

NERVA.

September 18, A.D. 96 saw Domitian fall victim to a palace plot, Imperial Rome's second dynasty ending in a frantic struggle on the floor of the Imperial *cubiculum* (Suet. *Dom.* 17). The resulting situation bore little resemblance to the state of affairs after the death of Nero. Now there were no generals on the march, no legions in revolt. Moreover, a dynasty had ended before and Rome had gone on, there was a precedent. A replacement was found in the seemingly neutral figure of M. Cocceius Nerva and the fraught phase of transition effected with a minimum of public distress. Domitian's had been a well managed murder.

Time was not to be on Nerva's side. Aged sixty at his accession, he would not survive his climacteric year. But who at this stage was to know that? Why not build towards a future; had Augustus not died in his 76th year, Tiberius at 77, Vespasian at the end of his sixties? Work on Domitian's numerous building projects could be continued under the new *princeps* the honour from which would now accrue to Nerva.

The Temple of Minerva and possibly also the encompassing Forum Transitorium needed completion. This they got (Martail, 10, 28; Suet.,

Dom., 5; Staius, *Silv.*, 4, 3, 9-10; Eutropius⁷, 23, 5; Aur. Vict., *Caes.*, 12.2; *CIL* 6. 953, 31213). Nerva thereby gained the honour of overseeing the dedicatory celebrations at the beginning of A.D. 97. Gained also was the opportunity to have his name inscribed on the entablature of the temple. Officially misrepresented by its nomenclature this unmistakably Domitianic complex would now recall a rather transitory *princeps* by bearing the title of the Forum of Nerva. Apt perhaps that in time it was also to be titled the Forum Transitorium (S. H. A., *Alex. Sev.*, 28, 6; 36, 2; Servius, *ad Aen.*, 7, 607; Eutropius, 7, 23, 5).

Similar may have been a restoration of the Atrium Libertatis (*CIL* 6. 472 = *ILS* 274). Domitian had been carrying out extensive restoration work in the area as we have seen, with work on the Forum Julium and the Basilica Argentaria. The Atrium Libertatis had traditionally housed the functions of the censors. With Domitian having been censor in perpetuity, already restoring the area in question and interested in maintaining the conservative traditions in Rome, it would be highly probable it was Domitian who had initiated work on the Atrium. Accordingly, it would be not unsurprising if the Nervan input into the Atrium Libertatis was rather less than that of restoration, more a usurpation of work previously undertaken.

Similar again was the Nervan addition to Domitian's extensive

reworking of the Palatine. *Aedes Publica* inscribed on the façade was a quick, cheap though possibly effective swipe at the old regime (Pliny, *Pan*, 47, 4; *ILS* 9358). It was a more positive reaction than the destruction of the public presence of the last of the Flavians, the toppling of the arches, the ruination of the images, the removal of the name, the resentful negation of the existence of one who had in truth done much for Rome and her empire. These were actions precipitated by a vengeful senate, a senate to which Nerva belonged and owed his present eminence. The inscribing of *aedes publica* would fit well with senatorial sentiment, whilst effectively changing nothing. The Palatine complex still housed the Imperial Court. Likewise the Imperial Court still arranged itself around a *princeps*, and one who could act decisively, autocratically. No matter how essential the image of senatorial power sharing may have been to his regime, Nerva's adoption of Trajan in late October 97 was an act of autocracy, not one of idealised oligarchy. With it the continuation of the system of the principate was confirmed, if not assured. Not before time either, for within three months Nerva was dead. Upon Nerva's death Trajan, already Caesar, consul also, and commanding powerful military forces was as strongly positioned as possible to assume the role of *princeps*.

Trajan.

Word of the death of Nerva was conveyed to Trajan at Cologne by his nephew, the future emperor Hadrian (S. H. A., *Hadr.* 2. 6). As may have been expected, since it was in accord with tradition, Trajan had his recently acquired father declared a god by decree of the Senate and a temple for the new god was vowed (Pliny, *Pan.* 11. 1). Less to be expected is its non-appearance¹. Though it may have actually been built there is no further mention of such a building in honour in any of the sources for the rest of Rome's history². Nor have any remains of such a temple ever been detected, or at any rate identified at Rome. The lack of Trajanic promotion of filial piety to his deified adopted father should perhaps also be noted here. The coinage only admits mention of Divus Nerva ten years after the deification³. Trajan seemed to be relying on more substantial guarantees of power and prestige than those that could be gained from his immediate predecessor.

Trajan was in Germany with the legions when news of his good fortune arrived, and in Germany he stayed, initially, leaving only to advance into

¹Syme, R., *Tacitus*, Oxford, 1958, p. 12.

²The topographical dictionaries do not even mention such a structure.

³Syme, 1958, p. 12.

Pannonia and thence to Moesia, finally making his way to Rome in the late Spring or early Summer of 99, more than a year after his acclamation as emperor. Various interpretations of this unhurried approach by Trajan to his return to Rome have been made, from Syme's rather less than optimistic assessment that the delay was necessitated by caution and a desire to ensure the loyalty of the crucially positioned legions of the northern frontier provinces⁴, to Garzetti's claim that the security of Trajan's position allowed for seamless continuation of the status quo, including his previously planned tour on the northern frontiers⁵. Either way, Trajan's sojourn along the Rhine and Danube does indicate a certain pragmatism, a desire to deal with the necessities of the situation and leave the basking in glory until the appropriate time had come, no matter which interpretation of his behaviour is favoured. Thus Rome was to have to wait to welcome its new master. It was to have to wait even longer to enjoy the presence of Trajan's architectural largesse.

Though we do not have a memoir of Trajan's surviving to us, nor a literary *res gestae* like that of Augustus to indicate for us the pride in the achievements of his principate, we do have different sources from which to gain some insight into that which Trajan may have considered to be the proper role of the *princeps*. We have the testimony of the Younger Pliny in his well-known Panegyric, a work no doubt fashioned to find

⁴Syme, 1958, p. 18.

⁵Garzetti, A., *From Tiberius to the Antonines*. trans. Foster, J. R., London, 1974, p. 308.

favour with the *princeps*. We have also works fashioned under decree of that same *princeps*, actual *res gestae* rather than literary works.

The Forum of Trajan.⁶

That Trajan considered the conquest of Dacia to be the crowning glory of his reign to date is amply attested to in the evidence we have. The enormous wealth, both human and mineral, won for Rome with the conquest of Dacia made possible an extravagance of imperial largesse. Spectacles, games, donatives and banquets were provided, enough to sate the appetites of Rome. Lavish though it was, this form of largesse was ephemeral, dependent on memory, or upon literary and inscriptional survival for any form of longevity. Moreover, the splendour fails to fully translate into dry words and numbers. More substantial means were needed to impress the victory of Trajan into the collective memory of Rome. Trajan determined to build his achievement into the centre of the city of Rome, embellishing the city that stood at the centre of the empire that he had augmented with a new province.

⁶Though technically incorrect, the term Forum of Trajan will be used to describe the entire complex, inclusive of the separate elements such as the Ulpian Basilica and the libraries, except where clarity requires a distinction.

In an area that had probably already been prepared, perhaps cleared and levelled during the latter stages of the reign of Domitian to accommodate some project of that emperor⁷, Trajan decided to erect another forum. Just what Domitian may have had intended for the site is impossible to know. Evidence from brick stamps lends credence to the theory that Domitianic work was carried out in the area⁸, but a suggestion such as that of Darwall-Smith, that Domitian may have been planning a forum to glorify his own Dacian achievements, seems extraordinary⁹. That the marble quarries of Docimium (modern day Iscehisar), and in particular the main quarry north of Cakirsaz, known from *in situ* inscriptional evidence to have been initiated during the reign of Domitian, were to provide *pavonazzetto* Dacian figures for Domitian's project seems to be a naive reasoning at best¹⁰. *Pavonazzetto* was one of the most used marbles in prestigious imperial projects, only a small fraction of the stone quarried would ever have been shaped as Dacians. Moreover, along with the part sculptured 'barbarian' found at Cakirsaz were also found a number of column shafts in the same quarry¹¹. This was no stone particularly suited for shaping into defeated Dacian

⁷There seems to be consensus that Domitian was responsible for the initial clearing and levelling of the site, or at least part of it. What he intended to have built on the site is, however, very much open to speculation.

⁸See here Anderson, Jr., J. C., *Historical topography of the Imperial Fora.*, Brussels, 1984, p. 148 ff.

⁹Darwall-Smith, 1996, p. 243.

¹⁰For the quarries and their contents see Waelkens, M., 'From a Phrygian Quarry: the Provenance of the Statues of the Dacian Prisoners in Trajan's Forum at Rome', *AJA* 89, 1985, pp. 641-653.

¹¹Waelkens, 1985, p. 644.

warriors. One is on firmer though not solid ground if one confines oneself to an examination of what was built, rather than what may or may not have been planned.

In the case of the Forum of Trajan our knowledge of what was actually constructed is now better served in most parts following the publication of James Packer's monumental work on the *forum Traiani*¹², though there are still lacunae, and hence room for controversy and even reinterpretation.

On a man-made terrace abutting the Forum of Augustus to the south-east and the Julian Forum to the south-west the new forum was laid out. To the south the *area fori* was defined and delimited by a wall built along the line of a shallow curve and described by Packer as being articulated by three arched entrance ways, the central arch being in effect a triumphal arch, its proposed representation on coinage showing the triumphal nature of its crowning statuary groups. The two lesser symmetrically positioned arches are described as being in effect probably lesser versions of the central arch with only a single fornix, though again crowned with *bigae* and bronze trophy groups¹³. However, excavation of the area in recent years is beginning to bring to light evidence that would disallow

¹²Packer, J., *The Forum of Trajan in Rome*, Berkley, 1997, hereafter Packer, 1997.

¹³Packer, 1997, p. 85 ff.

this proposed reconstruction of a wall pierced by three triumphal entrances¹⁴. Not only does it seem that the wall may have had no monumental arched entrances at all, but the recent excavations seem to support the reconstruction first proposed by Bartoli of a wall articulated with columns *en ressaut*¹⁵. Further excavations may shed more light on the issue, until then it must remain controversial. However, that the wall faces would have been left unornamented whether the arches existed or not, would be as unthinkable in this context as in the Forum Transitorium.

The eastern and western sides of the forum comprised barrel-vaulted colonnades. These were augmented on either flank by hemicycles, centrally positioned and facing each other, their diameters approximately one third the length of their respective porticoes. Their size and position were such as to create a secondary axis within the *area fori*, an axis at 90 degrees to the main central axis that, in the Packer reconstruction, ran from the centre of the central fornix of the main arched entrance way and the central doorway of the Basilica Ulpia. The point of intersection of the two axes denoted the very centre of the *area fori*.

Access to the porticoes from the pavement of the *area fori* was gained

¹⁴Viscogliosi, A. 'Il foro Traiano riesaminato', JRA 12, 1999, pp. 600 - 613, hereafter Viscogliosi, 1999.

¹⁵Viscogliosi, 1999, pp. 602 - 3.

via three steps, these visually set off from the white marble paving of the plaza by being constructed in *giallo antico*. At the top of these steps was the colonnade, the order Corinthian, the bases and capitals in white marble, the shafts of fluted *pavonazzetto*. Enough of the various elements of the attic survive to allow full reconstruction¹⁶. It consisted of a marble Dacian warrior on a pedestal above each column, the Dacian posed in a position denoting submission, head bowed and arms and hands held across the front of the body in a gesture of passivity. The top of the head supported the elaborately detailed cornice¹⁷. Set at the centre of the panels that spanned the intercolumniations were positioned *imagines clipeatae*, the surviving fragments of which seem to suggest a theme incorporating diverse members of the various imperial dynasties and *principes* from the first century and a half of autocratic government at Rome¹⁸. Above the cornice carried by the atlantes was another crowning cornice. Placed on this cornice directly over each Dacian was a pedestal inscribed with the name of a legion, which in turn supported a set of three or five standards, the standards most probably fashioned of gilt bronze.

In the colonnade itself a floor paved in *giallo antico* and *pavonazzetto* was complemented by the *pavonazzetto* and white marble cladding of

¹⁶Packer, 1997, pp. 99, 425-6.

¹⁷Packer, 1997, pp. 99, 425-6.

¹⁸Packer, 1997, pp. 426-7.

the rear walls, whilst overhead there probably arched a hanging or false vaulted ceiling¹⁹.

As mentioned above the colonnades were augmented by hemicycles the diameters of which equalled approximately one third of the entire length of the colonnades. These hemicycles were screened off from the colonnade proper, a differentiation of space that was both enhanced by a differentiation in pattern of floor paving, though continuity was otherwise here maintained by means of continued employment of *pavonazzetto* and *giallo antico opus sectile* and a continuation of the grid patterning of the colonnades²⁰.

The curved walls of the hemicycles were broken by a series of niches, the axially central position being given over to what was probably a domed recess instead of a niche. Just what the sculptural decoration of these niches and the recesses was is unclear. Zanker favoured a scheme of earlier imperial dynasts and families²¹, though Packer rejects this theory on the basis that whereas Zanker based his argument on colossal portrait heads, those of Livia, Nerva, Agrippina Minor and Vespasian found in the area, he prefers to place them as the *imagines clipeatae* mentioned above. Packer on the other hand implies that a series of statues, one and

¹⁹Packer, 1997, p. 427.

²⁰Packer, 1997, p. 99.

²¹Zanker, P., 'Das Trajansforum in Rom.', *AA*, 1970, pp. 499-544, pp. 518-9.

a half times life size, and representing both military and civilian portraits, probably of Trajan, are better placed in the hemicycle niches²².

Between the southern wall, the eastern and western colonnades and the basilica to the north stretched the *area fori*, a vast piazza, 300 RF wide and paved in a white marble. Packer's description follows tradition in interpreting rectilinear patterns inscribed on a fragment of the Severan Marble Plan as rows of trees, or perhaps some other form of herbage, planted in two sets of twinned rows laid along the minor axes that ran from the two lesser side entrances in the southern boundary wall to the two lesser side entrances in the southern wall of the basilica. Such a planting is seen to be an effort to relieve what may otherwise have been a rather austere and forbidding space²³. Viscogliosi on the other hand maintains that the archaeological evidence does not support the existence of any such arboreal scheme²⁴.

In the exact centre of the *area fori*, according to the illustrations of the reconstruction published in the work of Packer, was an equestrian statue of Trajan. The main axis of the *area fori* was that which was created by the alignment of the central porch of the southern façade of the Basilica

²²Packer, 1997, p. 105.

²³Packer, 1997, pp. 95, 419.

²⁴Viscogliosi, 1999, p. 603.

Ulpia and the centre of the Southern boundary wall of the *area fori*, where the proposed central triumphal gate would stand. The secondary axis ran at ninety degrees to the main axis, created by the positioning of the facing hemicycles of the east and west colonnades. According to Viscogliosi, the base for the monumental equestrian statue is not on direct axis with the two hemicycles, rather it is placed approximately 20m to the south of this alignment²⁵. However, even then it would retain a strong central positioning.

Placed athwart the northern end of the *area fori*, the façade of the Basilica Ulpia completed the enclosure of the square. Something of the form of the façade of the basilica can be known from its representation on coins (e. g. *RIC* II, 241, 261, nos. 246ff, pl. 9. 150, 287 nos. 616ff.; *BMC Emp.* III, 99 no. 492, pl. 17.15, 207 no. 982 pl. 38.8. In form the façade followed that of the *scaenae frons* of the theatre of Pompey, being articulated into a series of bays by the three intervening porches²⁶. Packer views the porches as following the strict axial alignment of the complex, with the main porch and entrance to the basilica in direct alignment with the central arched gateway he places in the southern boundary wall, the lesser flanking porches likewise counterparts to the lesser arched gateways approximately 400 RF directly to their south. On the attics of the porches were gilt bronze statue groups, that of the central porch a

²⁵Viscogliosi, 1999, p. 603.

²⁶Packer, 1997, pp. 244, 260 n. 6-7, 265 n. 23.

triumphal figure riding in a *quadriga*, on the lateral porches *bigae*. The figure in the *quadriga* was most probably Trajan as *triumphator*. Of those in the *bigae* there is less certainty, Packer proposes "chief aides"²⁷. At the head of the steps of *giallo antico* that led from the floor of the *area fori* up to the basilica were statue bases. Three are recorded, two survive. They are both inscribed with the same legend;

*S P Q R imp.caesari.divi nervae.f.nervae traiano.augusto
germanico.dacico pontif.max.tribunicia potest.xvi.imp.vi.cos.vi.pp
optime.de republica.(m)erito.domi.forisque*

(CIL 6. 959).

