Papers of the British School at Rome

<http://journals.cambridge.org/ROM>

Additional services for *Papers of the British School at Rome*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Studies in Roman Historical Reliefs

A. J. B. Wace

Papers of the British School at Rome / Volume 4 / January 1907, pp 228 - 276

DOI: 10.1017/S0068246200005146, Published online: 09 August 2013

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0068246200005146

How to cite this article:

A. J. B. Wace (1907). Studies in Roman Historical Reliefs. Papers of the British School at Rome, 4, pp 228-276 doi:10.1017/S0068246200005146

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

PAPERS OF THE BRITISH SCHOOL AT ROME

VOL. IV. No. 3

STUDIES IN
ROMAN HISTORICAL RELIEFS

BY

A. J. B. WACE, M.A.

*Formerly Librarian of the British School at Rome; Fellow of Pembroke College,
Cambridge*

LONDON: 1907

STUDIES IN ROMAN HISTORICAL RELIEFS.

	PAGE
1.—RELIEFS FROM TRAJAN'S FORUM	229
2.—THE RELIEFS OF THE ARCO DI PORTOGALLO	258
3.—A RELIEF IN THE PALAZZO SACCHETTI	263
4.—THE FRIEZE OF THE ARCH OF CONSTANTINE	270

THE four papers here printed are part of the fruits of a study of the development of Roman reliefs undertaken during the last three years in Rome. The object of this study has been to attempt to determine the Roman or Alexandrian origin of the 'Hellenistic' reliefs that have been the subject of so much controversy. The result of this main investigation will be published elsewhere at a later time. In the meantime it is hoped that these papers will help in some degree towards the explanation of some important Roman monuments, and towards a clearer knowledge of the development of Roman imperial art. To Professor Hülsen and Dr. Ashby I owe much for the help they have so kindly given me; but I am most deeply indebted to Mr. Stuart Jones, without whose aid these studies would never have been written. M. Héron de Villefosse and M. Michon I have to thank most warmly for the assistance and information they most courteously afforded me when studying the reliefs in the Louvre. My thanks are also due to Signor Ferretti for the skill with which he has carried out the difficult task of making the reconstructed drawings (**Plates XXIX-XXXII**).

RELIEFS FROM TRAJAN'S FORUM.

I.—*Their History.*

Towards the end of the sixteenth century there lay in the *cortile* of the Palazzo dei Conservatori several Roman historical reliefs of considerable importance. Whether they did, or did not, form part of the collection of sculpture belonging to the municipality, is not known. At all events, as Michaelis has shown in his *Storia della Collezione Capitolina*

di Antichità,¹ they were removed between 1576 and 1650 from the Capitol to the Villa Borghese,² where they formed part of the decoration of the eastern façade. Thence they passed to the Louvre, when Napoleon I. bought the Borghese collection. It has up till now been unknown where these reliefs were found, how they came to the Capitoline collection, and why, or when they passed to the Villa Borghese. They consisted of a large composition representing an *extispicium* before the temple of *Jupiter Capitolinus*, broken into two pieces, the *extispicium* itself, and a group of men before the temple, the pediment of which has been lost. There was also a smaller relief in several fragments showing a sacrifice of two bulls. Both these though badly damaged are still in existence.³ To them we may add another representing a Victory flying to the right and holding a long staff (perhaps a *vexillum*) in her right hand. By her feet appear the ends of two *fascēs*. Several sixteenth century drawings of all these exist. A reference table of them will be convenient.

	COBURGENSIS ⁴ 1550-1554.	COD. VAT. 3439, ⁵ 1570-1576.	PIERRE JACQUES, ⁶ 1572-1577.	BEROLINENSIS, ⁷ 1572-83.
I.—Temple of Jupiter. (a) Pediment (lost). (b) Group in front, Louvre, 1089. (c) <i>Extispicium</i> , Louvre, 978.	f. 156. ⁸	f. 83. ⁹ Pl. XX. f. 94. Pl. XXIV.	f. 48. f. 18.	f. 25.
II.—Sacrifice, Louvre, 1098.		{ ff. 85, 88. Pl. XXI., XXIII.	f. 17 bis (half only).	
III.—Victory (lost).		f. 88. Pl. XXIII.	f. 13 bis.	

¹ *Röm. Mitt.* 1891, p. 22.

² v. Manilli, *Villa Borghese* (1650), p. 46; cf. Montelatici, *Villa Borghese* (1700), p. 172.

³ Louvre (Héron de Villefosse, *Cat. Sommaire*), Nos. 978, 1089, 1098.

⁴ Matz, *Berl. Sitzungsberichte*, 1871, p. 445.

⁵ Professor Hülsen tells me that these and several other leaves of this codex are by Panvinus having been intended originally for his lives of the popes. For instance f. 88 is marked *Calixtus* II, and *Anacletus* II, the leaf in its present state consisting of two gummed together; f. 83 is marked *Clemens* II, and f. 85 *Ben(edictus)* II and *Inn(ocentius)* V (?). The other leaves are not so marked but are of the same quality of paper; this applies also to the leaves on which are the drawings of the arch of Titus: v. *Röm. Mitt.* 1891, p. 79.

⁶ S. Reinach, *L'album de Pierre Jacques*.

⁷ Michaelis, *Röm. Mitt.* 1891, Pl. III, pp. 21 *segg.*

⁸ Reproduced by Schulze, *Arch. Zeit.*, 1872, Pl. 1.

⁹ Reproduced by Hülsen, *Röm. Mitt.* 1889, p. 251; the pediment was engraved by Piranesi, *Della Magnificenza ed Architettura de' Romani*, Pl. 198.

It is from the brief underlines added by Pierre Jacques and the Berolinensis that we know that these reliefs were in the Capitoline collection. Their provenance has however always been unknown, and their passing to the Borghese collection is mysterious. The object of the present paper is to show where they were found, to attempt to throw some light on the second problem, and finally to try to determine to what period and monuments they belonged.

Amongst the sketches of Antonio da Sangallo the younger, preserved in the Uffizi at Florence, there is one which gives a small sketch-plan with a long description written below, which runs as follows: ¹—

*Di questo edifitio se cauato in casa
mess gieronimo cuccino e retroua
to molti frammenti in ruina
dove e quello emiciclo a piè delle
militie e se trouato questi capitelli
cioe A. B. C. D. e la colo
na E e molti altri frammenti
di pilastri gialli piani.
Una storia de uno sacrificio
grande le fiure quanto naturale.
Due tonde per mettere una testa
come quelli di di rauenna dell arco
della porta aurea.
In ditta storia ne tinpano del tempio
di (facia) ² cie ioue in mezo di due
donne a sedere a piedi sua sia
laquila e nel basso dello
tinpano da ogni banda sia una
biga.
In sul mezo del fronte spitio in su uno
dado sia una quadriga
In sulli angoli una biga che corre in su
In fra lla biga e quadriga due statue ritte
In sullo cantone laterale. . .
architraue una aquila al [ta. . .
quanto larchitraue colla a[quila. . . ³*

¹ No. 1178; quoted incompletely by Lanciani, *Storia degli Scavi*, ii. p. 124; the full version here given I owe to Professor Hülsen.

² Lanciani reads *fatti*; Professor Hülsen is not certain what the word is, but from his copy it seems to me to read *facia*.

³ The paper is torn at the corner.

The *emiciclo a piè delle militie* is of course the hemicycle on the east of Trajan's forum, which is still in a fairly good state of preservation. The date of the excavation mentioned by Sangallo is obtained from another of his sketches representing a cornice block described thus:¹—*cornice cauata nel 1540 in lorto dello emiciclo delle militie del quale ui e larchitraue in casa col fregio de grifoni*. There are also in the famous Codex Barberini (*Barb. Lat.* 4424) a plan of the same hemicycle drawn by Giuliano da Sangallo and a sketch of some details by his son Francesco.²

It will at once be seen that the pediment of the temple of *Jupiter Capitolinus* as represented in the drawings (**Plate XX**) is exactly described by Sangallo in the first of the two passages quoted above. We may therefore say with certainty that the whole relief—it is drawn as a whole by the Berolinensis—of which this pediment once formed part, was found in 1540³ in Trajan's forum close to the eastern hemicycle. One of the problems before us is thus definitely solved. The style and date of this relief will be discussed later. We must consider the other reliefs that were with it in the Palazzo dei Conservatori, and see if we can give any reason for their having gone to the Borghese collection.

In this connection we may take a much quoted passage of the *Memorie* of Flaminio Vacca, who wrote in 1594. He says:⁴—*Mi ricordo intorno alla colonna Trajana dalla banda dove si dice Spolia Christi, essersi cavate le vestigie di un Arco trionfale con molti pezzi d'istorie, quali sono in casa del Sig. Prospero Boccapaduli, a quel tempo Maestro di Strade. Vi era anco Trajano a cavallo, che passava un fiume, e si trovarono alcuni prigionieri simili a quelli che sono sopra l'Arco che si dice di Costantino, della medesima maniera.*

The name *Spolia Christi* or *Spoglia Cristo* was applied to part of the area of Trajan's forum close by the now destroyed church of Santa

¹ Uffizi, No. 1211; Vasari, *Vite*, ed. Milanesi, 1880, v. p. 493. Lanciani (*op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*) takes the first passage in connection with three inscriptions copied by Smetius (p. 67, 2 = *C.I.L.* vi. 1. 1497) and Boissard (*MS.* pp. 410, 412 = *C.I.L.* vi. 1. 996, 1497, 1549), and dates the excavation to 1555 according to the date given by Smetius for the finding of one of the inscriptions. Antonio da Sangallo the younger died in 1546, so the incorrectness of Lanciani's statements is obvious.

² v. Fabriczy, *Handzeichnungen Giuliano's da Sangallo*, pp. 26 (f. 6^v), 51 (f. 38^v).

³ Therefore Michaelis' conjecture (*Röm. Mitt.* 1891, p. 20) that Marliani saw this relief amongst those *parietibus inclusa* in the Palazzo dei Conservatori before 1540, falls to the ground.

⁴ *Memorie*, 9.

Maria in Campo Carleo.¹ It was a rich mine for marble and other building material during the sixteenth century, and there are many references to it.² When Santa Maria was destroyed in 1863, many marbles were found, including a piece of a relief which cannot now be identified unless it is a battered fragment now walled in near the south-eastern angle of the excavated part of Trajan's forum.³ The church stood just at the point where the Via Alessandrina enters the Piazza del Foro Traiano. Lanciani suggests that the triumphal arch mentioned by Vacca is that referred to in the minutes of the *Conservatori* for March 23, 1526,⁴ in which mention is made of a discussion *super lapidibus peperignis amotis ab Arcu Traiani*. He further connects with these a fragment of an inscription copied by Salvestro Peruzzi *dell arco Traiaō ī foro*.⁵ This Henzen and Hülsen have shown to be part of the dedicatory inscription of the Temple of Trajan and Plotina,⁶ which stood on the other side of the column to Spolia Christi. Most probably therefore the 'Arch of Trajan' built of *peperino*—a strange material for a triumphal arch!—was part of the enclosing wall of the *Forum Transitorium* which was completed by Trajan. This view receives confirmation from a passage of Poggio,⁷ who, writing in the fifteenth century, mentions in his list of triumphal arches that *pars Nervae Traiani quaedam praecipui operis residet iuxta Comitium, in qua sculptae literae Traiani arcum fuisse dicunt*. It is necessary to observe in any case that Vacca had the idea of an *Arco Trionfale* suggested to him by the *pezzi d'istorie*,⁸ the usual phrase for historical reliefs. The relief showing *Trajano a cavallo* has been rightly identified by Matz and von Duhn⁹ with a relief walled up in the garden front of the Villa Medici, which represents a Dacian on horseback swimming the Danube with the bridge built by Apollodorus in the background. It was engraved by Vaccaria in his first

¹ For the position of the church and an explanation of the name *Spoglia Cristo*, see Adinolfi, *Roma nell' età di mezzo*, ii. p. 55.

² Lanciani, *Storia degli Scavi*, ii. pp. 123, 125, 126, 161.

³ Pellegrini, *Bull. Inst.* 1863, p. 78; Visconti, *Archivio del Min. d. Belle Arti*, 1863, v. 1. 5.

⁴ *Op. cit.* i. p. 224.

⁵ Drawings in the Uffizi, No. 2076; cf. Lanciani, *op. cit.* i. p. 224.

⁶ *C.I.L.* vi. i. 996, vi. iv. 2. 31215.

⁷ Ulrichs, *Codex Topographicus*, p. 239.

⁸ Lanciani (*op. cit.* ii. p. 124) in commenting on this passage of Poggio says, without giving any reason for his statement, that in the Codex Vaticanus 3439 there are several drawings of the reliefs found on this occasion. In particular according to him *f. 84v* represents the capture of Decebalus on a fragment from Vacca's triumphal arch. It is really a drawing of the inside face of one of the piers of the *Arcus Argentariorum*.

