A hallmark of seventeenth-century portraiture was the simultaneous existence of highly original artistic solutions and, alongside this, an unprecedented number of imitations, replications and copies. While the increase in the latter can partly be explained by technical innovations in the production and diffusion of every kind of imagery, some of the most fascinating and, at the same time, provoking cases of images being constantly re-used were motivated by more complex reasons, some of which will be discussed in this paper. I will explore examples of both material re-use, i.e. the integration of physical parts of the old work into the new, and of the use of forms or compositions by way of copying and imitation. The first part of the text analyses the recurring references to visual and literary models of “Roman” virtue and dynastic succession in the self-representations of early-seventeenth-century nobility. I then turn to the influence exerted on late-sixteenth- and seventeenth-century portraiture by a number of free imitations of classical Roman monuments, the Twelve Emperors on Horseback. The paper will conclude with an examination of how portraits in the “Roman style” were used in representations of the French king Louis XIV and explain why this kind of imagery was suddenly criticised.

In 1590, a monument was commissioned by the city of Rome in honour of Alessandro Farnese, Il Gran Capitano, who in 1585 had reconquered Antwerp for the Habsburg dynasty and thus saved the city for the Catholic Church. The sculpture was placed in the so-called Sala dei Capitani at the Palazzo dei Conservatori on the Capitoline Hill. It consists of the torso of a classical Roman statue representing a military commander, with the modern portrait head of Alessandro added by the sculptor Ippolito Buzio.1 Alessandro’s statue was not the last of these assemblages of ancient and modern parts to be displayed in the room. In 1630, for example, the city’s governing council decreed that a similar monument be erected to the recently deceased general Carlo Barberini (Fig. 1). On this occasion, another classical Roman torso was joined to a portrait head produced by Gianlorenzo Bernini, while Alessandro Algardi contributed the arms and legs.2

Why did the city of Rome order this kind of patchwork imagery when it could have had complete statues made by Buzio, Bernini or Algardi? The most obvious explanation, of course, is time and money: with the largest segment of the sculpture already supplied in the form of the classical torso, the artists had less work to do and could charge only a fraction of the sum that would normally have been due for a more than life-size marble statue. However, the combination of ancient and modern sculpture certainly also served to draw attention to the continuity of ancient and modern Rome, thus enhancing the prestige and authority of the latter. In this context, Carlo Barberini’s statue not only stressed the permanence of Roman virtue, it also carried on a tradition established by the older, sixteenth-century statues in the same room. As time went by, the Sala dei Capitani was filled with more monuments to Roman citizens of merit. Each statue constituted a new point of reference to the previous one, while the whole group presented the city as a worthy successor to the great military and civic traditions of ancient Rome. Even the military uniformity of these figures (with the exception of the heads) made
them part and parcel of one great tradition. This intensification of a person’s merit or authority by placing him or her within the framework of historic imagery was far from new. In fact, it dates back to classical Rome: thus, the Triumphal Arch decreed by the Senate in honour of Emperor Constantine in 313 was adorned with reliefs and statues taken from monuments built previously for various of his victorious predecessors.³

In the seventeenth-century, the Roman nobility’s desire to legitimise its position in society by representing their virtuous ancestors was reflected in other works of art. The prestigious statues in the Sala dei Capitani must have shed such a favourable light on some of the most powerful noble families resident in Rome that at least one of them commissioned a private, more luxurious and complex version of the Capitoline sculptures for its own family palazzo: Simone Moschino’s entirely new statue, which today stands in Caserta, depicts Alessandro Farnese as a classical Roman commander placing his foot on a personification of the river Scheldt, whilst an allegorical representation of Victory crowns him with laurel. Odoardo and Ranuccio Farnese further propagated this image of their father as a paragon of Roman military glory by commissioning Francesco Villamena to make an engraving of the statue (Fig. 2) once the monument had been erected, i.e. in 1600.⁴