The Senate and the Roman People [dedicate this statue] to the Emperor Caesar Nerva Trajan Augustus Dacicus, son of the deified Nerva, Pontifex Maximus with Tribunician Power for the sixteenth time, Consul for the sixth time, father of his country, who deserves the best from the State at home and abroad.

The tops of these pedestals contain two large oval sockets, probably in order to secure by way of the feet greater than life-size gilt bronze statues, again probably of Trajan.²⁸

²⁷Packer, 1997, p. 221.

²⁸Packer, 1997, p. 218-9.

Above the columns that form, in the reconstruction of Packer, the semi-permeable ground floor façade of the basilica, the architrave carried inscriptions and a frieze of a single scene; *putti*, their legs metamorphosised into acanthus scrolls flanking S-shaped spirals of acanthus and a vase, repeated thirty-four times. Above these another level, Dacian atlantes supporting, visually if not actually, a cornice. In the inter-columniations between the Dacians were recessed marble panels, their surface a relief of piled weaponry identical in form to those on the pedestal of the Column of Trajan, though here carved in higher relief. On the cornice surmounting the Dacians and the relief panels were military standards. These were at the same level as the bronze statuary groups over the porches. The socket holes for their emplacement survive on fragments of the cornice. They are also depicted and clearly visible on coinage, and specifically mentioned by Aulus Gellius (13. 25. 1-2)²⁹. These standards too, like the statuary, were possibly fashioned of gilt bronze. Beyond and behind these was a clerestory level of the basilica, fashioned of columns of *cipollino* in the Ionic order. This colonnade supported the gilt tile roof, the eaves of which were decorated with what seem to be some sort of acroteria, possibly taking the form of eagles. High above all this, the gilt bronze statue of Trajan which topped the column just to the north of the basilica

²⁹For illustrations of the coin types see Packer, 1998, pp. 220-1, Ills. 131-2.

could be seen, surveying the whole of the complex thus far described.

A differing reconstruction is given by Amici³⁰ and appears to be supported by Viscogliosi³¹, with the basilica consisting of three stories, and therefore attaining a height which would preclude the view of the statue of Trajan placed on the top of the column from the *area fori*.

Moreover, Viscogliosi maintains that even the two storey version outlined by Packer, would only have at most permitted a view of the statue atop the column from the southern section of the *area fori*³².

One should also keep in mind that since the orientation of the statue is not known, the statue could have been orientated to any direction³³. To describe it as surveying the entire complex south of the basilica implies that the statue faced towards the south, and is a supposition required by the conceptual programme of the complex as understood by Packer and Zanker.

In the reconstruction of Packer, the basilica consisted internally of a double storeyed rectangular nave 300 x 85 RF (88.14 x 24.973 m.) entirely enclosed within a single storeyed double colonnade that formed the

³⁰Amici, C., *Il Foro di Traiano; Basilica Ulpia e Biblioteche*, Rome, 1982, fig. 68.

³¹Viscogliosi, 1999, p. 609 ff.

³²Viscogliosi, 1999, p. 610.

³³According to the A. D. 1588 restorers of the statue base, at the time of the placing of the statue of St. Peter bronze feet of a pre-existing statue were found, their orientation being towards the forum. Were these the feet of the original statue?, we cannot know.

aisles. The shafts of the columns of the internal colonnade were of grey Egyptian granite resting on bases of white marble, their Corinthian capitals also of white marble. On the immediately surmounting architrave a frieze, once again a single scene, in this instance composed of winged victories sacrificing a bull, and framed by candelabra, repeated sixty-five times surrounded the nave. The upper order that comprised the clerestory was the aforementioned Ionic colonnade with shafts of *cipollino*, the frieze of the accompanying architrave a simple acanthus leaf S-shaped scroll.

To the east and west of the central rectilinear hall were hemicyclical apses, closely corresponding in size and form with the hemicycles of the forum colonnades. The walls of the apses most probably each contained ten niches, five a side flanking a central tribunal that echoed the recesses in the colonnade hemicycles. Here too as in the recesses of the colonnade the tribunals probably contained representations of Trajan, much greater than life-size, though in civilian guise.

To the north of the basilica was located the peristyle courtyard that contained the marvel that we know today as the Column of Trajan. To the east and the west of the peristyle were libraries, one for Greek, one for Latin, the traditional Imperial demarcation. Built to a scale in keeping

with the other elements of the complex, the libraries were in effect large, rectangular halls, approximately 90 L. x 68.5 W. x 50 H.RF (27.10 x 20.10 x 14.69 m), the interior walls of which were articulated with a double order, the lower and upper both Corinthian, the friezes of both architraves fairly understated, schematised patterns of botanical elements³⁴.

In the peristyle between the two libraries rose the still extant colossal column. The sides of its pedestal were adorned with the same representations of piled up weaponry that occurred in the panels above the columned screen of the first order of the southern façade of the basilica, and also the inscription;

SENATVS POPVLVSQUE ROMANVS
 IMP CAESARI DIVI NERVAE F NERVAE
 TRAIANO AUG GERM DACICO PONTIF
 MAXIMO TRIB POT XVII IMP VI COS VI P P
 ADDECLARANDUM QUANTAE ALTITUDINIS
 MONS ET LOCUS TAN[tis oper]IBUS SIT EGESTUS

³⁴L. Richardson Jnr. 'The Architecture of the Forum of Trajan', *Archaeological News* 6, 1977, pp. 101-7 suggested that due to the large numbers of Hadrianic brickstamps found in the area north of the basilica that perhaps the entirety of this part of the complex was the product of that *princeps'* efforts, with the courtyard, the libraries the Temple of the Deified Trajan being constructed around the Column of Trajan, itself re-positioned here from an original location in the north-east hemicycle of the Forum of Trajan. The three brick-stamps known to be still *in situ* in the walls of the west library date from c. A. D. 110, Bloch, *Bolli.*, pp. 57-61, Boatwright, M. T., *Hadrian and the City of Rome*, Princeton, 1987, p. 82 n. 15.

(CIL 6. 960).

The Senate and the People of Rome [dedicate this column] to the emperor Caesar, son of the deified Nerva, Nerva Trajan, Augustus, Germanicus, Dacicus, Pontifex Maximus with Tribunician Power for the seventeenth time, hailed Imperator for the sixth time, consul for the sixth time, father of his country, to show how high a mountain - and the site for such great works - had been cleared away.

From the top of the pedestal rose the massive column, 92.05 RF (27 m) high if one includes the cincture in the measurements³⁵, or 100 RF (29.78 m) if one includes the column, the base and capital³⁶. On the top of the capital rose a pedestal on which stood a statue of Trajan where now is placed a statue of St. Peter. Whether the shaft of the column had in the time of Trajan its present appearance is a question that has recently been examined³⁷. Enough doubt has been raised in regard to what has generally been confidently assigned to a Trajanic dating of the scroll-like frieze so as to best leave this aside from any consideration of the decorative themes of the forum complex as envisaged under Trajan.

³⁵Packer, 1997, p. 448.

³⁶Richardson, 1992, p. 176; Wilson-Jones, M., "One hundred feet and a spiral stair: the problem of designing Trajan's Column.", *JRA* 6, 1993, pp. 23-38, esp. p. 27 ff.

³⁷Claridge, A., 'Hadrian's Column of Trajan', *JRA* 6, 1993, pp. 5-22.

Likewise it is probably wisest not to incorporate that little which is known of the Temple of the Deified Trajan. That the temple was built by Hadrian is quite clear, S.H.A. *Hadr.* 19. 9 tells us so, further stating that it was the only temple at Rome on which he had his own name inscribed as he who had had the edifice built. Some, however, have wished to include the temple in the discussions of the thematic programme of the forum complex, seeing in the temple an essential element of the overall decorative and ideological programme that must have been included as part of the original design of the whole.

Packer, following Zanker³⁸, wishes to see the entire forum complex including the column with its frieze and the Temple of the Deified Trajan in this way. His interpretation of the ideological theme of the forum complex as a sequentially revealed *res gestae* of Trajan moving from Trajan represented as military hero in the *area fori*, to Trajan as supreme civic leader as represented in the Basilica Ulpia, to Trajan as the patron of civilized and civilizing arts in the libraries, the entire theme capped off with Trajan as the deified *optimus princeps* relies on the incorporation of all of the elements of the forum complex as he believes they ultimately stood, each element of the complex as finally realised adding its weight to the interpretation of the theme³⁹. Notwithstanding the difficulties arising from the evidence brought to light by recent

³⁸Zanker, P., 'Das Trajansforum in Rom.', *AA*, 1970, pp. 499-544.

³⁹Packer, 1997, pp. 276-283.

archaeological excavations, some of which have been mentioned above, there are also serious difficulties in claiming that this was the aim of the design as developed during the principate of Trajan.

The column itself may not have been an element in the initial design of the forum complex, or at least not in the position it ultimately came to occupy⁴⁰. There is also no reason to assume that although the ashes of Trajan were to be placed in the pedestal at the base of the column (Dio, 69. 2. 3; Eutropius, 8. 5. 2; Aur. Vict., *Epit.* 13. 11), that this was an original intention in the conception of the column. There is also good reason to believe that the frieze that covers the outer surface of the column shaft was a later, probably Hadrianic addition⁴¹. The temple of the Deified Trajan was undoubtedly built during the principate of Hadrian (S.H.A. *Hadr.* 19. 9). Undeniable though this last fact is, efforts have been made to mitigate its importance in order to save the theory by postulating a plan conceived and drafted under Trajan to be finally realised by Hadrian⁴². There is no evidence for such forethought on the part of Trajan. Furthermore it is difficult to believe that Trajan would have made so obvious a provision for deification upon the occasion of his own

⁴⁰Richardson argues that the column was originally built in a different part of the complex, in the eastern hemicycle of the forum colonnade to be exact. Though his theory has not found favour, it does raise the point that the final design solution may bear little resemblance to the initial intention, Richardson Jr, L., 'The Architecture of the forum of Trajan,' *ArchN* 6, 1977, pp. 101-7.

⁴¹Claridge, 1993, pp. 5-22.

⁴²Packer, 1997, p. 131 ff; Zanker, 1970, p. 538 ff.

demise. Deification was an extremely sensitive area in which the wishes of the Senate needed to be taken into account if bad feeling was to be avoided. Deification was not a given, even at this stage of the principate⁴³. Finally, the idea that the forum complex was designed with the intention of realising in a sequence of spaces and imagery a form of *res gestae divi Traiani* is simply anachronistic.

Dedication ceremonies for the forum were held in the January of A. D. 113 with Trajan in his sixtieth year⁴⁴. The work on the complex had of course begun earlier, possibly immediately after the completion of Trajan's first Dacian war, in A. D. 106 - 7⁴⁵. Trajan would have then been in his early fifties. This would have meant that the design of the complex, including one would assume some plan for the thematic content of the self same complex, must have begun prior to this, with Trajan even younger, recently and outstandingly victorious in Dacia, and in the prime of life. It is difficult to believe that given the circumstances surrounding Trajan at the time of the initial design stages of the forum, he would have considered the Dacian victory to be the crowning achievement of his time as *princeps*. Following the dedication of the forum, in A.D. 113 Trajan set out for the East with the intent to lead his

⁴³An example of this need for the approval of the Senate, and the difficulties this could present, is well demonstrated by the persistence which Antoninus Pius had to employ in order to have Hadrian deified.

⁴⁴*Fasti Ostiensis*, 1. 1. 7

⁴⁵Packer, 1997, p. 5.

legions against the Parthians. Surely he did not expect his victories there, (and who would lead out armies expecting defeat?), to be less glorious than those victories he had had against the Dacians. The Dacian campaigns could not have figured in the thinking of Trajan as the greatest achievement of his principate when he was planning even greater. The forum of Trajan may reasonably be interpreted as embodying the *res gestae* of the Deified Trajan but only as it stood, a *fait accompli*, sometime after the death of Trajan and the subsequent interventions of Hadrian. To claim that incorporation of a sequentially revealed *res gestae* into the forum was an original element in its conception and design is anachronistic, untenable, and unsupported by evidence.

Furthermore, there is no real evidence that the Hadrianic Temple to the Deified Trajan stood to the north of the Basilica Ulpia, in the culminating position of the complex according to the thematic theory of Packer and Zanker. Instead it seems that there, where it is proposed that the temple stood, was an imposing monumental stair that provided the primary entrance to the complex⁴⁶. It has been proposed that the temple for the Deified Trajan was in fact built at the extreme other end of the complex, against the southern boundary wall of the *area fori*. Further excavations

⁴⁶Viscogliosi, 1999, p. 607; La Rocca, E., 'Il foro di Traiano e i fori tripartiti', *MDAI* 105, 1988, p. 153; Boatwright, M. T., *Hadrian and the City of Rome*, Princeton, 1987, pp. 85 ff.

may prove this theory to be correct.⁴⁷

There are more reasonable interpretations of the intentions of the Trajanic design evident in those elements that can be confidently assigned a Trajanic date.

The forum was positioned in close connection with the other imperial fora, physically and axially, taking as it did the central axis of the Templum Pacis as the determining alignment of its own central longitudinal axis, whilst the external face of the southern wall of the *area fori* took its alignment from the front colonnade of the Temple of Venus Genetrix in the neighbouring Forum of Caesar⁴⁸. Other connections between the imperial fora abound. There was a connection of proportion in the Trajanic version, the internal length of the courtyard of the Temple of Peace being adopted and used in multiples of fractions to determine the various sizes of the elements that constituted the Forum of Trajan⁴⁹. There was a strong visual connection maintained and continued by use of the same polychrome marbles that the other imperial fora displayed⁵⁰. There was the visual connection using form

⁴⁷Viscogliosi, 1999, p. 607. Since the time of the initial composition of this thesis subsequent excavations have proven this theory incorrect. Only a vestibule in the form of a sunken court with colonnaded passages on either side connected the Forum of Trajan with the Forum of Augustus. The evidence, not yet published, was supplied via private correspondence with A. Claridge.

⁴⁸Packer, 1997, p. 261.

⁴⁹Packer, 1997, pp. 261-2.

⁵⁰Packer, 1997, pp. 269-272.

to provide the linkages, for example the exhedrae of the Augustan Forum were mirrored in the Trajanic version. Another possible visual connection was that made by botanical plantings of the *areae* of the Temple of Peace and the Trajanic forum, though this has recently been brought into doubt⁵¹. There were similarities of sculptural decoration, wherein the forum built by Augustus had caryatids as part of the attic decoration, the forum of Trajan had its Dacian warriors to fulfil a similar role. Even the patterning of the colonnade pavings witnesses a connection between the the Augustan and Trajanic fora. The *equus Traiani* made reference to the equestrian statue of Julius Caesar in the neighbouring Julian Forum, whilst the use of a free-standing colonnade *en ressaut* to enhance architectonically the curving interior façade of the southern boundary wall of the *area fori Traiani* found precedent in the Forum Transitorium.

The forum of Trajan witnesses a wealth of references to its illustrious predecessors, so many in fact that some have been moved to remark that there may have been a desire on the part of the architect of the forum of Trajan, very likely Apollodorus of Damascus, to create with this forum an act of homage to the others lying close by⁵². This may be a misinterpretation of the intent behind the referencing to the works of

⁵¹Viscogliosi, 1999, p. 603.

⁵²Packer, 1997, p. 261.

illustrious forbears.

In size the Forum of Trajan far out-stripped the other imperial fora in ground area alone. Being so much larger the forum therefore used more materials, more marble, more gilt bronze. The largesse of the *princeps* was increased simply by increasing quantity. But not by quantity of materials alone was this increase shown; other features carried through this theme of 'more'. The hemicycles of the Augustan colonnades had been mirrored in the Trajanic version, but the Trajanic hemicycles were deeper. Moreover, by creating the apses at the western and eastern ends of the basilica, the number of hemicycles incorporated into the complex was effectively doubled.

The Basilica Ulpia in itself was an element of the Trajanic forum that went beyond the other imperial fora, giving greater utility to the complex, but also increasing the impression of massive imperial largesse. Furthermore the inclusion of a basilica provided a link between the Trajanic forum and the Forum Romanum, the only other nearby forum to contain such a structure. A reference at further remove was the roof material of the basilica, bringing to mind the gilt bronze tiles crowning the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus some way to the west.

However, in this instance the luxurious out-fitting of a roof is admired by Pausanias rather than condemned as the product of mania (Pausanias, 5.

