hidden under the column is then repeated by *Chronicon Paschale*, v. 1, p. 528; *Scriptores originum* II 45, p. 174 (according to Kulumus manuscript it was brought from Troada) and Zonaras, *Compendium Historiarum* XIII 3/28, v. 3, p. 18, see also Basset, *The urban image*, p. 205-206 (with references to ancient sources on the statuette and with its reconstructed iconography). It cannot be ruled out that the legend was inspired by the figurine of Nike standing on the orb held by the statue of Constantine; its early replacement with *globus cruciger*, however, would make this hypothesis questionable.

⁷⁹ On Constantine's religious beliefs, according to his own declarations and official documents, see P. Maraval, *La religion de Constantin*, "Anuario de Historia de la Iglesia" 22 (2013) p. 17-36.

⁸⁰ See, for example, Bergmann, *Der römische Sonnenkoloss*, p. 121-122, 127-129.

⁸¹ Karayannopoulos, *Konstantin der Große*, p. 352, fig. 1, followed by Berger, *Untersuchungen*, p. 298, presumes that Constantine's head was crowned with a diadem (similar to that depicted on the statue from Niš), misinterpreted by later authors as *corona radiata*. Besides, Karayannopoulos notes that a spear in the statue's right hand was never associated with the iconography of Helios. Mango, *Constantine's Column*, p. 3-4 accepts the statue's identification as Constantine and notes that the first attempts to link it with Apollo or Helios can only be found in relatively late sources.

imperial forum invokes the visual formula of a ruler who is also a founder of a new city and whose myth was willingly used by the Roman emperors⁸², makes all these efforts pointless and allows us to read in the figure of Constantine a logical, coherent message associated with the propaganda of power and thus free of any straightforward references to ancient solar cults.

8. Epilogue

The Cammin cameo has been lost for over seventy-five years. Nonetheless, thanks to the photographs taken by Spuhrmann and Borchers as well as the plaster cast held at the University of Göttingen, its visual form has been preserved and we have thereby been offered a chance to look from a different angle at the problem of reconstructing the appearance and meaning of another lost work of art – in this instance irretrievably – namely the statue of Constantine on the porphyry column. It should be stressed that the value and significance of the sardonyx gem, as well as of the other lost items from the cathedral treasury, do not lie in the material from which it was made, but in the documentary aspect of the object, which is in all probability the only contemporary iconographic testimony offering a representation of the statue, which at one time towered over the city named after her founder. One can therefore hope that its rediscovery, when it finally occurs, will allow to study its stylistic features minutely and, in result, positively verify the hypotheses presented above.

Translation: Dariusz Wójtowicz

The Lost Cameo, the Vanished Statue of the Emperor and Constantine as a New Alexander

(summary)

The aim of this paper is to propose a reinterpretation of the meaning of the lost colossus of Constantine the Great from the Forum of his name in Constantinople, in the light of the iconography of the emperor on the cameo from the cathedral in the Pomeranian town of Cammin. Although the gem was lost during the last war, it is known to us thanks to archi-

⁸² Bergmann as early as 1997 pointed out that the statue may have functioned as an image of a ktistes (in this case the ktistes of Constantinople), commonly worshiped in the ancient world, but she did not link this fact with a specific iconographic type, cf. Bergmann, *Der römische Sonnenkoloss*, p. 125.

val photographs and the plaster cast housed at Göttingen University. On this basis, Gerda Bruns associated the jewel with the statue of Constantine on the porphyry column in the New Rome, and her identification has since been widely accepted by the scholarly milieu. In recent years one has been able to observe growing popularity of this interpretation among researchers, who however refrain in their studies from pointing to the consequences of such a reconstruction of the statue's form. The author of this paper points out that Constantine purposefully chose the iconographical type of Alexander-ktistes as a model for his own representation in order to allude to his great predecessor and the founder of a number of cities which bore his name. The iconography of the statue became then a part of the programme of the celebrations arranged on the occasion of the dedication of Constantinople, in which numerous references to Alexander played the key role. This new understanding of the colossus, placing its significance within the frames of political propaganda, better matches the actual historical circumstances and the ruler's attitude towards Christendom than traditional interpretations which recognised the statue as Helios or Apollo, and thus introduced an incoherence – difficult to explain – in Constantine's attitude towards the new religion. This cumbersome question, which baffled the inquisitive minds already in the Constantinople of the Byzantine era, will be considered unsubstantial if we correctly interpret the monument on the Forum solely in the political and propagandistic context.