Other noble families not represented in the Sala dei Capitani were determined, nonetheless, to have their share of “Roman” glory: another – undated – engraving by Villamena (Fig. 3) shows a pompous monument to six soldiers, all of them members of the Orsini family, victoriously triumphing over various defeated enemies, most of whom can be identified by their turbans as Turks or Arabs. In the centre, a personification of Victorious Rome (Roma victrix) is shown sitting on a high pedestal, while an inscription on the plinth of the central group contains a dedication by the senate and people of Rome to the heroic Orsini. There is, however, no evidence that any such sculptural monument was ever made. As a matter of fact, a life-size group of such complexity would have been too expensive for even the wealthiest patrons. Contrary to what the dedication suggests, however, the print may well have been an attempt by the Orsini family to solicit the inclusion of a public monument to one of their heroes in the Sala dei Capitani – or (more probably) the Orsini wanted to impress a wider public with the artistic merits of a print representing Orsini grandeur, just as the Farnese had done before them. Not surprisingly, Villamena’s suggestive print was imitated more than once, e.g. by Edme Moreau, an engraver active in Reims until around 1650.⁵

Moreau meticulously copied (Fig. 4) most of the Villamena original, but changed the faces, turning the Orsini generals into a group of French military heroes, the one on the left representing (according to the inscription on the pedestal) Geoffroy de Bouillon, the Christian crusader who conquered Jerusalem in 1099. Few of Moreau’s compatriots would have

1. Classical Sculptor with additions by Gianlorenzo Bernini and Alessandro Algardi, General Carlo Barberini (Rome, Palazzo dei Conservatori)
known that his composition had originally been dedicated to the Orsini. However, Villamena’s mode of quoting from ancient sculpture and contemporary portraiture offered Moreau the perfect formulas for the representation of a related topic, as he himself wished to celebrate visually a number of national military leaders who had fought against Turks and Arabs.

Similar engraved groups of “virtual” statues representing illustrious ancestors were used by (or on behalf of) several noble Roman families to underline their claims to an important position in local society. Camillo Cungi’s Sculpture Hall (Fig. 5) was either commissioned by or dedicated to the Giustiniani family, whose Roman branch was recent and could not boast any prominent military leader. Unlike the Orsini print, the pedestals in Cungi’s work are filled with statues of high-ranking Giustiniani clerics and officials arranged around a three-dimensional rendering of the family’s coat of arms. In a rather bold move, a sculpture of the Roman Emperor Justinian was added - his name also providing a convenient and prestigious etymology for “Giustiniani”. The inscription in the frieze proclaims that the virtue of the family, as exemplified by its members, will bear the Giustiniani to immortality. Each of them, as represented by Cungi, is thus an embodiment of virtue, possessing a quality that has earned him, if not yet a real statue, at least a “virtual” one, in an engraving.

In medieval and early modern Europe, genealogy was an important means of legitimation in addition to a person’s or family’s actual military and financial powers. If families had no Roman ancestors at all, they could either invent them or acquire images of the First Twelve Roman Emperors in the tradition of Suetonius’ Vitae Caesarum, in the hope that some of the Caesars’ prestige would rub off on their own. This strategy, of course, predated the seventeenth century and was adopted far beyond the city walls of Rome. Originally, when Francesco Petrarca filled his copy of Suetonius with portrait drawings of the Caesars from classical coins, antiquarian interests may have dominated. Coins continued to serve as models for many Quattrocento portraits of the Roman Emperors in marble, bronze, majolica, and manuscript illuminations. However, the authoritative function of these images soon tended to outweigh purely historiographic intentions. As early as in 1453, Giovanni de’ Medici outfitted his studio with the portrait busts of the Twelve Emperors, and Ercole d’Este decorated the façade of the Palazzo Ducale in Ferrara with a series of Roman Emperors in 1471/72. Andrea Fulvio’s ILLVSTRVM IMAGINES (1517), which contains many images of Roman Emperors, begins with the author’s assertion that the ancient Romans placed images of great politicians and rulers (imagines praestantissimorum) in the atrium of their houses to serve as paragons of excellence. Immediately afterwards, he mentions the classical custom – as attested by Varro – of having images of philosophers...
and other writers in one’s library. Fulvio thus equated the positive effects of constantly looking at (rather than just reflecting on) great examples of political and intellectual virtue: “per bonorum exempla aemulationis studio paulatim incensa tantorum virtus eluxit”.

