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Abstract: Definition

Frederick II of Hohenstaufen, King of Sicily (1208–1250). Frederick II of Hohenstaufen was the second king of the Swabian dynasty to sit on the throne of Sicily. He was crowned in 1198, but, in consideration of his young age, he only ruled independently from 1208 to 1250 (the year of his death). He not only held the title of King of Sicily but also was the King of Germany (or of the Romans), the King of Jerusalem, and, above all, Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire. His most relevant and innovative iconographic representations were in Southern Italy. For this reason, we focus on the images in this geographical context. In particular, we have nine official (that is, those commissioned directly by him or his entourage) representations of him: the bull (in three main versions), the seal (in three main versions), five coins (four denari and one augustale), the statue of the Capua Gate, and the lost image of the imperial palace in Naples.
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1. Introduction

Frederick II of Hohenstaufen was crowned King of Sicily when he was less than four years old, but, at the beginning of his reign, he was under the regency of his mother, Constance (until 27 November 1198), and of Pope Innocent III (until 25 December 1208). After this period, he ruled independently until his death (13 December 1250). Frederick II was not only King of Sicily but also King of Germany or of the Romans (1212–1250), King of Jerusalem (1225–1250), and, above all, Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire (1220–1250) (for general information about Frederick II of Hohenstaufen, see: [1–11]). His most relevant and innovative iconographic representations were in Southern Italy, and, for this reason, we focus on the images in this geographical context. Historians have identified Frederick II in numerous artifacts, but, in reality, only a limited number of them can be considered real and official representations of the Swabian ruler (that is, those commissioned directly by him or his entourage). In particular, we have nine images: the bull (in three main versions), the seal (in three main versions), five coins (four denari and one augustale), the statue of the Capua Gate, and the lost image of the imperial palace in Naples (on the identification of Frederick II’s official images, see: [12] (pp. 82–87)).

2. Bulls and Seals

On 26 December 1208, when Frederick II began to rule independently, he continued to use bulls and seals prepared during the regency period as the King of Sicily. The first are hanging gold bulls with a diameter of 55 mm (on the bulls as the King of Sicily, see: [13] (Volume 1, pp. 27–30, images no. 27,3–4), [14] (p. 40), [5] (p. 302)), and the second are hanging red wax seals with dimensions that varied between $35 \times 45$ and $40 \times 53$ mm$^2$ that are placed in a wooden box with a diameter of 60 mm (on the seals as the King of Sicily, see: [13] (Volume 1, pp. 27–30, images no. 27,1–2 and 27,5), [15] (Volume 1, pp. 29–31, cards no. 43 and 45), [14] (pp. 25–27), [16] (pp. 118–120), [8] (card II.4, pp. 325–326), [17] (Volume 2, p. 26, card II.A.7 by V. Rödel)). Both of these types present the king sitting on the throne, even though the garments and symbols of power are completely different: the first group differs from the bulls of the Norman predecessors and is comparable to
more continental European models; instead, the second group more or less follows the seals of the predecessors William II and Constance of Hauteville (about that, see: [12] (p. 87)). However, both these bulls and seals were soon replaced by other types. Indeed, from December 1212, Frederick II began to use bulls and seals as the King of the Romans, and, from 22 November 1220, he used bulls and seals as the Holy Roman Emperor (used until his death on 13 December 1250). Both of the bulls are in gold and have diameters of approximately 62 and 42 mm, respectively; on one face, they present the king sitting on the throne, while, on the other face, they present an urban structure (presumably, a symbolic representation of Rome) or a sort of geographical map of Southern Italy (presumably, a symbolic representation of the Kingdom of Sicily) (on the bulls as the King of the Romans, see: [13] (Volume 1, pp. 27–30, images no. 28,2–5), [15] (Volume 1, pp. 31–34, cards no. 47 and 49), [8] (card III.2, pp. 330–331). On the bulls as the Holy Roman Emperor, see: [13] (Volume 1, pp. 27–30, images no. 30,2–5 and 30,6–7), [15] (Volume 1, p. 35, card no. 51), [5] (p. 302), [17] (Volume 2, pp. 27–28, card II.A.9 by V. Rödel)). Both of the seals are in red wax and have diameters of approximately 85 and 90 mm, respectively; again, they present the king sitting on the throne (on the seal as the King of the Romans, see: [13] (Volume 1, pp. 27–30, images no. 27,6–7 and 28,1), [15] (Volume 1, pp. 31–33, cards no. 46 and 48), [14] (pp. 28–29), [8] (card II.5, pp. 326–327 and card III.1, p. 329), [17] (Volume 2, p. 27, card II.A.8 by V. Rödel). On the seal as the Holy Roman Emperor, see: [13] (Volume 1, pp. 27–30, images no. 29,1–5 and 30,1), [15] (Volume 1, p. 34, card no. 50), [14] (p. 30), [16] (p. 128), [8] (card III.15, pp. 346–347)).

