

Collecting and Dynastic Ambition

Collecting and Dynastic Ambition

Edited by

Susan Bracken, Andrea M. Gáldy,
and Adriana Turpin

CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS

P U B L I S H I N G

Collecting and Dynastic Ambition,
Edited by Susan Bracken, Andrea M. Gáldy, and Adriana Turpin

This book first published 2009

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2009 by Susan Bracken, Andrea M. Gáldy, and Adriana Turpin and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-1401-6, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-1401-0

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Illustrations	vii
Acknowledgements	ix
List of Abbreviations	xi
Foreword	xiii
Introduction	xv
Chapter One.....	1
<i>Political Museums:Porticos, Gardens and the Public Display of Art in Ancient Rome</i>	
Elizabeth Macaulay-Lewis	
Chapter Two	23
<i>Antiquarians and the Preservation of Antiquity Collections</i>	
William Stenhouse	
Chapter Three.....	37
<i>Medici Collections of Dynastic Ambition: Arms, Armour, and Antiquities</i>	
Andrea M. Gáldy	
Chapter Four	59
<i>“...in quibus ars cum natura certabat” Art and Nature in Contest: Sculpture at the Dresden Electoral Court ca 1600</i>	
Esther Münzberg	
Chapter Five	69
<i>A Royal Pretender in Rome: Livio Odescalchi and Christina of Sweden</i>	
Stefanie Walker	
Chapter Six	85
<i>From Court Painting to King’s Books: Displaying Art in Eighteenth-Century Naples (1734-1746)</i>	
Pablo Vázquez-Gestal	

Bibliography	109
Authors' Biographies.....	139
Index	141

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

1. Reconstructed plan of the *Porticus Liviae*, based on the Severan Marble Plan (plan: Macaulay-Lewis). The letters mark the entrances to the complex.
2. Reconstructed plan of the *Templum Pacis* (plan: Macaulay-Lewis).
3. The relief panel from the Arch of Titus on the Sacra Via, Rome, showing the shew bread table, trumpets, and the menorah (photo: Macaulay-Lewis).
4. Ludovico Buti, Ceiling of room 21 of the Uffizi (former Armoury), *Battle Scenes*, Florence 1588 (photo: gabinetto fotografico degli Uffizi)
5. Valentin Silbermann, Buffets in form of an artificial mountain, *all'antica* and *aldeutzsch*, before 1591, ca 3 x 2m, destroyed 1945 ("Graue Kartei" of the Historisches Museum Dresden, now Rüstammer) B 46; Dresden, SLUB (photo: Deutsche Fotothek; Schönbach, in Barbara Marx, *Kunst und Repräsentation am Dresdner Hof*, München: Deutscher Kunstverlag 2005, 317)
6. Pietro Aquila, *Christina of Sweden*, 1674, engraving..
7. Pietro Aquila, *Livio Odescalchi*, ca. 1677, engraving
8. Massimiliano Soldani Benzi, *Medal of Christina of Sweden*, 1681, bronze, Museo Nazionale del Bargello, Florence.
9. Antonio de Gennaro, *Medal of Livio Odescalchi*, 1697, bronze, art market.
10. Ground floor of Palazzo Riario, Rome, as it appeared in the 17th century; from Enzo Borsellino, 1988, 282 (numbering added by Stefanie Walker).
11. *Clytie*, marble, Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid, E-22, E-698, F-31, F-51, F-82, F-85, Roman and 17th-century restorations.
12. Reconstruction of the sculpture gallery on the ground floor of Palazzo Chigi Odescalchi, Rome, as it appeared in the 17th century (reconstruction: Stefanie Walker).
13. Camillo Arcucci, *Sketch of the Muse Room at Palazzo Riario*, c. 1686-88, pen on paper, Nationalmuseum, Stockholm, THC (NMS 1045/1960, fols. 11-12).
14. Pietro Stefano Monnot, *Livio Odescalchi*, after 1692, marble, Ilok, Croatia.

15. Giulio Cartari, *Christina of Sweden*, c. 1680, marble, La Granja de San Ildefonso, Patrimonio Nacional, Segovia, inv. 10027284.
16. Francesco De Mura. *Alegoría del Genio Real con la apoteosis de la Casa de Borbón*. Oil on canvas: 1.16 x 1.35 cm. Patrimonio Nacional.
17. “Vesuvii Prospectus ex Aedibus.” In Francesco Serao. *Istoria dell’incendio del Vesuvio, accaduto nel mese di Maggio dell’anno MDCCXXXII scritta per l’Accademia delle Scienze*. Naples: Nella Stamperia di Novello de Bonis, 1738. Wellcome Library, London.
18. Title page. *Disegni intagliati in rame di pitture antiche ritrovate nelle scavazioni di Resina*. Naples, 1746. Patrimonio Nacional. Real Biblioteca, Palacio Real, Madrid, GRAB/12.
19. “Un Ercole, con pelle di Leone su le spalle, e clava, con un braccio disteso, figura intiera veduto per d’ avanti. *Figura I.*” In *Disegni intagliati in rame di pitture antiche ritrovate nelle scavazioni di Resina*. Naples, 1746. Patrimonio Nacional. Real Biblioteca, Palacio Real, Madrid, GRAB/12.