⁹ *Antike Bildwerke in Rom*, iii. No. 3518, v. below p. 243, Fig. 1.

edition of 1584 as *Horatii imago in aedibus cuiusdam nobilis Romani*.¹ It was also drawn by Pierre Jacques, who inscribed below it *apresso li Giudei*. This brief note is of great importance. It means that the relief in 1576, when Pierre Jacques drew it, was in a house near or in the Ghetto. Now it is known that the very Prospero Boccapaduli mentioned by Vacca as being in possession of the historical reliefs found on this occasion, lived till 1555 in the Ghetto in the Piazza del Mercatello. He moved, owing to the Jews being confined to that quarter, in the year mentioned to the Palazzo Boccamazzi in the Piazza Mattei also quite close to the Ghetto.³ Prospero Boccapaduli was as stated by Vacca *maestro di strade*, but not till 1570.⁴ He was however superintendent of the building of the Palazzo dei Conservatori from 1555 onwards, and also was in charge of the arrangement of the Capitoline collection in that Palazzo.⁵ Therefore the Louvre reliefs, which, as shown above, came from Trajan's forum, must have been in the charge of Prospero Boccapaduli, when Pierre Jacques saw them in the Capitoline collection in 1576. Most probably the notices of Vacca and Sangallo refer to the same excavation. Vacca is not precise as to the actual locality, nor in any case is *Spolia Christi* far from the hemicycle. So it is reasonable to conjecture that Boccapaduli either by purchase—the Cuccini sold⁶ some of the marble found in 1540—or by seizure had possession of the four reliefs we have had occasion to mention. These are the Temple of Jupiter with the extispicium, the sacrifice of two bulls, the lost Victory, and the 'Horatius.' Other fragments of historical reliefs,⁷

¹ *Antiq. Statuarum Urbis Romae icones*, No. 58.

² *f.* 56, *v.* Reinach, *op. cit.*

³ Bicch, *Notizia della famiglia Boccapaduli*, pp. 19, 20, 21.

⁴ Bicch, *op. cit.* p. 134.

⁵ Bicch, *op. cit.* pp. 115, 129.

⁶ Lanciani, *op. cit.* ii. p. 124.

⁷ It is possible that the well known relief believed to show the pediment of the temple of Venus and Rome, now in the Museo del Terme, was also in Boccapaduli's possession. The relief was drawn by Pighius (1547-1555, *v.* Jahn, *Sächs. Berichte*, 1868, p. 161), and by the Coburgensis (1550-1554, *v.* Matz, *Berl. Sitzungsberichte*, 1871, p. 445), but was lost again till 1819, when it was found in a house near Sant' Angelo in Pescaria, also in the Ghetto and by the original home of Boccapaduli. Ashby believes the relief was the model for one of the drawings attributed to Coner (*Papers B.S.R.* ii. Pl. 64 b), which would imply that the relief was found about 1520. The Lateran fragment, which Petersen has proved to be the bottom part of the relief (*Röm. Mitt.* 1895, p. 244, Pl. V.), was according to Nibby (*Roma nel 1838, parte antica*, ii. p. 218) found on the site of Santa Eufemia, a church that stood close to Santa Maria in Campo Carleo. This fragment is, as Benndorf and Schoene rightly remarked (*Die ant. Bild. d. Lateranischen Museums*, No. 20), Trajanic in style. But the temple of Venus and Rome, which it and its fellow are supposed to represent, was built by Hadrian, and dedicated in 135, though it must have been begun earlier (*v.* Richter, *Topog. d. S. Rom.*² p. 166. Jordan-Hüllsen, *Topographie*, i. 3. p. 17).

which may not unreasonably be attributed to the same find, are the fragments of a triumphal procession and a sacrifice before an architectural background drawn in the *Cod. Vat. Lat.* 3439 on pp. 83, 85, 86, 88 (**Plates XX-XXIV**). These are drawn on the same leaves as the Borghese reliefs and the lost Victory, which were all in the Palazzo dei Conservatori, and it is exceedingly probable that reliefs drawn together were all together in the same collection. The *extispicium* before the Temple of *Jupiter Capitolinus* was found in Trajan's forum. Therefore we may assume as a working hypothesis that all the reliefs drawn with it, both those lost and the one that has always accompanied it, were found with it. When we come to consider their subjects it will be seen that there are other reasons for connecting the lost fragments with the others.

It thus seems fairly certain that Prospero Boccapaduli had all these reliefs in his charge or in his private possession. He was a well educated man, and had a taste for art. There existed at one time in the archives of the family a sketch book of sculpture supposed to have been drawn by him.¹ He died in 1585, and his heirs may have sold his collection. Thus perhaps three of the reliefs passed to the villa built about 1615 by Cardinal Scipione Borghese,² who was distantly connected with the Boccapaduli family, and another, the 'Horatius,' was sold to Cardinal Medici, who bought the Villa Medici at that time. Such a dispersal of his collection is of course mere conjecture. The fate of the other fragments is unknown, but it is always possible that they may reappear.

II.—*Their Style and Subjects.*

The pedigree and provenance of these reliefs being thus fairly clear, we may proceed to attempt a rearrangement of them, and some estimation of their style and place in the history of Roman Art. As regards arrangement we must first consider the other fragments drawn with them by Panvinus in the *Codex Vaticanus* 3439. The leaves of the *Codex* which concern us are the following:—

This question will be discussed below. It must be observed that, whatever the date of the finding of the first fragment, it may have been in Boccapaduli's possession, and that the second is definitely said to have come from Trajan's forum. Cf. Matz-von Duhn, *op. cit.* iii. No. 3519.

¹ Bicci, *op. cit.* p. 107. 1.

² Bicci, *op. cit.* p. 104.

- f.* 83. **Plate XX.** The right hand part of the Louvre relief with the pediment of the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus; Louvre, 1089, **Plate XXV.**
- f.* 85. **Plate XXI.** *A.* The right hand fragment of the sacrifice of two bulls; Louvre, 1098, **Plate XXVII.**
B. A round building of two arcades with a domed roof before three small gables.
C. A fragment which by the shading shows part of the edge of a slab.
- f.* 86. **Plate XXII.** *A.* A fragment with a portion of a popa in the act of striking, and part of a man before a Doric colonnade, on which stands an arch.
B. A fragment of a gable over a low arcade on an architrave.
C. A bearded and a beardless man before a Corinthian column.
D. Two lictors appearing over the backs of two horses; the reins are seen hanging from the edge of the triumphal car.
E. A part of an emperor in a car.
- f.* 88. **Plate XXIII.** *A.* The right hand part of the *extispicium*; Louvre, 978, **Plate XXVI.**
B. A headless Victory holding the staff of a *vexillum* in her right hand, flying to the left above two *fascēs*.
C. The left hand part of the sacrifice of two bulls; Louvre, 1098, **Plate XXVII.**
D. Three men and a *camillus* before a building composed of gables above a low arcade resting on the architrave of a colonnade.
- f.* 94 B. **Plate XXIV.** The *extispicium*; Louvre, 978, **Plate XXVI.**

A. Now reference to the Berolinensis¹ drawing shows a triangular gap existing in the Extispicium-Jupiter Capitolinus scene below the left corner of the temple, and that the head of one man is missing. This gap is exactly filled by the fragment *f.* 86 c. Thus the group before the temple is completed. This disposes of *f.* 83, *f.* 86 c, *f.* 88 a, and *f.* 94 b, **Plate XXIX.**

B. The Victory next claims our attention. The manner in which she flies over the *fascēs* of lictors suggests a Victory above a triumphal

¹ *Röm. Mitt.* 1891, Pl. III.

procession, as on the panel of the arch of Constantine showing the adventus of M. Aurelius.¹ The *fascēs* connect her with the lictors of *f.* 86 d. The lictors by the horses of a triumphal car—they are laurel-wreathed, and so we know a triumph is concerned—are perhaps to be joined to the fragment of the emperor in a car of *f.* 86 e. Thus we have part of a triumphal procession showing an emperor in the triumphal car escorted by laurel-wreathed lictors, over whose heads *Victoria* flies to crown the conqueror; **Plate XXX.**

C. Of the other reliefs drawn *f.* 85 a and *f.* 88 c combine to make up, without restorations, the greater part of the sacrifice of bulls, which is now in the Louvre; **Plate XXXI.**

D. Four of the remaining fragments, *f.* 85 b, *f.* 86 a, *f.* 86 b, and *f.* 88 d, seem to be closely related by the extraordinary architecture in the background. Two of them, *f.* 85 b and *f.* 88 d, clearly join, and *f.* 86 b, since its architecture is almost identical, must be placed close to the left hand side of those two. Likewise *f.* 86 a may be conjecturally placed to the left again, since the heads on the two fragments we have joined all look to the left. The position of the remaining fragment, *f.* 85 c, is altogether uncertain. It may have been on the right of this group, as shown in the reconstructed drawing (**Plate XXXII**) or have belonged elsewhere.

Thus we have four historical reliefs, none of which exists as drawn in the *Codex*, and one has lost one of its most important parts, the pediment of the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus. All the small fragments have entirely disappeared. But proceeding from the reconstructions we can now deal with them in more detail.

A.—*The Scene before the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus.*

The large relief of the *extispicium* before the Temple of *Jupiter Capitolinus* certainly came from Trajan's Forum,² and is also Trajanic in style.³ There is no particular feeling for texture, and the whole is rendered in a hard serious manner very similar to the reliefs of the arch at Beneventum and the Trajanic battle scenes on the arch of Constantine (**Plate XXVIII**).

¹ *Papers B.S.R.* iii. Pl. XXIV. 3.

² *v.* above, p. 232, Strong, *Roman Sculpture*, p. 165, note.

³ For an account of the Trajanic style see *Papers B.S.R.* iii. pp. 280, 292.

In composition we have in this relief the Trajanic method of consecutive groups arranged in a frieze representing as it were successive views of the same procession. This broken down processional treatment is very noticeable on the reliefs of the passage-way of the arch at Beneventum,¹ and is to be remarked in the battle scenes already referred to. It is also the method employed for relating the Dacian campaigns on the column. A bold, simple composition rendered in a broad, effective style is typical of Trajanic art, and coupled with the hard and military treatment already observed is characteristic of an age of bold imperial enterprise.

As a further proof of the Trajanic date of the relief we may take the inscription cut on the right forefoot of the bull which Pierre Jacques² drew, and which still exists. This reads :—

M. V
O R E .
T E S

After the V Pierre Jacques saw an L, therefore we may restore the whole as M. VL[PIVS] | ORE[S]|TES. This is the signature of the artist of the relief. The form of his name would indicate that he was a client or freedman of Trajan, since it is well known that such persons took the *nomen* and *praenomen* of their patron. Probably Orestes³ was a Greek artist admitted to Roman citizenship by Trajan and not a freedman.

We have now to consider the meaning of the scene represented. The reliefs as they now exist in the Louvre (**Plates XXV, XXVI**) have been considerably restored and damaged: their condition when found is shown, with as near an approach to accuracy as is possible, in the reconstructed drawing (**Plate XXIX**). The restorations are as follows going from left to right :—

The Bull, nose and part of the entrails.

A. *Man behind bull*, head and chest, right shoulder, left arm and hand.

B. *Haruspex*, head and left arm.

¹ Wickhoff, *Roman Art*, p. 109, Figs. 37, 38; cf. below, p. 261.

² S. Reinach, *L'album de P. J.*, f. 18.

³ Orestes occurs as the name of a sculptor in a Pergamene inscription; Fränkel, *Inschriften v. P.* i. 75. For the form of the name compare M. Cossutius Kerdon and A. Sextus Eraton; Loewy, *Inschriften griech. Bildhauer*, 334, 376. For the introduction of the artist's signature into the relief compare the inscription CEAEYKOC EΠΘEI on the wall-paintings from the Farnesina; Helbig, *Führer*², ii. p. 221.

I. Nose, mouth, right eye, forehead,
and hair.	} A triangular piece has been inserted
here at the bottom to restore the
lower part of the legs and the feet
of these two.
J. <i>Emperor</i> , both hands and fore-
arms, head.	

¹ He also appears in the Aurelian panel representing a sacrifice before the same temple, *Papers B.S.R.* iii. Pl. XXVI. 7.

be sought. Mr. Stuart Jones has suggested that this relief represents the *nuncupatio votorum* on the Capitol before Trajan set out on his Dacian campaigns. Since the other reliefs from Trajan's forum concern the Dacian wars, this relief also is probably connected with them: and so this suggestion may be correct.