12. 6).

The libraries of the Trajanic forum balanced those of the *Templum Pacis*, whilst the Column of Trajan which they flanked was without compare in any of the other fora, imperial or not. Likewise the other imperial fora consisted of one *area fori* apiece, the Trajanic forum was to have effectively two, whatever may have been the original design for the area north of the basilica, or for that matter its final form. As pointed out above it seems unlikely, if not impossible, that the Temple of the Deified Trajan could have been part of the original design for Trajan's forum. Boatwright makes a case for this second *area* being open towards the north-west, allowing full visibility of the column and the libraries and basilica from the *via Lata*, and accordingly an expansive view over the imperial monuments of the Campus Martius from the forum would have been provided⁵³. It is an attractive theory if for no other reason that it does not need to posit the existence of structures for which no good evidence exists. It is also a theory that recent archaeological work seems to have supported⁵⁴. It is a theory that also fits nicely with a conception of the design of the Forum of Trajan providing everything and more than was provided by the other Imperial fora, all of which were designed to exclude the surrounding urban landscape, only Trajan's providing a

⁵³Boatwright, 1987, pp. 85 ff.

⁵⁴Viscogliosi, 1999, pp. 605-7.

scenic view. It does however raise the rather startling possibility that the Forum of Trajan was designed without the inclusion of any presence of the gods. The sculptural decoration admits of no such presence in any part of the area *fori*, not on or in the colonnades, nor upon the external and internal surfaces of the basilica. Packer 'assumes' the existence of the presence of Minerva in niches within the libraries, but this is conjecture⁵⁵. The only structure that undoubtedly alludes to divine presence is the Column of Trajan. There on the sculptural frieze may be found representations of the Danube as a river god (pl. 6), a winged Victory inscribing a shield (pls. 136, 137), a forest deity (pl. 277), a representation of Selene the moon goddess (pl. 52), and a god that could be taken to be Jupiter, thunder-bolt at the ready (pl. 30)⁵⁶.

However, the representation of Danube as an anthropomorphic god is probably best understood as visual shorthand to set the scene in the absence of written explanation. The veiled figure of Selene, who appears above a battle scene but not as a participant in the action, is used to show that a battle took place at night. The winged Victory appears to provide a closing cypher to the first campaign, and a means of visually separating the two distinct campaigns. The figure that could be Jupiter with thunderbolt aloft is to be taken as a depiction of a thunderstorm during

⁵⁵Packer, 1997, p. 450.

⁵⁶For a full illustration of the frieze see Settis, S., ed., *La Colonna Traiana*, Turin, 1988. The plate numbers employed there are used here.

one of the early battles of the campaign, once more a similar exercise in visual shorthand to show an environmental condition rather than the active intervention of a deity. Furthermore, if one accepts the theory proposed by Claridge⁵⁷, the frieze of the column is a Hadrianic contribution, not Trajanic at all.

The only possibility for the presence of a divinity within the forum complex is that area that was to be given over to the Temple of the Deified Trajan. In any event, that edifice was a Hadrianic addition. Perhaps then the evidence, such as it is, requires the conclusion that there was never any inclusion of a divinity in the original conception and design of the forum, in itself a bold and original departure from precedent, and the one element of which the Trajanic forum provided less than did its neighbours.

The design and meaning of the Forum of Trajan as conceived under Trajan cannot be that as interpreted by Packer. His explanation does not stand scrutiny. It is an interpretation reliant on now superseded archaeological evidence, and also the anachronistic inclusion of elements only incorporated after the death and subsequent deification of the *optimus princeps*. Rather it may be in those very words *optimus princeps* that a sounder understanding of the intentions of the design

⁵⁷Claridge, 1993, pp. 5-22.

may be found. As outlined above, the Trajanic forum incorporated elements of all the neighbouring fora. Elements of measurement, materials, axes, architectural forms and perhaps botanical plantings, libraries, colonnades, equestrian statuary and the sculptural and decorative Dacian atlantes all found precedent or reference in the nearby fora. In the Trajanic forum these elements are always amplified, multiplied, or simply included, whereas they do not all appear in any of the preceding fora. So the Trajanic forum has colonnades, and hemicycles, and libraries, and a basilica, and two *areae*, and more, the monumental column, the gilt roof of the basilica, the view of the Campus Martius. The Trajanic forum had moreover a sculptural programme that echoed that of the Augustan forum, but whereas the Augustan version featured the Imperial family and mythological antecedents along with the most notable figures of Roman Republican history, the Trajanic sculptural programme seems to have concentrated on Imperial antecedents only, with the exception of the present incumbent of the principate. Here is where one of the most noticeable divergences from tradition is evident. Trajan's image was omnipresent in his forum, in the colossal equestrian statue that dominated the centre of the *area fori*, in the recesses that dominated the centres of the hemicycles (conjectured), in the statue groups that topped the entrances to the basilica (conjectured), in the apses of the basilica and the niches in

the libraries(conjectured), and finally crowning the architectural and engineering marvel of the colossal column. At the feet of the emperor on the top of the column the visitor could look out on the golden roof of the basilica, and perhaps beyond the great work spread out below, to the neighbouring fora made smaller and perhaps less significant not only due to the effect of distance, but also because of the scale and magnificence of the complex laid out below, necessarily experienced at least in part in gaining access to the column and its viewing platform. To the north the same visitor would have beheld the panorama of the Campus Martius, with all its monuments recalling the past glories of previous *principes*. It is difficult to believe that there was not the intention that such comparisons should be made. Trajan declared himself on coinage to be the *optimus princeps*. With his forum it seems he set out to demonstrate that he was not only the *optimus* but also *maximus, princeps optimus maximus*.

Thermae Traiani.

Not with the forum alone. To the north-east of the Flavian amphitheatre on the brow of the *mons Oppius* closely adjacent to the *thermae Titi* and to the Portico of Livia that lay 250 m to the north-east, were laid out the *thermae Traiani*⁵⁸. In order to provide a suitably

sized area on which to pour the massive concrete foundation platform the so-called Esquiline wing of the Domus Aurea was utilised. Its upper floor or floors were demolished, its rich decorative materials thriftily removed from that part that would be buried⁵⁹. Then those parts of the lower floor directly under the new bath building were strengthened by the insertion of parallel barrel vaulted chambers. The remaining cavities of the building were then packed with earth and rubble, and with that what was one of the last remaining traces of Nero's domestic delight was dispatched from the visible landscape of Rome. The Domus Aurea had now all but disappeared and could be forgotten⁶⁰.

Its interment did however permit the close positioning of Trajan's bath complex to that of Titus. Brought into such close connection, the two Imperial *thermae* were thus also brought into comparison. The *thermae* of Trajan were not to be found wanting. The actual bathing

⁵⁸On the Baths of Trajan see De Fine Licht, K., *Untersuchungen an den Trajansthermen zu Rom.*, ARID Supp. 7, Copenhagen, 1974; Anderson Jr., J. C., 'The Date of the *Thermae Traiani* and the Topography of the *Oppius Mons.*', *AJA* 89, 1985, pp. 499-509.

⁵⁹Segala, E., Sciortino, I., *Domus Aurea.*, trans. Swift, C., Milan, 1999, p. 19. The thrift involved in the probable recycling of the materials of the Domus Aurea is in interesting contrast to the Domitianic work practices in evidence on the Palatine. There, in the redevelopment of the site that was to house the *cenatio* of the Domus Flavia, Neronian era *opus sectile* flooring of outstandingly high quality was left *in situ*, that which was not destroyed to make way for foundations being simply buried beneath the Flavian version. The stark contrast in attitudes evident in these two cases of burial of Neronian buildings may add some weight to the argument that the *thermae Traiani* were a wholly Trajanic project.

⁶⁰It was left to Hadrian to fully complete this process with his subsequent removal of the reconfigured colossus of Nero and redevelopment of the site of the already converted atrium of the Domus Aurea to accommodate the Temple of Venus and Rome.

block, c. 190 x 140 m.⁶¹ was placed on the north-east boundary of the platform. It was here at the centre of the north-eastern side that the monumental main entrance to the complex was, faced away from the monumental centre of Rome, rather turned towards what would have been residential areas⁶².

This main entrance gave direct access to the bathing complex, a symmetrically opposed arrangement of dual bathing suites. The duality of the bathing suites may have provided a number of different advantages. For the architect it provided the pleasing possibility of following Roman aesthetic tradition with a strict symmetry of elements interplaying with a complexity of major and minor axes. For the clientele it doubled the bathing space available, thus adding to the accessibility of the service and the efficacy of its utility. For the patron, Trajan, the advantages were multiplied. The advantage to the architect was also that of the patron, the results of the architect's skill and creativity adding lustre to the largesse of the patron. Likewise, the advantages to the clientele in reverse wise spoke well of the patron. The generosity of the amenity itself provided an added glory, notwithstanding the doubling in numbers of grateful bathers that could enjoy the recreational experience and be beholden to its provider.

⁶¹Claridge, 1998, p. 288.

⁶²Richardson, 1992, p. 397.

However, rather more practical considerations may have been the determining factor in the doubling up of the bathing suites. As pointed out by Delaine⁶³, there were practical limitations as to the size of buildings that Roman technology could hope to accomplish. The result of these natural limitations was that the bathing blocks of later Imperial *thermae* in Rome never managed to exceed by any significant degree the dimensions of the Trajanic version, the physics disallowed. The elements of a bathing suite, the individual room sizes were limited by the materials and technologies available. Thus it is suggested that the doubling of the bathing suites was a means by which the bathing block as a whole could be conceived and perceived as monumental and massive, whilst the dimensions of the individual interior spaces remained within the proscribed limitations. Therefore the dual bathing suites of the Trajanic *thermae* may also have been attractive to the patron in that they allowed these Imperial *thermae* to reach dimensions far beyond those of its predecessors. By means of the multiplication of bathing suites the bathing block itself could be of such a scale that proportionally it harmonised with the enormous expanse of the surrounding peribolos and palaestra, the entire complex of such a size that its land area far outstripped any other single contemporaneous building in Rome, with the exception of the Circus Maximus.

⁶³DeLaine, J., 'Recent Research on Roman Baths.', *JRA* 1, 1988, pp. 11-32, p. 21.

It was not by size alone that the Trajanic bath complex set itself apart from its near neighbour. Eschewing the cardinally orientated alignment of the nearby *thermae*, Trajan's version was so orientated that greater use of the afternoon sun to assist in the heating of the *caldarium* was effected, the afternoon being the most common time for bathing. Whilst practical considerations may best explain the orientation, it should be noted that of the three Imperial bathing complexes erected in Rome prior to those of Trajan, those of Agrippa, of Nero, and of Titus, none had incorporated this pragmatic approach to solar assisted heating⁶⁴. All had been orientated in order that their exterior walls were more or less in alignment with surrounding structures, even at the expense of utility. With the Baths of Trajan there is utility of positioning at the expense of aesthetics, indeed a general lack of concern with the aesthetics of the exterior⁶⁵.

All these characteristics of the Trajanic Baths combine to allow an interpretation of the building that is close in nature to the interpretation that is possible in the case of the Forum of Trajan. The Baths conform to a building type not common, but present, in the Imperial building

⁶⁴Neilson, I., *Thermae et Balnea: The Architecture and Cultural History of Roman Public Baths I-II.*, Aarhus, 1990, vol. 1., p. 50.

⁶⁵De Fine Licht, K., 'Marginalia on Trajan's Baths in Rome.' in *Studia Romana in Honorem Petri Karup Septuagenarii.*, Odense, 1976, pp. 87 - 95, p. 90 ff.

traditions at Rome. The site for the complex was a commanding one, and made more so through engineering prowess. The Baths were in close proximity to the monumental works of predecessors, but in effect flaunted their independence by quite literally having their back turned towards these near neighbours. The Baths, as did the Forum, exceeded its predecessors not only in sheer size, but also in quantity. In both buildings the multiplication of facilities provided greater, or at any rate wider benefits to those among Rome's population who chose to make use of the Imperial munificence. Interestingly there is with both complexes a concern on the part of the *princeps* to provide for the earthly needs of Rome's population, the Baths as did the Forum eschewing the celestial in favour of terrestrial concerns. With the Baths the allegiance of the Roman people is curried by concern for their physical and social comfort and well-being; in the Forum their legal and administrative needs were accommodated.

Both complexes demonstrate an Imperial largesse on a monumental scale, on a scale that seems designed to overshadow (in the case of the *thermae Titi* quite literally) the achievements of predecessors. Both were showplaces, as such both would have been spared no expense in the lavishness and luxury of their decorative appointments. And interestingly, both required the erection of a highly utilitarian structure to complement their existence.

The Markets of Trajan.

Pendant to the Forum of Trajan, the Markets of Trajan sat in their imposing utilitarian bulk to the east of that complex⁶⁶. Pendant and utilitarian they were, and in a number of ways. The site of the forum had required excavation of a spur of the Quirinal in order to provide the expanse of level surface needed (Dio, 68. 16. 3). Accordingly, the resultant scarp required retention, a buttress, in order that it should be stabilised. The terraced form of the Markets of Trajan would, at least in part, seem to have been the result of this need to hold back the weight of the hill behind⁶⁷. This buttressing function may have been assisted by the hemicyclical form that comprises a large percentage of the extant remains of the markets. Acting in effect as a vaulted arch turned ninety degrees from the vertical to the horizontal, the horizontal forces created by the mass of the hill could thus be diffused and mitigated in accordance with the principles that govern conventional arches, but here on a massively increased scale. The terracing of the hemicycle up the slope of the hillside would also assist this buttressing function (See Plate 19).

⁶⁶For the most detailed treatments on the Markets see Meneghini, R., *Il foro e i Mercati di Traiano.*, Rome, 1995; Ricci, C., *Il mercato di Traiano.*, Rome, 1929; or more briefly, Ungaro, L., *LTUR* 3, 1996, pp. 241-5.

⁶⁷Ungaro, L., *LTUR* 3, p. 243; Richardson, 1992, p. 175.

The hemicyclical form accommodated the exhedra of the eastern colonnade that flanked the *area* of the Trajanic forum. The hemicycle accommodated the exhedra but the two curved façades are not in alignment with each other, they do not share a central radial point. Accordingly the intervening street does not enjoy a regular width, rather it expands towards the apex of the two arcs⁶⁸, perhaps suggesting a primary independence in the design process of the two complexes, in that they are pendant to each other, not necessarily dependent upon each other (See Plate 18).

The markets were built almost entirely of brick-faced concrete⁶⁹. It was a medium that allowed the flexibility of design and the strength of form to tackle such a challenging site whilst simultaneously creating well ventilated and lighted spaces, even of considerable internal volume, as instanced in that part of the markets now known as the Great Hall, or the *aula Traiana*⁷⁰. The brickwork, wearing a coat of stucco, would have presented a neat if unspectacular façade to the world, enlivened only by moulded brick entablatures picked out in red paint⁷¹. Whilst the stucco may have helped to create visual coherence for the otherwise somewhat

⁶⁸MacDonald, 1982, vol. 1, p. 84.

⁶⁹Claridge, 1998, p. 170; Richardson, 1992, p. 175.

⁷⁰MacDonald, 1982, vol. 1, p. 76.

⁷¹Claridge, 1998, p. 172.

disparate units of the complex, it would also have been in distinct contrast to the lavish use of luxury materials in the neighbouring forum⁷². The hierarchy of prestige was thus reinforced.

Though labelled the Markets of Trajan, an appellation applied as recently as the excavations of the Fascist era⁷³, the markets in fact comprise a number of distinct and independent units, though contemporaneously erected as a whole⁷⁴. The complex is probably best understood as an urban redevelopment⁷⁵. It comprised in the main *tabernae*, which would lend themselves to either commercial or administrative functions, but also residential apartments, streets, and interconnecting stairs. The markets were perhaps intended to house activities and occupants displaced by the insertion of the Forum of Trajan into a very central, and therefore densely inhabited part of the city⁷⁶. At any rate, with its system of streets, connecting stairs and functional spaces the markets repaired a rent in the prosaic fabric of the city, turning to utility the difficult and otherwise wasted space that had resulted from the generous proportioning of the spectacular, but hardly utilitarian, Forum

⁷²MacDonald, 1982, vol. 1, p. 76.

⁷³Labelled as such by Ricci, C., *Il mercato di Traiano.*, Rome, 1929.