ABBREVIATIONS

AG	<i>Archivio Gonzaga</i>
AGS	Archivo General de Simancas, Valladolid, Spain
AJA	<i>American Journal of Archaeology</i>
ArtB	<i>Art Bulletin</i>
ASF	Archivio dello Stato di Firenze
ASMn	Archivio di Stato di Mantova, Mantua, Italy
ASNA	Archivio di Stato di Napoli, Naples, Italy
BMC	Biblioteca di Medicina Centrale, Careggi, Florence, Italy
CJ	<i>Classical Journal</i>
GaR	<i>Greece and Rome</i>
GM	<i>Guardaroba Medicea</i>
JGH	<i>Journal of Garden History</i>
LTUR	<i>Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae</i>
MAAR	<i>The Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome</i>
MAP	<i>Mediceo avanti del Principato</i>
MP	<i>Mediceo del Principato</i>
NA	National Archives, Kew, England
OCD	<i>Oxford Classical Dictionary</i>
PALAZZO VECCHIO	Barocchi, Paola, ed. <i>Firenze e la Toscana dei Medici nell'Europa del Cinquecento: Palazzo Vecchio: committenza e collezionismo medicei 1537-1610</i> (Catalogo della mostra, Firenze 1980). Florence: Centro Di, Alinari, Scala, 1980
RM	<i>Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung</i>
TAPA	<i>Transactions of the American Philological Association</i>
VZ	Valentini, Roberto and Giuseppe Zucchetti. <i>Codice topografico della città di Roma</i> . With an introduction by Pietro Fedele. Rome: Tipografia del Senato, 1953

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We as the editors of the present volume would like to thank first of all the contributors for their articles and for their collaboration during the editing process.

The collection of essays based on conference papers has also greatly benefited from the audience at the Collecting & Dynastic Ambition conference held in London in July 2006; thank you for your feedback and for returning to our seminars and conferences.

It is a pleasure to thank the Institute of Historical Research for giving a home to the monthly seminar and for hosting two of the summer conferences so far. Moreover, IHR administrative staff has supported our seminar and conferences in the most helpful manner. We are also deeply grateful to the Henry Moore Foundation who has generously sponsored this and two subsequent summer conferences.

Finally, we would like to thank Cambridge Scholars Publishing for taking on this project at a time when multi-authored art historical studies are so very difficult to place.

FOREWORD

They differed in collecting as they did in everything else. Mr. Peter's collecting, as has been shown, was keen, furious, concentrated; Lord Emsworth's had the amiable dodderingness which marked every branch of his life. In the museum at Blandings Castle you might find every manner of valuable and valueless curio. There was no central motive, the place was simply an amateur junk-shop. Side by side with a Gutenberg Bible for which rival collectors would have bidden without a limit, you would come upon a bullet from the field of Waterloo, one of a consignment of ten thousand shipped there for the use of tourists by a Birmingham firm. Each was equally attractive to its owner.

—P.G. Wodehouse, *Something Fresh*, London: Arrow, 2008, 54-55

Collecting curios is a pastime that goes back to the mists of time. While spare time and spare cash seem an absolute necessity for this kind of activity, every collector has his or her own way to approach the forming of a collection. This regards not only the choice of theme and category, but also the ways in which the material is gathered. For every Mr. Peters who fired by the chase for genuine collectors' items becomes an expert of his chosen category of collectibles, there is a Lord Emsworth who, adding to the curiosities he inherited from his forebears, is guided by sentimental value and often cannot distinguish between junk and the priceless objects that form together the bulk of his private museum.

Displaying one's treasures is another important instance, in which one collector differs from another. Glass cases, niches, trays, cupboards, or drawers have to be adopted; sometimes cards offer information on the subject, its age and provenance; an overall theme may have prompted the choice of the actual objects displayed together; security reasons suggest one room over another. If there is little reason in having a collection if nobody knows about it, does that necessarily mean that one has to show one's treasures indiscriminately? A judicious limitation of visitors might be wise for reasons of security, preservation, and an enhanced mystique that will prove highly attractive. Perhaps having someone write about what is behind the locked doors without anybody being able to see the objects might be an even better idea, imparting notions of quality and quantity that cannot easily be verified.

Collecting and Display are the keywords in the name of the working group founded by three scholars in 2004. The group has been running a

research seminar at the Institute of Historical Research at the University of London since 2005 and has also organised summer conferences since 2006. We would like to present with this book the first volume of proceedings of these conferences and hope that it will be followed by a whole series dedicated to different aspects of collecting and display. The key dates for contributions are from the late Roman Republic to the Enlightenment but topics dealing with earlier and later collections have always been and will continue to be welcome.

Our first conference took place in July 2006 at the Institute of Historical Research and discussed the connection between collecting and dynastic ambition. Several of the original papers were turned into the written contributions you find in the present volume, while several more were commissioned to complement and contrast the themes and theses proposed by the original event. At the time of writing, the papers of our second conference in July 2007 *Collecting & the Princely Apartment* have already been accepted for publication; we also expect to publish the contributions of *Women Collectors* (July 2008) and of *Collecting East & West* (June 2009) in due course.