Virtue, indeed, was at the centre of a concept that encompassed a wide range of artistic means to stress the authority of a certain ruler or to point out the public benefits of dynastic succession. A condensed visualisation of this idea can be found in Pierre Perret’s portrait (Fig. 6) of the young Infante Charles of Austria (1607–1732), the son of King Philip III of Spain. The print was produced as a frontispiece to the Epitome
de la vida i hechos del Invicto Emperador Carlos V by Juan Antonio de Vera y Zúñiga, published in Madrid in 1622. A copy of Juan Antonio’s book, which is inscribed EPIT. CAR. V, can be seen lying on the table next to the Infante. Charles of Austria is standing in full armour and looking up at a portrait of his namesake, Emperor Charles V, who is also shown in armour. The top of the frame of the Emperor’s portrait carries the inscription VIRTVTEM EX ME. Significantly, the verb is missing and the addressee remains unspecified. The beholder can understand the phrase as a personal message from Charles V to the reader and/or as a message from the Emperor to his progeny as represented by Perret, filling in “accepi [you have received your virtue from me]” or “accipe [receive your virtue from me]”, as the case may be. The print thus reflects on the contemporary notion of dynastic virtue being handed down from one generation to the next, while it also elegantly promotes the book for which it was made as an illustration, signalling that the Infante needs the information contained in it so as to match the political and military achievements of his famous great-grandfather.

While Charles of Austria was thus the book’s “ideal” reader, the text was also intended for a wider public – a public preparing itself to judge the degree to which the Infante lived up to the standards defined by his ancestor. In this sense, dynastic virtue was not only a benefit, but could also turn out to be an obligation or even a burden.

While the Perret is a kind of short summary of these ideas, the pompous cenotaph of Emperor Maximilian I (1459–1519) in the Hofkirche of Innsbruck displays the period’s full range of hereditary virtue.
of opportunities in the visualisation of virtue. The tomb's original appearance as planned during the Emperor's lifetime remains open to debate, and Maximilian I was not even buried there. However, later in the sixteenth century, a sumptuous construction consisting of twenty-eight bronze statues of Maximilian's actual and "spiritual" ancestors (among them Geoffroy de Bouillon), personifications of virtues, marble reliefs with scenes from his life and twenty-one bronze busts of Roman Emperors starting with Julius Caesar was erected in the church (Fig. 7). It is known that the Roman Emperors by Jörg Muskat and his workshop were based on the model of coins chosen by the famous humanist Konrad Peutinger. While a life-size representation of Maximilian kneeling in prayer was placed on top of the Innsbruck cenotaph in the late sixteenth century, it is far from clear if this portrait was part of the original concept. If the Emperor himself did in fact plan this, then Maximilian I will have wanted to integrate himself visually into his "gallery" of virtuous ancestors and classical Roman Emperors, thus stressing both the long succession of the Habsburg dynasty and the great tradition on which the office of Emperor could look back. However, a similar notion of dynastic continuity and "Roman" authority would have conveyed itself to the visitors even without a direct inclusion of Maximilian's portrait, as all the bronze figures would have been assembled around his tomb.

Lavishly illustrated publications in homage to the Habsburg family, such as Francesco Terzio's Imagines Gentis Austriacae (1559), propagated and popularised the imperial concept of dynastic succession as a foundation of political power. Not surprisingly, several commissions of cycles of Roman Emperors in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are demonstrably related to this kind of ideology. In Augsburg and Nuremberg, the Fugger and Imhoff families thus stressed their ties with the Habsburgs, either expecting to host the Emperor or having been honoured by his visit. In ordering a similar set of portraits, social climbers such as the Rieters in Nuremberg announced to the public that their house was likewise ready for an imperial visit. The Rieter cycle consisted of the classical Suetonian dozen and was an addition to the decoration of the famous Hirs vogelsaal erected earlier in the sixteenth century. Each of the busts was placed on the top of a painted scene from the same Emperor's life.

When Maximilian I of Wittelsbach added a new wing to his Munich Residenz, which was designated to host the Habsburg Emperors and other important guests during their visits to the town, he did not miss the chance to equip these rooms, the Kaiserzimmer, with busts of the Twelve Roman Emperors. He also decided to embellish the stairs leading to the apartment, the Kaisertreppe, with niches in which life-size representations of some of his most important ancestors, among them Charlemagne, can be seen. By tracing his family back to the latter, Maximilian I was at pains to display the time-honoured traditions of his family, especially wishing to emphasize to the Habsburg Emperors that they shared the same illustrious family roots with the Wittelsbachs. These efforts were not in
vain, as Emperor Ferdinand II, who must have been impressed with the “Roman” grandeur of the Kaiserzimmer and Kaisertreppe (and the financial means of his cousin Maximilian I), granted him electoral status in 1623.