⁷⁴For the most recent argument as to the Markets being a wholly Trajanic project as completed, rather than a Domitianic project completed by Trajan, see Lancaster, L., 'The Date of Trajan's Markets: An Assessment in the Light of Some Unpublished Brickstamps.', *PBSR* 63, 1995, pp. 25-44.

⁷⁵Claridge, 1998, pp. 170-2; MacDonald, 1982, vol. 1, p. 79; Richardson, 1992, p. 175.

⁷⁶Richardson, 1992, p. 175.

of Trajan.

And More Besides.

The *thermae Traiani* being of such an enormous size would have required a substantial and constant supply of water. To provide such a supply the structure now commonly known as the *sette sale* was built⁷⁷. It was a cistern, containing nine internal and interconnected chambers, the whole raised on a foundation of such a height as to allow gravity feed of its contents to the *thermae* sitting at a lower level. The cistern being able to hold up to eight million litres, gravity in conjunction with the sheer weight of the water must have provided ample force to the flow, even for such a huge bath complex. Such a drain on Rome's water supply was supplemented by the building of a new aqueduct, the *aqua Traiani*, the last of the great aqueducts to be built into the city, and the first to provide potable water from springs lying to the west of the Tiber⁷⁸. There is some evidence that water from this aqueduct ended up helping to supply the *sette sale*⁷⁹, but more

⁷⁷See here De Fine Licht, F., *Untersuchungen an den Trajansthermen zu Rom:2. Sette Sale*, Rome, 1990.; *ARID* supp. 20, 1990, Rome.; Castagnoli, F., *Le 'sette sale' cisterna delle terme di Traiano*, Val di Pesa, 1956.

⁷⁸On the Aqueduct of Trajan see Ashby, T., *The Aqueducts of Ancient Rome.*, Oxford, 1932, pp. 357-364; Virgili, P., *LTUR* 1, 1993, pp. 70-2.; Aicher, P. J., *Guide to the Aqueducts of Ancient Rome.*, Wauconda, 1995.

⁷⁹Inscriptions on lead pipes, found on the Oppian in 1935, indicate that the Baths of Trajan were

importantly it would have provided the means by which the levels of water usage enjoyed in the city prior to the erection of the *thermae Traiani* could be maintained, if not increased. Shifting the source of the Anio Novus added to both the quality and quantity of water entering the city (Frontinus, *Aq.* 2. 93). It is interesting to note that the supply was now at a level that even the erection of those massive bath complexes that were constructed after the time of Trajan, those of Caracalla and Diocletian, did not require the supplementation of Rome's water supply by additional aqueducts.

Water would have been needed also for a naumachia constructed by Trajan⁸⁰. This recreational amenity recalled that of Augustus and probably replaced that of Domitian. The destruction of the Domitianic version, its site unknown, is implied by the re-use of materials from its fabric in the major repair work of the Circus Maximus effected during the principate of Trajan (Suet. *Dom.* 5; Dio, 68. 7. 2; Pliny, *Pan.* 51. 5). The naumachia constructed for Trajan is probably that usually identified with the remains of a large structure found to the north-west of the Mausoleum of Hadrian. The use of *opus signinum* for parts of its construction and the inclusion of drainage facilities, in conjunction with

supplied from the Aqua Traiana.", Nash, 1968, vol. 1, pp. 53-4.

⁸⁰For the naumachia see Buzzetti, C. 'Nota sulla topografia dell'Ager Vaticanus', *QuadIstTopAnt* 5, 1968, pp. 105 - 111; Richardson, 1992, p. 266; Buzzetti, *LTUR* 3, pp. 338-9.

that which is known of its form, tiered seating and a rectangular ground-plan (therefore not a circus), lend weight to its identification as a naumachia, though do not prove it to be the one constructed for Trajan.

Trajan was not averse to providing entertainment for Rome's masses, nor venues for these entertainments. His construction of a naumachia, his restoration of the Circus Maximus⁸¹, his construction of a theatre in the Campus Martius, its site unknown as it was later demolished under Hadrian (S.H.A. *Hadr.* 9. 1-2), and the completion, restoration or remodelling of the Odeum of Domitian (Dio, 69. 4. 1) all attest to this⁸². Nor was the *optimus princeps* ungenerous in providing for the city's needs by other means. The Forum, the Baths, the expansion of the water supply, the urban redevelopment of the markets all indicate this concern on the part of Trajan. Nor are these concerns particular to the principate of Trajan, they were by this period a standard area for imperial activity. These projects may be remarkable for their size, the wealth displayed by the quality and quantity of the materials employed, or the engineering prowess demonstrated by their form, but they are nonetheless variations on a theme. There is however one area of Trajan's building programme that does mark it out from a simple continuation of the preceding Imperial building programmes in Rome, and that is in provision of

⁸¹In the first instance see further Ciancio Rossetto, P., *LTUR* 1, 1993, pp. 272-7, and the bibliography there cited.

⁸²For the Odeum, Virgili, P., *LTUR* 3, 1996, pp. 359-60.

largesse for the gods.

A temple for Nerva was vowed at the instance of the deification of that emperor, but it is uncertain as to whether it was ever built. What is quite certain is evidence for a major rebuilding of the *atrium Vestae*; Trajanic brickstamps found *in situ* make this conclusion unavoidable⁸³.

However, as with so many of the projects carried out during the principate of Trajan, there is some evidence to suggest that initial work may have been in progress during the principate of Domitian⁸⁴. If that was the the situation facing Trajan on his assumption of the purple there would have been no choice but to bring to completion this building which housed one of the oldest and most venerable, and also quintessential of Rome's indigenous cults. The Vestals could not have been left to remain unaccommodated indefinitely.

No choice but to bring to completion also the restoration of the Temple of Venus Genetrix in the Forum of Caesar. This had been another of Domitian's projects left unfinished at his sudden demise. Work continued under Trajan, and the Temple was ready to be dedicated on the

⁸³For the history of construction of the *atrium* see Scott, R., 'Excavations in the Area Sacra of Vesta, 1987-89.', in *Eius Virtutis Studiosi; Classical and Post-Classical Studies in Memory of Frank Edward Brown (1908 -1988)*, Scott, R. T., and Scott, A. R., eds, London, 1993; Scott, *LTUR* 1, 1993, pp. 138-42; Bloch, H., *Il bolli laterizi e la storia edilizia romana.*, Rome, 1947.

⁸⁴Blake, 1959, p. 115; Platner - Ashby, p. 59; Nash, vol. 1, pp. 154-9. On the perceived continuation of Domitianic policies under Trajan in general see the still enduring article by Waters, K., 'Traianus Domitiani Continuator.', *AJPh* 90, 1969, pp. 385-405.

same day as the Column of Trajan (FO, *Inscr. It.* 13. 1, 5, 203). The rebuilding of the *atrium Vestae* and the completion of the Temple of Venus Genetrix seem to be the only instances in which any concern for the religions of Rome was evidenced in the building programme of Trajan in Rome. Perhaps the extent of Domitian's work in this area may have had some bearing on Trajan's behaviour. It may well be the case that there was little left to be done. However, the apparent lack of provision for a tutelary divinity in the prestige project *par excellence* of Trajan's reign, his forum, in conjunction with the omission of any other religious building except for the two mentioned, projects probably left unfinished from the programme of Domitian, may be an indication of an over-all lack of concern on Trajan's part for matters divine.

In the October of 113 Trajan departed Rome again (Dio, 17, 1-2)⁸⁵, seeking once more military success and its attendant glory. This time he turned his attention from the Empire's northern borders, turning instead to the East. Behind him he left a city that he had embellished with some of the finest, and some of the largest structures that that city was ever to receive from the largesse of the principate. Trajan's building programme, while not as extensive as Domitian's nor as all-embracing as that of Augustus, was impressive nevertheless. Trajan's buildings at Rome combined grandiosity and monumentality with practicality and utility, whilst his

⁸⁵Syme, 1958, p. 235; Garzetti, 1974, p. 365.

choice of building types remained well within the range traditional for the principate. Lavishness of both scale and materials were the means by which Trajan sort to rival his predecessors, were the means by which he sort to stamp the presence of his reign into the landscape and memory of Rome. It was not an idle hope. In A. D. 357 when Constantius visited Rome for the first time Ammianus Marcellinus was present, and provides us with an account of that Emperor's impressions of the city (Ammian. Marc., 16. 10. 13-15). He writes of the Emperor's awe at the glories of Rome, but singles out for special attention Constantius' humility in the face of the achievement that was the Forum of Trajan, an achievement Ammianus declares is never again to be imitated by mortal men.

But the works of Trajan were the works of a mortal. In the early August of A. D. 117 at Selinus in Sicilia Trajan suffered some sort of seizure (Dio, 68, 33, 3). Journeying from the East to Rome he was never to reach his destination. Word was brought to Hadrian in Syria of the death of the *princeps* and his subsequent adoption as Trajan's heir. On August 11, two days after Hadrian had learnt of his good fortune, the legions at Antioch proclaimed him to be the new Emperor (S.H.A. *Hadr.* 4. 6) . Rome now had herself a new guardian.

HADRIAN

Once again Rome had a new master, a new patron. Once again the *princeps* was proclaimed far from Rome; in the East, as had been the case with Vespasian (S. H. A. *Hadr.* 4. 6. ff.). Once more the new *princeps* was in direct control of the loyalty and the destiny of the bulk of the Empire's battle ready legions. Once again caution or duty would keep Rome's new master far from her fora for a significant period of time. Patterns previously set prevailed. The request was received at Rome, divine honours for the newly acquired parent and senatorial compliance with the *fait accompli*. Both were forthcoming (S.H.A. *Hadr.*, 6. 2). Then divergence. With an unsettled empire at his back and the uncertain conquests of Armenia and Mesopotamia before him Hadrian chose moderation; retreat and consolidation replaced the Trajanic policy of expansion. Renunciation of territory ostensibly won, moreover won from Rome's traditional *bête noire* the empire of the Parthians, would be risky policy. It was an action which turned its face against the driving force of Rome's self-image, of her self-professed right, if indeed not mission, to conquest and rule based on overwhelming military superiority. There was the danger that this retreat, appearing as it did to be unforced, may be perceived as weakness. Perhaps more fraught still if it were to be seen as a betrayal of the achievements of *principes* past, or

an abandonment of traditional Roman values inherited from the countless generations that had gone before. Precedence, piety, both could be marshalled to obscure or palliate policy change, directional shift, a novel approach. These were the tools chosen at the very start of Hadrian's reign to provide a veneer of acceptability for many of his decisions and actions. These were decisions and actions that could well result in that process most feared by the Roman psyche; change.

Withdrawal of the legions of Rome from all territories east of the Tigris and Euphrates, those territories so recently the object of Trajan's acquisitive attentions, was enacted on the pretext of secret Trajanic directives (S.H.A. *Hadr.* 9. 2). If an authority of a more compelling nature was required to quell murmurings of discontent that too was to hand, with no less a figure than Augustus himself having counselled that the limits of empire ought best remain as they were at his death (Tac. *Ann.* 1. 11; S.H.A. *Hadr.* 5. 1). This antique advice was now adjoined to present policy, though the partial nature of its implementation reveals its true function. Territories acquired post-Augustus, even as recently as had been the Dacian province, were retained. Only the Trajanic gains in the East, vast, unconsolidated, and untenable in the face of instability within the empire, need be removed for the benefit of the whole.

Efficient, focused and of moderate scope too was the removal of potential tensions within the hierarchy of the military. Cornelius Palma, Publilius

Celsus, Avidius Nigrinus and Lusius Quietus, all four highly placed ex-consular generals under Trajan, were neutralised. The responsibility for their deaths rested with the Senate and not with the new *princeps* according to our sources (S.H.A. *Hadr.* 7. 1 ff; Dio, 69. 1. 5), though this claim has sat uneasily with observers both contemporary and modern (S.H.A. *Hadr.* 7. 3 ff)¹. Fear, uncertainty, disquiet, the removal of potentially destabilising individuals invoked broader discontent within the city of Rome, a discontent best dealt with at source. It was to Rome that Hadrian finally made his way in A. D. 118, entering the city some time early in the July of that year². It was a city that throughout the next twenty years of Hadrianic rule was to once again find itself transformed to better suit the concept of the role of the principate in relation to the constitution of the Roman world as envisaged by its incumbent.

The building programme of Hadrian in Rome was to be extensive both in the number and type of buildings involved, traditional in many of its concerns, foci and functions, yet in some ways revolutionary in its aims and intents. It was to be a fresh approach clothed in the architectural language of accepted practice, incorporating and celebrating a venerable

¹Syme, R., *Tacitus.*, Oxford, 1958, pp. 244 ff, provides an example of modern scepticism. Garzetti, A., *From Tiberius to the Antonines.* trans. Foster, J. R., London, 1974, p. 384, finds in Hadrian's favour.

²Garzetti, 1974, p. 384.

past whilst re-directing those elements towards a new interpretation in the future. One way in which the building programme of Hadrian diverges from those of the preceding *principes* is in its datability. More than any of the building programmes of prior *principes* that of Hadrian is well served by datable evidence such as brick-stamps, epigraphic sources, stylistic evidence and the like. So much so that a general chronology was able to be produced in the catalogue of Hadrianic buildings incorporated into the primary work dealing specifically with the Hadrianic building programme at Rome, M. T. Boatwright's *Hadrian and the City of Rome*. However, even a brief survey of this data reveals still the lack of precision in our knowledge of this area. A strong and precise chronology for a period of Roman topography remains elusive. A chronological approach to the material would present insurmountable difficulties, whilst a typological approach would be even less suitable for the Hadrianic building programme than it would have been for the building programme of Domitian, Hadrian's buildings being as diverse, though not as numerically extensive, as those of the last of the Flavians. The approach, then, will be the topographical one adopted by the most comprehensive work that addresses itself to the subject of Hadrian's building programme in Rome³.

³The chapter that follows is indebted to Boatwright's work, Boatwright, M. T., *Hadrian and the City of Rome*, Princeton, 1987, hereafter Boatwright, 1987. There are however divergences. Here there will be, for instance, no discussion of Hadrian's Villa at Tivoli. Though the Villa is incorporated with good reason to strengthen Boatwright's argument, it is for this work too far outside the limits of Rome, and with no direct relationship to the demonstration of Hadrian's public presentation as to his concept of

The Campus Martius.

It had been just over a century since the ashes of Augustus had been placed in his Mausoleum in the northern reaches of the Campus Martius. Through the intervening years much of Rome had been transformed, particularly those areas centred on the Forum Romanum and its surrounding hills, the Palatine, the Colosseum valley, the flanking procession of the Imperial fora and the Templum Pacis, the *mons Capitolinus* and its environs, and not least the southern and central regions of the Campus Martius. Fire, building collapse, population growth, and the provision of housing for those of its inhabitants displaced by the expansion of the monumental and public spaces of Rome would have effected substantial changes throughout the remaining regions of the city. There was however one significant area that had remained virtually unchanged throughout the transformative flux of that century. The northern section of the Campus Martius, the roughly triangular region of the Tiber flood plain, bordered to the west by the river, to the east by the *via Flaminia*, to the south by the Pantheon and the *thermae Neronianae* and visually directed to the north by the Augustan Mausoleum had retained its park-like nature as laid out

the role of the *princeps*, to be included.

during the incumbency of the first *princeps*⁴. Intervention during the time of Domitian had done little to change the nature of the area. The paved area of the *solarium Augusti* had been raised by 1.60m, most probably to restore the accuracy of the gigantic sundial made redundant through repeated inundation (Pliny, *HN*. 36. 73), rather than substantially change its nature⁵. Possibly at the same time new paving had been laid on the north, south and west sides of the Ara Pacis, burying the staircase that had provided the means of access to the western side of the enclosure, and providing a surrounding pavement that was of a uniform level on all sides. Buchner's investigations reveal the minor extent of this intervention⁶.

Other minor changes are known to have taken place under Imperial sponsorship in the area. In A. D. 75 Vespasian and Titus had reworked the line of the pomerium. In 1933 Romanelli reported the finding of a *cippus* from this Vespasianic undertaking, the top of which came to light 6m below the present street level. Its inscription denoted it as the 158th of the pomerial line and provided its identification and dating as Vespasianic. Found *in situ*, its position was, maybe rather surprisingly, well within the *platea* of the *solarium Augusti*⁷. These were all

⁴For a plan of the Campus by the end of the time of Hadrian see Plate 20

⁵On the *solarium Augusti* and the subsequent modifications see Buchner, E., *Die Sonnenuhr des Augustus. Nachdruck aus "RM" 1976 und 1980 und Nachtrag über die Ausgrabung 1980/1981.*, Mainz, 1982.