—London and Florence, August 2009

INTRODUCTION

Dynastic Ambition, the desire to advance one's family fortune and reputation, is the reason for all kinds of sometimes bewildering behaviour and activities. Within the study of the history of collecting, many and various motives have been given that underlie the patronage and collecting of art, from personal to public, private to princely, self-interest to philanthropy. A growing interest in the commissioning, collecting, and display of art in the early modern period has led to new discussions of the motivation of princes and rulers for the amassing of collections of art. Recent historians of patronage have turned to economic motivations for such activities and to the development of markets in art objects. The notion of conspicuous consumption, seen by Theodore Veblen as an irrational form of behaviour, has been taken up and developed by art historians to explain how individuals and families have used the arts to demonstrate status. In Renaissance studies, the revival of Aristotelian concepts of *magnificence* and *splendour* now forms a crucial part of our understanding of the commissions and acquisitions of the new rulers of Italian city states; these concepts can equally be applied to the collecting habits of northern princes. Richard Goldthwaite summed up the impact this had on collecting behaviour, when he wrote about the new Italian urban elites, "their spending habits arose from what is perhaps the universal desire of the rich to utilise wealth to set themselves off from ordinary people."¹ More recently, this has been taken further by Jonathan Nelson and Richard Zeckhauser in their study, *The Patron's Payoff: Conspicuous Commissions in Italian Renaissance Art*, when they analyse the benefits of patronage to the Renaissance collector in terms of the economic theories developed by Michael Spence.² Here patronage is explained in terms of the benefits accrued to the individual, which while not financial, nonetheless increase the status of the individual. The need to commission, acquire and display art is seen as part of the complex networks in which the individual uses the arts to create his identity or, perhaps, to separate himself from others in the same group.³

Another aspect of collecting that has recently been the focus of

¹ Goldthwaite 1993, 203.

² Nelson and Zeckhauser 2008, 5.

³ Bordieu, 1985.

attention is the role of the display of collections as a means of self-promotion and self-representation. Thus Peter Burke in *The Fabrication of Louis XIV* discusses Louis' policies towards the arts in general as a form of political propaganda, carefully orchestrated to glorify the monarch, using well-understood images to present the *persona* of the king as the symbol and protector of the country.⁴ The importance of the arts in terms of the representation of the prince to an increasingly wide audience has been identified as an important element of princely collecting and the cultural politics of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In *The Culture of Power and the Power of Culture*, Tim Blanning shows the ways in which the cultural politics of European princes were directed at the outset to the elite groups of their courts and gradually at the wider public of the nation.⁵

While historians have emphasised the importance of dynastic politics in determining cultural policy, it is less frequently discussed as a motive in the creation and display of collections. As the title of this book suggests, the essays presented here combine to present dynastic ambition as a motive for the patronage of art and the formation of collections. There is indeed a long tradition, from the Pharaohs in Egypt to the modern ruler, of the importance given to the image of the dynasty. During the early modern period, as princes were laying claim to political power and developing their territorial ambitions, the dynastic game was an extremely important one to play; it could be used to justify and legitimise the prince or ruler, but could also be used to underpin and support these claims. Thus the Burgundian dukes used ritual and the conspicuous display of wealth to inaugurate and maintain the status of their dynasty in comparison and competition with the kings of France. As argued by Birgit Francke and Barbara Welzel, "dynastic events such as baptisms, weddings, funerals and burials, as well as chapters of the Order of the Golden Fleece, meetings between sovereigns and ducal appearances in the towns, all served the purposes of self-presentation and the demonstration of power and political claims on a grandiose scale and the entire machinery of aesthetic power and decorum was set in motion in order to stage them."⁶ The emphasis they placed on their self-glorification through the magnificence of their displays was emulated by succeeding rulers. Recent studies on Henry VIII in England, have argued that he, unlike his father, saw magnificence as an important element in his ambition to rival Francis I or Charles V. His

⁴ Burke 1992.

⁵ Blanning 2002, 40-42.

⁶ Francke and Welzel 2009, 53.

collections of tapestries must have been one means of ensuring his reputation; with over 2000 tapestries, he could rival any of his contemporaries in the quantity and costliness of his artistic commissions and his acquisition of the Abraham series, which remains in the Royal Collection, can be directly linked to his urgent need for a male heir.⁷

The representation of the prince played an increasingly important role in the politics of early modern European rulers; it also relied on an understanding of dynastic links for the specific imagery chosen. In fact, Louis XIV, whose own dynasty had only been in power for fifty years when he acceded in 1643, incorporated the inheritance of the Valois king, who had brought the Renaissance and its culture to France, to complement and sustain his own. The implicit links between Bourbon successor and Valois predecessor add resonance to Louis' cultural policies and to his well-known patronage of the arts both in terms of what he chose to emulate and, indeed, where he chose to be novel. Thus the representation of Louis as Hercules would have had links with Francis' assuming that iconography, as would the image of Louis as creator of academies and as the founding father of tapestry workshops; in contrast, the decision at the *Galerie des Glaces* to reject the Herculean mythology and to represent the king as a military leader in his own time can be seen as an important step towards creating a new iconographic model, to be taken up by successive rulers throughout Europe. In his collecting habits, Louis can also be seen as following patterns of previous collectors: his interest in hardstone objects and bronzes can be seen as the result of an influence on his taste by his mentor, Cardinal Mazarin; it can also be argued that it linked him with previous collectors of such works, from the Romans to the Habsburgs.