In every type of bull and seal, the inscription changes according to the different titles of Frederick II as the King of Sicily (REX SICILIE), the King of the Romans (ROMANORVM REX), the King of Jerusalem (REX IERVSALEM), and Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire (ROMANORVM IMPERATOR), but, in all of the artifacts, the representations of the ruler are similar (with only some insignificant changes), and they follow the same iconographic tradition (see, for an example, Figure 1). In particular, Frederick II sits on a throne with a backrest. He probably has long hair and a shaved face, and he wears a long tunic (in one specimen, the tunic is clearly embroidered with eagles), a broad cloak, a long lily scepter, a cruciferous globe, and a crown with lateral pendilia. The crown can be low with two crossed arches (a Bügelkrone) or high and squared (a Plattenkrone). The latter type probably represents the Reichskrone of the Holy Roman Empire. These iconographic elements differ from the figurative tradition of the Norman kings of Sicily and follow German patterns—in particular, the bulls and seals of the Swabian predecessors (grandfather Frederick I Barbarossa, father Henry VI, and uncle Philippe of Swabia). Evidently, this image represents Frederick II as a German emperor rather than as the King of Sicily, but this choice does not seem to possess specific political or propagandistic meanings. Presumably, it is due to the new status achieved and the consequent necessity to adopt adequate new cultural references in the representation of the ruler’s figure (on that, see: [18], [12] (pp. 87–89) with more details and bibliographic references).

The royal image on bulls and seals is without a doubt an official representation of Frederick II and mainly had a juridical function (it was used to corroborate the legal value of diplomas and documents issued by the royal chancellery). Its mobile support would have facilitated its circulation, and we should consider that bulls and seals were in use not only in the Kingdom of Sicily but also in Frederick II’s other domains. However, they were not made to be moved around but to be stored, with their documents, in the archives of their recipients, and their dimensions were somewhat reduced and certainly of scarce visual impact. Moreover, multiple documents could be issued for the same recipient and the subjects involved were limited to the aristocratic and ruling class of Southern Italy in particular. However, Frederick II’s image on the bulls and seals has bigger dimensions and stylistically pays more attention to the iconographic details than the Norman specimens. This made the royal figure certainly more visible. Moreover, we should note that Frederick II’s chancery issued a very high average number of documents per year in comparison with that of his predecessors on the Sicilian throne. Probably, during his reign, the circulation of
bulls and coins was capillary and widespread, and, for this reason, the royal image could reach a large number of subjects (about that, see: [12] (p. 89). About Frederick II’s chancery, see in summary: [19,20]).

3. The Denari

Among the official representations of Frederick II, there are also those on the denari (silver coins) minted between 1220 and 1221 (in two different types) (about these denari, see [21] (p. 113, images no. 19, 19a, and 20)) and in 1225 (in two other types but, possibly, with a similar version minted already in 1222) (about these denari, see: [22] (Volume 18, pp. 201–202), [23] (p. 197), [21] (p. 98, image no. C4 and pp. 114–115, images no. 25–27), [5] (p. 274)). Their functions were mainly legal: they were used in order to corroborate the value of the coin. The coins of the first group were minted in Palermo and Messina, and their weight was approximately 0.7 g (between 0.38 and 0.5 g for the mezzo denaro version).