⁶Buchner, 1980/1, pp. 369-70.

minor changes and developments, however, and as far as the evidence allows, it may be presumed that the park-like atmosphere of the northern reaches of the Campus Martius, the *silvae et ambulationes* recorded by Suetonius (Suet. *Aug.* 100. 4), was allowed to remain intact.

Directly above the *cippus* of Vespasian and Titus Romanelli reported the finding of a Hadrianic version, again identified as the 158th of the pomerial line, its top 3.10m below the present street level. The intervening years had seen the ground level rise by around 3m. As pointed out by Boatwright, such a rapid rise in ground level, approximately 3m in less than fifty years where the next 1800 odd years accounted for a raising of the ground level by approximately 4m, would strongly suggest human intervention in connection with the first, dramatic raising of the ground level⁸. A further raising of the pavement level by between 1.80-1.88m around the Ara Pacis, and datable to the time of Hadrian by brick-stamps from the retaining wall that was necessitated by this, is probably also to be connected with this Hadrianic phase in the northern Campus. Perhaps it was at this time as well that the *platea* of the *solarium Augusti* was raised still higher than it had been during its Domitianic phase, with a water basin being incorporated into its meridian line, and the ground level to either side of this being

⁷Romanelli, P., 'IL-Roma. Reg. IX-Via della Toretta.-Cippi del pomerio.', *NSc*, 1933, pp. 240-244.

⁸Boatwright, 1987, p. 66.

raised by around 1m by earth fill.

Boatwright reconstructs the Hadrianic changes in the area of the northern Campus as an attempt by the *princeps* to provide a means of protecting the central and southern reaches of the Campus from periodic flooding. The raising of the ground level across a broad sweep of the northern campus, whilst maintaining a park-like ambience, was in effect a broad ridge or dyke that extended from the eastern side of the *via Flaminia* at least as far as the find-spot of the pomerial *cippi*. Wiseman supports this idea but goes further, suggesting that the ridge or dyke continued west as far as the banks of the Tiber⁹. If this were the case and the ridge did extend this far to the west, planted out as a park, it would have provided more than a simple utilitarian benefit as a flood control. With a pleasant atmosphere it would have invited recreational use, its elevation aiding the view to the north towards the Mausoleum of Augustus. However, with the Ara Pacis now buried to half its height by the raising of the ground level, the schematic connection of the altar and the tomb would have been lessened. Lessened too would have been any sense of connection that may have been previously evident between the Mausoleum and the Pantheon, the dramatic change in ground elevation would manifest a sense of physical dislocation between the two, if not a barrier to direct line of sight. However, if the ridge did extend as far as

⁹Wiseman, T. P., *LTUR* 1, 1993, p. 224.

the bank of the Tiber another direct line of sight connection would have been evident. The view then from the far western end of the ridge would have permitted a view to the north-east that looked across the Campus to the Augustan Mausoleum, and to the south-west across the Tiber to the Mausoleum of Hadrian rising in its bulk on the opposing Campus Vaticanus.

Whether or not the ridge provided recreational space and strategic views it retained its utilitarian value. Not that it prevented the inundation of the central and southern sections of the Campus Martius. These low-lying areas remained subject to regular flooding until the Tiber was finally tamed by the embankments constructed at the end of the nineteenth century. What the ridge or dyke would have done was protect these more built up areas from having to face the full force of the stream, destructive enough of itself one would think, made more so by debris carried in its torrent. The buildings of the central and southern Campus would, after the erection of the dyke, have to contend still with rising waters, but no longer rushing waters. Protection for this area of Rome would have been of prime concern for Hadrian. It was in the area of the central Campus that much of his building programme, particularly in its earlier stages, was effected.

The Domitianic rebuild or restoration of the Agrippan Pantheon had been struck by lightning in A.D. 110, and had been destroyed by the fire that followed (Orosius, 7. 12. 5; Hieron *a. Abr.* 2127). It is thus possible that Trajan may have planned to restore the structure, indeed plans may already have been drawn up in readiness, but this we cannot know for certain¹⁰. What is indisputable is that the Pantheon that stands to this day is a product of the time of Hadrian, the brick-stamp evidence is undeniable¹¹. Though the majority of brick-stamps known from the Pantheon are from A.D. 123, some are known from the earliest years of the reign, and for Boatwright, prove that work began on the building in A.D. 118, probably soon after Hadrian's return to Rome as *princeps*¹². Others have tried to prove otherwise, notably W. D. Heilmeyer, who proposed that the structure was the product of Apollodorian ingenuity,

¹⁰Heilmeyer, W. D., 'Apollodorus von Damaskus, der Architekt des Pantheon.', *JdI* 90, 1975, pp. 316-47 attempts to re-date the Pantheon as a product of Trajan's building programme. Boatwright, 1987, p. 43, n. 30, firmly rejects this claim.

¹¹Given its state of preservation and the uniqueness of its design the rotunda has been the subject of an enormous amount of scholarship, conjecture and interpretation. The standard works in English, De Fine Licht's *The Rotunda in Rome* (*op. cit.*) and W. L. MacDonald's *The Pantheon: Design, Meaning and Progeny*. are now complemented by more recent works, including: Godfrey, P., Hemsoll, D., 'The Pantheon: temple or rotunda?' in King, A., Henig, M., eds., *Pagan Gods and Shrines of the Roman Empire.*, Oxford, 1986; Jacobson, D. M., 'Hadrianic Architecture and Geometry.', *AJA* 90, 1986, pp. 69-85; Mark, R., Hutchinson, P., 'On the structure of the Roman Pantheon', *ArtB* 68, 1986, pp. 24-34; Davies, P., Hemsoll, D., Wilson-Jones, M., 1987, (*op. cit.*), Sallman, H., 'The Pantheon Coffers. Pattern and Number.', *Architectura* 18, 1988, p. 121 ff., Loerke, W., 'A Rereading of the Interior Elevation of Hadrian's Rotunda.', *JSAH* 49, 1990, pp. 22-43, Ziolkowski, A., 'Was Agrippa's Pantheon the Temple of Mars in Campo?', *PBSR* 62, 1994, pp. 267-282, Wilson-Jones, M., *Designing Roman Architecture.* (forthcoming).

¹²Boatwright, 1987, p. 42. The datable brick-stamps are conveniently catalogued by Heilmeyer, 1975, pp. 327-9.

and work had begun in A.D. 113 under the auspices of Trajan¹³.

Regardless of when the Pantheon was designed, or by whom, or who originally desired it, it was Hadrian who chose to finance it to completion, to dedicate the building, and to associate himself with it in his official capacity (Dio, 69. 7. 1). It follows, therefore, that the building as completed must have suited his agenda. This is enough for our purposes here.

The Pantheon sits at the bottom of a natural depression, a depression made more pronounced by the accretion of detritus through the intervening centuries in the surrounding area, the most completely preserved survivor of the Rome of antiquity, a remarkable survival of a remarkable structure. It was only one element however, though the focal one, of a larger complex. To the north the Pantheon was preceded by a fore-court, probably rectangular, approximately 60m wide¹⁴.

Colonnades, access to which was gained via six steps of *giallo antico* from the fore-court paving¹⁵, matched the corresponding elements of the pronaos with bases, capitals and entablature of Pentelic marble, with monolithic column shafts of grey Egyptian granite¹⁶. The treatment of

¹³Heilmeyer, 1975, pp. 316-47.

¹⁴Boatwright, 1987, p. 47. For an illustration of how the Pantheon complex is conjectured to have looked see Plate 22.

¹⁵De Fine Licht, K., *The Rotunda in Rome. A Study of Hadrian's Pantheon.* Copenhagen, 1968, p. 29; Boatwright, 1987, p. 47.

¹⁶Ziolkowski, A., *LTUR* 4, 1999, p. 57.

the northern end, its location still uncertain, is unknown. Various proposals have been put forward as to the length of the fore-court, making its length everything from 60m to 150m¹⁷. A length of 120m would have brought the northern façade into alignment with the northern façade of the *thermae Neronianae* to the west, and perhaps also to the northern façade of the precinct of the Temple of the Deified Matidiae to the east. That result would have its attractions, providing a cohesion between the various complexes. A fore-court length of 120m would also mean that the internal dimensions of the fore-court of the Pantheon, 120m x approximately 70m (including the depth of the flanking colonnades) had much the same dimensions as the Forum Julium (c. 124m x 75m including the colonnade depth). The length of the Pantheon forecourt would also approximate that of the Augustan Forum (c.125m), with the width of its open plaza (60m) exceeding the open space of the Augustan (c. 50m). These may have provided further attractive design elements. Moreover, the materials chosen to comprise both the fore-court and the pronaos of the Pantheon recall the material fabric of the Imperial fora, *giallo antico* stairs for the colonnade (Trajanic and Augustan fora), granite columns with bases, capitals and entablature in white marble (Trajanic forum and perhaps the Trajanic reconstruction of the Julian).

¹⁷De Fine Licht, 1968, p. 26 lists the various theories. He himself proposes a fore-court 100m in length (p. 29), a length tentatively accepted by Boatwright, p. 47. Richardson, 1992, p. 284; Claridge, 1998, p. 202, and Ziolkowski, A., *LTUR* 4, 1999, p. 57, all leave the question open.

The southern end of the fore-court was demarcated by the façade of the pronaos of the Pantheon. Set above the floor of the fore-court on a modest podium 1.32m high, 34.2m wide, faced with five steps of *giallo antico*, the façade of the pronaos was octostyle Corinthian, the bases, capitals and entablature of Pentelic marble, the monolithic shafts of grey and pink granite, the whole supporting a pediment steeper than was usual¹⁸. It has been argued that the original design called for column shafts taller than those that were eventually used, of 50 RF rather than of 40 RF as is the case¹⁹. This would have given the façade proportions very closely approximating those of the Temple of Mars Ultor in the Augustan Forum, though on a much lower podium²⁰. Decoration for the tympanum has been reconstructed by Cozza as an eagle framed by a *corona civica*, fashioned in gilt bronze as a plaque to enable it to be accommodated in the restricted depth of the pediment²¹. The *corona civica* would recall the one displayed with such pride on the house of Augustus (RG. 34. 2; Dio, 53. 16. 4; Pliny, HN. 16. 3-4).

¹⁸Ziolkowski A., *LTUR* 4, 1999, p. 57.

¹⁹Davies, P., Hemsoll, D., Wilson-Jones, M., 'The Pantheon: Triumph of Rome or Triumph of Compromise?', *Art History* 10. 2, 1987, pp. 133-53.

²⁰The façade of the Temple of Mars, 36m wide, octostyle Corinthian, the order 60 RF high with column shafts of 50 RF, the pediment at 16 degrees markedly shallower than that of the Pantheon's 23 degrees.

²¹Cozza, L., 'Le tegole di marmo del Pantheon', in *Città e architettura nella Roma Imperiale.*, ARID suppl. 10, 1983, De Fine Licht K., ed., Odense, 1983, pp. 109-118.

Quite literally underscoring the connection with the Augustan age the dedicatory pedimental inscription,

M.AGRIPPA.L.F.COS.TERTIUM.FECIT

(*CIL* 6. 896 = 31196 = *ILS* 129)

which soberly recalled the founder of the original Pantheon.

Behind the pronaos is the so-called intermediate block, an attempt maybe to find both a way to mesh satisfactorily the traditional pronaos with the innovative *cella*, and to hide or at least soften the unconventional aesthetics of these two disparate elements of the complex. The intermediate block was pierced at its centre by the door to the *cella*, to the left and the right of this door apsidial niches which may have held statues of Agrippa and Augustus such as those reported to have been included in this way in the original Pantheon (Dio, 53. 27. 3). In fact, Dio's anachronistic understanding of the Pantheon of his day as being that originally built by Agrippa would tend to strengthen the theory of the dual statues being present in these niches of the Hadrianic Pantheon whilst shedding no light on the version of Agrippa.

The terse and somewhat misleading inscription, the screening bulk of the intermediary block, in conjunction with the surrounding buildings that

effectively obscured the presence of the rotunda all served to heighten the effect of this bold departure from tradition. The rotunda, spectacular if not unprecedented, nevertheless contains references to previous imperial constructions²². The patterning of the marble and granite floor slabs provides the clue; it mimics the patterning of the paving of the Trajanic Forum's hemicycles, basilica and apses, though it varies the materials for a different polychromy. Seen in this way the rotunda is in effect two apsidial hemicycles without an intervening basilica. A prosaic enough inspiration perhaps, but leading to a unique result.

To the south of the rotunda was contemporaneously constructed the so-called South Building, a basilical hall physically independent of the rotunda but later joined to it by the erection of a series of massive (buttressing?) walls that divided the intervening space into a parallel series of spaces divided by a central corridor²³. Identified by Gatti as the Basilica Neptuni²⁴, a building reported to have been restored under Hadrian (S.H.A. *Hadr.* 19. 10), De Fine Licht proposed that rather the South Building may have been the library *en Pantheio* mentioned by

²²Two beds of concrete, both circular, one c. 4m, the other c. 2.45m, exist below the present flooring of the rotunda. It has been suggested that these floor beddings may indicate two previous rotundas on the site, i. e. the Agrippan and the Domitianic re-builds of the Pantheon (Loerke, 1982, Wilson-Jones). However, the arguments of Ziolkowski, *LTUR* 4, p. 55 against this interpretation would seem to be a more reasonable position. For a plan of the remains of the pre-Hadrianic structures see Plate 3.

²³De Fine Licht, 1968, pp. 147-56; Blake/Bishop, 1972, pp. 48-50; Boatwright, 1987, p. 48.

²⁴Gatti, G. "Il portico degli argonauti e la basilica di Nettuno." *Atti del III convegno nazionale di storia dell'architettura*, Rome, 1940, pp. 61-73.

Julius Africanus (P. Oxy. 3. 412, ll. 63-68)²⁵. As pointed out by Boatwright, there is no good proof for either of these proposals²⁶. However, as Coarelli sensibly states, the one need not preclude the other. The building could be both, a basilical library²⁷. De Fine Licht's proposal does however raise the interesting suggestion that the complex created under Hadrian contained as one of its constituent parts a library. If it did it would provide one more connection between the Pantheon complex and the Forum of Trajan, and moreover the Templum Pacis, Vespasian's version of an Imperial forum.

The Hadrianic Pantheon, whilst purporting to be an Agrippan edifice, in fact diverged radically from the original. In the case of the temple proper, it may have been orientated exactly 180 degrees in opposition to the Agrippan Pantheon, and was also of a much increased size²⁸. These differences when placed alongside the insistence on the Augustan linkages, emphasise the Hadrianic desire to take from the past but to mould those references towards his own Imperial agenda. Furthermore, the inflation of the smaller temple into a large complex consisting of many elements that recalled those to be found elsewhere in Rome in

²⁵De Fine Licht, 1968, pp.156, 231, cf. 306 n. 43.

²⁶Boatwright, 1987, p. 49.

²⁷Coarelli, *LTUR* 1, 1993, p. 197.

²⁸Though this re-orientation is debated, see further Davies, Hemsoll, Wilson-Jones, 1987. Claridge, 1998, p. 206 allows for the uncertainty.

Imperial fora, also the fact that it is known that Hadrian used the Pantheon much as the other Imperial fora were used (Dio, 69. 7), would suggest that Hadrian was mimicking his predecessors in creating his own version of one of the Imperial fora. In what looks suspiciously like an antique occurrence of post-modernity, Hadrian mixed into his Pantheon complex an eclectic assortment of his predecessors' proudest architectural achievements in order to create a building at one and the same time traditional yet also completely new.

The association of the Hadrianic Pantheon with the works of regimes past was not confined to the interior spaces created by the porticoes and temple. The entire area surrounding the complex was rich in monuments celebrating the Imperial past. Bordering the Pantheon to the west were the *thermae Neronianae* and the *stagnum Agrippae*, to the west of these the Stadium of Domitian and the Odeum²⁹. To the south of the Pantheon were the *thermae* or *lavacrum Agrippae*, to the east the *Saepta Julia* stretched its long flanking porticoes from beyond the southern end of the *thermae Agrippae* to beyond the northern end of the rotunda of the Pantheon. To the east of the *Saepta Julia* were the temples of Isis and Serapis, to the east and south of these the Temple of Minerva Chalcidica and the *Templum Divorum*, and further east again the triumphal arch of Claudius celebrating his victories in Britain crossed

²⁹For an illustration of the topography of the area see Plate 21.

the *via Lata* carrying on its attic the channel of the *aqua Virgo*. Lying to the south of the Claudian arch the large buildings, tentatively identified as the Porticus Minucia Frumentaria, filled much of the space remaining on the western side of the *via Lata*. To the north, as has been mentioned above, the view probably still included the Augustan monuments of the northern Campus. On every side Hadrian's new edifice was surrounded by a dense fabric of urban development that recalled or had links to all the major *principes* since the development of the Imperial system under Augustus.