Collecting, it can be argued, goes together with genealogy; the old ruling houses mostly owned rich collections of a wide range of possessions, attesting to the age and power of their lineage. The individual saw himself as part of a succession and his patronage often emphasised these dynastic links. That collecting itself could involve dynastic considerations has been less commented upon than the particular concerns of the individual. However, collecting was regarded as a princely pastime and the volume of objects in one's collection in conjunction with the value of the items and the age of the collection in general attested to the nobility of the owner's family. Hence the scions of the ruling houses of Europe were keen to extend their family's collections and willing to spend considerable amounts of money in order to do so. Very often the types of collections formed were based on the collections of previous members of

⁷ Campbell 2003, 59-85.

the dynasty. Equally, the contents of the collection could demonstrate dynastic links. In the sixteenth century, the Habsburgs took this to unprecedented levels, so that the precious works of art, armour, or *exotica*, collected by the Emperor became the inalienable inheritance of his successors. Luc Duerloo, who gave a paper at the conference in 2006, in his forthcoming book on the Archduke Albrecht, co-sovereign of the Habsburg Netherlands, shows how important the division of their brother's collection of art was considered by the siblings of Emperor Rudolf. The correspondence between the brothers makes it clear that the works of art were valued not only for their intrinsic cost or aesthetic values but as an important element in consolidating their political and familial inheritance. The new families, attempting to rise in rank and become ennobled, needed comparable collections in order to acquire a lineage through their possessions. Ownership was important but it needed to be broadcast through display and publications, so that fellow collectors and fellow noblemen would know about one's treasures and take one's dynastic claims seriously, even though they may have been recent and based mainly on purchasing power rather than bloodlines. Indeed the very "costliness" of collecting was an indication of the nobility of this kind of activity and an additional incentive for members of the aristocracy to indulge in this hobby.

Compared to wars, intrigues, and bribery, collecting precious objects may seem rather harmless. Nonetheless, dynastic collectors frequently presented themselves as ruthless pillagers of booty in order to secure a coveted collectible. Access to the art market was as important as the availability of knowledgeable advisers for the building of a collection. Export licences were sometimes difficult to obtain and attempts at smuggling were not always crowned by success. Occasionally, potential collectors, therefore, decided to concentrate on categories of objects that they could acquire easily and relatively cheaply within their own dominion. Others pounced on collections assembled by fellow aristocrats and suddenly available at the death or financial failure of the previous owner. Such whole-sale purchases, for example the acquisition of the Gonzaga collection by Charles I, are not unheard of; occasionally the collection remained together as a *Gesamtkunstwerk*, more frequently it would have been dismantled and sold off to different collectors as ironically happened to Charles I's collection after his execution.

Many of the collectors amassed artworks of different kinds and provenance. Antiquities, contemporary paintings and sculpture, armour and weapons, plants, animals, and objects of virtue were gathered together and displayed in residences across Europe. If a piece was particularly old

or came from an exotic part of the world, it immediately acquired additional political value within a court culture that was firmly based on etiquette, questions of precedence, and appropriate display of splendour and wealth.

It may seem peculiar to us that a family like the Medici or the Fugger who were late-comers to the ranks of European aristocracy felt the need to join the competition for antiquities when they could have used their funds for other, more pressing projects. The Medici family had, of course, been collectors of antiquities from the fifteenth-century onwards and so Duke Cosimo I could be seen as continuing a family tradition. At the same time, he also showed himself as someone who understood the workings and deeper meanings of cultural politics that were then seen as an integral part of political negotiations between principalities and leading families. Such customs did not start with the Italian Renaissance; they go back to Classical Antiquity at least.

The conference, whose papers we present in this volume, discussed therefore different aspects of collecting and dynastic ambition, starting with the late Roman Republic. Elizabeth Macaulay-Lewis looked at *Political Museums: porticos, gardens and the public display of art in ancient Rome* with a special focus on the public display of art for political and ideological ends. In the Roman world public display of private collections was very important; a practice that was only revived again much later as can be understood from the other essays in this volume.

Collecting art and precious objects and their public display served many different ends in ancient Rome. In the case of public displays, specific goals or ideals were frequently being pursued. In particular, generals or emperors used these collections as a way to show off their success, to promote their careers (Metellus), to tell their version of history (Vespasian and Titus), and to persuade the people towards adopting specific policies (Augustus encouraging the Romans to support him and to accept a specific view of Roman womanhood).

In her essay, Macaulay-Lewis makes a particular point of the importance of gardens as realms of collecting and display in Classical Antiquity. A garden could recreate a fictional or real landscape. The set-up of a collection in a garden certainly reflected the values of patron or collector and could be used to champion his or her ideas and convictions. Far from being a mere appendix to architecture, gardens were an essential space for the display of art, putting the exhibits in context and making them come alive.

William Stenhouse concentrated on *Antiquarians and the preservation of antiquity collections* during the Renaissance. His essay examines ways

in which late Renaissance collections of antiquities were preserved in print, securing the fame of the collectors, their families, and, to a lesser extent, of individual objects that made up the collections. At a time when legal methods for preserving the actual collection were uncertain, antiquarian scholars were able to immortalise it in virtual form. In sponsored publications, and then in funerary orations and biographies, antiquaries discussed collections and the uses to which their owners had put them. These sources have not been fully exploited by historians of collecting; they also offer an intriguing window into how the reputation of a collection might be secured for a family dynasty.

Andrea M. Gáldy's contribution explored *Medici Collections of Dynastic Ambition: Arms, Armour, and Antiquities*. Her long-standing interest in collections of antiquities owned by the the Medici here finds a new outlet, discussing the set-up of the early Uffizi, in which paintings were in the minority while antiquities, armour, and weapons formed the nucleus of the exhibition. Both categories were used by the Medici to underpin dynastic and territorial claims and to create an aura of ancient nobility for their family that was comparable to that of other European ruling houses. The display contained examples of antiquities that also had a martial character and pieces of armour that were also antiquities and invited the comparison with ancient artworks in the collections.