Both inscriptions refer to Frederick as an emperor (FREDERICVS IMPERATOR) and as a king of Jerusalem and Sicily (REX IE RUSALEM ET SICILIE), while the iconography presents a little change. The first coin presents the crowned royal bust with a scepter and cruciferous globe on the obverse side and a cross on the reverse side. The second coin also presents the royal image on the obverse side and a cross on the reverse side; however, here, Frederick II is instead seated and enthroned with a crown, scepter, and cruciferous globe. In both cases, the king seems shaven and has short hair. The coins of the second group were minted in Messina, and their weight was between 0.59 and 0.91 g (approximately 0.41 g for the mezzo denaro version). Both the inscriptions refer to Frederick as an emperor (FRIDERICVS IMPERATOR) and as a king of Jerusalem and Sicily (REX IERUSALEM ET SICILIE), while the iconography presents a little change. The two coins have a cross on the obverse side and a royal bust crowned with a high and squared crown (possibly the Reichskrone of the Holy Roman Empire) on the reverse side, and, in both cases, the ruler seems shaven. However, in the first, the king faces forwards and whether he has long or short hair is unclear; in the second, instead, Frederick faces to the side and has long hair (Figure 2).

All four types of denari have small dimensions, they have a highly stylized iconography, and they do not pay particular attention to figurative details. For this reason, it is difficult to say if they were following a specific iconographic tradition. Coins could move across the kingdom and the lower worth of a silver coin (as in the cases of denari and mezzo denari) in comparison with a golden coin would have made its use more widespread. However, the number of issues in these denari was quite low, and their circulation was limited only to the Sicilian Island and concentrated within a short period of time: probably, 1220–1221 (for the first group) and 1225–1228 (for the second group). Moreover, their use coincided with that of coins without the royal image and they could be hoarded. Furthermore, anthropologists have noted that, in general, when coins are used, more attention is placed on their economic worth than their images. Therefore, the possibility of coming
across royal images on coins was not high. Likely, these coins did not play a political and propagandistic function, but they simply celebrated the acquisition of the imperial and Jerusalemite titles (about that, see: [12] (pp. 89–91)).

Figure 2. Denaro of Frederick II of Hohenstaufen, obverse and reverse sides of a silver coin, 1225. Pen drawing published in [12] (Figure 22).

4. The Augustale

This coin is made with gold at 20.5 carats, weighs between 5.24 and 5.29 g (between 2.63 and 2.65 g in the mezzo augustale version), and has a diameter of 20 mm. It was directly commissioned by Frederick II and was minted in Messina and Brindisi from 1231 to 1250. On the reverse side, FRIDERICVS is inscribed and the image of an eagle, the symbol of the empire, is found. On the obverse side, IMP(ERATOR) ROM(ANORUM) CESAR AVG(VSTVS) is inscribed and the royal image is found. The king is in half bust, in profile position, and he has short hair and is clean shaven. Moreover, he wears a paludament and a laurel wreath as well as an ancient Roman emperor (Figure 3). Iconographic affinities have been highlighted with the coins of the Carolingian Emperors Charlemagne and Louis the Pious but also of the Roman Emperors Constantine and, above all, Augustus. Certainly, symbols of power, attires, and physical features perfectly imitate that of an ancient Roman emperor (about the augustale, see: [22] (Volume 18, p. 196), [24], [1] (pp. 209–210 and pp. 705–711), [25], [23] (p. 195), [14] (pp. 73–74), [26] (pp. 70–74), [5] (p. 272), [27], [9] (pp. 634–636), [28], [17] (Volume 2, pp. 54–56, cards III.A.2–6)).

Figure 3. Augustale of Frederick II of Hohenstaufen, obverse and reverse sides of a gold coin, 1231–1250. Naples, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Collezione Fiorelli, no. 1127. Image published in [12] (Figure 23).

From a stylistic point of view, this coin is one of the best in all of the Middle Ages, it pays special attention to the figurative details, and the royal image is clear and legible. It particularly impressed the contemporaries (who quoted and described it in their chronicles), and its iconographic accuracy has, in the past, led modern historians to consider the royal image to be a portrait of Frederick II (although, now this interpretation cannot be followed). Moreover, this coin was conceived as a commercial currency with high value and international circulation, but it also had a very practical use (facilitated by the minting of the mezzo augustale). The augustale was part of a specific monetary policy that, in
comparison with previous periods, tried to impose a royal monopoly in matters of coinage and intensify the circulation of moneys in the Kingdom of Sicily. These coins were minted in substantial quantity (we still preserve 334 augustali and 88 mezzi augustali), and they circulated far beyond the lands of Southern Italy: specimens have been found in France (in particular, in Poitiers), in England, in Northern Italy, in southwestern Germany, and in Syria. Moreover, they were used even after Frederick II’s death. In short, although augustali circulated together with coins without the royal figure, they could play a significant role in spreading Frederick II’s official image in contemporary society (about that, see: [12] (pp. 91–93) with more details and bibliographic references. About Frederick II’s monetary policy, see: [21] (pp. 103–108), [29–34]).