A print by the Munich-based engraver Raphael Sadeler II (1584–1632) based on an invention of the little-known painter Thomas Hoffmann of ca. 1625–29 (Fig. 8) shows that other members of the Wittelsbach family made a similar use of the concept of dynastic succession: probably following models such as Cungi's Giustiniani allegory (Fig. 5), Sadeler’s work literally turns a gathering of some of the most important Wittelsbach ancestors into a gallery of statues starting from Emperor Ludwig IV of Bavaria (1294–1347) and ending with Duke Albrecht VI (1584–1666), the brother of Maximilian I. In the upper middle section, two winged putti and a female personification sitting on a chariot (probably a personification of Majesty) hold shields inscribed with the names of three of the five children of Albrecht Bavarici. The print appears to have been published at a time when Albrecht’s brother Maximilian I did not yet have any children of his own – the latter’s first son was born as late as in 1638. Sadeler’s print was thus a clear (if somewhat inelegant) attempt to signal that Albrecht’s numerous progeny were ready to guarantee the survival of the glorious and “virtuous” Wittelsbach dynasty: ET ADHVC SPES DVRAT AVORVM.18

As we have seen, the mise-en-scène of Roman virtue in the Kaiserzimmer and of the Wittelsbach dynastic succession in the Kaisertreppe relied heavily on classical or pseudo-classical sculpture. Sadeler’s print is a manifestation of the same preference for the celebration of dynastic virtue using the medium of stone. Even the decorative scheme adopted
by the Rieter family in Nuremberg mentioned above, i.e. the twelve busts of a Roman Emperor combined with a painted scene from his vita, tried to achieve the effect of stone.\textsuperscript{19} Probably in order to stress the “monumentality” of the room, the narratives were painted in monochromes, thus imitating relief sculpture. However, as Tacke has demonstrated, the decoration of the Rieter \textit{Saal} was inspired by a visual tradition that encompassed other media as well.\textsuperscript{20} While the immediate models of the Rieter monochromes were contemporary prints by Adriaen Collaert based on Jan van der Straet alias Giovanni Stradano (1523–1605), their combination with portraits of the Roman Emperors ultimately derives from a standard created in sixteenth-century Mantua. In the 1530’s, Federico II Gonzaga commissioned Titian to paint half-length portraits of the Twelve Roman Emperors for the so-called Camerino dei Cesari in his palace. The Gonzaga, needless to say, were another family with close ties to the Habsburg court.\textsuperscript{21} The pictures, today destroyed, were praised by the painter’s contemporaries for the great care with which he had studied ancient monuments and coins to achieve an “authentic” rendering of each personality.\textsuperscript{22} In the Camerino dei Cesari, Titian’s pictures were combined with paintings by Giulio Romano and his workshop representing scenes from each Emperor’s life and – another important innovation – with
his image on horseback (Fig. 9). The whole decorative system of the Camerino is recorded in drawings by Ippolito Andreani. Numerous painted copies were made of Titian's pictures.23 One such set is recorded in the Residenz in Munich, another was in the possession of Emperor Rudolph II in Prague.24 In the Palazzo Farnese in Rome, copies of Titian's Roman

Emperors (attributed to Annibale Carracci in a seventeenth-century inventory) were hung in the so-called Sala deli Imperatori around 1600, where they joined classical and Renaissance portrait busts of the same personalities from the family collection.25 The copies based on Titian's series that were owned by Rudolph II were reproduced by Aegidius Sadeler in a series of engravings (Fig. 10).26 It has already been noted that a printed portrait of Rudolph II in armour by Sadeler shows him in the same fashion as Titian's Emperors. The engraver thus visually compared Rudolph II to his famous predecessors.27

Suetonius had defined each Emperor's character by describing both his bodily features and his deeds. This literary tradition can account for the ease with which Jan van der Straet synthesized the three different types of pictures created for the famous Camerino dei Cesari, i.e. half-length “character” portraits of Roman Emperors, triumphal representations of Emperors on horseback and narrative scenes, thus creating images in which each Emperor’s portrait on horseback and one or more historic events from his life are combined. Stradano’s drawings served as models for an engraved series of the Twelve Roman Emperors on Horseback published in Antwerp by Adriaen Collaert ca. 1590; copies of Collaert's prints by Raffaello Guidi were issued in Rome not long after.28 The prints based on Stradano (Fig. 11) show monuments to each Emperor on a high pedestal decorated with narrative scenes, while huge architectural or landscape backgrounds provide a lot of additional space for the rendering of other episodes from his life. In the lower border, the Emperor’s name and Latin verses contain some more (moralizing) information on the personalities and histories represented.