Esther Münzberg's "...in quibus ars cum natura certabat": *Art and Nature in Contest: Sculpture at the Dresden Electorial Court ca 1600* looks at the sculpture commissioned at the time of elector Christian I of Saxony whose *Kunstammer* in Dresden mainly contained lavishly produced tools and scientific instruments. Her contribution leaves the *Kunstammer* rooms to investigate the colossal Freiberg tomb statues, the creations of silversmiths, as well as the sculpture displayed on the buildings and monuments of this period. Numerous gilded sandstone figures embellished Dresden castle and the new stable building while the fountains and city gates were also decorated with sculpture in stone. These and other artistic commissions repeat the topic of the contrast between art and nature, which ultimately was based on Italian models of princely representation as introduced to Saxon traditions of collecting by Gabriel Kaltemarckt and Giovanni Nosseni.

Stefanie Walker's contribution, *A Royal Pretender in Rome: Livio Odescalchi and Christina of Sweden*, focuses on the acquisition and display of the art collections of Christina of Sweden by the Roman nobleman Livio Odescalchi. On the one hand, the remarkable degree of correspondence in the layout of the sculpture collection at the residences of the two owners demonstrates Prince Livio's admiration for Christina, on the other hand,

some subtle additions and alterations reveal the prince's ambitious political and dynastic aspirations.

Finally, Pablo Vázquez-Gestal takes us to the court of Naples with his piece on *From Court Painting to King's Books. Displaying Art in Eighteenth-Century Naples (1734-1746)* in which he examines the different types of art display promoted in Naples by Charles of Bourbon as the new sovereign of the Two Sicilies from 1734 to 1746. In order to elaborate a specific idea of majesty, the Count of Santiesteban, chief major-domo of the Royal Household and Prime Minister from 1734 to 1738, decided to employ traditional court rhetoric to enact his master's royal identity. He commissioned Solimena and other Italian artists to paint allegorical images while a serious ceremonial reform was implemented at the Royal Palace of Naples. However, after the political change that took place in August 1738, José Joaquín de Montealegre, Marquis of Salas and secretary of State and Royal Household, became responsible for managing the Neapolitan crown's artistic initiatives. Unlike Santiesteban, he promoted another type of royal patronage, encouraging the public display of the Neapolitan king's artistic collections.

Many areas of the role of collections and collecting within the development of dynastic policy remain to be researched. One important aspect is the importance of gift-giving, which has been acknowledged as an important political and diplomatic statement, but which has connotations as a dynastic symbol as well as being a confirmation of personal links or allegiances. As these essays lead us to understand, the importance of dynastic inheritance in the early modern period is one that adds nuances and complements recent approaches to the history of collecting.

CHAPTER ONE

POLITICAL MUSEUMS: PORTICOS, GARDENS AND THE PUBLIC DISPLAY OF ART IN ANCIENT ROME

ELIZABETH MACAULAY-LEWIS

The practice of collecting objects, returning home with them, and displaying them has a long history that began in the Ancient Near East. While the focus of this volume is on Renaissance and Baroque collecting, an exploration of examples of the collection and display of art from ancient Rome demonstrates that the formation of art collections by individuals in Antiquity, like those in the Renaissance and Baroque periods, was highly complex and generally done with specific aims in mind—be it social or political. Thus, the study of collecting art in Antiquity provides both a useful introduction to collecting as a subject matter and may also serve as a point of comparison and contrast to the nature of collecting in the later periods that form the main focus of this volume.

Collecting art, plants, and objects from abroad was an important element of elite culture in Republican and early Imperial Rome. Collections of Greek art became important, if not fundamental decorative, elements of the Roman villa and *domus*.¹ Since the nineteenth century scholars have debated whether these collections, perhaps best exemplified in the remarkable and exceptional sculptural finds from the Villa of the Papyri, destroyed by the eruption of Vesuvius in AD 79, were coherently organised with specific artistic, cultural, or social goals.² Such *objets d'art*

¹ Neudecker 1998, 77-91; Welch 2006, 91-161.

² Neudecker 1998, 82-91; for a recent comprehensive treatment and up-to-date bibliography, see Mattusch 2005. For the original, opposing sides of the debate, which is still raging today, see Friedländer 1852 and Hermann 1856. The ancient sources seem to suggest that much like today people collected art for various purposes—from a love of art to wanting to project a specific social or cultural status. For example, see Juv., 3.212ff. For an organised collection, see Cic., *Att.*, 1.4.3; 1.8.2.; 1.9.2; *Fam.*, 7.23.1-3; Plin., *HN*, 31.6.6, where Cicero discusses his collection

were often booty, which Roman generals had taken during their successful campaigns.³ These collections of objects, works of art and even plants were paraded in a general's triumph in Rome, a process, which emphasised their importance.⁴ Successful generals and later emperors frequently placed looted works of art on permanent display in public triumphal monuments, primarily in public portico-garden complexes, temples and *fora*, in addition to their private residences.⁵ While much scholarly work has considered the significance of these art collections in the private sphere, few scholars have focused on the collection and display of art in Rome's public sphere.⁶ For the purposes of this study, art or works of art means works, such as sculptures or paintings, as well as other objects, which were captured or recovered while on campaign.

Therefore, this paper explores one of the public contexts for the display of such works of art, the monumental *porticus*, or portico, and portico-temple, as a type of public, politicised museum, and the evolution of public collecting and display of art.⁷ It does not use the concept of the museum in the sense of the ancient word, *mouseion*, from which our modern word derives. Rather it looks at the public monumental porticos and portico-temples of Rome as museums where public collections of art were exploited by ancient generals, politicians and emperors for political ends. Furthermore, it examines the aims of the individuals who built these complexes, and the evolution in the nature of public art collections and the public display of art from this period. Specific examples from the late Republic and early Empire are studied in order to understand how these spaces articulated the political agenda of successful generals and, later, the emperors through their art, architecture and plantings. Likewise, I explore how these spaces functioned as museums that attempted to educate, or

and purchases of statues for his Academy in his villa. Also see Neudecker 1998, 78, nn. 6-19.