The hexastyle Corinthian temple in the background is without doubt that of *Jupiter Capitolinus*. Though the part that showed the pediment is unfortunately lost, it is preserved in four drawings.¹ Another independent monument also represents the pediment, one of the panels from the arch of M. Aurelius in the Palazzo dei Conservatori. The artist of the latter relief has abbreviated the temple by making it tetrastyle. His representation of the pediment differs from that shown in the drawings, and the point is worth examining in some little detail.² We see in the Aurelian relief³ Jupiter in the centre of the pediment with Juno on his right and Minerva on his left. At his feet is the eagle. Below Juno is seen a youth, perhaps Ganymede. On the left of Minerva is Mercury, and below him Aesculapius and Salus (Hygieia). To the right of Juno is Luna in her car descending to the left, and beyond Vulcan and the Cyclopes at an anvil. To the left of Mercury is Sol in his car ascending, and three figures which might also represent Vulcan and the Cyclopes. As acroteria the pediment carries a quadriga in the centre and a biga at each corner. The drawings⁴ of the lost relief show a somewhat different composition. Cod. Vaticanus,⁵ 3439, f. 83, **Plate XX.**

Quadriga									
Statue base				Venus					
Mars									
Biga of Luna, <i>ascending</i>		Juno	Jupiter Eagle	Minerva	Biga of Sol	Cyclopes?	Recumbent figure	Biga	

¹ See above, p. 230.

² For previous discussions of the pediment, see Schulze, *Arch. Zeit.* 1872, Brunn, *Kleine Schriften*, i. p. 105, Daremberg-Saglio, *s.v. Capitolium*.

³ v. Brunn, *Kleine Schriften*, *loc. cit.* Fig. 31.

⁴ See above, p. 230.

⁵ Audollent (*Mélanges d'Arch. et Hist.* 1889, p. 125) criticizes this drawing adversely. It is however for a sketch exceedingly good, and compares very well with the others. To obtain an idea of Panvinus as an accurate artist, see the drawings of the arch of Titus. *Cod. Vat.* 3439, ff. 75, 89.

Pierre Jacques, *f.* 48.

Berolinensis, *f.* 25.

Coburgensis, *f.* 156.

The figures standing on either side of the eagle do not appear in these drawings: probably if they were shown in the relief, they were broken off. This will also explain the presence of only one figure instead of three behind Sol. Similarly the recumbent figure in the angle, to which we may assume with Schulze a corresponding figure in the other angle, is wanting in the Aurelian relief. But this latter relief is probably correct in showing Luna descending. Whether the representation of her as ascending is due to the sixteenth century artists, or to the Trajanic sculptor's idea of symmetry cannot be decided. In any case the descent of

ful group, which may perhaps be Neptune and the Venti. Finally in each angle we have Tellus and Tiber. Thus earth and fire are balanced by air and water, and these four elements surround the supreme divinity of the central group already framed by the gods of light. The asymmetry shown by the introduction of Mercury, and the balancing of Hercules against Salus and Aesculapius, is an artistic trick designed to hide the studied composition.

This pediment of course belongs to the temple rebuilt by Domitian¹ after the fire of Titus. The previous temple was that built by Vespasian,

FIG. 1.—THE 'HORATIUS' OF THE VILLA MEDICI.

of which we have representations on coins.² To judge by the similarity of the later pediment to the coins, Domitian seems to have followed his father's plan very closely; for in the pediment of Vespasian's temple on the coins we again see a central group of three deities with corresponding groups on each side. It seems to have been quite usual in Rome to make the composition of pediments symmetrical. Those of the temple of

¹ Richter, *Topographie d. Stadt Rom*², p. 125.

² Cohen,² Vespasian 486, Titus 242, 243, Domitian 23, 172-174.

Quirinus,¹ of the temples of Mars⁴ and the Magna Mater,² of which we have representations on reliefs, all show the same balanced composition which is undoubtedly imitated from Greek temple sculptures.³

We have conjectured above that these reliefs formed part of a series illustrating Trajan's Dacian campaigns. It is noticeable that the extant fragments do not form one composition, and must therefore have been executed at different times and probably by different artists. We may arrange them as follows:—

A. The *Nuncupatio Votorum*.

B. The Campaigns.

- (1) The eight slabs on the arch of Constantine.⁴
- (2) The fragment in the Louvre.⁵
- (3) The 'Horatius' of the Villa Medici (**Fig. 1**).⁶

C. The Triumph (?). The three reliefs in the Villa Borghese formerly wrongly attributed to the arch of Claudius.⁷

All three groups of reliefs differ in style as well as in composition. The first two are more alike in style, and the last two in the height of the slabs,⁸ and in the crowding and size of the figures.⁹ It is of course possible that **A** has no connection with the Dacian campaigns, and relates to some other incident in Trajan's career. Still, since they all probably came from Trajan's forum, and the total height of the slabs is the same, it is reasonable to suppose that they formed part of the same scheme of decoration.

Besides these there are two more fragments that we can consider from their style as Trajanic. One¹⁰ is a large relief, unfortunately broken and

¹ Hartwig, *Röm. Mitt.* 1904, Pl. IV.

² Petersen, *Ara Pacis Augustae*, pp. 63, 67.

³ On the composition of Greek pediments see Furtwängler, *Aegina*, pp. 316 *seqq.*

⁴ v. Sieveking apud Brunn-Bruckmann, 580; Strong, *Roman Sculpture*, Pls. XLVII, XLVIII.

⁵ *Papers B.S.R.* iii. p. 226, Fig. 1; in *Les Monuments Antiques du Musée Napoléon*, iv. (1806), Pl. 77, its provenance is given as Trajan's forum; Louvre, *Cat. Somm.* No. 412.

⁶ Mrs. Strong, *Roman Sculpture*, Pl. L., Messrs. Duckworth have most kindly lent the block for this illustration.

⁷ Stuart Jones, *Papers, B.S.R.* iii. p. 215, Pl. XX.

⁸ **A** is 1.96 m. high (it must have been at least 2.50 m. originally); the slabs on the arch of Constantine, **B** 1, are 3.00 m. high; the highest fragment of **C** is about 2.30 m. high.

⁹ In **A** the figures are 1.41 m., in **B** 2.27 m., and in **C** 1.70 m. high.

¹⁰ Museum No. 460; Benndorf-Schoene, *Die ant. Bildwerke d. Lat. Museums*, 223; the relief is 1.75 m. high, and the standing figure in its present state is 1.61 m. high.

incomplete, in the Lateran (**Fig. 2**). It is conceivable that it may have had some connection with this Trajanic series. At all events its style seems to be of that period, and shows the same effective vigorous workmanship coupled with a hard rendering and little sense of texture. The relief shows the lower right-hand corner of a slab. On it stands a man clad in a long toga and wearing boots. He is almost certainly a person of some

[Photo, Moscioni.]

FIG. 2.—RELIEF IN THE LATERAN.

importance. Before him seated on a rock is part of a male figure clad in an *exomis* that leaves the right arm and shoulder bare. Its provenance is unknown, but it certainly comes from some imperial monument. Its size as well as its style suggests connection with the Trajanic group.

The second is a fragment formerly in the Mattei collection and now in

the Louvre (**Fig. 3**).¹ It has undergone considerable restorations. These are as follows from left to right:—

- A. *Bearded man*, part of laurel wreath.
- B. *Flute player*, most of fingers, flutes, part of laurel wreath.

[Photo, Giraudon.]

FIG. 3.—RELIEF FROM THE MATTEI COLLECTION, NOW IN THE LOUVRE.

- C. *Victimarius*, right hand and arm, head.
- Bull*, left horn, nose, half of ornament on head.
- D. *Victimarius*, head, right hand, most of left arm and axe.

¹ Louvre, *Cat. Somm.* 992; *Monumenta Matteiana*, iii. p. 74, Pl. XXXVIII; from the Mattei collection it passed to that of Cardinal Fesch, thence to the Aguado collection, and afterwards came to the Louvre. H. 1·65 m.; L. 2·09 m., the whole relief was probably about 2·30 m. high originally. M. Michon writes as follows concerning it, *certain indices m'ont donné la conviction que ce bas-relief devait provenir du même édifice, sans doute un arc de triomphe, que le No. 1079*. No. 1079 is a relief representing five Roman soldiers. It has been much restored, but the soldiers are beardless, and their eyes are plain. The style also is Trajanic, especially in the drill ornamentation. Other Trajanic reliefs are the fragments in Turin (*Memorie dei Lincei*, Ser. V. Vol. viii, pp. 34 *segg.*). Similar in style also are two heads from high reliefs at Berlin (*Ant. Skulpturen B. Museums*, 960) and at Mantua (Museo Civico, 221, Dütschke, iv. 807).

There are also restored the bottom and left edges, the peak of the temple pediment, and fragments of the drapery on the figures.

The two original heads are both beardless, and the eyes are plain. The hair is stiff and straight, and not worked with the drill. The dry, rather unnatural rendering of the faces recalls those on the Trajanic reliefs on the arch of Constantine, and the fragment in the Louvre. Another point of similarity is that the use of the drill is restricted to ornamentation. Here the ornaments on the bull, the temple and the architecture show the same use of the drill in minor details that is observable in the decoration of the shields, helmets, and other armour of the battle scenes referred to. Nothing being known of the finding of this relief, it is impossible to do more than conjecture its provenance from Trajan's forum or a triumphal arch of that emperor. In any case it represents a sacrifice in honour of a triumph, since the figures wear laurel wreaths. The temple and gateway before which the sacrifice takes place cannot as yet be identified. As before the size and style of the relief incline us to consider it Trajanic.

But still more alike in style to the *extispicium* group are the two fragments in the Lateran and the Museo delle Terme believed to represent a procession before the temple of Venus and Rome.¹ In style, size, and composition the reliefs are very like one another. Still there is little doubt that the temple in the Lateran delle Terme relief, if decastyle, is that of Venus and Rome. This temple however was built by Hadrian, who consecrated it in 135 A.D. long after Trajan's death. At its consecration the temple may not have been finished, but there is no reason to suppose it was begun by Trajan, although we may assume it took several years to build. The Lateran fragment was found according to Nibby in Trajan's forum,² but the provenance of the other piece is not known. From the date of the temple we are bound to assume the relief to be Hadrianic. Thus, since this date seems certain, its Trajanic style—recognised by Thorwaldsen, who restored a head of Trajan on the Lateran fragment—compels us to assume that

¹ v. Petersen, *Röm. Mitt.* 1895, p. 244, Pl. V. ; v. above, p. 234, n. 1. According to the *Chronica* the date of its dedication was 132 or 135. In Pauly-Wissowa (i.¹ p. 508, s.v. Aelius, 64) von Rhoden gives the date as 128. As Hadrian was in or near Rome from 118 to 120, from 126–128, and from 134 till his death, and most probably dedicated so important a temple himself, its dedication must fall in one of the periods given. Possibly the temple of Venus and Rome like his villa (Winnefeld, *Villa Hadrians*, p. 26) was begun between 126 and 128 and finished after his return in 134. For a restoration of the relief see Michaelis, *Arch. Anzeiger*, 1906, p. 315, Fig. 1.

² *Roma nel 1838*, parte antica, ii, p. 218.

Trajanic artists were still working on his forum during Hadrian's reign. This leads to a further suggestion that Trajan's forum begun about 113 A.D. the date on his column, was not finished at his death. It seems reasonable to suppose that the enormous excavation, the building, and the decoration took more than five years. The *Forum Transitorium* begun by Domitian before 95 A.D.¹ was continued by Nerva and only completed by Trajan. The fact that this building, comparatively small by the side of Trajan's forum, required at least six years, gives us every reason to suppose that Trajan's forum occupied about twelve years in building. That it was still in construction under Hadrian, is proved by the fact that the plan was altered to admit the *Templum Traiani*. Thus it should cause us no surprise to find a Hadrianic relief in Trajanic style in Trajan's forum. It is fair to believe that the artists and decorators employed continued to work under Hadrian, since we know that Apollodorus,² Trajan's chief architect, continued in the imperial service after his death. Since it was the custom not to sculpture reliefs till the marble slabs had been placed in their proper position in the building, some of Hadrian's acts may well have been commemorated by the side of those of his predecessor.

This must be our argument if we follow the orthodox view³ and believe the temple on the relief to be decastyle and therefore to represent that of Venus and Rome. The identification rests on the supposition that the temple represented had ten columns. Careful examination of the relief, however, shews that if we restore the angle of the pediment, it stops not over the fifth but over the sixth column.⁴ A dodecastyle temple is not to be thought of, therefore we must assume it to be in perspective,

¹ v. Stuart Jones, *Papers B.S.R.* iii. p. 244, 2.

² Apollodorus was apparently still alive in 133, if Hadrian consulted him about siege operations in the Jewish revolt (v. Pauly-Wissowa, i.¹ p. 513). His adverse criticism of the temple of Venus and Rome, which is supposed to have made Hadrian execute him, was probably expressed after the temple was finished (cf. Cassius Dio, lxi. 4). If the temple was completed in 135, it is possible that Apollodorus was put to death in 136 at the time that Ursus Servianus, another Trajanic veteran, and others were executed after the adoption of Aelius Verus.

³ Strong, *Roman Sculpture*, p. 238. Mrs. Strong also believes, following a suggestion of Petersen, that these large Trajanic reliefs do not represent the Dacian Wars already detailed on the column, but thinks they relate to the Dacian campaigns of Domitian. To me at least the reliefs appear certainly Trajanic rather than Domitianic (*op. cit.* pp. 149, 164).