The Collaert prints must have been the immediate models for a similar series etched

10. Aegidius Sadeler (after Titian), Augustus (private collection)

11. Adriaen Collaert (after Giovanni Stradano) Galba on Horseback (private collection)
in 1595/96 by Antonio Tempesta, Stradano’s pupil. Tempesta imitated the basic elements, but avoided the crowded compositions of his teacher by reducing the high pedestals to mere plinths and completely removing the narrative background scenes. Even the Latin legends are left out; only the names remain. This enhanced sense of ‘Roman’ simplicity appears to be the main reason for Tempesta’s Emperors enjoying greater popularity than those of Stradano in the seventeenth century.

Tempesta dedicated the Roman Emperors on Horseback to the historian Giacomo Bosio (1544–1627). Giacomo was the uncle of Antonio Bosio, the famous founding figure of Christian archaeology. Several paintings by the artist are mentioned in the inventory of Giacomo’s and Antonio’s collection. The frontispiece of the Emperors on Horseback (Fig. 12) carries the address of the print publisher Battista Panzera. Crowned by the Bosio coat of arms and the family motto SICVT FLAMMA CORVSCAT, the text of the print’s dedication is flanked by two winged female creatures whose bodies end in acanthus leaves. In his introduction, the artist mentions that he has already dedicated his Plan of Rome to Bosio. As he points out, his images of the Twelve Roman Emperors are a logical continuation of the Plan of Rome, because the Ceasars’ power once dominated both the city (urbs) and the whole world (universus orbis). While it is now up to other nations to rule the different parts of the globe, he argues, the former capital of the Roman empire has found a new physical shape and serves a different purpose – he obviously means Rome’s function as the capital of Christianity. Time, the master of all things (rerum omnium domitor), has reduced the former importance of the Emperors, those political giants of antiquity, to their good or bad fame. The virtuous among them, he continues, have suffered less from death and destruction than the others because they live on in the glory of their virtue. According to Tempesta, his dedicatee and patron Bosio can consider himself equally happy, because his virtue and generosity are so enormous that, as was the case
with the virtuous among the Roman Emperors, Bosio is almost immortal. Under these terms, Tempesta implies, the medium from which future generations will learn of Bosio’s virtue is the present product of his own activities as a printmaker.

While Tempesta’s last sentence smacks all too much of artistic self-promotion, his dedication as such propagates the Twelve Roman Emperors as a speculum virtutis. In other words, the beholder is invited to draw conclusions from the appearance of each Emperor and, by comparing the images with literary sources describing each person’s morality and character, he will be able to judge the extent of each one’s virtue. Does the artist keep his promise? Some general features appear to facilitate a reading in terms of character analysis: each of Tempesta’s Roman Emperors on Horseback is isolated and literally ready for inspection, as he is shown on a small plinth and without any indication of a background. In contrast to Stradano, most of the Emperors ride on a parallel line to the picture surface or are only slightly turned inwards. Some of the horses, for example that of Julius Caesar, are shown rearing (Fig. 13). Significantly, the only horse that is not moving at all is that of Augustus (Fig. 14). Augustus, moreover, is the only Emperor whose face is represented frontally. With the exception of Julius Caesar (who has his customary laurel wreath), all Emperors wear richly decorated uniforms and helmets, and most of the horses are similarly adorned. While with Stradano these decorative elements are generally less obtrusive, Tempesta’s sequence displays a growing tendency towards extravagance in the garb of horses and riders, starting with Tiberius (Fig. 15). Claudius is shown as a somewhat exotic — soldier, but Galba (Fig. 16) resembles an overdressed actor who does not really convey any ability to fight for his country. Similar observations apply to the eccentricity of Galba’s murderer and successor Otho, whose horse is shown rearing just like Julius Caesar’s, although this comparison is entirely to Otho’s disadvantage. A climax of ridiculous pomp and
arrogance is reached in *Domitian* (Fig. 17), the last Emperor of the series. It is no accident that in some of these cases the face of the horse looks more intelligent than that of the rider.

