The Classical Review

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

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

British School at Rome

T. Ashby

The Classical Review / Volume 19 / Issue 03 / April 1905, pp 183 - 184
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00000275, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00000275

How to cite this article:

T. Ashby (1905). British School at Rome. The Classical Review, 19, pp 183-184 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00000275

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

great result. The fragments of any importance for the subject are of course well known. It is convenient however to have everything brought together, and the writer touches on a good many points, great and small, which have interest for classical scholars, especially those fond of the drama. He does not interpret *litteras* very strictly, and various topics of comedy which are not exactly literary judgments find their way in. I have noticed nothing important enough to call for special comment.

Akin to Mr. Baker's article is another by Mr. Capps on the *Nemesis* ascribed to Cratinus. It is an argument to show that Plutarch was wrong, probably misled by taking things at second hand, in giving this play to the great predecessor and rival of Aristophanes, and that it was really by the younger poet of the same name, and typical of the Middle Comedy. Mr. Capps makes out a good case.

The other most interesting article is one on the *Consolatio Philosophiae*, in which Mr. Rand maintains a certain amount of origin-

ality and force on the part of Boethius, more than many recent critics have allowed. It is argued that though he owed much to Plato, Aristotle and others 'he combined diverse elements in an independent fashion,' and that Books IV. V are really a criticism of Neoplatonism from his own distinct point of view. Boethius was not a pagan at heart nor a lukewarm Christian: the book is an attempt at establishing by the unaided reason what others might base upon faith.

Two other articles deal, one by Mr. Pease with 'Some Uses of Bells among the Greeks and Romans,' taking the rather disjointed form of comments upon a book by the Abbé L. Morillot; the other by Mr. Balentine with 'Some Phases of the Cult of the Nymphs,' seeking to show that both in Greece and in Italy the Nymphs were regarded as actual givers of water in the shape of rain, rivers, etc., not merely connected with it in a way apart from causation; and further that they were also treated as deities of marriage and birth.

H. RICHARDS.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

BRITISH SCHOOL AT ROME.

THE second open meeting of the British School at Rome was held in the library on the afternoon of February 21st. The Director (Mr. H. Stuart Jones) read a paper upon the circular reliefs of the Arch of Constantine. These are eight in number, and fall into four pairs, consisting each of a hunting scene (or, in one case, the departure for the chase) and of an offering at the shrine of some deity, the figure of an emperor appearing in the centre of each of the groups. The original arrangement, which has not been preserved, was clearly demonstrated by Prof. Petersen in the *Römische Mitteilungen*, 1889, 314-339, and pl. XII. (cf. *Antike Denkmäler*, i. 42, 43), who, following the general opinion, considers that they belong to the time of Trajan. An examination at close quarters has convinced Mr. Stuart Jones that the emperor represented can in no case be proved to be Trajan, nor is it possible, as Arndt has recently attempted to do (Brunn-Bruckmann, *Denkmäler*, Text to No. 555), to find Hadrian upon any of the reliefs. In those upon the

south side, which have not been restored in antiquity, only one head of an emperor is sufficiently well preserved to admit of the recognition of any of its characteristics; and this, though beardless, and therefore certainly not Hadrian, is not altogether like Trajan, but from the fullness of the lower part of the face is more like one of the Flavian emperors. On the north side of the arch a curious and unsuspected state of things presented itself. Here the original features of the emperor are in no case preserved: all the imperial heads have the nimbus, which has been cut into the background at a comparatively late date; and the heads themselves are of two distinct types, which occur alternately. In the two hunting scenes we have a portrait of Constantine himself, the original heads having been roughly broken off and the new ones fitted with great care to the fracture, though they do not fit exactly into the background; but in the two scenes of sacrifice the emperor is certainly neither Constantine nor any emperor of the first or second century, but is represented with hair and beard treated in a style which

could not be earlier than the reign of Severus Alexander. This emperor is not certainly identifiable from coins; but it is well known that immediately after the death of Maximianus (310 A.D.) Constantine proclaimed himself the grandson of the deified Claudius Gothicus, who was represented as the father of Constantius Chlorus: and this, Mr. Stuart Jones thinks, must be the emperor represented.