⁴ Coner however thought it was decastyle: *Papers B.S.R.* ii. p. 64 b. Professor Furtwängler tells me he believes that the temple is not decastyle and not that of Venus and Rome; but he thinks the relief is Augustan.

as can be seen from the slope of the roof and the gradually widening interspaces between the columns on the right. The temple then may have been octastyle. If this view is accepted the identification of the temple as that of Venus and Rome falls to the ground, and a Hadrianic date is no longer necessary for the relief. Thus all difficulty vanishes, and we are free to consider the relief Trajanic on stylistic grounds alone, as Benndorf and Schoene, and Thorwaldsen thought. The octastyle temple may be that of Mars Ultor or Venus Genetrix,¹ and the relief relate to the *inauguratio* of Trajan's forum.

Finally we have to answer the question as to the position of this group of Trajanic reliefs in the decoration of his forum. Unfortunately on this evidence is entirely lacking. It is however a reasonable conjecture that they decorated the wall under the colonnade that encircled the area.²

B.—*The Triumphal Procession.*

The next fragments with which we have to deal are those that we have tried to combine into part of a triumphal procession (**Plate XXX**). There is no certainty that any of the fragments belong together, but there is at the least a strong probability that the Victory and the lictors are part of the same scene. In the triumphal procession of the arch of Titus Victory accompanies the emperor, before whose car march laurel-wreathed lictors. She is again the companion of M. Aurelius³ and Diocletian⁴ at their triumphs. Laurel-wreathed lictors also march before the triumphal car, probably of Domitian, in the relief of the Belvedere.⁵ The connection of the Victory and the lictors seems obvious by reason of the fasces appearing below her feet.

The connection of the piece showing a figure standing in a car is not so probable. The edge of the car seems on a level with the emperor's foot, while in the reliefs of Titus and M. Aurelius the car rises to the waist. Again on the fragment with the lictors the reins are seen rising to their shoulders, which gives confirmation to the belief that we should have here a high car of the type seen on the reliefs quoted. It is merely to give an idea of the composition that this fragment has been allowed to

¹ The pediment sculptures would suit either of these temples. Prof. Hülsen suggests as another possibility the temple of Mars *extra portam Capenam*.

² See the plan given by Richter, *op. cit.* Pl. II.

³ v. *Papers B.S.R.* iii. Pls. XXVI. vi.

⁴ v. below, p. 274 and Pl. XXXVII.

⁵ *Papers B.S.R.* iii. p. 283, Fig. 1.

remain where it is in the reconstructed drawing, since it is not at all certain that it belongs to the other two fragments. In any case it is clear that the artist drew this fragment on a much larger scale.

Any discussion as to the style of this relief is impossible, since our knowledge of it rests only on these drawings. But satisfied that it represents a triumph, we may attempt to find out to what triumph it could refer, bearing in mind the probability that these reliefs were found in Trajan's forum. The earliest triumphs in the second century were Trajan's Dacian triumphs in 103 and 106 A.D. In honour of these were erected an arch¹ in the first region and the column as well as the battle scenes on the arch of Constantine and the other reliefs discussed above.² The third was the Parthian triumph celebrated by Hadrian in 119 A.D. in honour of the dead Trajan. Then comes a long gap, neither Hadrian himself nor Antoninus Pius having held a triumph, and the fourth is that of M. Aurelius and L. Verus in honour of the latter's Parthian victories in 166. Then follow the triumphs of M. Aurelius and Commodus in 176, and of Commodus in 180. Of the latter we have no monument. The former is commemorated by the Aurelian column and the panels on the arch of Constantine and in the Palazzo dei Conservatori.³ The Torlonia relief⁴ probably came from the arch of L. Verus⁵ that celebrated his Parthian triumph. Therefore our relief must fall between 103 and 119 or between 166 and 180. If we could determine its period, we might suggest what triumph it celebrates.

A test for its date must lie not in its style, but in its composition. We may assume that the artist, probably Panvinus, who drew the fragments in question, drew them fairly accurately. As proofs of his accuracy we may put forward the two drawings of the arch of Titus⁶ in the same *Codex*. These when compared with the originals not only show the extraordinary care of the artist, but also that since the sixteenth century the reliefs have been little damaged.

Now in the fragment showing the lictors by the triumphal car, it is

¹ v. Richter, *Topographie d. S. Rom*, pp. 61, 71, 318; Jordan-Hülsen, *Topographie*, i. 3, p. 216, where it is considered probable that it may be identical with the so-called Arch of Drusus, which had originally three openings, inside the *Porta Appia*.

² v. above, pp. 244 *seqq.*

³ v. Stuart Jones, *Papers B.S.R.*, pp. 251 *seqq.*

⁴ Matz-von Duhn, *Ant. Bildwerke in Rom*, iii. No. 3526.

⁵ Richter, *op. cit.* p. 349; Jordan-Hülsen, *loc. cit.*

⁶ *Cod. Vaticanus*, 3439, ff. 75, 89.

noticeable that though they are behind the horses their arms, shoulders, and chests are clearly visible above them. On the arch of Titus only the heads and necks are seen above the horses. If we turn to the panel of the triumph of M. Aurelius,¹ we at once remark that of the trumpeter and the other figure the arms and shoulders appear above the horses' backs. A steep perspective is found in Trajanic reliefs, noticeably the battle frieze on the arch of Constantine (**Plate XXVIII**). But, although there are there several rows of heads one above another, the perspective is never so distorted as it is in the Aurelian relief.² The Aurelian method of putting the figures in the background on a higher level than those in front is also well illustrated by the position of the hill in the panels of the *lustratio* and the sacrifice.³ Since this peculiarity, which seems to occur mainly in Aurelian reliefs, is observed in the fragments under discussion, we must place them in that period rather than in the Trajanic.

They in that case should refer to the triumphs of 166, of 176, or of 180. Since the reliefs probably came from Trajan's forum, the triumph of 166 can be excluded, for the *Arcus Veri* stood on the *Via Appia* in the first region.⁴ If we incline to refer these fragments rather to the triumph of 176 than to that of 180, it is because we have no record of any triumphal monument of Commodus, while an *Arcus M. Aureli* is known of from the Einsiedlensis.⁵ Therefore we may conjecture that these fragments come from some monument of M. Aurelius erected in or near Trajan's forum. To this point we shall return again below.⁶

C.—*The Sacrifice of Bulls.*

We now pass to a consideration of the other Borghese relief in the Louvre⁷ (**Plate XXVII**). A comparison of the reconstructed drawing (**Plate XXXI**) and the photograph of the relief in its present condition gives a general idea of the restorations it has undergone. It will be convenient however to give a detailed list of them from left to right.

¹ *Papers B.S.R.* iii. Pl. XXVI. vi; cf. Pl. XXIV. iv.

² The 'bird's-eye perspective' of Trajan's column cannot be considered here, since it is an entirely different method of composition.

³ *Papers B.S.R.* iii. Pl. XXVI. vii, XXVII. viii.

⁴ Richter, *op. cit.* p. 349; Jordan-Hülse, *loc. cit.*

⁵ *C.I.L.* vi. 1014. Also on the coins referring to this triumph Victory is seen flying over the procession and does not accompany the victors in the car, Cohen², M. Aurelius 367, Commodus 738.

⁶ *v.* page 253 *seqq.*

⁷ H. de Villefosse, *Cat. Somm.* 1098.

- A. *Victimarius*, head, right hand, and foot.
Bull, nose, left horn and ear.
- B. *Man above bull*, head and shoulders.
- C. } *Men behind*, noses.
- D. }
- E. *Camillus*, head and shoulders.
- F. *Victimarius*, head, shoulders, hands, and forearms.
Bull, left horn.
- G. *Bearded man above bull*, nose.
- H. *Camillus*, head, hands, and the object in the hands.
- I. *Camillus*, nose.
- J. *Man with fasces*, nose.

All the lower right-hand corner with the altar is also modern, the triangular piece above the right-hand bull does not seem to be original, and has not been included in the reconstructed drawing. That there were more figures than the artist drew is certain, since the upper left-hand part with the columns and two figures does not occur in the Vatican *Codex*. All the figures wear laurel wreaths, so a triumph is again in question. Also it is to be noted that Pierre Jacques in his drawing¹ of the right-hand fragment portion places at the end of the fasces a patched border exactly similar to that seen on most of the fragments grouped above under D, in which the figures are also laurel-wreathed. Since therefore **C** and **D** seem to belong together it will be best to discuss group **C** with **D**.

D.—*The Fragments with an Architectural Background.*

As we have stated above, the common factor in the four principal fragments grouped together in the reconstructed drawing (**Plate XXXII**) is the architectural background. Another point to be observed is that in two (*f.* 85b, and *f.* 88d) of the fragments the figures are laurel-wreathed. This scene also seems to have concerned a sacrifice, since in one piece we recognize a *victimarius* and in another a *camillus*. Thus this group has in common with the Borghese relief **C**, the subject—a sacrifice, the laurel wreaths, the hatched border at the top, and the architectural background. The top of the Borghese relief **C** has been cut away, but similar Doric columns occur in one piece of Group **D**, which shows an upper arcade like the other fragments. We may even go so far as to conjecture that both

¹ S. Reinach, *L'Album de P. J.*, Pl. 17 bis.

groups formed originally one composition, of which **C** is the left and **D** the right half. The subject is a sacrifice of four bulls, two of which are visible, and the presence of a *camillus* and a *victimarius* in **D** some distance away from one another hints that two more bulls were included. This sacrifice celebrates a triumph, since all the figures wear laurel wreaths. It perhaps represents the *Solutio Votorum* on the emperor's return after a successful campaign. The Borghese relief seems to be complete on the left, and all its principal figures look to the right. On the other hand in **D** all the figures are turned to the left. Thus we might expect the emperor to have been in the centre of the whole composition. This would have formed a frieze at least twice as long as the Borghese relief, which is 2.30 m. long. Thus we may assume the original obtained by uniting the two groups **C** and **D** to have been about 5 m. long. This is about the length of relief necessary for the inner faces of the piers of a triumphal arch. The sides of the arches of Titus, Septimius Severus, and of Constantine are respectively 4.73,¹ 7.07, and 6.58 metres long, consequently it is just possible that the reliefs when in their original state decorated the inside of one pier of a triumphal arch.

Granted then that these reliefs refer to a triumph, we may attempt to determine to what triumph they relate. As stated above² in discussing group **B** there are only six triumphs in the second century which they might celebrate. These are the Trajanic triumphs of 103, 106, and 119, the Parthian triumph of L. Verus and M. Aurelius in 166, and the Germanic triumphs of M. Aurelius and Commodus in 176 and 180. Thus these fragments should belong either to the Trajanic or the Aurelian period. When we examine the stylistic details of the only part that survives, the Borghese relief in the Louvre, there is no reason against dating it to the latter period. All the original heads have the eyes indicated in the manner that is first found in the Hadrianic period and becomes usual afterwards.³ The iris is indicated by an incised circle, and within that the pupil is rendered by two small drill holes side by side. We further notice the free, loose drilling of the hair and beard so common in Aurelian portraits.⁴ Another characteristic of the same period is, as remarked above, the manner in which the figures in the background are made to stand a good head and

¹ The length of the reliefs is 3.89 metres.

² *v.* p. 250..

³ Cf. *Journal Brit. and American Arch. Soc. of Rome*, vol. iii. 8, p. 468.

⁴ Cf. *ibid.* p. 474.

shoulders above those in front. The rather clumsy composition, the excessive use of the drill, the thick, short figures, which are only 1.18 m. high, and the high relief recall the Aurelian panels on the arch of Constantine.¹ In a word there is little doubt that, as far as style is concerned, this relief is of the Aurelian period.

Therefore we may take it that one of the Aurelian triumphs is in question. As before, as the reliefs probably came from Trajan's forum, the Parthian arch of L. Verus is excluded, since it was in the first region. The Germanic triumph of Commodus in 180 was insignificant, and celebrated no definite success against the enemy.² Also we have no record of any triumphal monument of this emperor. We may therefore consider if it is possible for these reliefs to have belonged to an arch of M. Aurelius. Such a monument certainly existed, since the Einsiedlensis saw its inscription *in Capitolio*.³ There are also eleven panels that belonged to some arch of this emperor, three once in Santa Martina, now in the Palazzo dei Conservatori, and eight in the attica of the arch of Constantine. Mr. Stuart Jones⁴ brings these into connection with the arch called by the 'Mirabilia' *Arcus panis aurei in Capitolio* and believes it to be the same as the *arcus argentariorum sub monte Tarpejo* of the forged bull of John III, and that the arch of M. Aurelius stood below the Capitol on the *Clivus Argentarius* by the modern Via di Marforio. However his arguments that the *arcus panis aurei in Capitolio* is the same as the *arcus argentariorum sub monte Tarpejo* do not seem convincing. The latter arch from its position between the *hortus mirabilis* (the forum of Augustus) and the *Mons Tarpeius*, which name in the Middle Ages was applied to the whole of the Capitoline hill⁵ must have been somewhere on the west side of Trajan's forum. It may have been one of the entrances to that forum, or an arch standing in it. But that an arch described as *sub monte Tarpejo* could be *in Capitolio*⁶ hardly seems possible. Now all the reliefs that can be connected with this arch of M. Aurelius point to some relation with Trajan's forum.⁷

¹ v. *Papers B.S.R.* iii. Pls. XXIII.-XXVIII.