Tempesta’s series is not a mere compilation of archaeological findings or historic facts. The artist appears to have digested basic information about the characters or deeds of the Emperors, but he tried to visualize their character without showing any deeds. This new approach accounts for much of the exaggerated costumes and caricature-like aspect of the faces, to which he must have been inspired by ornamental prints and designs for court festivals in the manner of Rosso Fiorentino.\(^3\) As Stradano had done (Fig. 11), Tempesta counted on his beholders being aware of the classical “prototypes” produced in the Emperors on Horseback scheme such as the bronze statue of *Marcus Aurelius* on the Capitoline Hill and a number of coins representing similar monuments.\(^3\) Moreover, a residue of Stradano’s witty concept of representing the Roman Emperors on Horseback as sculptures of Roman Emperors on Horseback is conserved in Tempesta’s small plinths under each Emperor’s horse. However, the connection with the text by Suetonius is much looser in Tempesta than in Stradano’s crowded compositions. It is enough to mention that Tempesta’s fantastic helmets cover one of the Emperors’ most characteristic features: their hair or – as the case may be – their baldness, both of which Suetonius tends to describe at great length. Moving away from Stradano’s rendering of the *res gestae*, Tempesta has drawn his *Emperors* with the same playfulness and irony that informs his *Praemium Virtutis* in the Sala Vecchia degli Svizzeri in the Vatican, a Roman soldier standing on a pedestal who resembles an old drunkard rather than a personification of *Merit*.\(^3\)

Tempesta did not always opt for the kind of blank background he used in his *Roman Emperors*. When representing the *Monument to Cosimo de’ Medici on Horseback* (Fig. 18),\(^3\) he placed Giambologna’s famous bronze statue on a high pedestal in front of an imaginary battle scene (rather than showing it on the Piazza della Signoria in Florence). For once fully adopting the provoking scheme of different “layers” of
reality with which Stradano had experimented in his *Emperors on Horseback* series (Fig. 11), Tempesta thus tried to enhance and to make more concrete the glory of Cosimo’s military achievements. However – as the pedestal of the statue is quite dominant – the “reality” of the battle scene is relegated to the background while the presence of the work of art becomes almost overpowering.

Tempesta’s etching, *King Henry IV of France on Horseback in a Battle* (Fig. 19), in which the French monarch and his galloping horse are represented without a pedestal or a plinth, appears not to have been influenced by the popular sculpture paradigm that pervades so many of the period’s representations of political and military leaders. Henry IV is shown during an unspecified military action. The composition stresses his energy and military power and conveys a less distancing image than that of Tempesta’s Cosimo de’ Medici on his high pedestal. However, even in this case the artist made use of another established iconographic scheme dating back to at least Titian’s *Charles V at Mühlberg* (Fig. 20). The mechanics of this kind of visual allusion can be further studied in a composition by Adriaen de Vries, who combined Titian’s and Tempesta’s images to create a portrait engraved by Aegidius Sadeler of *Rudolph II on Horseback in a Battle* (Fig. 21). The print celebrates the Emperor as a military leader in the tradition of Charles V, but places him in the midst of a battlefield whereas his ancestor had been alone in a landscape. In Sadeler’s image, *Rudolph II*, who is generally remembered as a peace-loving monarch, has an active role in an important military event. This fact alone appears to have been intended to convey an important message. Characteristically, we can form no clear idea of the precise circumstances of the event represented without additional information, i.e. without consulting the legend in the lower border, where Rudolph’s military engagement against the Turks is described.  

It is well known that Giambologna’s small bronze portrait of *Emperor Rudolph II on Horseback* (Fig. 22) exists in another version, which differs only in the fact that the rider’s head is that of King Henry IV of France. While the formulas of imperial dignity remained the same, the individual features of a contemporary ruler could thus be replaced. Because Tempesta’s *Twelve Roman Emperors on Horseback* served a similar purpose, they are among the most successful and influential prints that the artist ever produced. Their undefined setting appears to have contributed to the enormous success of the series, as it offered artists the opportunity to use the prints as models for a wide range of different images. An enormous number of originals and copies have been preserved. More than a dozen sets of printed copies and free variants (Fig. 23) were made all over Europe, and several painted versions exist. Emperors based on Tempesta were produced as far away from Rome as in the workshop of Francisco Zurbarán and even travelled from there to Mexico and South America. Unlike the images of Roman Emperors discussed above, in most of these cases their purpose was clearly not to prepare or document a personal visit of a Habsburg
ruler. Instead, the rendering of each Roman Emperor’s character and, even more, the aura of undisturbed dynastic succession must have emanated from the paintings and filled the rooms of their owner, further ensuring the series’ success. Not surprisingly, several images of post-classical rulers represented on horseback in seventeenth century art can be demonstrated to be copies or variations of prints from Tempesta’s Emperors series, for example the Count Olivares by Diego Velázquez (Fig. 24), whose pose is a direct quotation from Tempesta’s Julius Caesar (Fig. 13).\(^3\) Just as was the case with the classical-modern portrait sculptures in the Sala dei Capitani, the re-use of a classical (or here: pseudo-classical) prototype by Velázquez was fully intended to be detected and appreciated by the beholder. The highly popular subtext of the Emperors on Horseback series enhanced the importance and prestige of the person depicted.