With the exception of the Odeum which had been restored or completed during Trajan's incumbency, and the *stagnum Agrippae*, which may by this time have been incorporated into the *thermae* of Nero and Agrippa³⁰, all of the buildings listed above are known to have, or show signs of, work from the time of Hadrian. Colini reports brick-stamps dating to the Hadrianic era in the Stadium of Domitian, and brick-stamps are again the evidence for work during this time on the *thermae Neronianae*³¹. The writer of the *Historia Augusta* is the primary source for two or three of the others, linking them with the Pantheon;

³⁰Buzzetti, C., *LTUR* 4, 1999, p. 344 following Coarelli, F., 'Il Campo Marzio occidentale. Storia e topografia.' *MEFRA* 89. 2, 1977, pp. 815-18.

³¹For those of the Stadium of Domitian; Colini, A. M., *Lo Stadio di Domiziano*, 1943, pp. 84-87; Virgili, P., *LTUR* 4, p. 341, for those of the Baths of Nero, *CIL* 15. 481, 15. 364.

Romae instauravit Pantheum, Saepta, Basilicam Neptuni, sacras aedes plurimas, Forum Augusti, Lavacrum Agrippae; eaque omnia propriis auctorum nominibus consecravit

At Rome he restored the Pantheon, the Saepta, the Basilica of Neptune, many sacred temples, the Forum of Augustus, the Baths of Agrippa; and he consecrated all of these in the names of their original builders

(S.H.A. *Hadr.* 19. 10).

Two are certain, the Saepta and the Baths of Agrippa. A third, the Basilica of Neptune, may have been either a part of the Saepta, an interchangeable nomenclature for the Porticus Argonautarum, or a separate structure, perhaps the so-called South Building as mentioned above. Both the eastern and western sides of the Saepta have yielded evidence of Hadrianic intervention by way of brick-stamps, as too has the South Building³². All three are by this evidence proved to be a part of a Hadrianic renovation of the area surrounding the Pantheon.

Into the centre of the eastern portico of the Saepta was inserted a massive quadrifrontal arch, the so-called *Giano accanto alla Minerva*, securely dated by brick-stamp evidence to the time of Hadrian³³. The arch, sited in direct alignment with the *Arco di Camigliano* constructed by

³²Boatwright, 1987, p. 50.

³³On the arch see further Gatti, G., 'Topografia dell'Iseo Campense', *RPAA* 20, 1943-4, pp. 117-63.

Domitian on the opposite, eastern side of the *Iseum campense*, helped to provide a means of communication and ease of movement between the area surrounding the Pantheon and those buildings lying to its east as far as the *via Lata*. This freeing up of traffic and movement throughout the monumental precinct of the Campus is Boatwright's interpretation of Hadrian's main motivations in much of his work in this area, and is expressed throughout Chapter Two of her work.

To the east of the Serapeum and Iseum, the *Templum Divorum* also received attention at this time. Our evidence is from an inscription, reconstructed by Degrassi thus:

[...*Imp. Caesar Traianus Hadrianus Aug(ustus) munu[s]*
 [*edidit...t]emplum Divoru[m]*
 [*...dedicavit, ob quam] causam in circo*
 [*...munus editu]m et consumm[at(um)]*
 [*...(paribus)] MDCCCXXXV*

(Degrassi, *II*, 13.1, 202-3, 233)

[The emperor Hadrian] produced a show of gladiators...the Temple *Templum Divorum*...he dedicated, for which reason in the circus...the [a?] show of gladiators was produced and brought to perfection with

1835 pairs of gladiators

(Smallwood, # 24, ll. 1-5; A. D. 126)

The renovation of the Templum Divorum would seem to have been thorough and substantial. Games involving 1835 pairs of gladiators speak of the significance to Hadrian of its rededication. To what extent this monument to the Flavian dynasty was allowed to retain its original character is an interesting, though unanswerable question.

To the east of the Templum Divorum the rusticated building that edged the *via Lata* was renovated as well. Having been severely damaged by fire, a single brick-stamp records its Hadrianic era transformation from a once porticoed building to one that contained a series of *cellae* surrounding a courtyard³⁴. Its new guise has been interpreted as being consistent with known plans for second century *horrea*³⁵. To its north and south other scant remains of similar construction suggest there was a row of *horrea*. The *horrea* were not a single edifice, but incorporated a block to the north that was separated from the central building by a street that ran from the *via Lata* to the open area in front of the Templum Divorum, the plaza in which sat the Temple of Minerva Chalcidica³⁶.

³⁴Boatwright, 1987, p. 58 reports the brick-stamp as being dated to A. D. 123, but gives no details. Blake/Bishop, 1972, pp. 51-53 argue that the renovations were late Hadrianic. However, De Spirito, G., *LTUR* 3, 1996 does not mention Hadrian at all, recording rather that the remodelling is primarily of the Severan age.

³⁵Boatwright, 1987, p. 58.

The entire central Campus thus was the recipient of intense restoration, renovation or transformation during Hadrian's rule. However, amidst the far-reaching programme only one edifice was an entirely new foundation, the as yet unmentioned Temple of Matidia.

In the area immediately to the north of the Saepta and west of the forecourt of the Pantheon Hadrian probably had erected a temple to his mother-in-law, the niece of Trajan. Little remains from which to gain any idea of how this temple may have looked³⁷. However, what little evidence that has come to light suggests a complex of impressive size and magnificence. Column stumps of *cippolino* have been found during the centuries in the vicinity of the *Vicolo dello Spado d'Orlando*. One of the five reported is still visible, its diameter 1.70m³⁸. The diameter of the column stump would lead to a reconstruction of its original height as being somewhere between 13m and 17m³⁹. These proportions, larger than those of the Pantheon's granite monoliths, are of a size consistent

³⁶ For the primary report on the archaeological finds in the area, Sjöquist, E., 'Studi archeologici e topografici intorno alla Piazza del Collegio Romano.', *OpusArch* 4, 1946, pp. 47-157.

³⁷ Boatwright, 1987, pp. 58-63 marshalls what little evidence there is.

³⁸ de Caprariis, F., *LTUR* 3, 1996, p. 233; Richardson, 1992, p. 247; Boatwright, 1987, p. 60.

³⁹ Coarelli, F., *Roma.*, Bari, 1980, p. 298, and Rodríguez - Almeida, p. 127 both reconstruct the column as originally 17m high, the height being 10 times that of the lower diameter. These are the proportions for the columns of the Hadrianeum, a later construction. The columns of the Pantheon have a proportion of the height being approximately 8 times the lower diameter (De Fine Licht, 1968, p. 40). It is reasonable to assume that these columns would have been somewhere within this height range.

with a temple façade. Smaller columns, their diameter of 1.10m and of a material described as '*granito verde*', have been assigned to the temenos of the temple⁴⁰. This temenos is tentively identified by Boatwright as the Basilicae of Matidia and Marciana⁴¹. Large proportions and a rich polychromy of stonework attest to the importance of the building, and would place it within the tradition of Imperially sponsored prestige projects.

It may also be the case that Hadrian's monument to deified female members of his adoptive dynastic family displayed architectural inspiration arising from the nearby dynastic promotional project of Domitian, the *Templum Divorum*. The evidence for the Temple of Matidia and the Basilicae of Matidia and Marciana is scanty indeed, the lacunae in the knowledge allowing distinctly different interpretations as to the lay-out of the structure⁴². Nevertheless, Boatwright proposes an attractive, if unprovable, reconstruction. The plan incorporates the *Tempio di Siepe*, a small, octagonal, segmentally domed structure with a central oculus. The *tempio* is now known to us only from three depictions, an engraving and two sketches⁴³. Boatwright, following

⁴⁰Lissi Caronna, E., 'Roma. Rinvenimenti in Piazza Capranica 78.', *NSc*, ser. 8, 26, 1972, p. 403.

⁴¹Boatwright, 1987, pp. 58-61.

⁴²Boatwright, 1987, p. 60, n. 75 provides a précis of the multiple and various reconstructions that this meagre evidence has allowed.

⁴³The engraving, reproduced in Boatwright, 1987, p. 63, is from Giovannoli, A., *Veduti degli antichi vestigi di Roma*, Rome, 1619, fol. 39. The sketches, one in the Uffizi, *Uffizi, Arch.* 2976, the other at

Hülßen proposes that the Temple of Matidia, flanked by double-storied porticoes, the Basilicae of Matidia and Marciana, was aligned with the neighbouring Pantheon complex, and likewise orientated towards the north⁴⁴. The *Tempio di Siepe* would then have stood in front of the entrance to the complex, in a position paralleling the Temple of Minerva Chalcidica's relationship to the *Templum Divorum*.

Monumentality of proportion, richness of materials and, perhaps, architectural referencing to previous regimes' monuments were not the only Imperial traditions continued by the Temple of Matidia and the Basilicae of Matidia and Marciana. Women of the Imperial family had of course been publicly honoured by past regimes, in particular by deification. However, no building in Rome is known to have been named for a female member of the Imperial family since the time of the Julio-Claudians⁴⁵. Now under Hadrian the two women were so honoured. Both were further honoured by their deification. Marciana had been consecrated *diva cognominata* by her brother following her death in A.D. 112⁴⁶. On the decease of Matidia in A.D. 119 and her consecration as a *diva*, Marciana was elevated to the same status⁴⁷.

Windsor, no. 12138.

⁴⁴Hülßen, C., 'Trajanische und hadrianische Bauten im Marsfelde in Rom.', *öJh* 15, 1912, 124-42.

⁴⁵The last would have been the shrine to the Deified Poppea in the time of Nero.

⁴⁶F.O. 22; Syme, 1958, p. 233, n. 2.

⁴⁷Syme, 1958, p. 246, n. 2

Matidia was to be honoured further, and to a degree beyond that which any other women had been honoured at Rome. She was to receive her own temple, the first time a new foundation is known to have been dedicated solely to an Imperial *diva*⁴⁸.

In the central Campus Martius, an area rich in buildings that recalled the self and dynastic promotions of past regimes, an area substantially restored, renovated or transformed during the time of Hadrian, he built at the centre a structure that served his own dynastic needs. The past was honoured and preserved, if updated and edited, by Hadrianic activity, his own presence obscured by his practice of only inscribing the name of the original founder of a building on its façade. Into this mesh of the Imperial past he placed his own contribution, a foundation promoting his own adopted dynasty. However, whilst honouring and continuing the traditions of the principate he also transformed those traditions. His own presence is suppressed for the most part, being included only by association with the one building that radically broke with the Imperial traditions, the first temple building to be dedicated solely to a female member of an Imperial family, the Temple of the Deified Matidia and the Basilicae of Matidiae and Marciana. These thematic concerns of Hadrian, evident in his work throughout the Campus Martius, were by no means confined to that area of Rome. These concerns find expression elsewhere

⁴⁸Boatwright, 1987, p. 62.

in the building programme of Hadrian, not least in the Imperial fora.

The Imperial Fora.

In A.D. 117 Hadrian, on the edge of empire, farewelled the earthly remains of Trajan, sending them in the care of Plotina, Matidia and the Praetorian Prefect, Acilius Attianus, to Rome (S.H.A. *Hadr.* 5. 10; Aur. Vict., *Epit.* 13. 11). To the Senate at Rome he dispatched a request, divine honours for his adopted father. The senators agreed without demur, eager to please the new son arisen in the East (S.H.A. *Hadr.* 6. 1). The Triumph owed to Trajan was proffered and refused, in this instance the new *imperator* would allow the victor to keep the spoils (S.H.A. *Hadr.* 6. 3). It would be no great sacrifice. Such an action gained more than it lost. The pious son could generously concede such an honour. The reflected glory may obscure the ceding of territory newly won by Trajan whilst still adding lustre to his own reputation.

Further honours awaited the deceased *princeps*, honours that too could be used to suit the agenda of the present incumbent. Trajan's ashes, conveyed to Rome, awaited interment. The new *divus* alike awaited a fitting shrine. For the *optimus princeps* an outstanding honour was to be provided, burial within the pomerium, under the monumental

column he had dedicated in A. D. 113 in his forum (Eutrop. 8. 5. 2. 3; Dio, 69. 2. 3; Aur. Vict. *Epit.* 13. 11). To further amplify yet condense the honour paid to Trajan the temple in his honour was erected within the precinct of his forum also, either on the site to the north of the Basilica Ulpia and facing back towards the column as has been traditionally thought, or at the southern limits of the complex, facing across the *area fori* towards the south face of the basilica⁴⁹. It was probably in conjunction with these additions to Trajan's forum that the frieze that now covers the shaft of the column was designed and executed⁵⁰. The conceptual meaning of the forum as an architecturally realized *res gestae divi Traiani*, as interpreted by Zanker and followed by Packer, was now complete. The complex built from the proceeds of a major military victory in order to celebrate that victory had been subtly transformed. A great military achievement effected under the auspices of Trajan was now to be promoted and remembered as his greatest achievement, and as a major element of his life that led to his ultimate deification. For Hadrian the benefit of this transformation must have appeared highly desirable. The memory of Trajan was honoured, filial duty done. His own dynastic antecedents were glorified and promoted. Moreover, Trajan's Parthian campaign was allowed to slip from the record, the Dacian victory was to be the jewel in the crown of Trajan's principate, the

⁴⁹As more fully discussed in the previous chapter.

⁵⁰Claridge, 1993, pp. 5-22

glorious end to which his life had been directed. His victories in Parthia, the triumph for which had been celebrated with the triumphator *in absentia*, would in time fade from memory. With their passing would fade also Hadrian's diplomatic retreat.

With the passing of time changed circumstances and needs transformed the message built into the Forum of Trajan. The passing of time had seen the promotional programme of the Forum of Augustus change as well from a complex vowed to commemorate revenge against fellow citizens to one that celebrated a victory over foreign foe. In their final form both managed to obscure facets of Rome's on-going relations with Parthia. The Forum of Augustus celebrated Rome's military strength whilst neglecting the fact that the victory over Parthia was of a diplomatic nature, the Forum of Trajan celebrated an actual military victory in Dacia, a victory which was to have been the penultimate conquest by Trajan, not the ultimate as the thematic programme of the Forum declared.

Both fora also shared another common link, namely that both received attention during the principate of Hadrian. However, whereas the Forum of Trajan received a major embellishment in the form of the Temple of the Deified Trajan, later including Plotina, and had its thematic programme transformed, Hadrianic intervention in the Forum

of Augustus has left little trace, and may have effected little or no change to the appearance of the forum⁵¹. That Hadrian had work carried out in the Augustan forum is not in doubt, the fact is listed in his biography (S. H. A. *Hadr.* 19. 10), and a few minor architectural elements, dated on stylistic grounds to the time of Hadrian, have been found in the debris of that forum. A Corinthian column capital of Proconnesian marble, a fragment of frieze⁵², an antefix and perhaps some spouts in the form of lion's heads⁵³, comprise the sum total of architectural ornament that can be ascribed to a Hadrianic date. Nor does it seem that there was any attempt to change the thematic programme of the forum, in fact quite the opposite. With so little evidence with which to work it is perhaps best to understand Hadrianic work on the Forum of Augustus as simply a timely restoration of the complex. After all, at the time of Hadrian's accession more than 120 years had passed since the dedication of the forum in 2 B. C. Detailed study of the column capital has led to its being dated to the later years of Hadrian's reign, indicating an even greater period for the passage of time to wear away at the materials of the forum. A much needed restoration with a recognisable attempt to imitate the

⁵¹Boatwright, 1987, p. 96; Zanker, P., *Forum Augustum. Das Bildprogramm.*, Tübingen, 1968, pp. 11-12 discuss the controversy over the differences in the Augustan and Hadrianic stylistic analyses, which at base appears to be that the Hadrianic additions were somewhat schematic versions of the Augustan decorations.

⁵²Illustrated in Kraus, T., 'Ornamentfrieze vom Augustus-forum.', *MDAI* 6, 1953, pp 46-57, pl. 10.1.