Keywords: Cammin Cathedral; Constantine; Cameo; Constantinople; *Imitatio Alexandrii*

Zaginiona kamea, nieistniejący posąg cesarza i Konstantyn jako Nowy Aleksander

(streszczenie)

Celem niniejszego artykułu jest reinterpretacja znaczenia bezpowrotnie utraconego posągu Konstantyna z noszącego jego imię Forum w Konstantynopolu w świetle ikonografii cesarza na kamei z katedry w Kamieniu Pomorskim. Choć gemma ta zaginęła podczas ostatniej wojny, jej wygląd jest nam znany dzięki archiwalnym fotografiom i gipsowemu odlewowi przechowywanemu na Uniwersytecie w Getyndze. Na ich podstawie Gerda Bruns podjęła próbę połączenia wyobrażenia na klejnocie z rzeźbą cesarza na porfirowej kolumnie w Nowym Rzymie, a zaproponowana przez nią identyfikacja spotkała się z życzliwym przyjęciem w środowisku naukowym. W ostatnich latach można zaobserwować wzrastającą popularność owej interpretacji wśród badaczy, którzy jednak powstrzymują się w swoich pracach przed określeniem treści niesionych przez taką rekonstrukcję formy posągu. Autor artykułu stara się wykazać, że Konstantyn celowo sięgnął po ikonograficzny typ Aleksandra ktistesesa jako wzór dla własnego przedstawienia, czyniąc tym samym aluzję do swojego wielkiego poprzednika, a zarazem fundatora wielu miast noszących jego własne imię. Ikonografia posągu wpisała się tym samym w szerszy program uroczystości z okazji dedykacji Konstantynopola, w trakcie których rozliczne odniesienia do Aleksandra odgrywały istotną rolę. Proponowane nowe odczytanie przekazu niesionego przez posąg, lokalizujące jego znaczenie w ramach propagandy politycznej, znacznie lepiej pasuje do realiów epoki, a w szczególności do stosunku władcy wobec chrześcijaństwa, niż tradycyjne interpretacje wyobrażenia jako Heliosa lub Apollina, wprowadzające trudną do wytłumaczenia niespójność w postawie Konstantyna wobec nowej religii. Owa kłopotliwa kwestia, z którą borykały się już dociekliwe umysły średniowiecznych miesz-

kańców Konstantynopola, staje się nieistotna w momencie, gdy poprawnie zinterpretujemy pomnik na Forum wyłącznie w jego politycznym i propagandowym kontekście.

Słowa kluczowe: Katedra w Kamieniu Pomorskim; Konstantyn; kamea; Konstantynopol; *Imitatio Alexandrii*