As said, images on coins mainly had a legal function, but, in the case of the augustale, we can also attribute a specific political function to the royal figure. Indeed, it probably played a role in strengthening the social bond between the ruler and his subjects. Moreover, its written text and iconography displayed and celebrated a fundamental aspect of Frederick II’s political ideology: the renovatio imperii, namely the connection between the German Holy Roman Empire and the Ancient Roman Empire. However, the conception and realization of the augustale was placed in the peaceful and politically quiet period that followed the treaty of San Germano (23 July 1230). In this historical context, the royal image on this coin also having a propagandistic function does not seem plausible (about that, see: [12] (pp. 93–94) with more details and bibliographic references. For more information about Frederick II’s renovatio imperii, see: [35]).

5. The Statue of the Capua Gate

In 1234, Frederick II ordered the edification of a monumental gate on the bridge of the Volturno River that gave access to the city of Capua (the building was finished in 1239/1240 but, perhaps, the decoration lasted until 1247). Currently, this building has been dismantled (Figure 4), but, thanks to previous written and graphic evidence, figuring out the original structure and decoration of the gate is possible. It consisted of two towers connected with an arch decorated with numerous statues in marble (probably in part recovered in ancient monuments), sculptures that celebrated the imperial triumphs, and inscriptions that clarified the meaning of the iconographic apparatus. In particular, the external façade had, in the upper part, a loggia and, below this, the imperial statue. It was located within a niche, flanked by two other effigies (possibly, Diana and Apollo) and, probably, combined with the inscription: “Quam miseris facio quos variare scio!” (How miserable I make those whom I know that they err!). At the top and sides of the fornix of the arch, three other niches with as many busts were found. They have been identified with the allegorical representation of justice (combined with the inscription: “Cesaris imperio regni concordia fio” (By order of the Cesar, I am built to keep the Kingdom)) and two judges (individually combined with the inscriptions: “Intrent securi qui querunt vivere puri” (Enter safely those who wish to live honestly) and “Infidus excludi timeat vel carcere trudi!” (Fear to stay out or to be thrown into prison who is hostile)). However, more recently, a new proposition suggests that, probably, at the top of the fornix was not a statue but only the inscription, as if the door itself spoke (about the Capua Gate and its decoration, see at least: [36] (with previous bibliography), [37], [38] (pp. 225–302), [8] (pp. 366–368, cards V.5-7), [9] (pp. 752–755), [17] (Volume 2, pp. 149–160, cards IV.C.1-15 by L. Speciale), [39] (Chapter 7, Potere e immagine: la Porta di Capua, pp. 171–210 and Chapter 8, Vivit et non vivit. Il mito e lo specchio. Francesco Daniele e la vera storia del Gesso Solari, pp. 211–240), [12] (pp. 94–98) with more details and a new interpretation).

The decoration of the Capua Gate staged one of the most important aspects of Frederick II’s political ideology: the Iustitia Caesaris. Namely, the gate represented the king while he carried out his duties as a judge for the good of his subjects and the whole kingdom. This role was inextricably intertwined with that of being king as lex animata in terris, namely the king authorized to legislate in order to achieve justice within his domain. In this sense, this building represented a real gateway to a realm that was based on justice, and it materialized
the theoretical conception of power presented in the Prooemium of the Liber Constitutionum, a collection of laws enacted by Frederick II in Melfi in September 1231 (about that, see: [12] (p. 99) with more details and bibliographic references. About the aspects of Frederick II’s political ideology in particular, see: [40] (passim), [1] (pp. 211–239), [2] (pp. 171–179), [41] (pp. 82–96), [9] (pp. 564–579), [42]. About the Liber Constitutionum, see in summary [43]).