² v. Pauly-Wissowa, ii.² p. 2472.

³ *C.I.L.* vi. 1014.

⁴ *Papers B.S.R.* iii. p. 253.

⁵ Jordan, *Topographie d. Stadt Rom*, ii. p. 463.

⁶ The *arcus panis aurei in Capitolio* was perhaps that of Nero; v. Tacitus *Ann.* xv. 18.

⁷ Mr. Stuart Jones, who has read this paper in proof, makes the following objections to the argument: (1) The inscription of M. Aurelius was *in Capitolio* and there was also an arch *in Capitolio*; it is natural to connect the two; (2) The list of arches in the *Mirabilia* follows the *Via Lata* south to S. Marco, and then gives *arcus in Capitolio*. The *Clivus Argentarius* continued the *Via Lata* and there was an *arcus argentariorum*, so again the connection is natural. Also *sub*

The panels in the Palazzo dei Conservatori were once in Santa Martina,¹ which stands near Trajan's forum, together with the Trajanic reliefs in the Villa Borghese formerly wrongly attributed to the arch of Claudius.² The decoration of the arch of Constantine besides the eight Aurelian panels comprises eight slabs of a battle frieze universally admitted to be from Trajan's forum, seven statues of Dacian prisoners, and some of the columns and architectural ornament³ from the same source. Similarly the Borghese relief in the Louvre **C** has always been, as far as we know its history, a companion to the extispicium group **A**, which we now know certainly came from Trajan's forum. With them were also the fragments of groups **B** and **D**. It thus seems likely that this arch of M. Aurelius stood in Trajan's forum. Since the arch must have been injured by the removal of eight of its reliefs by Constantine, there is no reason why, it being destroyed, its inscription should not have been *in Capitolio* at the time of the Einsiedlensis. Further it is quite probable that there were triumphal arches in Trajan's forum. We know in fact that one arch did stand there. In 116 A.D. the Senate according to Cassius Dio,⁴ ἀψίδα αὐτοῦ (s.c. Trajano) τροπαιοφόρον πρὸς πολλοῖς ἄλλοις ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἀγορᾷ αὐτοῦ παρεσκεύαζον. This has always been supposed to be the grand entrance to his forum, which appears on coins almost certainly not later in date than 114 and inscribed FORVM TRAIANI.⁵ It seems unreasonable to identify what the coins call the FORVM TRAIANI with an arch erected ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἀγορᾷ—that is to say that the whole building represented on the coins is identified with an arch which stood within that same building. Therefore we must

monte Tarpeio (on the slope of the Capitol) might equal *in Capitolio* when taken vaguely; (3) S. Martina, whence the panels in the Palazzo dei Conservatori came, is on the line of the *Clivus Argentarius*; (4) The inscription would hardly have travelled from Trajan's forum to the Capitol unless the arch was destroyed, and yet it is represented as probable that the reliefs remained in Trajan's forum.

¹ v. Helbig, *Führer*, i.² 559-561.

² Stuart Jones, *Papers B.S.R.* iii. pp. 215 *seqq.*

³ Richter, *Topographie d. Stadt Rom*², p. 173. The medallions, which probably came from the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, were taken by Constantine for special reasons; v. Stuart Jones, *Papers B.S.R.* iii. pp. 229 *seqq.* The provenance of the four slabs of the frieze, which are probably Diocletianic, is unknown; v. below, p. 274.

⁴ lxxviii. 29.

⁵ Donaldson, *Architectura Numismatica*, p. 250; Cohen² (167-169), Rossini (*Archi Trionfali*, p. 11), and Arndt (Brunn-Bruckmann, text to 555, 559, 56c, 565) thought the medallions shown on the building of the coins to be the round reliefs on the arch of Constantine. That Stuart Jones was right (*Papers B.S.R.* iii. p. 247) in thinking that the medallions on the coin were *clipei* to contain busts, is shown by the words of Sangallo quoted above (p. 231), *due tonde per mettere una testa*, which refer to sculpture found in Trajan's forum (cf. Strong, *Roman Sculpture*, p. 148, note).

take the words of Dio to refer to an arch and the coins to represent the grand entrance to the forum. There is nothing against arches standing in Trajan's forum. In the *Forum Romanum* were the arches of Augustus, Septimius Severus, and Tiberius,¹ in the *Forum Transitorium* a *Janus*,² and in the forum of Augustus the arches of Drusus and Germanicus.³ Similarly we know that in the forum of Trajan stood an arch of that emperor.⁴ To pair with this we can supply conjecturally the arch of M. Aurelius. The upper part, the attica, of this arch would have been decorated with the eleven panels mentioned above. One side of its archway would have been occupied by the reliefs of groups **C** and **D**, as supposed above. The other side perhaps contained the composition of which group **B** are fragments, the emperor in his car attended by lictors and crowned by Victory. It will be remembered that we suggested an Aurelian date for these reliefs,⁴ and were disposed to connect them with the triumph of 176. Also the Victory was once in the Palazzo dei Conservatori with the Borghese reliefs, and it and the other fragment of **B** are drawn in the Codex Vaticanus on the same pages as reliefs of groups **A**, **C**, and **D**. Consequently, since all these reliefs seem to belong to the same find, and to come from Trajan's forum, if group **B** cannot belong to group **A** which is clearly Trajanic and does not refer to a triumph, there is every reason to connect it with groups **C** and **D**, which like **B** are also triumphal and of the Aurelian period.

It remains for us to discuss briefly the strange architecture in the background of group **D**. We see on the right a long colonnade of Corinthian columns. Some support the architrave directly, others are separated from it by low arches. Above the main architrave is a low arcade. This has three kinds of arches, (1) plain semicircular arches, (2) some supported on Corinthian columns, (3) others resting on Doric columns. Above this is a cornice with dentils, which is surmounted by a series of small pediments also with dentils. Most probably the Doric columns of **C** continue the left-hand fragment of **D**, although there appears to be a break in the background on the right of **C**. Before this colonnade on the right is a round building of two stories, both of which consist of an arcade surmounted by a dentil band. Above the second story is a domed roof. It is quite uncertain what buildings in Rome are

¹ v. Hülsen, *Roman Forum*, pp. 66, 82, 150.

² Richter, *op. cit.* p. 114.

³ Richter, *op. cit.* p. 112.

⁴ v. above, p. 255.

here represented. An arcade in the second story of a colonnade is rare.¹ It apparently existed in the now destroyed 'Temple de Tutelle' at Bordeaux,² a second century building; and mediaeval drawings of the so-called *Crypta Balbi* show similar architecture.³ We might then suppose the *Crypta Balbi* to be represented here. This building has recently been identified by Hülsen⁴ as the *Porticus Minucia*, which was one of the places where *congiaria*⁵ were distributed. The sacrifice then may represent the *Solutio Votorum* of M. Aurelius on his return and triumph in 176.⁶ It must be remembered that the so-called *Crypta Balbi* were near the *Circus Flaminius* and the temple of Bellona, buildings intimately connected with triumphs. If we assign the two reliefs, as suggested above, to the passage-way of a triumphal arch, we have represented the procession and the *Solutio Votorum* with the promise of a *congiarium* to follow. The Doric architecture on the left may be the *Porticus Philippi*, which stood near.

The presence of the four bulls may indicate that two emperors sacrificed on this occasion. This would suit the triumph of 176 very well, since we know that Commodus was associated with his father in it. At all events there is no reason against assigning these reliefs to an arch of M. Aurelius. Their style is in favour of their attribution to this period, but there is no definite proof that they do belong to such an arch. Still the conjecture put forward is very probable.

We hope that we have been enabled to add something to our knowledge of Trajan's forum and its decoration, and of the Borghese reliefs. At least we have determined the date and provenance of the relief showing the *extispicium* before the temple of *Jupiter Capitolinus*. If the Boccapaduli archives could be searched, and the sketch-book of Prospero Boccapaduli be found, we should quite possibly be able to confirm our conjectures or replace them by certain knowledge as to the date and origin of the other fragments.

¹ The most famous example of this is in the palace of Diocletian at Spalato, a late third century building; Adam, *Ruins of Emperor Diocletian's Palace*, Pl. XIII. On the development of this architectural motive, see Schulz, *Jahrbuch*, 1906, pp. 221 *seqq.*

² Jullien, *Inscriptions de Bordeaux*, i. 79, ii. 557, Pls. X, XI; Geymüller, *Les Du Cerceau*, Fig. 50, p. 107.

³ Lanciani, *Ruins and Excavations of Ancient Rome*, p. 498, Fig. 194; cf. Fabriczy, *Handzeichnungen Giuliano's da Sangallo*, pp. 24, 25.

⁴ Jordan-Hülsen, *op. cit.* I. iii. pp. 514, 545 *seqq.*

⁵ Pauly-Wissowa, s. v.

⁶ Cf. Cohen,² M. Aurelius 1026, Commodus 981.

THE RELIEFS FROM THE ARCO DI PORTOGALLO.

During the middle ages these two reliefs¹ (**Plate XXXIII**) formed part of the decoration of the so-called *Arco di Portogallo*, which spanned the Corso close to San Lorenzo in Lucina. On the destruction of that arch, which was apparently only either a mediaeval *pasticcio* or a construction of the later empire built with the spoils of other monuments, by Alexander VII in 1662,² they were removed by the Conservatori to the staircase of the Museo Capitolino. In 1815 they were transported to the corridor of the Palazzo dei Conservatori.³ In 1903⁴ on the rearrangement of the Museum in that Palazzo one of the reliefs, the Apotheosis, was transferred to the upper landing outside the picture gallery.

For some time past the reliefs have been considered as dating from the time of Hadrian.⁵ As I have recently had the opportunity of examining them closely with a ladder to ascertain the amount of restoration, it will perhaps be worth while to reconsider the arguments as to their date, which rest upon stylistic grounds only. In the first place the restorations must be given in detail.

A. Emperor making a proclamation (**Plate XXXIII, 1**).

The Emperor: the right ear and the whole right side of the head including the beard and lower lip, the right arm and shoulder, the projecting part of the left hand, which has been rightly restored, both feet and various splinters from the drapery are all new. On the upper lip is a moustache, so the emperor was originally bearded. The *suggestus* on which he stands has been almost entirely restored, none of its original surface is now visible. *The beardless man behind the emperor* also on the *suggestus*: the eye, nose, mouth, and chin are new: the rest has been worked over.

The bearded man on the *suggestus*: the face and head have been worked over, and his right arm is restored.

The man with a spear: the right arm and shoulder, the nose, right

¹ Helbig, i.² 564, 565; Michaelis, *Röm. Mitt.* 1891, p. 53; Lanciani, *Ruins and Excavations of Ancient Rome*, p. 506; Strong, *Roman Sculpture*, p. 236.

² v. Richter, *Topographie d. Stadt Rom*, p. 261; Jordan-Hülse, *Topographie*, I. iii. p. 466.

³ v. Lanciani, *op. cit.*

⁴ *Bull. Com.*, 1903, 317 sqq.

⁵ v. Helbig, *loc. cit.*; Lanciani considers the arch to have been antique and of the Antonine age (*Bull. Com.* 1892, pp. 18-23).

cheek, fingers of left hand, the spear, and the right leg are restored. The left hand probably held a spear originally.

Boy before the emperor: the top of the head, the lower part of the face, and both hands are new.

Semi-nude youth on right: his right hand and forearm, mouth, chin nose, left eye, and forehead are restored. The projecting parts of the left hand are new, also parts of his chest and drapery. The left hand held some long object, since there is a *puntello* on the thigh and the drapery on the shoulder is broken.

Man behind youth: nose and eye are new.

The temple in the background is perfect except that the end of the gable, and architrave with the capital below are damaged. In the pediment is visible the tail of a snake or of a Triton.

The whole relief is 2'67 m. high and 2'09 m. wide, and was never any wider or higher, since remains of all the original edges may still be traced. It has been cracked, but on the whole is in good condition.

B. Apotheosis of an empress (**Plate XXXIII**, 2).

The emperor: the right hand and fingers, the left hand and fingers, the nose, left eye, wreath, left ear, and hair, the left cheek, jaw, and mouth are new. He was originally bearded, because there is a moustache on the upper lip, and there are traces of whiskers before the crack on the neck. Parts of the drapery are also restored.

Man behind emperor: most of the hair, the left ear, left side of face, mouth, eye, and nose are new.

Empress: the nose, left hand and breast, most of left leg and the drapery round it are restored. The fingers of the right hand are missing. The head has been slightly worked over but is original.