Bibliography

Sources

- XII Panegyrici Latini*, ed. R.A.B. Mynors, Oxford 1964.
- Anna Comnena, *Alexias*, ed. D.R. Reinsch – A. Kambylis, *Corpus Fontium Byzantinae Historiae* 40, Berlin – New York 2001.
- Anonymus, *Narrationes breves chronographicae: Constantinople in the early eighth century: the Parastaseis syntomoi chronikai: introduction, translation, and commentary*, ed. Av. Cameron – J. Herrin, *Columbia Studies in Classical Tradition* 10, Leiden 1984.
- Chronicon Paschale ad exemplar Vaticanum*, ed. L. Dindorf, *Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae* 11, Bonn 1832.
- Constantinus Rhodius, *Descriptio Urbis Constantinopolitanae*, in: *Constantine of Rhodes, On Constantinople and the Church of the Holy Apostles*, ed. L. James – I. Vassis, Surrey – Burlington 2017.
- Des Thomas Kantzow *Chronik von Pommern in Hochdeutscher Mundart*, ed. G. Gaebel, Stettin 1897 (reprint: Norderstedt 2016).
- Eusebius Caesariensis, *Vita Constantini*, in: *Eusebius, Über das Leben Constantins*, in: *Eusebius Werke*, ed. F. Winkelmann, *Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller* 7/1, Berlin – New York 1991.
- Georgius Cedrenus, *Compendium Historiarum*, ed. I. Bekker, *Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae* 8, Bonn 1838.
- Georgii Monachi, *Chronicon*, v. 1-2, ed. C. de Boor, Leipzig 1904.
- Ioannis Malalae, *Chronographia*, ed. I. Thurn, *Corpus Fontium Byzantinae Historiae* 35, Berlin 2000.
- Ioannis Nikiou, *Chronicon*, in: *John of Nikiû, The Chronicle of John, Bishop of Nikiu*, tr. Zotenberg's Ethiopic Text R.H. Charles, London 1916.
- Ioannis Zonarae, *Epitome historiarum libri XVIII*, ed. M. Pinder, *Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae* 49, Bonn 1897.
- Johannes Tzetzes, *Historiarum variarum Chiliades*, ed. Th. Kiessling, Leipzig 1827.
- Michaelis Glycae, *Annales*, ed. I. Bekker, *Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae* 24, Bonn 1836.
- Nicephori Callisti Xanthopuli, *Ecclesiasticae historiae libri XVIII*, PG 145-147, Paris 1904.

- Philipp Hainhofers, *Reisetagebuch, enthaltend Schilderungen aus Franken, Sachsen, der Mark Brandenburg und Pommern im Jahr 1617*, ed. F.L. von Medem, "Baltische Studien" 2/2, Stettin 1834.
- Philostorgius, *Historia ecclesiastica*, in: Philostorgius, *Kirchengeschichte. Mit dem Leben des Lucian von Antiochien und den Fragmenten des arianischen Historiographen*, ed. J. Bidez – F. Winkelmann, Berlin 1981.
- Petrus Gyllius, *De Constantinopoleos topographia libri IV*, in: Pierre Gilles, *The Antiquities of Constantinople*, tr. J. Ball, ed. R.G. Musto, New York 1988.
- Plinius Secundus, *Historia naturalis libri XXXVII*, in: Pliny, *Natural History*, v. 2, ed. H. Rackham, London 1959.
- Procopius Caesariensis, *De bellis*, in: Procopii Caesariensis, *Opera omnia*, v. 2, ed. J. Haury – G. Wirth, Leipzig 1963.
- Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum*, ed. Th. Preger, Leipzig 1901 (cf. also S. Ivanov – V. Zharkaya, *The Unknown Version of "Patria Constantinoupoleos"*, "Scriinium" 11 (2015) p. 218-224).
- Socrates Scholasticus, *Ecclesiastica historia*, in: Socrate de Constantinople, *Histoire ecclésiastique*, v. 1, ed. P. Périchon – P. Maraval, SCh 477, Paris 2004.
- Strabo, *Rerum geographicarum*, in: *The Geography of Strabo*, v. 8, tr. H.L. Jones, London 1967.
- Symeon Magister et Logotheta, *Chronicon*, ed. S. Wahlgren, Corpus Fontium Byzantinae Historiae 44/1, Berlin – New York 2006.
- Vita Sancti Andreae sali: The Life of St. Andrew the Fool*, v. 1-2, tr. and ed. L. Rydén, Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Byzantina Upsaliensia 4/1-2, Uppsala 1995.
- Theophanis, *Chronographia*, v. 1-2, ed. C. de Boor, Leipzig 1883.
- Vita Constantini et Helenae: 'Un βίος di Costantino'*, ed. M. Guidi, "Rendiconti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei, Classe di Scienze Morali, Storiche e Filologiche, Serie quinta" 16 (1907) p. 306-340, 637-655.
- Vita Constantini et Helenae (epitome et narratio)*, in: F. Winkelmann, *Die älteste erhaltene gr. hagiographische Vita Konstantins und Helenas (BHG 365Z, 366, 366a)*, in: *Texte und Textkritik. Eine Aufsatzsammlung*, ed. J. Dummer, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 133, Berlin 1987, p. 623-638.