³ Neudecker 1998, 78-80; n. 24; Pollitt 1978, 155-158.

⁴ For a general discussion of Roman triumphs, see Versnel 1970; Beard 2007.

⁵ On the public display of Greek art in Republican Rome and under Augustus, see Pollitt 1978, 155-174. On the *Forum Augustum*, see Kockel 1995, 289-95; Zanker 1998, 194-5, 210-215; fig. 149. On the *Forum Traiani*, Packer 1995, 348-356; Packer 1997; On the *Forum Transitorium*, D'Ambra 1993; Bauer and Morselli 1995, 307-11.

⁶ Notable exceptions are Pollitt 1978, 155-174; Kuttner 1999, 343-373; Zanker 1995; Walker 2000, 61-75. Noreña 2003, 25-43.

⁷ Kuttner 1999, 343-370, in particular. 345-350. Kuttner is the first to envisage a public garden, *Porticus Pompei*, as a museum. This piece is indebted to her 1999 article. Scholars have also seen Rome as being transformed into a museum under Augustus, see Walker 2000, 61-75.

perhaps manipulate, the urban populace in line with the wishes of specific individuals.

New Wealth, New Display Spaces: the Monumental Portico and Portico-temple

Rome's armies began to spread across the Mediterranean in the third century BC, transforming Rome into the dominant military force in the region for the next 500 years.⁸ Due to their successes, the Roman army and generals vastly increased their wealth. As noted above, they constructed public victory monuments in the heart of Rome paid for by their booty, in which they displayed many of the objects that they had captured. Until the second century BC, temples had been the traditional type of edifice erected to commemorate a military victory.⁹ At this point, a new type of victory monument, the monumental portico and portico-temple, emerged. The monumental *porticus*, often misunderstood as a derivative form of the Greek *stoa*, was in fact a new architectural form,¹⁰ typically composed of four connected porticos that enclosed an open space, for example a garden, in which a temple or water features were often set. These porticos were a different type of space from the *stoa*, which often lined public spaces and played an important role in the public life of Greek cities. By contrast, the monumental portico offered an enclosed, defined space that a patron could construct and manipulate to suit his purposes. Furthermore, by virtue of being a unit of discrete space, these complexes created specific, controlled environments to display works of art. It is unsurprising therefore that in the second century BC monumental porticos and portico-temples emerged as a popular depository

⁸ For the history of the Roman Republic and the expansion of Rome in the Mediterranean, see Crawford 1992 and Cornell 1995.

⁹ For a recent publication on Roman temples, see Stamper 2005.

¹⁰ On the monumental porticos and portico-temples as a unique architectural form, see Macaulay-Lewis 2008a, 89-148. Like the Greek *stoa*, the Roman *porticus* was an extremely flexible architectural form. A *porticus* could be the porch of a temple or basilica, or a form of connective urban architecture. For a good summary of the various types of porticos known in the Roman world, see Gros 1996, 95-120. Thus it should be emphasised that this paper is discussing only one type of *porticus*. The *Stoa Poikile* in Athens may have been an exceptional precursor, as it had an outstanding collection of paintings. Architecturally however, it was very different from Rome's monumental porticos and portico-temples, which were generally quadriporticos.

for *spolia* from military campaigns.

Collecting and Display in the Porticos of Republican Rome: the *Porticus Metelli* and the *Porticus Octaviae*

None of Rome's earliest monumental porticos, like the *Porticus Metelli*, are known archaeologically.¹¹ Nonetheless, the ancient sources describe the works of art displayed here, suggesting that the porticos of Rome contained impressive collections of art.¹² A study of the works of art displayed in the *Porticus Metelli* and the *Porticus Octaviae*, which replaced the *Porticus Metelli*, demonstrates that the collecting and display of art in a public context in ancient Rome was political and often ideological: the meanings of these collections were multifaceted and frequently reflected the views of the individual, who had built the porticos. These art museums are known primarily through the ancient sources, whose authors had their own interests and agenda. In books 34, 35 and, in particular, book 36 of his *Natural History* Pliny the Elder lists and discusses many of the works of art on public display in Rome with a specific interest in their status, function, and in certain cases "their political usefulness".¹³

M. Caecilius Metellus constructed the *Porticus Metelli* between 146 and 143 BC; the portico enclosed the temples of Juno Regina and Jupiter Stator, the latter of which he also erected.¹⁴ The *Porticus Metelli* housed a collection of artistic booty with which Metellus returned from his campaigns in Macedonia.¹⁵ The works that are known to have been displayed here publicised his achievements and may have also promoted his political and social goals.

The most famous works displayed were the Greek sculptor Lysippus'

¹¹ We do not know if the *Porticus Metelli* and other complexes, like the *Porticus Octavia*, were quadriporticos or single porticos, nor do we know whether gardens, which play an important role in many of the later complexes, were planted in these early porticos. For summaries of the art and known evidence in the *Porticus Metelli* and the *Porticus Octavia*, see Viscogliosi 1999a, 130-132 and Viscogliosi 1999b, 139-141, respectively. Despite their nearly identical names, the *Porticus Octavia* and the *Porticus Octaviae* were two different porticos (Contra Richardson 1976).

¹² See Isager 1998, for a summary of many of the ancient sources.