The winged figure: has been badly damaged. The end of the right wing is new, as also are the nose, mouth, and chin. Both breasts, both forearms with hands, the foot and knee of the right leg, and all the torch but the flame are restored.

Seated figure: all the forearm and hand, small pieces of the drapery and of the body are new.

Of the pyre the squared masonry is, if not modern plaster, at least recut.

The relief is 2'10 m. wide and 2'68 m. high, and does not seem to

have ever been any larger. It is badly cracked, and all the upper left corner is new, but on the whole its condition is fair.

It will thus be seen that apart from the style, we have two fixed points to aid us in dating the reliefs: the certainty that the emperor was bearded, and the head of the empress. Since the emperor was bearded, the reliefs, which, as the measurements show clearly, form a pair, cannot be earlier than the Hadrianic period. The portrait of the empress, if we can identify it, will form a surer ground for a possible date. The head fortunately is very perfect and closely resembles the later portraits of Sabina, especially those on coins inscribed *DIVA AVGVSTA SABINA* and lettered on the reverse *CONSECRATIO*.¹ Also only on the coins on which she is called *DIVA* is she veiled.² The style of the hairdressing agrees also with that adopted by her.³ The hair is waved back from the forehead, and fastened in a knot on the crown, and in front above the forehead is placed a *stephane*. Since Plotina, Matidia, and Marciana are never shown wearing their hair in this fashion, which does not occur at a later period than that of Hadrian,⁴ we may conclude that the empress here represented is Sabina. It is also to be noted that the head closely resembles the portraits identified as Sabina from the evidence of the coins.

Now that the personality of the empress is determined, it is easy to explain the reliefs. The Apotheosis, **Plate XXXIII**, 1, represents the burning and deification of Sabina in the *Campus Martius* personified by the reclining figure before the pyre.⁵

The other scene, **Plate XXXIII**, 2, will then represent the *laudatio memoriae* of the same empress. We see Hadrian⁶ on a *suggestus* making the formal oration. Behind him stand a bearded man whom we may possibly recognize as Aelius Verus, consul in 136, the year of Sabina's death.⁷ The beardless man may be the other consul Vetulonius Civica. We might suppose as is usual the *praefectus praetorio* rather than the consuls to be the emperor's companion. But this scene is essentially civil

¹ Cohen², 27-34.

² Cohen², 27-34, 56.

³ Lady Evans, *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1906, p. 52, Pl. IV. 32; Bernoulli, *Röm. Ikonographie*, ii. 2, Pl. XL. pp. 128 seqq.; Wace, *Journal Brit. and American Arch. Society of Rome*, iii. 8 p. 474.

⁴ See Bernoulli, *op. cit.*; Lady Evans, *op. cit.*

⁵ Cf. the base of the column of Antoninus Pius, Amelung, *Cat. Skulp. Vatican. Mus.* i. p. 883.

⁶ Part of the *laudatio* of Matidia spoken by Hadrian himself is preserved, *C.I.L.* xiv. 3579.

⁷ For these and other dates, etc. of Hadrian's reign, see Pauly-Wissowa, *s.v. Aelius*, 64. The bearded man might be a personification of the Senate, cf. *Jahreshefte*, ii. p. 179.

and not military, therefore we might naturally expect the consuls to appear. The man by the side of the *suggestus*, since the restoration of the spear seems correct, is without doubt the *trecenarius* of the *speculatores* or imperial bodyguard.¹ Of the figures before the emperor we may recognize with Helbig in the semi-nude youth the *genius Populi Romani*, introduced to personify a crowd of citizens as on the arch of Beneventum.² We may then restore in his left hand a *cornucopiae*, which exactly fits the marks left by the missing attribute, and which is carried by the similar figure on the arch of Beneventum. Possibly the *laudatio memoriae* was pronounced in the *Forum*: in that case we could identify the *suggestus* as the *Rostra* and the temple-like building as the *Curia*, which we know was of the Corinthian order.³

We have thus definitely obtained a Hadrianic date for the reliefs, and it remains to be seen if their style agrees with the date assigned. The first point to notice is the panel composition. It has been shown elsewhere that the panel style begins to replace the processional at the close of the Trajanic period. Up to the Flavian age the processional style is dominant, as exemplified in the *Ara Pacis*,⁴ in the arch of Titus, and in the Domitianic fragment in the Vatican.⁵ On the arch of Beneventum, in the long reliefs of the main archway,⁶ where we should expect a processional composition, the treatment is rather that of a group. There is a distinct centre round which the figures were arranged, and no movement of them before the spectator. In the panel reliefs of the faces of the arch there is the same treatment. The persons are grouped round the emperor. But two things are to be noted: the figures are too crowded, and the arrangement of the heads in two or more rows is not so marked as in early Trajanic art. In these two Hadrianic reliefs, the next dated monument after the arch at Beneventum (which dates from the last year of Trajan, 117), we find a distinct advance in the panel style. The figures are less crowded and better spaced, and there is never more than one row of heads. But as in the Beneventum panels the relief ends directly above the heads of the figures, and there is no vacant space as in the Aurelian groups.⁷ In the actual execution of the

¹ Stuart Jones, *Papers B.S.R.* iii. p. 263, 1, 2.

² Domaszewski, *Jahreshefte*, ii. p. 179.

³ Hülsen, *Roman Forum*, pp. 112 *sqq.*

⁴ Petersen, *Ara Pacis Augustae*, Plates.

⁵ *Papers B.S.R.* iii. pp. 280, 281, Fig. 1.

⁶ Wickhoff, *Roman Art*, p. 109, Figs. 37, 38; *Papers B.S.R.* iii. pp. 280, 281, 292.

⁷ *Papers B.S.R.* iii. Plates XXIII-XXVIII.

reliefs there is a dull formality and a lack of freshness. In the Apotheosis the figures of Sabina and *Aeternitas* have a rather Greek appearance. In details the use of the drill is very noticeable, especially in the hair, and is far more marked than in Trajanic sculptures. In them the drill is only used as an accessory in the working of the hair. Here the hair is almost entirely worked by it. Further a difference can be observed between the drill work here and that on Aurelian reliefs. Here the work is rather flat, and the curls are tight, and the drill runs through them. In Aurelian portraits the hair is very loose, and has the appearance of having been lifted up by the drill. Apart from these points the reliefs have little stylistic distinction, and their execution is commonplace and facile. But on the whole there is no reason why they should not be Hadrianic, and they fall into place here very well since they shew the transition from the Trajanic to the Aurelian style.

Since these reliefs came from the *Arco di Portogallo* near San Lorenzo in Lucina, they probably belonged to a monument situated somewhere in that part of the *Campus Martius*. Now not far off at Monte Citorio stood the *Ustrinum Antoninorum*,¹ and further to the north by San Carlo was another *Ustrinum* by the mausoleum of Augustus.² At both of these places the ceremonial burning of members of the imperial house took place. Therefore we may assume the burning of Sabina to have occurred near here. Thus it is highly probable that just as M. Aurelius and L. Verus erected a column in honour of Antoninus Pius on the spot where he was burnt, so Hadrian set up a monument to his wife, at the place where she was cremated and deified. There will then be a striking similarity between the sculptures on the two monuments.³ On the front of the base of the Antonine column, there is on the left the *Campus Martius* personified as in the Hadrianic relief.⁴ The deified Antoninus and Faustina are borne to heaven by a winged male figure, perhaps the *Genius Jovis*, which compares well with the female *Aeternitas*. On the right, instead of the emperor, Roma is seated watching the scene. The back of the base is occupied by the inscription, and the sides by the representations of the *decursio* in honour of the deceased. We may then assume that the two Hadrianic

¹ Richter, *Topographie d. Stadt Rom*, p. 255. Jordan-Hülsem, *Topographie* i. 3. p. 605.

² Richter, *op. cit.* p. 250. Jordan-Hülsem, *op. cit.* p. 620.

³ v. Amelung, *op. cit.* Pls. 216, 217, 218.

⁴ It is interesting to observe how the Hadrianic upright panel has broadened into the oblong Aurelian relief. The latter shows the group composition on a relief of the *pluteus* shape.

reliefs occupied two sides of a similar base;¹ a third side would have contained the inscription, and the fourth side, supposing it to have been visible, may have been occupied by the text of the *laudatio* or by a third relief now lost. If the base had only three decorated sides we could arrange the reliefs thus:—

Back	
Relief, <i>Laudatio memoriae</i>	Relief, <i>Consecratio</i>
Inscription	

It is possible that Sabina's ashes rested here till their removal to the mausoleum of Hadrian by Antoninus Pius after he completed it in 139.

Since Sabina died towards the end of 136 A.D. these reliefs must date from the interval between her death and that of Hadrian. They therefore fall in the period from 136 to 138 A.D. Thus a careful examination of these reliefs has enabled us to restore to the *Campus Martius* somewhere near the *Ustrinum Antoninorum* an important and dated monument hitherto unknown, which we may call the *Columna Sabinae*.²

A RELIEF IN THE PALAZZO SACCHETTI.

The provenance of this relief (**Plate XXXIV**) is quite unknown, nor can it be ascertained how long it has been in its present position.³

¹ It is hardly likely that the Arco di Portogallo was a memorial arch to Sabina, since every extant account and drawing of the arch lead us to suppose that it was, if not a mediaeval *pasticcio*, built by some late emperor out of the spoils of earlier monuments. The *Mirabilia* always calls it *Arcus Octaviani*. As Poggio (*De Var. Fortunae*, apud Urlichs, *Codex Topographicus*, p. 239) apparently saw some remains of its inscription, it is quite likely that *Octaviani* conceals the name of its builder, a late emperor, such as Gratian or Valentinian. It is probable that had the authors of the *Mirabilia* thought the arch to be that of Augustus they would have called it *Arcus Augusti* and not *Arcus Octaviani*. Hülsen (Jordan, *Topographie d. Stadt Rom*, i. 3, p. 467) thinks the arch cannot have been earlier than the second century.

² The *Ustrinum Antoninorum* is not mentioned by any author, and its existence was unsuspected, till it was discovered by excavation. The correct name of the *Columna Antonini* was also unknown till it was excavated in 1703. v. Amelung, *op. cit.* p. 883; Richter, *op. cit.* p. 255; Hülsen, *Röm. Mitt.* 1889, pp. 48–64; Jordan-Hülsen, *op. cit.* p. 603.

³ Matz-von Duhn, *Ant. Bildwerke in Rom*, iii. No. 3516. In Murray's *Central Italy and Rome* (2nd ed. 1850), p. 515, it is said that the statues in the Palazzo Sacchetti were collected by Cardinal Ricci: I have been unable to find any confirmation of this statement. I am inclined to doubt it, since the same authority says Benedict XIV bought the sculptures and founded the

Braun, who first published it over fifty years ago, attempted to explain it as the reception of a triumphant emperor by the senate,¹ and referred in this connection to a passage of Josephus describing the meeting of the Senate with Vespasian and Titus before the Jewish triumph. He also in accordance with the words of Josephus² recognized the building in the background as the *Porticus Octaviae*, but he made no attempt to date the relief beyond remarking that its style seemed late.

It is perhaps possible to determine the subject and date of the relief. In the first place Braun's opinion that it referred to a triumph is untenable, since none of the figures wears laurel leaves. We have then to look for another explanation. It will be an advantage if we can first determine its style. The relief is 2.35 m. long and 1.575 m. high, and the figures are .97 m. high. Though badly weathered it has not been restored. There is a large patch of plaster in the background over the heads of the front figures before the *suggestus*. The whole lower border on the left, with the feet of the figures which are missing, has also been replaced by plaster. The most noticeable feature is the fact that it is almost entirely worked with the drill. The overhanging cornice is loaded with ornament that is honeycombed with drill holes. The short squat figures all wear heavy beards and long hair, which are also drill worked. One man only, who stands just below the window in the background, has his hair and beard clipped close. Thus we might assume the relief to date from the period just before the time when it became usual to clip the hair and beard quite close.³ This fashion, it is well known, began before the reign of Caracallus and was dominant by the time of Severus Alexander. We might thus venture as a working hypothesis to date the relief from the time of Septimius Severus. The points of style noticed agree well with the extant monuments of his reign. His triumphal arch and the *arcus argentariorum* are crowded with heavily drilled ornamentation. The squat figures in this relief can be paralleled by those on the later arch. In portraits of Septimius Severus and of his rival Clodius Albinus the most noticeable feature is the honeycomb drilling of the bushy beard

Capitoline Museum. Clement XII, who bought the Albani collection and gave it to the Capitol, was the true founder of that Museum. I have been unable to trace any of the statues given to the Capitol by Benedict XIV to the Sacchetti Collection. Strong, *Roman Sculpture*, p. 301.

¹ *Bull. Inst.* 1853, p. 85; *Mon. Ann. e Bull. Inst.* 1854, p. 78, Pl. 11.

² vii. 5. 4.