Studies

- Albu E., *Imperial Geography and the Medieval Peutinger Map*, "Imago Mundi" 57/2 (2005) p. 136-148.
- Albu E., *The Medieval Peutinger Map: Imperial Roman Revival in a German Empire*, Cambridge 2014.
- Amedick R., "Jesus Nazareus Rex Iudaeorum". *Hellenistische Königsikonographie und das Neue Testament*, in: *Picturing the New Testament. Studies in Ancient Visual Images*, ed. A. Weissenrieder – F. Wendt – P. von Gemünden, Tübingen 2005, p. 53-66.

- Aurea Roma: dalla città pagana alla città cristiana (Roma, Palazzo delle esposizioni, 22 dicembre 2000 – 20 aprile 2001)*, ed. S. Ensoli – E. La Rocca, Roma 2000.
- Bardill J., *Constantine, Divine Emperor of the Christian Golden Age*, New York 2012.
- Barnes T.D., *Constantine and Eusebius*, Harvard 1981.
- Basset S., *The urban image of late antique Constantinople*, Cambridge 2004.
- Bauer F.A., *Stadt, Platz und Denkmal in der Spätantike*, Mainz 1996.
- Bauer F.A., *Statuen hoher Würdenträger im Stadtbild Konstantinopels*, “Byzantinische Zeitschrift” 96 (2003) p. 493-514.
- Berger A., *Untersuchungen zu den Patria Konstantinupoleos, Poikila Byzantina* 8, Bonn 1988.
- Berger A., *Constantine’s City: the Early Days of a Christian Capital*, “Studia Ceranea” 10 (2020) p. 11-29.
- Berger A., *The Statues of Constantinople*, Cambridge 2021.
- Bergmann M., *Der römische Sonnenkoloss, der Konstantinsbogen und die Ktistes-statue von Konstantinopel*, “Jahrbuch Braunschweigische Wissenschaftliche Gesellschaft” 14 (1997) p. 111-130.
- Bergmann M., *Die Strahlen der Herrscher: theomorphes Herrscherbild und politische Symbolik im Hellenismus und in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Mainz 1998.
- Borchers W., *Der Camminer Domschatz*, Stettin 1933.
- Borchers W., *Kammin. Domschatz, Urkunden, Drucke, Ausstellungskatalog, Pommersches Landesmuseum Stettin 1.02-31.05.1938*, Stettin 1938.
- Bruns G., *Staatskameen des 4. Jahrhunderts nach Christi Geburt*, Winckelmannsprogramme der Archäologischen Gesellschaft zu Berlin 104, Berlin 1948.
- Calza R., *Iconografia romana imperiale: Da Carausio a Giuliano (287-363 d. C.)*, Quaderni e Guide di Archeologia 3, Roma 1972.
- Comstock M.B. – C.C. Vermeule, *Sculpture in Stone: the Greek, Roman and Etruscan Collections of the Museum of Fine Arts*, Boston 1976.
- Czejarek R., *Sekrety Pomorza Zachodniego*, Łódź 2017.
- Fowden G., *Constantine’s porphyry column: the earliest literary allusion*, “The Journal of Roman Studies” 81 (1991) p. 119-131.
- Grotowski P.Ł., *Arms and Armour of the Warrior Saints: Tradition and Innovation in Byzantine Iconography (843-1261)*, The Medieval Mediterranean 87, Leiden – Boston 2010.
- Györi V., *The lituus and Augustan provincial coinage*, “Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae” 55 (2015) p. 45-60.
- Hannestad N., *Die Porträtskulptur zur Zeit Konstantins des Grossen*, in: *Konstantin der Grosse: Ausstellungskatalog*, ed. A. Demandt – J. Engemann, Trier – Mainz 2007, p. XCVI-CXVII.
- Harms K., *Wo blieb der Cordula-Schrein? Ein kostbares Stück des Camminer Domschatzes – Im Treck 1945 verloren*, “Pommerschen Heimatkirche” 6 (1955) p. 4.
- Harrison E.B., *The Constantinian Portrait*, “Dumbarton Oaks Papers” 21 (1967) p. 81-96.