In this sense, the prominence of Roman Emperors cycles in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century art needs to be seen in the light of the epoch’s habit to reflect on the personal qualities of rulers in dynastic and historic terms. This practice resulted in a system of visual manifestations of virtue (and expressions of various degrees of divergence from it) whose reverberations continued to be felt for centuries. Even in Federico Fellini’s film La Dolce Vita of 1961, images of the First Twelve Roman Emperors have a key function. One sequence shows Marcello Mastroianni alias Marcello Rubini attending a party (sometimes more fittingly described as an “orgy”) in a country house on the outskirts of Rome. The setting for this section of the film was the Palazzo Giustiniani in Bassano di Sutri. The room in which the party took place had been decorated by Vincenzo and Benedetto Giustiniani with busts of the Twelve Roman Emperors in the early Seicento.\(^4\) Fellini chose this kind of surrounding because he wished to confront the decadence of the Roman nobility of his own days with the characteristic features of their ancient predecessors lined up along the wall.\(^5\) This confrontation is all the more revealing as it revives the speculum virtutis tradition spelled out in Tempesta’s dedication to Antonio Bosio (Fig. 12). Indeed, the frontispiece to a set of copies based on the Tempesta series by the Dutch engraver Laurens Eillaerts (Fig. 25) contains portraits of Maurits of Nassau and
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his two brothers. Roman and Dutch virtue are thus paralleled.

In 1604, a set of Habsburg Emperors on Horseback starting with Rudolph I and ending with Rudolph II was published by Crispijn de Passe in Cologne. Significantly, most of the Emperors by de Passe are based on the model of Stradano’s and Tempesta’s Roman Emperors, e.g. Albert II (Fig. 26) is a variation of the latter’s Tiberius (Fig. 15) and Albert I (Fig. 27) of his Vespasion (Fig. 28). Landscape grounds in which military activities are going on and lower borders filled with Latin inscriptions have been added. While it is difficult to say whether the artist wished to point out precise similarities between the lives of each classical and modern ruler, the popularity of Stradano’s and Tempesta’s Roman Emperors on Horseback implies that de Passe expected his beholders to recall the already famous printed models. The series by Crispijn de Passe ends with a copy after Sadeler’s image of Rudolph II on Horseback (Fig. 21), i.e. with the synthesis of Titian and Tempesta as devised by Adriaen de Vries. Significantly, this is the only portrait of the series not derived from Stradano’s or Tempesta’s Emperors on Horseback series. It would be wrong to interpret this in terms of a deliberate rejection of the Stradano/Tempesta scheme at the moment when a living Habsburg ruler had to be represented. Rather, de Passe employed the de Vries for Rudolph II because it followed a more aggressive idea of “military” leadership which some of the most important rulers of his own era preferred, e.g. Henry IV of France or Maurits of Nassau. Both schemes, in any case, had been created or popularised by Tempesta – and this “Roman” note further integrated all Habsburg rulers represented in the set.

The “Roman” quality of de Passe’s series is also stressed by the fact that the frontispiece (Fig. 29) is a simplified copy based on the frontispiece of the Roman Heroes by Hendrick Goltzius of 1586, which already bears a dedication to Rudolph II. Significantly, the personification of Rome sitting on top of Goltzius’s dedication has been replaced with the Habsburg eagle – a solution previously adopted by Raffaelo Guidi for the frontispiece of his set of copies based on the Roman Emperors of Adriaen Collaert. Not surprisingly, the inscription of de Passe’s frontispiece explicitly mentions the Suetonian Twelve Roman Emperors and parallels them.
with the dynastic succession of the House of Habsburg as represented in the following ten (!) portrait prints. The series published by de Passe ends with a copy in reverse of Goltzius's Allegory of Fame and History with which the Dutch artist had concluded his Heroes cycle and addressed Emperor Rudolph II as a descendant of the ancient Trojans and Romans, praising him as an heir of their military valour. De Passe, in other words, re-used the already existing Roman Emperors and Roman Heroes prints not just for economic reasons, but because he wished to visually transplant authority from one visual context to another.