³ v. *Journal Brit. and American Arch. Soc. Rome*, iii. 8, p. 476.

and long hair.¹ In the portraits as well as on the relief we find the treatment of the eye that prevails after the Hadrianic period.² Amongst the figures on the *suggestus* we might expect to be able to identify one or two of them with some of Severus' family. The seated emperor is unfortunately headless. But the head of the youth on the emperor's right is fairly well preserved (**Fig. 4**). A youthful member of Severus' house should be either Caracallus or Geta. When we compare with this

FIG. 4.—CARACALLUS ON THE SACCHETTI RELIEF.

FIG. 5.—CARACALLUS IN THE CAPITOL.

figure the heads once wrongly called Geta, but which Bernoulli has rightly determined to be the youthful Caracallus (**Fig. 5**), the likeness between the two is striking.³ There is the same oval-shaped face with puffy cheeks, and a look of sulky obstinacy is common to both. The hair is in short rather tight curls. Further a comparison of this figure with the Caracallus on the *arcus argentariorum* leaves little doubt that the figure on the Sacchetti

¹ *Ibid.* p. 475.

² *Ibid.* p. 468.

³ Bernoulli, *Röm. Ikon.* II. 3. pl. XXI. p. 51.

relief is to be identified with him. We may thus proceed on the assumption that our working hypothesis is correct.

Before attempting an explanation, let us recapitulate the scene. On the right on a low *suggestus* is seated the emperor Septimius Severus. On his right stand two figures, one headless, probably Fulvius Plautianus, the *praefectus praetorio*: the other we have just identified as Caracallus. Behind him stand a bearded man and a headless youth, perhaps Geta. Before the *suggestus* stand eleven men in togas, probably senators. They come towards him from under an arch decorated with two Victories. The whole of the background is occupied by a building with engaged Corinthian pilasters, and in the middle a small window. Against one of the pilasters we see traces of two lances. These probably indicate that in the restored space there stood two *speculatores*.¹ We may thus assume that the scene represents some formal occasion when Severus communicated an important decree to the Senate. A brief consideration of the early part of his reign will help us to decide this.

On the death of Pertinax and the accession of Didius Julianus the armies in Britain and Gaul, in Pannonia, and in the East made their commanders candidates for the purple. Severus with the Pannonian troops won the race to Rome, and became the avenger of Pertinax. He won over his nearest rival Clodius Albinus with the title of *Caesar*² and the promise of the succession. Then proceeding to the East he crushed his most dangerous enemy, Pescennius Niger. In 196 he returned victorious to Rome. The rival Augustus removed, he could afford to deal shortly with Albinus. It is said he dispatched assassins with the letter in which he announced to him the defeat of Niger.³ At all events he broke with Albinus, and declared as *Caesar* his son Bassianus, giving him the name of M. Aurelius Antoninus, and thus linked him to the Antonine dynasty,⁴ just as he had called himself son of M. Aurelius and brother of Commodus. In 197 he returned to Rome after the defeat and death of Albinus. Then he could carry out his plans to establish his family on the throne and legitimize its pretensions. He obtained from the Senate recognition of his son's rank as *Caesar*, which had been conferred while the latter was in Pannonia.

¹ Cf. Stuart Jones, *Papers B.S.R.* iii. pp. 263, 1, 2, 249.

² *Scriptores Hist. Augustae*, xii. 1, 2; 7, 3; Herodian, ii. 15. 2.

³ *Script. Hist. Aug.* xii. 8, 1; Herodian, iii. 5. 2, cf. iii. 6. 1.

⁴ *Script. Hist. Aug.* x. 10, 3; 10, 6.

Other honours too were heaped on Caracallus. He became *princeps Iuventutis*, *Pontifex*, a *sodalis Augustalis*, and probably one of the *fratres Arvales*. The Senate also gave him *insignia imperatoria*¹; and he was proclaimed *imperator destinatus*. He alone of all future emperors placed this title on his coins.² This formal proclamation took place in Rome and was without doubt an occasion of some ceremony. This is the scene then that we may conjecture is celebrated by the Sacchetti relief, the formal presentation of Caracallus to the Senate as *Imperator Destinatus*. There is every reason to suppose this event would have been commemorated by a monument, since it was of great dynastic importance to the house of Severus. It was his ambition to found an imperial family. He thought to accomplish this by adopting the Antonine line as his ancestors, and giving his son a name that recalled the good government of Antoninus Pius and M. Aurelius.³ It would be the crowning point of his policy to set up a sculptured monument as an outward and visible sign of the continuation of the Antonine line. The proclamation of Caracallus as *Imperator Destinatus* is more likely to have been commemorated than his promotion to the rank of *Augustus*, since that took place at the instance of the army in 198 during the Parthian campaign. We may recognize then in this relief the proclamation of M. Aurelius Antoninus, who later won for himself the nickname Caracallus, as *Imperator Destinatus*, and the recognition by the Senate of the legitimacy, if we may say so, of the house of Severus.⁴

It is impossible even to guess what monument this relief originally decorated. It seems certain that it stood fairly high above the ground, for the tops of the heads are left rough. Also the two Senators, whose heads look up so awkwardly, do not appear clumsy when seen from below. As suggested by Matz and von Duhn the likeness of this relief to the Trajanic *plutei*⁵ in the Forum is remarkable; but we cannot identify the buildings represented in it. The arch on the left recalls the scene on the arch of Beneventum, in which Trajan is seen entering the forum. But this proclamation of Severus, we might imagine, would have taken place in the senate house. We must confess that in the relief the indications of locality are so vague that we cannot say what are the buildings represented.

The front and side of the *suggestus* on which the emperor is seated are

¹ *Script. Hist. Aug.* x. 14, 3.

² Cohen², 53, 54.

³ *Script. Hist. Aug.* x. 21, II.

⁴ For other references to the early history of Caracallus, see Pauly-Wissowa, ii. 2, p. 2440.

⁵ Hülsen, *Roman Forum*, p. 98.

adorned with twelve rows of three round knobs (**Fig. 6**). Similar knobs occur on the reliefs in the Villa Albani celebrating the institution of the *Puellae Faustinae* by Antoninus Pius,¹ on the Aurelian panels of the arch of Constantine, and in the Palazzo dei Conservatori,² and on coins which represent *congiaria*, *liberalitates*, *adlocutiones*, and the like.³ In only two cases do they not occur, on the Hadrianic relief once on the Arco di

FIG. 6.—ANGLE OF THE *SUGGESTUS* ON THE SACCHETTI RELIEF.

Portogallo (**Plate XXXIII**, 1), and on the base of the supposed statue of Nerva which figures on the Trajanic *pluteus* in the Forum.⁴ The *suggestus* on the Hadrianic relief is so restored that its evidence is neutral.⁵ But on

¹ Helbig, ii. 2 778, 779.

² *Papers B.S.R.* iii. Pls. XXIII–XXVIII.

³ Cohen², M. Aurelius 75, L. Verus 159, Caracalla 273; Grueber, *Roman Medallions*, Pl. XLI. 6, XLVII. 2; Froehner, *Médailles de l'empire Romain*, pp. 154, 184, 211.

⁴ Richter, *Topographie d. Stadt Rom*, Pl. 8, a; Hülsen, *Forum Romanum*, pp. 84 *seqq.*

⁵ On the Diocletianic relief on the arch of Constantine (**Plate XXXVI**, Fig. 1) the *suggestus* has no knobs, but as the *rostra* in the companion relief (**Plate XXXVI**, Fig. 2) have no ships' beaks, this omission perhaps need not be taken seriously.

the Aurelian reliefs knobs occur on *suggestus* shown in scenes in the field and in camp as well as in Rome. This diversity of place indicates that the *suggestus* with round knobs is no permanent erection, but a movable wooden platform, and that the knobs are the ends of stays or tie-beams. They occur too when mythical figures such as Roma are introduced, as in the Antonine relief already mentioned. Even if the *suggestus* in the scenes of *congiaria* like that on the Aurelian panel on the arch of Constantine are taken to be of stone, the knobs would indicate the survival in stone of a peculiarity due to wood construction. We may then say that, when we find an emperor standing on a *suggestus* with knobs, a real scene is represented, and the emperor is meant to be alive. Consequently on the Trajanic *pluteus* the fact that the base on which stands the supposed statue of Nerva has no knobs, confirms the usual view that the base is a statue base, and not a *suggestus*.

Finally it is interesting to observe that this relief shows a group composition in relief surviving in the age of Severus. Hitherto the map-like reliefs of his arch led us to suppose that what we may call bird's-eye perspective was the only method employed at that time. The group system which first occurs on the arch of Beneventum is at its best in the Aurelian panels on the arch of Constantine and in the Palazzo dei Conservatori.¹ The bird's-eye perspective occurs on the Trajanic and Aurelian columns,² but is first used for ordinary relief-work for the *decursiones* on the base of the column of Antoninus Pius.³ It is fully developed on the arch of Septimius Severus. Consequently the survival of the group or panel system seems to indicate the continuance of artistic tradition even in this period. This particular relief though a group has been lengthened almost into a *pluteus*. In this respect it has the same relation to an ordinary panel relief that the long *Consecratio* scene on the base of the column of Antoninus Pius has to the Hadrianic panel from the Arco di Portogallo (**Plate XXXIII**, Fig. 1). As we know the *pluteus* still existed in the Hadrianic period,⁴ we can only surmise that with the development of the bird's-eye perspective style, the *pluteus* and panel

¹ *Papers B.S.R.* iii. Pls. XXIII-XXVIII.

² Cichorius, *Die Reliefs der Trajanssäule*, Plates; Petersen, Domaszewski, and others, *Die Marcussäule*, Plates.

³ Amelung, *Cat. Skulp. Vat. Mus.* Pl. 217.

⁴ E.g. the Chatsworth relief, Petersen, *Röm. Mitt.* 1899, Pl. VIII.

became assimilated to one another and eventually combined as we see in this Sacchetti relief. Further discoveries of historical reliefs will throw more light on this question of the development of types.

THE FRIEZE OF THE ARCH OF CONSTANTINE.

Hitherto it has always been supposed that all the reliefs which form the frieze of the arch of Constantine were actually executed for that arch. A careful examination of these reliefs has led to a somewhat different conclusion. The slabs, or rather the groups of slabs (for each relief is carved on several blocks) which compose the frieze are arranged on the arch thus :—

North Side.

The scenes have been explained by different writers¹ thus :—

	VENUTI, <i>Descrizione</i> , III ^a EDIZIONE.	NIBBY, <i>Roma Arch.</i> , 1838, PARTE ANTICA, II. p. 454.	<i>Beschreibung Rom's.</i>	MONACI. ²
A	Battle at Pons Mulvius	Pons Mulvius	Pons Mulvius	Pons Mulvius
B	Siege of Verona	Siege of Susa	Siege of Verona	Siege of Susa
C			Triumph of Crispus over Licinius and the Goths	Triumph of Constantine
D	Congiarium	Congiarium	Congiarium	
E	Allocutio	Allocutio	Speech on Rostra	
F			Triumph of Constantine over Maxentius	Triumph of Constantine

¹ Only those are given who have attempted any detailed description of the scenes.

² See his two papers in the *Atti della Pontificia Accademia di Archeologia*, 1901, pp. 107 *seqq.*; 1904, pp. 3 *seqq.*; and also *Bull. Comm.*, 1900, pp. 75-116. Cf. Strong, *Roman Sculpture*, p. 332.

It is the object of the present paper to examine the subjects of the reliefs, and to attempt to determine their date. The first point to notice is that an emperor is represented only in four of the six, in **B**, **D**, **E**, and **F**. In only one of these (**B**) is the emperor's head preserved. In the other three the heads are lost, and close examination reveals that these heads had been changed at some time or other. In the background of the reliefs as well as in the torsi of the figures holes have been carefully chiselled to admit new heads. This means that in antiquity the original heads were broken off, and new heads applied. When we consider the other sculptures of the arch it is probable that the emperor whose head was thus replaced was not Constantine and was bearded. In the reliefs of the main archway the beardless head of Trajan is still preserved.¹ In the Aurelian panels of the attica the bearded head of M. Aurelius was replaced by a beardless portrait of Constantine.² We reach this conclusion that, as Constantine was the first beardless emperor since Hadrian, a beardless head which might be taken for him was preserved, while bearded heads which could not possibly represent Constantine were replaced by his portrait.³ It is reasonable to assume the emperor in the siege scene **B**, whose head is original and unchanged, to be the builder of the arch of Constantine, since the style of the relief points to that period. The other three, **D**, **E**, **F**, in which the head has been replaced, are so like the siege scene in style that they have always been thought to be contemporary. Therefore it is to be expected that these refer to one of Constantine's immediate predecessors. Since it is obvious that one of them **F** celebrates a triumph, we must find an emperor who satisfies both conditions. There are four possible emperors, Maxentius, who triumphed in 311, Diocletian, who celebrated a Persian triumph for the victories of Galerius in 303, Probus, and Aurelian, who triumphed in 280 and 274. As Maxentius' African triumph only occurred the year before his death, there would hardly have been time for him to erect a monument to commemorate it. Probus and Aurelian are rather too early to be considered. Diocletian's Persian triumph, which he celebrated on the occasion of his *vicennalia* in 303, is the most likely subject. The

¹ Sieveking (text to Brunn-Bruckmann 580) considers that the head has been worked over and made a portrait of Constantine.