¹³ Isager 1998, 157-159.

¹⁴ Vell. Pat., 1.11.3; 2.1.2; Vitruv., *De arch.*, 3.2.5; Viscogliosi 1999a, 130-132.

¹⁵ Cic., *Verr.*, 2.4.126; Viscogliosi 1999a, 130-132; Isager 1998, 160.

Turma Alexandri, or Granicus Monument, equestrian statues of twenty-five of Alexander the Great's *heteri*, or companions, who were killed in the Battle of the Granicus River, and a seated bronze statue of Cornelia, the daughter of Scipio Africanus, the first known honorific statue to a woman in Rome.¹⁶ It is likely that other works of art were displayed here, but no traces of such works have survived.¹⁷ This seems an unlikely "collection" of works—an honourable Roman *matrona* and twenty-five of Alexander's *heteri*. While there is not a clear link between the *heteri* and Cornelia in terms of theme or subject matter, both the *heteri* and Cornelia articulate values important either to Metellus or to the Romans of the second century BC.

The display of the *heteri* conveys a number of militaristic messages closely associated with Metellus.¹⁸ Most fundamentally, the display of *heteri* celebrated Metellus' military victory over Macedonia, which had now been integrated as a province into the nascent Roman Empire. He had even been awarded the title of *Macedonicus* due to his success. This victory was the source of the wealth that funded the construction of the *Porticus Metelli* and the temple of Jupiter Stator, the first marble temple erected in Rome. These sculptures also aggrandised Metellus' victory. The display of such statues implied that Metellus was a great conqueror and general, who had defeated the homeland of Alexander, arguably the greatest general of Antiquity. Simultaneously, the display of *heteri* in a public portico suggests that the Macedonians, whom Metellus had defeated, were a noble enemy, deserving honour even in defeat. Thus, in a way this sculptural group emphasises the "justness" of the war; they were not feeble opponents whom the Romans had attacked unnecessarily or unjustly.¹⁹ This too augmented the magnitude of Metellus' achievement; he had defeated a worthy opponent. Lastly, the inclusion of the *heteri* also brought the war that Metellus had waged home to the people of Rome. Most Romans would never visit Macedonia; however, the fame of

¹⁶ On the Granicus Monument, see Plin., *HN*, 34.64-5; Vell. Pat., 1.11.3-4; Pollitt 1978, 157. On the statue of Cornelia, see Dixon 2007, 30; 56-57.

¹⁷ The variety and quantity of works shown in the *Porticus Pompei* and the *Templum Pacis* suggests that more works of art were probably on display in the *Porticus Metelli* and other similar structures, although record of them has not survived.

¹⁸ Considering the close connection between the Granicus Monument as a symbol of Macedonia and Metellus' victory over Macedonia, it seems most probable that the monument was present in the *Porticus Metelli*, as a part of the original collection of artworks displayed herein.

¹⁹ Thanks to H. Platts for bringing this observation to my attention.

Alexander and his conquests was known to many. Therefore, by displaying these works, the urban populace of Rome could participate in the military success achieved by Metellus and the Roman army.²⁰

The other artwork displayed in the *Porticus Metelli* was a seated bronze statue of Cornelia,²¹ which was not a piece of booty. It was, in fact, the first public statue ever dedicated to a Roman woman. The Romans celebrated Cornelia as a model of Roman female virtue.²² She bore twelve children, of whom only three survived; she was mother to the ill-fated Gracchi brothers. After the death of her much older husband, she remained a widow and dedicated herself to the study of Latin and Greek literature, apparently refusing a marriage offer from Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II.²³

Scholars debate the reasons for including her statue in the *Porticus Metelli*.²⁴ It could have been the artistic articulation of Metellus' social views and his attempts to put these views into practice. Reportedly, Metellus made a speech on the necessity of marriage, even if it was a flawed institution; he also attempted to make marriage compulsory for Romans in 131 BC.²⁵ Cornelia, as noted above, was seen as the ideal Roman matron. However, this interpretation seems unlikely, as the *Metelli* and the *Gracchi* were political rivals at the end of the second century BC. Rather it seems more plausible that the statue was added to the *Porticus Metelli* by the pro-Gracchi *populares* after her death or sometime in the late second century BC, as a triumphal act over the *Metelli*, an élite, patrician family.²⁶ The inscription that Plutarch describes on the base of her statue, calling her the mother of the Gracchi, may further support this interpretation, as her sons were only reaching their political apex in the late 130s and 120s BC, not in the mid 140s when the *Porticus Metelli* was constructed. Regardless of who placed this statue in the *Porticus Metelli*, the messages about Roman womanhood remain the same; women were meant to be virtuous and to bear sons who served the Roman state and her people.

The problems in pinpointing the timeframe for the initial display of the statue of Cornelia highlights an irresolvable problem in the study of

²⁰ The *heteri* were moved to the *Porticus Octaviae* (Vell. Pat., 1.11.3-5); the presence of the Granikos monument would underscore the continuity between the two complexes and the military achievements of Metellus and Augustus.

²¹ Plin., *HN*, 34.31; Plut., *C. Gracch.*, 4.3-4.

²² Dixon 2007.

²³ *OCD*³, 392.

²⁴ Dixon 2007, 30; Coarelli 1978, 13-28.

²⁵ George 1988, 299; Gell., *NA*, 1.6.1-6.