⁵³Kockel, V., 'Beobachtungen zum Tempel des Mars Ultor und zum Forum des Augustus.', *MDAI* 80, 1983, pp. 438-9.

style of the original architectural decoration would suggest an honouring of the past. There would seem to have been no editing of the past to align the Forum of Augustus with a Hadrianic agenda. Perhaps no editing was needed.

The Forum Romanum and Environs.

Whilst the Forum of Trajan was transformed by Hadrianic intervention, and the Forum of Augustus allowed to retain its original character and thematic programme, the Forum Romanum was to feel the impact of Hadrianic work carried out in its vicinity, though change to the forum proper was minimal. In the actual forum, that area delineated to the north-west by the base of the Capitoline hill, to the south-west by the Basilica Julia, to the north-east by the Basilica Aemilia, and to the south-east by the Temple of the Deified Julius there would seem to be no evidence of any Hadrianic work, except for the report of Dio (69. 7. 1) that Hadrian honoured some of his friends by having statues of them erected in the forum. Nor does that area adjacent to the forum, lying between the Temple of the Deified Julius and the Arch of Titus on the *summa sacra via*, bordered to the east by the Templum Pacis and to the west by the Palatine slope, seem to have been the subject of any Hadrianic activity. The Hadrianic building programme had little physical impact in

the Forum Romanum. It did however affect the forum visually.

Domitian, more fully realising a scheme of Caligula's, had extended the summit of the Palatine hill towards the north, building massive substructures against the slope of the Palatine that, bordering the *clivus Victoriae*, rose to support the platform upon which the Domus Tiberiana was situated. In conjunction with this work he began, though indications are that he may not have finished, the so-called Vestibule of Domitian, the forum level structure that provided by way of a covered ramp communication between the level of the forum and the Imperial residences covering the top of the Palatine. Hadrian in part extended this work of Domitian, in part transformed it.

In the Vestibule the western-most room, that titled the *aula*, was transformed from what was to have been a single, monumental space suitable for Court ceremonial to a perhaps more utilitarian purpose⁵⁴. Brick-faced concrete walls were built perpendicular to the longer eastern and western walls, creating a series of *tabernae*, multi-storeyed, that faced onto a central courtyard⁵⁵. The floor level of the ground floor *tabernae* was higher than that of the courtyard in order to accommodate

⁵⁴For the Vestibule and the changes effected under Hadrian see further, Hurst, H., *LTUR* 2, 1995, pp. 197-9; Hurst, H., 'Nuovi Scavi nell'area di Santa Maria Antiqua.', *ArchLaz* 9, 1988, pp. 13-17; Boatwright, 1987, pp. 112-18.

⁵⁵See Plate 23.

a hypocaust system. Externally, the western façade of the building that faced the *vicus Tuscus* was likewise transformed with the erection of a series of brick-faced concrete walls into another row of *tabernae*. The result was to demonumentalise this western portion of the Vestibule, transforming it into what has been interpreted as an *horreum*, simple and utilitarian. Along the north façade of the Vestibule building a portico was erected at about the same time as the *horreum* was created. The eastern portion of the Vestibule building was, with minor additions, allowed to retain what seems to have been the originally designed function of the entire building, as being an entry point to the Domus Tiberiana and the entire Imperial residential complex that sprawled across the top of the Palatine hill above⁵⁶.

Space at the top of the Palatine hill was to be extended by the work of Hadrian. The extension of the platform for the Domus Tiberiana undertaken by Domitian had taken its principal alignment from the pre-existing platform, and by means of massive substructures, had been built out in the direction of the Forum Romanum as far as the street which ran along the slope of the Palatine from (possibly) the Velabrum towards the *clivus Palatinus*, a street wrongly termed the *clivus Victoriae* since it was incorrectly identified as such by Lanciani's mistaken placing of the Severan Marble Plan fragment *FUR 42*⁵⁷. Hadrian had the platform

⁵⁶Hurst, H., *LTUR* 2, 1995, p. 199.

built out even further towards the Forum⁵⁸. The street was retained, but a significant stretch of it was now encased in the substructures of the Imperial residence. A double storied barrel-vaulted passageway allowed for its continued use. The rest of the substructures were formed as *tabernae*, the whole structure a multi-storeyed precinct in its own right, extending the Domitianic version to border the *via Nova*. The imposing presence of this brick-faced concrete structure still dominates the Forum below. However, as pointed out by Boatwright, the Hadrianic extension took its principal alignment from the alignment of the forum buildings which were now near neighbours, the height of the new building serving to hide the alignment of the Imperial residences which it supported⁵⁹. This is used by Boatwright, in conjunction with her interpretation of the Temple of Venus and Roma, to characterise the work of Hadrian in this instance as evincing "...imperial submission to the state rather than imperial domination of the Roman people"⁶⁰. Whilst the presence of the Hadrianic extension of the platform for the Domus Tiberiana may dominate the forum today, it should be acknowledged that with the buildings of the Forum in their complete state, much less of the flank of the Palatine would have been readily

⁵⁷On what is known of the route of the *clivus Victoriae* see Wiseman, *LTUR* 1, p.

⁵⁸For the Hadrianic extensions to the Domus Tiberiana see Krause, C., *LTUR* 2, 1995, pp. 189-197, and the bibliography cited there. Also Boatwright, 1987, pp. 118-19.

⁵⁹Boatwright, 1987, p. 119.

⁶⁰Boatwright, 1987, p. 133.

visible from the Forum. Moreover, the regularity of the façade produced by the repetition of the *tabernae*, and any finish it may have had, would probably have lessened the visual impact of the extension, creating a neutral background border to the forum rather than the dominating presence which it now displays.

Conversely, the Temple of Venus and Roma would have had in its original condition a far greater visual impact than the extant remains do today⁶¹. The monumental atrium for Nero's Domus Aurea had been neutralised under Vespasian, re-incorporated as a monumental entrance to an Imperial residence under Domitian, and left unchanged under Nerva and Trajan. It was only under the direction of Hadrian that the atrium was to disappear completely; its site, for more than sixty years part of the Imperial patrimony, returned finally and quite literally to the possession of Rome.

At the crest of the Sacra Via the Neronian era platform was utilised and extended to provide a level area 145m x 100m, the extension being to the east, towards the Flavian amphitheatre⁶². The natural lie of the land

⁶¹The account of the temple and its surrounding porticoes which follows is to all intents and purposes the standard interpretation of the evidence as outlined in Boatwright, 1987. However, archaeological work continues to uncover new evidence, giving rise to different interpretations. For the most up to date account of the temple see Cassatella, *LTUR* 5, 1999, pp. 121-3, and the useful bibliography there cited.

⁶²Boatwright, 1987, p.120; Barattolo, A., 'Il Tempio di Venere e Roma: un tempio 'greco' nell' Urbe.', *MDAI* 85, 1978, pp. 397-410, p. 399, n. 12; Coarelli, F., *Roma*, Bari, 1980, p. 95; Blake/Bishop, 1972, p. 40.

resulted in the platform being a feature of unequal dominance at either end. To the west as approached by the Sacra Via the platform rose 2.50m from the level of the street, a broad flight of stairs provided the means of access⁶³. To the east a height differential of almost 8m between the top of the platform and the floor of the valley below would have made such a flight of stairs unfeasible. Dual staircases in two flights at either corner of the platform were provided instead⁶⁴. On the platform was the temple, Greek in form, its podium surrounded by a continuous flight of seven steps⁶⁵. Its façades were decastyle, with twenty columns lining its longer sides. The order was Corinthian, 60 RF high, made of white marble⁶⁶. Dual *cellae* placed back to back, each preceded by a pronaos, housed the deities for which the temple was constructed, Venus Felix and Roma Aeterna. The roof of the temple was clad in tiles of bronze, most likely gilded⁶⁷. To the north and south of the temple colonnades flanked the temenos. The one to the north consisted of a single row of columns closed behind by a wall. The southern colonnade was perhaps left more open, consisting of a dual row of grey granite columns with no screening wall, a centrally placed propyleum differentiated by columns in

⁶³Boatwright, 1987, p. 121 following the figures given in Reina, V. *et al*, *Media pars Urbis*, Rome, 1910. However, Barattolo, A., 1978, p. 399, gives the heights as 2.70m and 9m respectively.

⁶⁴Richardson, 1992, p. 410; Boatwright, 1987, p. 128; Claridge, 1998, p. 114.

⁶⁵Barattolo, A., 1978, p. 399; Barattolo, A., 'Nuove ricerche sull' architettura del Tempio di Venere e di Roma in età Adriana.', *MDAI* 80, 1973, pp. 243-69.

⁶⁶Claridge, 1998, p. 113, though these remains may be from the Maxentian re-build, Boatwright, 1987, p. 125.

⁶⁷Richardson, 1992, p. 410.

cippolino breaking the monotony of the long colonnade⁶⁸.

The height of the temple and its and the platform's breadth, in conjunction with the position at the crest of the Sacra Via, would have made its presence dominate the approach up the slope from the forum. Nero had recognised the visual strength of the position when he had had the Atrium for the Domus Aurea laid out there, had re-aligned the Sacra Via to accentuate the effect, the bronze Colossus of himself capping the whole. The Flavian re-development of the Colosseum valley had opened up another major area of Rome for public use. The position of the Temple of Venus and Rome on that part of the Velia could now dominate two of the most important public precincts of Rome. Hadrian recognised the fact⁶⁹. From the Colosseum valley the looming bulk of the temple, accentuated by the 8m high face of the platform's wall and the re-positioned Colossus (S. H. A. *Hadr.* 19. 12-13), would have been an even more imposing presence than it was from the Forum Romanum. Domitian had recognised the importance of the site, re-aligning the Atrium to provide a monumental entrance point to the Imperial residences on the Palatine. Hadrian's work diminished this aspect of the

⁶⁸Barattolo, A., 1978, p. 400; Boatwright, 1987, p. 127.

⁶⁹He also helped to amplify it. There is evidence of Hadrianic work of a fundamental nature in the Baths of Titus, and repair work to the Ludus Magnus is also known. For the Baths of Titus see Caruso *et al.*, 'Scavi alle terme di Tito.', *ArchLaz* 10, 1990, pp. 58-67. For the Ludus Magnus Blake/Bishop, 1973, p. 65; Colini, A.M., Cozza, L., *Ludus Magnus.*, Rome, 1962, pp. 103, 145-6.

site by providing a building that had an independent presence and importance. Domitian had also recognised the strength of the position as being the final crest to the triumphal route before the procession moved down into and through the Forum, and had placed the Arch of Titus here. The Temple of Venus and Rome would garner similar benefit from the site, whilst the sheer size of the structure would have simultaneously diminished the Flavian character of the area without removing it entirely.

The Temple of Venus and Rome can be seen to embody the dominant themes and functions that elsewhere characterise the Hadrianic building programme. The temple acted as a nodal point linking the three areas mentioned above, the Forum Romanum, the Palatine, and the Colosseum Valley. It sat at the primary intersection of these three areas, its non-axially determining Greek form addressing each area equally. One was the hallowed Republican centre of Rome re-modelled to integrate the presence of the Julio-Claudian *gens*. Second was the Imperial presence in the city *par excellence* the Palatine palaces, another of its entrance points now de-monumentalised in a fashion similar to the Vestibule⁷⁰. The third was the monumental recreational centre developed under Rome's second Imperial dynasty, the place where Rome's population was amused, courtesy of Imperial largesse, by the

⁷⁰Also the façade of the Domus Augustana was de-monumentalised. For Hadrian's work on this part of the Imperial residence see Boatwright, 1987, pp. 150-5.

quintessential Roman entertainment of the games. The foundation of the Temple of Venus and Rome at such a site and in such a form connected the legacies of the previous dynasts, helping to consolidate their disparate aims towards the establishment of a new conception of the Roman world. To this end the Temple was non-dynastic, though not traditional. The deities which it housed had not previously been worshipped at Rome, nor was the Greek architectural form of the temple in any way common at Rome⁷¹. The *genius* of the city was now housed at a central point of the city in a Temple that recalled the glories of the empire she ruled. Now Rome/Roma, in conjunction with a Venus that was associated with fecundity, marked a nexus between the people symbolically present in the Colosseum valley, the historical authority of the city symbolically present in the Forum Romanum, and the *princeps* symbolically present on the Palatine above. All now met at a single point in support of the city symbolically present in the temple.

Tradition, non-tradition, the bridging of the past to the future, the opening up of new possibilities, these too were themes that found resonance in another of the major projects of Hadrian's building

⁷¹The Greek form of the Temple does however fit nicely with Hadrian's known interest in all things Greek. At Rome he established the Athenaeum, a Greek style educational institution, and the headquarters for the ecumenical guild of athletes and victors, the participants in the Greek style games. For a convenient summary of Hadrian's promotion of the Greek element in what is presented as Hadrian's ideal of a Graeco-Roman Empire see Boatwright, 1987, p. 202 ff.

programme at Rome, his Mausoleum and the adjacent Pons Aelius.

Hadrian's Mausoleum and the Pons Aelius.

Much of the Hadrianic building programme at Rome so far noted had concerned itself with the renovation, and often subsequent remodelling of the works of previous *principes*. The Temple of the Deified Trajan may have been a new foundation, and the only building on which Hadrian had his own name inscribed (S.H.A. *Hadr.* 19. 1), but it was designed to be an element of a pre-existing complex. Similarly, the Temple of Venus and Rome, whilst being a new foundation, re-used and converted a site previously incorporated into the buildings of former *principes*. With his Mausoleum Hadrian quite literally expanded monumental Rome into entirely new territory.

In the time of Hadrian the Ager Vaticanus remained relatively free of the encrustation of buildings that characterised the other regions of Rome. The Ager was low-lying, subject to flooding, thought to be unhealthy for habitation and of poor agricultural quality (Martial, 6. 93. 3; Juv. 6. 344; Tac. *Hist.* 2. 93)⁷². By and large the area would seem to have been largely under-developed, though perhaps somewhat surprisingly with

⁷²See further Toynbee, J. M. C., Ward-Perkins, J. B., *The Shrine of St. Peter and the Vatican Excavations.*, London, 1956, p. 5; Grimal, P., *Les Jardins romains*, 2nd.ed., Paris, 1969, pp. 139-42.

some of the area given over to villas and *horti*, places of refuge and pleasure for the aristocracy of Rome⁷³. During the course of the principate much of the area had become Imperial property, but had by and large retained its private nature. Naumachias may have been built in here. The Circus of Gaius and Nero most certainly was. However, even such a structure as the circus, perhaps originally intended to be publicly attended under Caligula, had returned to private usage under Nero⁷⁴. Roads had been constructed across the area in subsequent reigns, but the area had retained its sparsely populated, semi-rural character⁷⁵. Hadrian seems to have wished to change the character of the region.

In order to do so access needed to be facilitated. To this end a bridge, the Pons Aelius, was constructed (S. H. A. *Hadr.* 19. 11; Dio. 69. 23; *CIL* 6.973)⁷⁶. The bridge was (is) of typical Roman form, two mid-channel piers providing the central support for the three spanning arches upon which the road-bed was laid. At either end of the bridge ramps sloped

⁷³It was in this area that the *horti Domitiae* and probably the *horti Drusi* were. For the *horti Domitiae*, Richardson, 1992, p. 198, for the *horti Drusi*, Eck, E., *LTUR* 3, 1996, p. 59.

⁷⁴For the circus see further Castagnoli, F., 'Il circo di Nerone in Vaticano', *RPAA* 32, 1959-60, pp. 97-121; Magi, F., 'Il circo vaticano in base alle più recenti scoperte.', *RPAA* 45, 1972-3., pp. 37-73. For the private nature of the *horti* under Nero, and also the bridge he had erected to gain access to them, Grimal, P., *Les Jardins romains*. 1969, p. 40.

⁷⁵Boatwright, 1987, pp. 165-7.