Figure 4. Capua, bridge of the Volturno River, Capua Gate, current state. Photo taken by the author.

The imperial statue, now decapitated and severely mutilated (Figure 5), was 115 cm high, 64 cm wide, and 49 cm deep. The emperor was sitting on a throne, and he wore a draped cloak laced with a buckle on the right shoulder. The lack of symbols of power and the head makes understanding the iconographic features of the statue difficult. However, historians have connected the whole gate with the ancient imperial triumphal arch, and the statue itself, although stylistically Gothic, imitates the language of the classical sculpture. Hence, we can argue that the cloak possibly represented the paludament of the ancient Roman emperors, as we already saw in the augustali. However, here, the laurel wreath would have been replaced with a sort of spiked crown (perhaps, a sort of radiated diadem of the Roman imperial tradition). Instead, as in the augustali, the face would have been clean shaven and the hair would have been short (about that, see again [12] (p. 98) with more information and bibliographic references).

The statue, although destined to remain stationary in a specific place and positioned in one of the upper registers of the gate (hence, far from the ground), was part of an iconographic scenography of extraordinary and monumental impact. Moreover, the placement in a public space, as a civic gate, provided very wide visibility. Certainly, everyone who passed the bridge noted it, and, indeed, the statue attracted the interest of contemporary chroniclers, who quoted and described it with particular attention in their texts. Capua was the political, religious, economic, and cultural center of a wide territory, and, there, in those years, one of the most important annual fairs of the kingdom had been established. Moreover, Capua was the main city that travelers who, entering the kingdom from the north, came upon, and, most likely, not only Capuan citizens but also merchants, pilgrims, ambassadors, and travelers coming from the other lands of Italy and Europe used the bridge and its gate. In summary, the statue was internationally visible (about Capua in those years, see [44]. About the visibility of the statue, see again [12] (p. 98)).

Regarding the function of Frederick II’s statue in the Capua Gate, first, we point out that it played a memorial and celebrative function of the ruler and his role as judge. Moreover, it also had a political role: it admonished and exhorted those who passed through this sort of gate to the kingdom to respect the laws of this country in order to maintain internal harmony. In other words, this sculpture had to arouse and stimulate a sense of justice in its beholders. However, it does not seem possible to also attribute a propagandistic intent towards the imperial adversaries (in particular, the papacy) to the
The iconographic program of the gate. The promulgation of the Liber Constitutionum was a cause of friction between Frederick II and Pope Gregory IX due to the fact that the latter opposed the royal ius condende legis (about that, see [45]). Nevertheless, it is only in the period between 1239 and 1250 that the relationships between the pope and the emperor degenerated into a bitter conflict and, moreover, the message of the Capua Gate seems to be addressed more to the Sicilian subjects and foreign visitors of the lands of Southern Italy than the papacy (about that, see again [12] (pp. 99–100) with more information and bibliographic references).

Figure 5. Headless statue of Frederick II, sculpture, from the façade of the Capua Gate, 1234–1247. Capua, Museo Provinciale Campano. Image published in [12] (Figure 24).