²⁶ Dixon 2007, 30, 56; Coarelli 1978, 13-28.

ancient art and collecting. Scholars are at the mercy of the ancient sources to inform us about the artists, subject matters, and locations of artwork. Many of these authors, such as Plutarch, were writing decades or, in many cases, centuries after the events they describe. Thus, as scholars, we have to accept that we often have a partial and biased view of ancient art derived from the ancient sources.

The re-display of Cornelia's statue in the *Porticus Octaviae*, which was constructed between 33 and 27 BC and which replaced the *Porticus Metelli* in the last decades of the first century BC, suggests that the statue also embodied an important Augustan political and moral message.²⁷ The architectural form of the *Porticus Octaviae* is known from archaeological evidence and the Severan Marble Plan;²⁸ aside from the base of the statue dedicated to Cornelia, none of the art collection survives. The complex was dedicated in the name of Octavia, the emperor Augustus' sister, and financed by Augustus with booty taken from his campaign in Dalmatia in 33 BC.²⁹ By displaying the statue of Cornelia in the *Porticus Octaviae*, Augustus applauded certain traditional Roman ideas of female behaviour and likened his sister Octavia to Cornelia.³⁰ Although the complex was completed after the Battle of Actium in 31 BC, its construction, which began in 33 BC, and the inclusion of a statue of Cornelia were a subtle form of architectural and artistic warfare against Antony and Cleopatra, as well as a harbinger of the social programmes that Augustus was to

²⁷ Scholars also debate whether the same statue of Cornelia was displayed, as Pliny the Elder reports (*HN*, 34.31; Dixon 2007, 56; Coarelli 1978, 15ff.). At some level this is a moot point since the ancient perception in the first century AD was that the statues in the *Porticus Metelli* and *Porticus Octaviae* were one in the same. On the relationship between the *Porticus Metelli* and *Porticus Octaviae*, see Viscogliosi 1999c, 141-145. Richardson 1976, 57-64, however, argues for a different development of the *Porticus Metelli* and *Porticus Octavia* (which he sees as linked complexes) and the *Porticus Octaviae*.

²⁸ For a recent study of the archaeological remains and the depiction of the *Porticus Octaviae* on the Severan Marble Plan (fragments 31u, 31z [missing], 31vaa, 31bb, 31dd, 31cc, 31ii), see Gorrie 2007, 1-17. The Severan Marble Plan or *Forma Urbis Romanae (FUR)* poses many problems when used as a document for understanding the topography of Rome. It seems to reflect the Severan priorities for Rome as a city rather than acting as a cadastral map. See Reynolds 1996, for a recent study of the plan.

²⁹ On the art collection and financing of the complex, see Viscogliosi 1999c, 141; *RG* 4.19; App., *Ill.*, 28; Dio Cass., 49.43. At this point in time, Augustus was still known as Octavian; only in 27 BC did he receive the title of Augustus; for simplicity's sake, however, I refer to him as Augustus throughout this essay.

³⁰ Dixon 2007, 57.

promote throughout his reign.

Married off to Antony in 37 BC to solidify the uneasy alliance between Antony and her brother, Octavia epitomised the Roman *matrona*. The ever-devoted wife, she raised her children by Antony, as well as his children from his previous marriage to Fulvia.³¹ Despite Octavia's assistance and service as a messenger between her husband and brother, Antony abandoned her for Cleopatra; his divorce from Octavia happened at Octavian's insistence in 32 BC.³²

By erecting a portico in Octavia's name and including a statue of Cornelia, the most virtuous Roman woman of the second century BC, Augustus transformed Octavia into the Cornelia of her day. She was what a Roman *matrona* should be—loyal to her husband almost to a fault, a mother, and a dedicated wife. She embodied everything that Cleopatra was not. By lending her name to the complex and by being likened to Cornelia, Octavia became a symbol of all that Augustus reportedly had fought for during the civil wars—the restoration of the Roman Republic, its values and traditions. Interestingly, Suetonius reports that Augustus read parts of Metellus' speech, "On increasing the family" to the senate.³³ Thus, the site of the *Porticus Octaviae* atop the *Porticus Metelli* and its reuse of important works of art may have further re-enforced Augustus' ideological messages about marriage and Roman society.³⁴

A large collection of Greek works of art was also displayed in the *Porticus Octaviae* and its temples, library, and school.³⁵ These sculptural works of art included *Eros of Thespieae* by Praxiteles,³⁶ *Eros with a Thunderbolt*, two statues of breezes (*aurae*), four satyrs, *Artemis and Asclepius* by Kephisodotos, the son of Praxiteles, three statues of Aphrodite in various poses by three different Greek sculptors, including one by Phidias, *Pan and Olympus* by Heliodoros, an ivory statue of Jupiter

³¹ She also raised his children by Cleopatra; see *OCD*³, 1059.

³² *OCD*³, 1059.

³³ Suet., *Aug.*, 89.2.

³⁴ Despite the fact that Augustus wanted Roman citizens to marry and remarry if divorced or widowed, he often ignored the problems with the historical and familial examples that he used to promote his views. A case in point is his wife, Livia; see the discussion of her as an *exemplum* of a Roman woman below, 11-3.

³⁵ Plin., *HN*, 36.22-23, 35; Pollitt 1978, 172; Isager 1998, 160-162. Lewis 1988, 198-200 proposed that there might have been a sculptural display of Roman mothers, like the *summi viri* that were displayed in the *Forum Augustum*. While there is no evidence for this theory, it remains an interesting idea.

³⁶ Caligula first brought this statue to Rome. Claudius then sent it back to Thespieae; Nero again returned it to Rome, where it was destroyed by fire in AD 80. See Isager 1998, 154, n. 541.