² Stuart Jones, *Papers B.S.R.* iii. p. 251.

³ v. Bernoulli, *Römische Ikonographie*; Imhoof-Blumer, *Porträtköpfe auf röm. Münzen*, Plates II-IV. The question of the Flavian medallions does not enter into the discussion here; v. Stuart Jones, *Papers B.S.R.* iii. pp. 229 *seqq.*

campaigns took place in 297 and 298 and were carried to a victorious conclusion by his Caesar Galerius. The triumphal arch at Salonica, which has been attributed to so many emperors, has been rightly determined by Dr. Kinch to be a memorial of his success.¹ As a working hypothesis we may consider the earlier reliefs to be Diocletianic. If however we find this impossible, we can consider the other alternatives.

Thus we may provisionally distribute the reliefs into two groups, Diocletianic and Constantinian, represented respectively by **D**, **E**, and **F**, and by **B**. An examination of technical points will help us to decide to which group the others belong.

- A.* (**Pl. XXXV**, 1). This relief has all its edges complete and fits properly into its architectural framework. Its lower edge rests on the blocks above the archway.
- B.* (**Pl. XXXV**, 2). This like **A** also fits exactly into the architecture round it, and the feet of the figures, though cut free, rest level on the blocks above the arch and are not broken.
- C.* (**Pl. XXXVII**, 2). This relief has no border at the end, and the right-hand part of the top border seems to have been cut away to admit the two blocks above. The bottom border has the same moulding as that of **A** and **B**.
- D.* (**Pl. XXXVI**, 1). Here it is noticeable that the relief has no proper bottom border, and that all the legs are broken at the ankle and have no proper feet. There are faint traces of feet roughly cut on the tops of the blocks above the archway. The moulding above which they appear is similar to the Constantinian mouldings below **A**, **B**, and **C**.
- E.* (**Pl. XXXVI**, 2). The figures here also have their ankles broken, and their feet are roughly cut on the two blocks above the arch, and the moulding below is of the Constantinian type below **A** and **B**. Also the bottom of the rostra has been clumsily cut away to fit the curving slab above the keystone.
- F.* (**Pl. XXXVII**, 1). This relief fits well into its architectural surroundings, but it is to be remarked that the moulding below, which

¹ *L'Arc de Triomphe de Salonique*, Paris, Libraire Nilsson, 1890.

is really part of the relief, is totally different from that below **A**, **B**, and the others.

Thus we may certainly connect **A** with **B** as Constantinian, and **C** is probably to be classed with **D**, **E**, and **F** as Diocletianic. It is likely from technical grounds that it belongs to the earlier class, and when we consider its subject this opinion receives confirmation.

- A. (**Pl. XXXV**, 1). The subject of this relief, since it is Constantinian is almost certainly the rout of Maxentius at Pons Mulvius.
- B. (**Pl. XXXV**, 2). This relief has been explained either as the siege of Susa or that of Verona. It seems more probable that the latter is here represented, since the defeat of Pompeianus at Verona was the decisive event of Constantine's campaign in northern Italy, and laid open the way to Rome. The emperor appears here dismounted, and superintends in person the siege operations, while Victory hovers by him. Neither this scene nor **A** can refer to a Persian or Germanic campaign, since the vanquished do not wear the typical eastern dress, and are not represented as barbarians. Both the contending armies seem to be Roman.
- C. (**Pl. XXXVII**, 2.) This is without doubt part of a triumphal procession. In front we see trumpeters, then follow soldiers carrying *signa*. Next came others leading a camel and a mule laden with bags, probably of gold or other treasure.¹ The crouching figure before the mule is not easily intelligible. Lastly we have a cart drawn by four horses on which is seated a captive. This probably represents the cart in which the images of the family of Narses were shown in the triumph. Eutropius indeed says that his family actually appeared in the triumph,² but, since peace had been concluded some time before in 298, his family can no longer have been prisoners. The presence here of a camel suggests an eastern campaign, and this animal occurs in the reliefs of the arch of Galerius at Salonica which as Dr. Kinch has shown celebrates his Persian victories.³ As the

¹ Camels laden with treasure, etc. are seen on the arch of Galerius at Salonica; v. Kinch, *Arc de Triomphe de Salonique*, Pl. VIII.

² ix. 27.

³ Kinch, *op. cit.* The four-wheeled cart on our relief may be the Persian *harmamaxa* which Kinch identifies on the arch of Galerius; v. *op. cit.* Pl. VII., pp. 30, 31.

details of this relief can be explained if we consider it to be Diocletianic, and cannot if it be Constantinian, the earlier date is the more probable. Further it was not till 324, after the death of Licinius, that Constantine was brought into close relations with the East, and if the camel is to be taken as a sign of an eastern triumph, this relief cannot refer to Constantine, since the arch dates from 315.

D. (Pl. XXXVI, 1). This relief probably commemorates the *Congiarium* given by Diocletian after his triumph in 303. It is noticeable that the *suggestus* on which he sits has not the knobs which occur in all other cases. The building behind has been taken to be the *Porticus Minucia*, for *congiaria* were usually distributed there.¹ But this is only a conjecture.

E. (Pl. XXXVI, 2). Here Diocletian is seen making a proclamation from the *rostra*.² On the right is the arch of Septimius Severus, and on the left that of Tiberius and the *Basilica Julia*. The ships' beaks are omitted from the front of the *rostra*, as the knobs are not shown on the *suggestus* in *D*.

F. (Pl. XXXVII, 1). This scene shows the emperor in the triumphal car, which is driven by Victoria. Most noticeable amongst the soldiers who accompany him are the *draconarii*, who also appear in the scene of the *allocutio* of the arch of Galerius. Kinch takes their presence there to mean that Dacian troops were employed in the Persian campaigns by Galerius, who was himself born in that province.³ The use of *dracones* as ensigns was possibly borrowed from the Dacians. Their presence here agreeing with the arch of Galerius is perhaps an additional reason, if one were needed, to connect this relief with the triumph of Diocletian.

It is hardly possible that we can connect the Diocletianic reliefs with any definite monument of that emperor. We know that several buildings in Rome were erected or restored by him. The Chronicle of 354 says he built the senate house, the *Forum Caesaris*, *Basilica Iulia*, the theatre of

¹ v. Pauly-Wissowa, *s.v.* *Congiarium*: they were distributed elsewhere; Commodus gave one in the *Basilica Ulpia* (*Script. Hist. Aug.* vii. 2. 1).

² Hülsen, *Roman Forum*, pp. 70, 72.

³ Kinch, *op. cit.* pp. 15, 16; Pl. IV. See however Pauly-Wissowa, *s.v.* *Draco*.

Pompey, two porticoes, three *nymphaea*, two temples, the Iseum and the Serapeum, the *Arcus Novus*, and the *Thermae Diocletianae*.¹ Of these the *Curia*, the *Forum Caesaris*, and the *Basilica Iulia* had been destroyed in the fire of Carinus.² The *Arcus Novus*, which the Chronicle ascribes to him, was pulled down by Innocent VIII in 1491.³ It stood near Santa Maria in Via Lata.⁴ Near here Marliani⁵ saw many marbles dug up, 'in quibus' he says '*trophaea triumphalesque imagines vidi, cum hac inscriptione: votis x et xx . . .*' Hülsen on the strength of this has assigned to the arch of Diocletian a relief in the Villa Medici, which has in it a similar inscription.⁶ This relief in its present state is a *pasticcio* and probably consists of the missing *Pallada con due teste* of the Della Valle inventory combined with the inscription seen by Marliani.⁷ In any case Marliani's words do not justify us in assuming that the inscription was on the triumphal reliefs. If however the whole of the Villa Medici relief really comes from the *Arcus Novus*, that arch can hardly have been that of Diocletian, since it is not of the style of the period, for Fulvio says *haud dubie posteriorum esse imperatorum ex ornatu apparet*.⁸ This description does not suit the Medici relief, which deserves close and careful examination. If the *Arcus Novus* was that of Diocletian, Marliani's inscription proves the arch to have been erected after his *vicennalia* in 303, after his triumph. But there is no need to connect our four reliefs with a triumphal arch, they may have decorated the base of a monument, perhaps an equestrian statue in Trajan's Forum set up to Diocletian after his triumph. There exist drawings of sculptured bases set up in the *Comitium* celebrating the *vicennalia* of Diocletian and Maximianus and the *decennalia* of Galerius and Constantius, the latter of which has recently been re-found.⁹ Constantine would have had no scruple in destroying or injuring a monument of Diocletian and replacing that emperor's head by his own, since, as he wished to win favour from the Christians, it would be an act of policy to overthrow a memorial of a notorious persecutor. When the four reliefs were transferred to his arch, the two, **C** and **F**, celebrating the Persian

¹ Mommsen, *Chronica Minora*, p. 148.

² Mommsen, *op. cit.* p. 147.

³ Fulvio, *Ant. Urbis Romae* (1527), iv. p. 60.

⁴ Richter, *Topographie d. Stadt Rom*, p. 261; Jordan-Hülsen, *Topographie*, i. 3. p. 469.

⁵ *Topographia* (1534), p. 136.

⁶ *Bull. Comm.* 1895, p. 46, 1; Matz-von Duhn, *Ant. Bildwerke in Rom*, 3525.

⁷ Michaelis, *Jahrbuch*, 1891, p. 231, 69.

⁸ *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*

⁹ Hülsen, *Roman Forum*, p. 95; v. *Röm. Mitt.* 1893, p. 281.

riumph were relegated to the ends, since they could not have much connection with Constantine. Instead two new reliefs **A** and **B** celebrating Constantine's victories over the champion of paganism were made for the south front, while the two colourless Diocletianic slabs **D** and **E** were inserted on the north side. As Constantine had no hesitation in breaking with tradition and being the first to erect a triumphal arch for victories won in a civil war, still less would he have avoided representing those victories of Roman over Roman in the decoration of his arch. Probably the sculpture on the short ends of **C** and **F** were made to match the rest after they were in position on the arch, just as two fresh medallions were made to bring the number up to the ten rendered necessary by architectural considerations.

As the style of these reliefs has formed the text for one of Riegl's most suggestive chapters,¹ it is not to the point to enter into it here. Also we cannot discuss the place of this frieze in the development of Roman reliefs, since from the age of Septimius Severus to that of Diocletian we have no monuments. Even if the opinions expressed above as to the Diocletianic date of **C**, **D**, **E**, and **F**, and their relation to his triumph are not accepted, it must be admitted that the replacing of the emperor's head on **D**, **E**, and **F** makes it certain that these reliefs are pre-Constantinian.

¹ *Die spätömische Kunstindustrie*, Chap. II.

COD. VAT. LAT. 3439 F. 83.

Phot. Sansini.

COD. VAT. LAT. 3439 F. 94.

Phot. Giraudon.

TRAJANIC RELIEF IN THE LOUVRE (1089)

Phot. Giraudon

TRAJANIC RELIEF IN THE LOUVRE (978) (LEFT HALF)

Phot. Girardon.

AURELIAN RELIEF IN THE LOUVRE (1098)

Phot. Anderson.

TRAJANIC RELIEF ON THE ARCH OF CONSTANTINE

RECONSTRUCTED DRAWING OF TRAJANIC RELIEF.

FRAGMENTS OF A TRIUMPHAL PROCESSION.

AURELIAN RELIEF IN LOUVRE, RECONSTRUCTED DRAWING.

FRAGMENTS OF SACRIFICIAL SCENE.

Fig. 1. HADRIAN MAKING AN ORATION.

Fig. 2. APOTHEOSIS OF SABINA.

RELIEFS FROM THE ARCO DI PORTOGALLO

Phot. Faraglia.

RELIEF IN THE PALAZZO SACCHETTI

Fig. 1. THE ROUT OF MAXENTIUS BY CONSTANTINE AT THE PONS MULVIUS.

Fig. 2. THE SIEGE OF VERONA BY CONSTANTINE.
RELIEFS OF THE FRIEZE OF THE ARCH OF CONSTANTINE, SOUTH SIDE.

Phot. Faraglia.

Fig. 1. CONGIARIUM OF DIOCLETIAN.

Fig. 2. DIOCLETIAN MAKING A PROCLAMATION FROM THE ROSTRA.

RELIEFS OF THE FRIEZE OF THE ARCH OF CONSTANTINE, NORTH SIDE

Phot. Faraglia

Fig. 1. TRIUMPHAL PROCESSION OF DIOCLETIAN.

Fig. 2. PART OF TRIUMPHAL PROCESSION OF DIOCLETIAN.
RELIEFS OF THE FRIEZE OF THE ARCH OF CONSTANTINE, EAST AND WEST ENDS

Phot. Faraglia