6. The Lost Image of the Imperial Palace in Naples

Francesco Pipino, a Dominican friar from Bologna, in his Chronicon written around 1320 describes this image of Frederick II currently lost (about this image, see: [1] (pp. 336–337 and pp. 534–535), [46] (p. 41), [47] (pp. 333–335), [48] (pp. 24–27), [49], [50] (p. 751), [51] (p. 101), [59] (pp. 196–203)). He states that the image was in the imperial palace of Naples and represented the king seated on the throne together with his chancellor and logothete Pier della Vigna (or, more likely, a generic figure of imperial judge). In front of them were Sicilian subjects asking the ruler to administrate justice while he delegated this task to the judge (“Cujus [namely, Pier della Vigna] quidem singularis familiaritatis apud Imperatorem fuit illud signum insigne, quod in Neapolitano Palatio, Imperatoris et Petri effigies habebantur. Imperator in throno, Petrus in cathedra resiedebat. Populus ad pedes impertoris procumbens, justitiam sibi in causis fieri his versibus innuebat: Caesar amor Legum, Friderice pannis Regum, / Causarum telas nostras resolve querelas. Imperator autem his alis versibus ad haec videbatur tale dare responsum. Pro vestra lite Censorem juris adite: / Hic est; jura dabit, vel per me danda rogabit. / Vinee cognomen Petrus Judex est sibi nomen. Imperatoris enim figura respiciens ad Populum, digito ad Petrum sermonem dirigere indicabat” [52] (col. 660). About this author and his work, see: [53,54]). Unfortunately, we do not know if the image was a mosaic, a sculpture, or a painting, and we do not have specific information about Frederick II’s aspects (in particular, Francesco Pipino does not provide details about the ruler’s garments and symbols of power apart from the fact that he sat on a throne). Considering the subject of the image, its location was probably in a courtroom where the compalatius (the royal representative in the city of Naples) administrated justice. For this reason, the image was most likely located in Castel Capuano (about this interpretation, see: [55,56]. About the compalatius, see [57]. About
Castel Capuano in general, see: [58] (pp. 71–78)). The date of the work is also uncertain, but we can assume that Frederick II commissioned this image in the same period when he ordered the construction of the Capua Gate, namely, between 1234 and 1239. Moreover, even if we do not have explicit information about it, it seems plausible that the image had monumental dimensions (perhaps it took up a wall of the courtroom) and quite good visibility. Its beholders, presumably, were participants at the various judicial sessions held within the city (in particular, the compalatius with his assistants and the respective parties involved in the processes) (about that, see: [12] (pp. 100–101) with more details and bibliographic references).

This representation, as the statue of the Capua Gate, referred to some of the most important concepts of the Frederick II’s political ideology, as they had been expressed in documents issued by the royal chancellery: the Iustitia Caesaris and, in particular, the notion of a ruler as lex animata in terris (namely, the king as the source of law and the one who transmitted the laws, inspired by God, to humankind). Hence, we can assume that its function was to celebrate Frederick II as a judge and legislator. However, it probably also ensured and legitimized the legal activity of the Neapolitan compalatius. In this sense, the image could have a purely political task: stimulate respect for the local royal official and his legal work. That said, it seems unlikely that the image also played a propagandistic role. Indeed, in these years, no particular political tensions in the city of Naples occurred, and if, as already noted, the papacy opposed the royal ius condende legis, we should point out that the image (and its message) was not specifically addressed towards the pope (about that, see again: [12] (pp. 101–102) with more details and bibliographic references. About the aspects of Frederick II’s political ideology in particular, see again: [40] (passim), [1] (pp. 211–239), [2] (pp. 171–179), [41] (pp. 82–96), [9] (pp. 564–579), [42]).

7. Conclusions

In order to summarize the general line of Frederick II of Hohenstaufen’s iconography, we can conclude that the number of official images commissioned by this king seems to be limited in comparison with what has been generally claimed by historians, and, regarding royal representation, the emperor also left the initiative to the local powers. However, in comparison with other kings of Sicily in the period between the 12th and 14th centuries, this monarch made more extensive use of his image and introduced important innovations. Regarding the media utilized, he privileged coins and seals but also adopted monumental representations of himself that, for the first time, were intended for secular locations and for wide public visibility: the façade of the Capua Gate and the courtroom of the Castel Capuano in Naples. These images were addressed to all subjects of the Kingdom of Sicily (and, in part, to foreign visitors of the lands of Southern Italy). If we also add to these the augustale (with its international circulation), we can assume that, after 1231, Frederick II began to pay specific attention to the management of his image, and he attempted to use it as a government tool for particular political purposes. The thematic and iconographic choices confirm this impression. Indeed, they explicitly referred to the ideological program developed by Frederick II’s court. In particular, the figurative themes are connected to the concepts of Frederick II as judge and legislator and as successor of the Ancient Roman Empire. Additionally, the iconographic rendering of the royal image (and the related symbols of power, attires, and physical features) perfectly follows the iconographic tradition of ancient Roman emperors. The particular attention that contemporary chroniclers devoted to these artworks seems to confirm that we face something original and highly innovative for that time. However, that said, we should underline that these are only limited and isolated examples, and this interpretation should not be overemphasized. Moreover, we should point out that Frederick II’s use of his image does not seem to have any explicit propagandistic function.
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