- Hatt J.-J., *Review: 'Staatskameen des 4. Jahrhunderts nach Christi Geburt'*, "Latomus" 10 (1951) p. 271-272.
- Holtz A., *Ist der Cordula-Schrein aus dem Domschatz Cammin verloren? Bericht und Dokumentation*, "Baltische Studien, Neue Folge" 52 (1966) p. 133-137.
- Jongkees, J.H., *De "apotheose Van Claudius" in Het Haagsche Penningkabinet*, "Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek" 4 (1952) p. 21-46.
- Jouanno C., *Byzantine Views on Alexander the Great*, in: *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Alexander the Great*, ed. K.R. Moore, Leiden – Boston 2018, p. 449-476.
- Jurkiewicz J.L., *Tajemnice Skarbca Katedry Kamieńskiej*, Stargard Szczeciński 2014.
- Karamouzi M., *Das Forum und die Säule Constantini in Konstantinopel: Gegebenheiten und Probleme*, "Balkan Studies" 27 (1986) p. 219-236.
- Karayannopoulos I., *Konstantin der Große und der Kaiserkult*, "Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte" 5 (1956) p. 341-357.
- Kiilerich B., *The Head Posture of Alexander the Great*, "Acta ad Archaeologiam et Artium Historiam Pertinentia" 29 (2017) p. 1-23.
- Kitzinger E., *Byzantine Art in the Making. Main Lines of Stylistic Development in Mediterranean Art 3rd-7th Century*, London 1977.
- Kochanek, P., *Vignette of Constantinople on the Tabula Peutingeriana. The Column of Constantine or the Lighthouse*, "Studia Ceranea" 9 (2019) p. 475-521.
- Kochanowska J., *Skarby katedry w Kamieniu Pomorskim*, Szczecin 2004.
- Kochanowska J., *Tajemnice Pomorza. Okolice, Tajemnice, Szlaki*, Szczecin 2004.
- Kunkel O., *Urgeschichte, Volkskunde, Landesgeschichte und Stadtkultur, kirchliche Kunst (Mitteilungen aus dem Pommerschen Landes-Museum)*, "Baltischen Studien, Neue Folge" 40 (1938) p. 308-309.
- Kühnen A., *Die imitatio Alexandri in der römischen Politik (1. Jh. v. Chr. bis 3. Jh. n. Chr.)*, Münster 2008.
- Lenski N., *Constantine and the Tyche of Constantinople*, in: *Contested Monarchy: Integrating the Roman Empire in the Fourth Century AD*, ed. J. Wienand, Oxford 2015, p. 330-352.
- Lichtenberger A., *Severus Pius Augustus: Studien zur sakralen Repräsentation und Rezeption der Herrschaft des Septimius Severus und seiner Familie (193-211 n. Chr.)*, Impact of Empire 14, Leiden – Boston 2011.
- L'Orange H.P., *Studien zur Geschichte des spätantiken Porträts*, Oslo 1933.
- L'Orange H.P., *Kleine Beiträge zur Ikonographie Konstantins des Großen*, "Opuscula Romana" 4 (1962) p. 101-105 (reprint in: H.P. L'Orange, *Likeness and Icon: Selected Studies in Classical and Early Medieval Art*, Odense 1973, p. 23-31).
- L'Orange H.P., *Das spätantike Herrscherbild von Diokletian bis zu den Konstantin-Söhnen: 284-361 n. Chr.*, Berlin 1984.
- Łuczak M., *Ewakuacja skarbcza kamieńskiego w 1945 roku. Próba analizy materiałów dotyczących poszukiwań utraconych zbiorów*, in: *Służby w ochronie dziedzictwa*