These two heads are (in contradistinction to those on the other two reliefs on the north side) the original ones, very carefully worked over, one of them having been accidentally broken and replaced.

To the same monument probably belong the two reliefs in the Villa Medici, representing a procession in front of the temple of the Magna Mater and of Mars Ultor respectively, which were, until the most recent excavations (in which it was found that there was no room left for them), supposed to belong to the Ara Pacis Augustae. In the former of these the head of the emperor has been worked over so as to represent the same person that is depicted in the round medallions representing the scenes of sacrifice (Petersen, *Ara Pacis Augustae*, 73 n.). The style both of these reliefs and of the medallions is, in Mr. Stuart Jones' opinion, that of the Flavian period; and the question now arises, to what building they can originally have belonged. We know from the *Historia Augusta* (c. 4) that Claudius Gothicus was proclaimed emperor 'in ipso sacrario Matris,' and the only building which he is recorded to have erected or restored is the so-called Gens Flavia, or mausoleum of the Flavian family, on the Quirinal (c. 3, 6 'gentes Flavias propagavit'); and we further know (a) that Claudius Gothicus is called Flavius Claudius in the *Hist. Aug.*, (b) that Constantine bore the name Flavius and that *templa gentis Flaviae* were erected in honour of his family at Hispellum and in Africa.

The significance of the re-arrangement of the reliefs consists in this—that the unrestored medallions of the south face of the arch represented the emperors of the old Flavian house, while those on the north, all of which have the 'nimbus,' show the new Flavian dynasty. The rest of the paper was devoted to meeting possible objections drawn from considerations of style, special stress being laid on the fact that the companions of the emperor have features distinctly characteristic of the Flavian period and even show a decided resemblance to the Flavian family. Prof. Petersen

remarked that he had not as yet had the opportunity of examining Mr. Stuart Jones' conclusions in detail; but that for the present he must decline to abandon his former views.

Mr. A. J. B. Wace followed with a short paper upon certain hitherto unnoticed reliefs in the Vatican and the Lateran, which according to him fill the gap which exists in the history of art between the execution of the sculptures of the Arch of Titus (A.D. 81) and those of the Arch of Trajan at Beneventum (A.D. 114). The first of these is a relief in the Museo Chiaramonti, which presents almost a duplicate of part of the relief of the Arch of Titus representing the procession bearing the table of the shewbread: this may belong to the Arch of Vespasian and Titus at the entrance of the Circus Maximus (A.D. 81). The second is a group of fragments of sculptures, some over life-size, some representing a procession of lictors, in the Lateran again resembling the style of the Arch of Titus, but showing two rows of heads instead of one. None of the heads bear laurel wreaths, and the fragments do not therefore belong to a triumphal procession; but the fragments over life-size probably came from a group. If so, they are almost the earliest example of the transition from procession to group which occurred between 81 and 114 A.D. The third is a fragment of a relief in the cortile di Belvedere in the Vatican, representing a portion of a triumphal procession—lictors wearing laurel wreaths, and Roma leading the first horse of a quadriga. The composition is again slightly more crowded, and the relief, which was originally at least as long as the reliefs of the Arch of Titus, must belong to a triumphal arch—probably an unknown arch of Domitian. It cannot belong to the Ianus erected in honour of his Chattic and Dacian triumphs in 89 A.D., but may belong to another monument set up on the same occasion.

T. ASHEY, JUNIOR.

DÉCHELETTE'S POTTERY OF ROMAN GAUL.

Les Vases céramiques ornés de la Gaule Romaine (Narbonaise, Aquitaine, et Lyonnaise). By JOSEPH DÉCHELETTE, Conservateur du Musée de Roanne. 2 vols. Paris: Picard et Fils, 1904. 4to. Pp. vi. + 668. With 29 plates and numerous illustrations in text. 50 fr.