During the Thirty Years War, another engraved series of military dignitaries in the guise of Tempesta's Emperors on Horseback appeared: the prints bearing the monogram "HB" represent, among others, Emperor Ferdinand II (Fig. 30) whose figure is based on that of Tempesta's Vitellius. Another person represented is unnamed (Fig. 31), but the face and the play on words imply that he is Maximilian I of Bavaria. His posture follows that of Tempesta's Caligula. A third figure, General Spinola (Fig. 32), is represented in
the guise of Julius Caesar (Fig. 13). While the degree to which some of Tempesta's models have been reworked is greater than was the case with Crispin de Passe's adaptations (compare especially the arms and armor), there can be no doubt that the basic mechanism was still working. Modern rulers and military leaders fashioned their images (or they were fashioned) on the examples of what was considered to be the prime model of supreme leadership: Roman virtue as embodied by the ancient Roman Emperors. In this case, however, the scheme of the Roman Emperors on Horseback was not employed any more to visualise the dynastic continuity of a single post-classical family, but, instead, to assemble and praise the military leaders of one side of the current military conflict, i.e. the Catholic faction.

While this modified use of images of "Roman" succession can be explained by the special propagandistic needs of the Thirty Years War, the first major crisis suffered by the legitimating strategy of re-used images in portraiture was yet to come. As king of France, Louis XIV was repeatedly represented by his
court artists in the guise of a Roman Emperor—his statue in Versailles by Jean Warin, which an inventory of 1672 describes as “le roy à la romaine”, or Pierre Mignard’s portrait of the king on horseback as a Roman commander in the company of a personification of Glory (Fig. 33) are just two examples of how much the court of the Roy soleil adhered to the visual standards established in the days of Federico II Gonzaga and Rudolph II. It is no coincidence that a room in the king’s apartments in Versailles was decorated with busts of the First Twelve Roman Emperors.

In the 1660’s, Louis XIV and his advisor Colbert suddenly opted against the current standards in royal depictions. While working on the drawings for the tapestries of the Histoire du Roy (1664), Charles le Brun received the order to leave out all the usual elements of allegory and classical Roman history and to represent the deeds of Louis XIV in a purely documentary fashion. The deeds of Louis XIV were considered to be too great to require the paraphernalia of history painting: the pure facts were, it was felt, enough to show his genius. While these criticisms were levelled primarily at the thoughtless use of allegory, they appear to have been extended to encompass the historical guise in the representations of Louis XIV, too—and thus the re-use of images of the kind discussed above. The implicit equation of the king with Roman military leaders, something which had for so long been seen as an affirmation of the authority of the person represented, now became an obstacle to the celebration of his uniqueness.

In seventeenth-century France, however, the Histoire du Roy remained a mere episode. While the Flemish painter Frans van der Meulen continued to be employed to depict his documentary views of the king’s military campaigns, the more prestigious portraits and historical paintings produced in the 1680’s reintroduced Louis XIV to the public as a Roman military hero. The images on the ceiling of the Galerie des Glaces represent him in the established classical style, even the personifications are back in place. While the inscription under one of the paintings (Fig. 34) tells us that this is a depiction of the moment in 1672 when the king gave the order to attack Holland, his posture and uniform is close to that of a Roman general in the Sala dei Capitani. The power and the prestige of the traditional mode of representation were obviously regarded as being greater, after all, than the danger of the king’s “authenticity” being lost.

Seventeenth-century art had strong notions of decorum: certain functions required certain visual formulas. An artist’s originality was determined in large part by how he managed to cope with these established requirements, what materials he chose and what kind of imagery he used as a model. The visual expressions of ‘Roman’ virtue and dynastic succession and their various revisions in the art of the period are a typical example of this phenomenon. One of art history’s most important tasks today is to identify and describe these contemporary notions and their aesthetic consequences, as they are visible in the works of art. This study should not be limited to what has long been considered “high art”, but should be expanded to take in a wide variety of media and all levels of the production and “consumption” of images in any particular period.
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