- sakralnego i archeologicznego Europy Wschodniej*, ed. M. Łuczak, Szczecin 2018, p. 29-50.
- Łuczak M., *The lost Kamień Treasury: a Catalogue of War Losses from the Cathedral in Kamień Pomorski*, Warszawa 2020.
- Mango C., *Constantinopolitana*, "Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts" 80 (1965) p. 305-336 (reprint in: C. Mango, *Studies on Constantinople*, Aldershot 1993, text II).
- Mango C., *Constantine's Column*, in: C. Mango, *Studies on Constantinople*, Aldershot 1993, text III, p. 1-6.
- Maraval P., *La religion de Constantin*, "Anuario de Historia de la Iglesia" 22 (2013) p. 17-36.
- Matthews J., *Viewing the Column of Arcadius at Constantinople*, in: *Shifting Cultural Frontiers in Late Antiquity*, ed. D. Brakke – D. Deliyannis, London – New York 2012, p. 212-223.
- Megow W.R., *Kameen von Augustus bis Alexander Severus*, Berlin 1987.
- Möbius H., *Römischer Kameo in Kassel*, "Archäologischer Anzeiger" 63/64 (1948/1949) p. 102-118.
- Möbius H., *Der Grosse Stuttgarter Kameo (zuseiner Veröffentlichung durch Marie-Louise Vollenweider)*, "Schweizer Münzblätter" 13-17 (1963-1967) p. 110-124.
- Moreno Dorka M., *Imitatio Alexandri? Ähnlichkeitsrelationen zwischen Götter-sowie Heroenbildern und Porträts Alexanders des Großen in der griechisch-römischen Antike*, Rahden 2019.
- Neal J., *The structure and function of ancient metrology*, in: *Wonders Lost and Found: A Celebration of the Archaeological Work of Professor Michael Vickers*, ed. N. Sekunda, Oxford 2020, p. 33-47.
- Neverov O., *Nero-Helios*, in: *Pagan Gods and Shrines of the Roman Empire*, ed. M. Henig – A. King, Oxford 1986, p. 189-194.
- Ousterhout R., *The life and afterlife of Constantine's Column*, "Journal of Roman Archaeology" 27 (2014) p. 304-326.
- Parlasca K., *Alexander Aigiochos: Das Kultbild des Stadtgründers von Alexandria in Ägypten*, "Städel-Jahrbuch, Neue Folge" 19 (2004) p. 340-462.
- Petersohn J., *Die Kamminer Bischöfe des Mittelalters*, Schwerin 2015.
- Ramskold L. – Lenski N., *Constantinople's dedication medallions and the maintenance traditions*, "Numismatische Zeitschrift" 119 (2012) p. 31-58.
- Reinsberg C., *Alexander-Porträts*, in: *Ägypten, Griechenland, Rom: Abwehr und Berührung*, ed. H. Beck – P.C. Bol – M. Bückling, Frankfurt 2005, p. 216-234.
- Salway B., *The Nature and Genesis of the Peutinger Map*, "Imago Mundi" 57 (2005) p. 119-135.
- Schwarzenberg E., *The portraiture of Alexander*, in: *Alexandre le Grand*, ed. E. Badian – D. A.B. van Berchem – A.B. Bosworth *et al*, Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique 22, Genève 1976, p. 223-278.

- Smith R.R.R., *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, Oxford 1988.
- Spuhrmann R., *Der Camminer Dom*, Cammin in Pom. 1915.
- Stepanova E., *Victoria-Nike, on Early Byzantine Seals*, "Studies in byzantine Sigillography" 10 (2010) p. 15-24.
- Stewart A., *Faces of power: Alexander's image and Hellenistic politics*, Hellenistic Culture and Society 11, Berkeley – Los Angeles – Oxford 1993.
- Stewart A., *Alexander in Greek and Roman Art*, in: *Brill's Companion to Alexander the Great*, ed. J. Roisma, Boston 2003, p. 31-66.
- Talbert R.J.A., *Rome's world: the Peutinger map reconsidered*, Cambridge 2010.
- Tantillo I., *L'impero della luce. Riflessioni su Costantino e il sole*, "Mélanges de l'école française de Rome" 115 (2003) p. 985-1048.
- Tierney M., *Constantine the Great and His City*, "An Irish Quarterly Review" 23/89 (1934) p. 59-70.
- Trofimova A., *Imitatio Alexandri in Hellenistic Art. Portraits of Alexander the Great and Mythological Images*, Roma 2012.
- Westbrook N., *Notes towards the Reconstruction of the Forum of the Strategion and Its related Roads in Early Byzantine Constantinople*, "Journal of the Australian Early Medieval Association" 9 (2013) p. 3-38.
- Whitby L.M., *The Great Chronographer and Theophanes*, "Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies" 8 (1982) p. 1-20.
- Whitby M., *Images for emperors in late antiquity: a search for New Constantine*, in: *New Constantines: The Rhythm of Imperial Renewal in Byzantium, 4th-13th Centuries, Papers from the Twenty-sixth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, St Andrews. 1992*, ed. P. Magdalino, Aldershot 1994, p. 83-93.
- Wojciechowska A. – Nawotka K., 'The Reception of Alexander the Great in Roman, Byzantine and Early Modern Egypt', in: *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Alexander the Great*, ed. K.R. Moore, Leiden – Boston 2018, p. 427-448.
- Woods D., *Constantine's Tetradrachms*, "The Numismatic Chronicle" 176 (2016) p. 207-220.
- Wright D.H., *The True Face of Constantine the Great*, "Dumbarton Oaks Papers" 41 (1987) p. 493-507.
- Yoncaci-Arslan P., *Towards a new honorific column: The column of Constantine in early Byzantine urban landscape*, "Middle East Technical University Journal of the Faculty of Architecture" 33 (2016) p. 121-145.
- Yoncaci-Arslan P., *Registrars of Urban Movement in Constantinople: Monumental Columns and the Mese*, "Annual of Istanbul Studies" 7 (2018) p. 7-29.

Figures



Figure 2. Emperor in an aegis, sardonyx cameo from the cathedral treasury in Cammin, photo taken in 1938 (from the archive of the National Museum in Szczecin, acc. No. 6386).



Figure 1. Gothic cross-pax with the ancient cameo (lost) from the cathedral treasury in Cammin, photo taken 18. 12. 1934 (from the archive of the National Museum in Szczecin, acc. No. 6697A).



Figure 4. Alexander-ktistes, bronze statuette, Alexandria, first century A.D., the British Museum (formerly in D. M. Fouquet collection), © The Trustees of the British Museum.



Figure 3. Plaster cast of the Cammin cameo, the Archaeological Institute of the University of Göttingen, photo by Stephan Eckardt, © Archäologisches Institut der Universität Göttingen.



Figure 5. Vignette of Constantinople on *Tabula Peutingeriana* (*Codex Vindobonensis* 324), first quarter of the thirteenth century (?), photo by the author.



Figure 6. Forum of Constantine depicted on the column of Arcadius, drawing by Lambert de Vos (?), ca. 1574, *Freshfield Album*, Cambridge, Trinity College Library, Ms. O. 17.2., photo: <https://mss-cat.trin.cam.ac.uk/Manuscript/O.17.2> (accessed: 15.07.2022).