⁷⁶For further description of the bridge Pierce, S. R., 'The Mausoleum of Hadrian and the pons Aelius.', *JRS* 15, 1925, pp. 95-98.

down, bridging the gap in height and length between the level, arch-supported roadway and the solid banks of the river. The Pons Aelius did however display a feature unusual in a Roman bridge. Coin evidence may bear witness to the decorative programme that the bridge bore, sculptures raised on columns atop the flanking parapets that lined the sides of the bridge⁷⁷. To the south the bridge was joined by a street that in turn connected with the so-called Via Recta, the main street that ran east-west through the central area of the Campus Martius, bordering to their north the Baths of Nero, the Pantheon, and the Temple of the Deified Matidia. Beyond this intersection with the Via Recta the street continued south to merge with the street later termed the *porticus Maximae*, another major thoroughfare that ran from the eastern end of the Pons Neronianus to the region around the Circus Flaminius, and perhaps beyond. The Pons Aelius was thus well connected into the pre-existing street plan of the Campus Martius. At its northern end the Pons Aelius ran down to join a street of the Hadrianic period that ran along the bank of the Tiber, to the west connecting with the Via Triumphalis and thus into the network of roads that had begun to form on this side of the Tiber. The Pons Aelius facilitated the role already begun by the Pons

⁷⁷Boatwright, 1987, Ill. 39, p. 179 depicts one of the known medallions. However, there is not general agreement as to which bridge is depicted on the medallions. Pensa, M., 'Rappresentazioni di monumenti sulle monete di Adriano.', *RIN* 80, 1978, pp. 27-78, pp. 66-69, identifies the depiction as that of the *pons Aelius*. Toynbee, J. M. C., *Roman Medallions*, New York, 1944, p. 146, n. 196, 232, identifies the bridge depicted as being the *pons Aelius* that spanned the River Tyne.

Neronianus of meshing the transport networks on either bank of the river⁷⁸. Immediately opposite the northern end of the bridge Hadrian had erected his Mausoleum⁷⁹.

The south face of the square base of the Mausoleum was directly perpendicular to the bridge, at its central point the entrance to the tomb, in strict axial alignment with the approach from the far side of the Tiber. The façade of the base, veneered in marble, 10-12m high and c. 85m wide, stood facing the viewer from behind a precinct fence of metal grille-work supported by travertine pillars that in turn were surmounted by bronze (gilded?) peacocks⁸⁰. The marble cladding of the base was sculptured, at either corner as monumental pilasters, with the face of the south wall being divided into zones. The lower of these was left free to carry the names of those interred within, whilst in the upper zone were panels imitating rusticated ashlar masonry alternated with pilasters. Above these zones there was perhaps an entablature of bucrania, garlands and paterae. Above the pilasters at each corner of the base were statue groups of men and horses (Procopius, *Goth.* 1. 22. 14)⁸¹. As solid looking as the base may have appeared externally it was in fact largely hollow.

⁷⁸Boatwright, 1987, pp. 178-9.

⁷⁹For the Mausoleum see De' Spagnolis, M., 'Contributi per una nuova lettura del Mausoleo di Adriano.', *BA* 61, 1976, pp. 62-68; Squadrilli, T., 'Il Mausoleo di Adriano.', *Capitolium* 50 7-8, 1975, pp. 20-31; Strong, D. E., 'Late Hadrianic Architectural Ornament in Rome.', *PBSR* 21, 1953, pp. 118-51.

⁸⁰Boatwright, 1987, p. 169; De' Spagnolis, 1976, pp. 62-4. On the grille-work and decoration see Rowland Pierce, 1925, pp. 76-7, 97.

⁸¹Boatwright, 1987, p. 170; Strong, 1953, pp. 129, 142-7.

Internally it consisted of a series of inter-communicating vaulted corridors radially arrayed, and ending at the wall of the next major geometric element of the Mausoleum, the drum⁸².

The drum was essentially a solid cylinder of concrete faced with tufa *opus quadratum* rising to a height of c. 31m from the level of the ground, 21m or so higher than the top of the base⁸³. It too was most likely clad externally in marble. The solidity of the drum was broken only by the entrance corridor that led to a vestibule, thence to a helical ramp that rose, making one complete 360 degree circuit to the right, ending at an antechamber that gave onto the centrally positioned mortuary chamber by way of a short corridor. Above the mortuary chamber another room, above which rose a tower containing at least one other chamber⁸⁴. How the Mausoleum was constructed and functioned above the level of the top of the drum is still an open question⁸⁵.

However, whatever may have been the form of the upper levels of the building, the whole structure seems to have been adorned at its summit by a statue group, perhaps as suggested by Boatwright, the *quadriga* group of incredible size described in a fragment of Dio⁸⁶. This would

⁸²Boatwright, 1987, pp. 170-1; De' Spagnolis, 1976, p. 62.

⁸³Boatwright, 1987, p. 171, including n. 36.

⁸⁴Blake/Bishop, 1972, pp. 57-8.

⁸⁵For a discussion of the alternatives Boatwright, 1987, p. 172 ff.

⁸⁶Boatwright, 1987, p. 173. For the fragment of Dio, Loeb, vol. 8, pp. 466-7

have produced a height for the entire structure of somewhere in the vicinity of 50m⁸⁷. It is also possible that at the foot of this statue group was a viewing platform, with the function of the annular ramp of the drum being continued in the levels above. An Imperial tomb designed as an inter-active tourist development. Not a new development when one recalls the Column of Trajan and the Augustan precinct of the northern Campus Martius.

Hadrian's Mausoleum had obvious similarities with the Mausoleum of Augustus. Principally the cylindrically shaped element of the Hadrianic version recalled that of the Augustan. Less certain, though possible, was the incorporation into the Hadrianic tomb of a tumulus on top of the drum, over-planted in like manner to the Augustan example⁸⁸.

However Hadrian's Mausoleum went beyond its predecessor. Its square base, the marble ornamentation, the statuary, its height, the ornamented and monumental approach provided by the Pons Aelius, all combined to amplify the new beyond the old. Augustus had positioned his tomb beside one of Rome's major arterial routes. Hadrian's tomb was positioned to draw people to it, thereby encouraging traffic along an alternative arterial route, perhaps with the intention of opening up for Rome an under-utilised area of the city. The novelty of the positioning of the Mausoleum of Hadrian in such a non-traditional area for burials

⁸⁷ De' Spagnolis, 1976, p. 64 estimates 48m; Blake/Bishop, 1972, p. 59 estimate 54m.

⁸⁸ Boatwright, 1987, p. 174 ff. discusses the various theories, leaving the question open.

was mitigated by its connection to the Campus Martius by the Pons Aelius and the subsequent inter-locking of the approach routes to the bridge into the street system of the Campus. Whilst physically, visually and technically outside the Campus, for all practical purposes the new Mausoleum was an appendage of that part of Rome, encrusted by this time with the dynastically focused monuments of Rome's Imperial past. Hadrian's tomb was connected into the history of Imperial Rome so present in the Campus, its form recalled the Augustan Mausoleum, there was (and still is) a direct line of sight between the two structures from the accessible heights of the Hadrianic Mausoleum. Similarities, and as has been pointed out, differences as well. The greatest difference perhaps was in what may have been the intentions of the sponsors for the on-going role of their tombs.

Augustus had begun or planned his tomb early in his life, perhaps even before he had wrested primary authority for Roman government to himself. His tomb, so large, was for personal and familial use, it was a dynastic monument, made the more so by the posthumous erection outside of it of the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*.

Hadrian began his tomb later in life, years after attaining the position of Emperor⁸⁹. Childless, and likely to remain so, his tomb was created on

⁸⁹Evidence from brick-stamps provides us with a *terminus post quem* of A. D. 123. For the brick-

an even grander scale than that of Augustus, with even more room available within its interior for interments. Moreover, its founder's name did not even appear on its façade until after his interment within (CIL 6. 984 = ILS 322)⁹⁰. Then his name was inscribed in a position of honour above the entrance. It was, however, to be one name among the many that space had been set aside for, and no copy of the Hadrianic *res gestae* was placed before his tomb⁹¹. The Hadrianic Mausoleum is comprehensible more as an institutional foundation, to house the remains of future *principes* and members of their families than as a purely dynastic foundation designed to protect the remains of an Imperial family linked to the dynasty's founder by blood or marriage. Once more with his Mausoleum Hadrian displays a characteristic evident elsewhere in his building programme. The past is acknowledged, utilised, and consolidated in and by a building that in turn subtly diverts tradition from the individual glorifications of preceding *principes* to a glorification of the principate, non-individualised, and looking towards a future supported by a re-edited past.

stamps see further Bloch, H, *Il bolli laterizi e la storia edilizia romana. Contributi all'archeologia e alla storia romana.*, Rome, 1968, pp. 253-56; Rowland Pierce, 1925, pp. 83, n. 4, 97, n. 2.

⁹⁰An inscription to the Deified Hadrian and Sabina installed over the entrance to the tomb in A. D. 139 by Antoninus Pius.

⁹¹Boatwright, 1987, p. 179.

Conclusion.

July 10, A. D. 138 saw Hadrian draw his final breath at Baiae. The event that marked the end of Rome's fourteenth *princeps* in no way brought with it any suggestion of an end to the role that he had occupied for the previous twenty years. The principate, strong, consolidated, entrenched, would, and so easily could, continue. The successor had been chosen, the transition would be smooth and uneventful. In the night on 170 years that had passed since Octavian had found himself victor at Actium, found himself, as head of the Julian faction, unopposed by serious contenders for control of the Roman world, the landscape at Rome, both physical and political, had changed. Not merely changed, it had been changed. Now the city not so much bore the signs of those who had it within their power to effect such changes, it was itself a sign, a symbol and a product of their power. Moreover, the shaper and the shaped had been drawn together into such a close symbiotic relationship that it had become difficult to determine which was the shaper, which the shaped. The public profile of the *princeps* was now as much determined by the city and its legacy of *principes* past as the city's was by the principate. The two had grown, evolved and been built in tandem with each other.

Octavian had more than forty years in which to create and refine a template for the role that he would create. That span of time had allowed not only trial and error to bring to bear their own talents to the process,

but had allowed the principate to find its own foundations within the city of Rome. The Augustan template had, as has been shown, four essential aims or themes which governed its behaviour.

First, and probably foremost, there was a desire to enshrine the presence of the imperial family into the physical fabric of the city. The process was thorough. From the dynastic Mausoleum in the northern Campus Martius with its associated Augustan monuments of the Ara Pacis Augustae and the Horologium, to the Theatre of Marcellus and the adjacent Octavian Portico, through to the two fora, the Julian and the Augustan, that trumpeted the family name, history and presence, to the Portico of Livia on the Oppian hill, buildings ostensibly built by the various members of the Julian family were widespread through-out the city. At the very heart of the city, in the Forum Romanum, the concentration of structures built by or for the members of the Julian *gens* was intense; to such a degree that the Forum of the Romans, the Forum Romanorum, was no longer that. The Forum had been hijacked, conquered; its occupying force was now omnipresent, and all focused on one name, that of the Julii.

By virtue of his position as head of the family that had claimed the city, Augustus could adopt the role as head of the family of the Romans, going so far as to eventually accept the title of *pater patriae*. Part of the role as head of the Roman family was that of priest. He took for himself the

position of Pontifex Maximus when the office became available. Until that time Augustus had adopted the role as chief intermediary between the city and its gods. In this aspect of the role of *princeps* Augustus proved to be a patron *par excellence* most especially to those gods whose mythologies could most readily be used to support the carefully tended and groomed mythology that was being created around the person of Augustus.

Father of the city, patron of the gods, Augustus was also patron of the city's populace. Their needs and well-being, of both a utilitarian and recreational nature, were cared for as well. Until his death in 12 B. C. this had been one of the roles filled by Agrippa, Augustus preferring to display his concern for the well-being of the city's population by acting as patron of the deputy who effected the direct patronage of the city's day to day needs.

The fourth characteristic of the Augustan behavioural template for the role of the *princeps* with regard to the physical nature of the city was the choice of materials, in a word, marble. The immense resources of Rome's master were marshalled towards the regeneration and renovation of Rome, a new and improved Rome. The riches and materials that the empire provided were exploited for Rome's benefit and adornment. Mistress of an empire, the city would wear the spoils of her conquests, her people daily reminded of her pre-eminence, as the stones

of the Mediterranean gleamed in their increasing presence across her hills and valleys.

The previous under-use of marble within the city allowed its extensive use under Augustus to proclaim visually the presence of the new order, and to provide a quantifiable means by which the extensive disbursement of the largesse of the *princeps* would be readily apparent. All in all, the major characteristics of the Augustan model for the building programme of the principate proclaimed one central idea, that Rome and her people would benefit if they continued to accept the patronage offered. But the patron would always take the position of prime importance, Rome would have to serve the *princeps* in order to receive the benefits in return. The city would glorify the individual and his family, in turn it would itself be rewarded.

The demise of Augustus proved to highlight the flaw in the template. Its success was dependent on the individual *princeps*. Tiberius moved away from the Augustan model, moved away from Rome, with the initial continuation of the Augustan behavioural ideal slowing and eventually stalling under Augustus' immediate successor. Rome found under Tiberius that it could have a *princeps* who apparently had no desire to ornament the city. The short reign of Caligula proved to show that an interest in adding to the edifices of the city could be of little attraction when the priority of the *princeps* was to elevate himself to the level of the divine. The reaction of Claudius was to prove a rather

cautious, perhaps somewhat dull, remediation. The city's buildings and its infrastructure were augmented, but there was little in the way of ornamentation, little concern to elevate Rome's aesthetic pre-eminence. Nero was too care for aesthetics, perhaps a little too much. Rome felt the strain of a master who used the environs and traditions of the city to trounce resoundingly the aristocracy of Rome at their own favourite sport, that of competitive display. Each of the Julio-Claudian successors reacted to or against the the Augustan template, and the behaviour of their immediate predecessor, each displaying his own conception of what the principate should or could be, none finding the sophisticated balance that characterised the Augustan model.

A change of dynasties appeared to bring with it a return to the Augustan ideal. There was piety to Rome's gods displayed in the re-building of the Temple of the Capitoline Triad, and concern that the new *princeps* be seen to take charge of the work, and in a physically active capacity. There was concern for Rome's recreational needs with the construction of that most Roman recreational facility, the Flavian Amphitheatre. There was a renewal of the Augustan theme of peace and bounty through conquest, expressed in the Temple of Peace with its adornment consisting of the spoils of conquest and empire, and there was the promotion of the dynastic succession to quell fears of instability and civil war. There was not, however, the adoption of the liminal position of the *princeps* as the mediator between the terrestrial and celestial planes. Vespasian's public

profile of gruff pragmatism would not have easily accommodated such a stance.

Gruff pragmatism was not a characteristic of the regally educated and acculturated Titus, but the Flavian concern with dynastic promotion continued, with the beginning of the Temple of the Deified Vespasian. Provision for Rome's entertainments and pastimes continued also, with the Flavian Amphitheatre brought to near completion and dedicated with spectacles and games, and with the Baths of Titus to compliment and complement Rome's new recreational zone.

Domitian followed the brief interlude of his brother's principate, and it was under Domitian that the Augustan template was most fully reinvigorated. Dynastic promotion, luxurious ornamentation of the city, pious attention towards the gods and Rome's religions, the association of the principate with military triumph, the association of the *princeps* with a tutelary goddess, the positioning of the *princeps* in the liminal position between gods and man were all present in the building programme of Domitian, and all found their equivalent in that of Augustus. Where the equivalence was not in evidence was in the sheer excess of all these aspects of Domitian's work. Under Domitian Rome was to become the recipient, willing or not, of a largesse that bordered on the hubristic or chauvinistic.

The principate of Nerva proved in hindsight to provide Rome with little other than a transitional phase between a principate characterised by one form of excess, and a *princeps* motivated to display another.

If the Flavian dynasty appeared to have wished to find legitimacy by continuing and equalling the acceptable aspects of the legacy of the Julio-Claudians, Trajan appears to have desired not to equal or rival, but rather to overwhelm the past with the sheer scale of his gifts to Rome.

Moreover, there was nothing of dynastic concern evident in his building programme, the contest was between an individual, two dynasties, and the night on 150 years of the history of the principate. The Trajanic example was probably at furthest remove ideologically from the Augustan example. There was no concern for the gods, no dynastic concerns, simply the desire to use Rome to glorify himself. Trajan was content to have his coinage advertise himself as the the very best *princeps*, his building programme revealed his desire to be remembered as *princeps optimus maximus*.

Could Rome have continued to accommodate such self-serving largesse? It would appear Hadrian for one thought not. He reacted against the example of his predecessor by editing the legacy of his predecessors. Every element of the Augustan model of behaviour for the principate's built presence in Rome was present in the building programme of Hadrian, and more besides. Hadrian had one element at his disposal that he could incorporate into his building programme that Augustus had

had not. Hadrian had the built legacy of *principes* past. Others had had this element too, but whereas those *principes* had, in making their own mark on the city, reacted either positively or negatively towards the legacy that they had inherited, Hadrian adopted a different approach. The building programmes of the *principes* were to be consolidated, integrated, maintained and augmented. The disparate threads of the various ideals and motivations in evidence in the accumulation of imperial edifices throughout the city were to be woven into a whole, to be augmented by new constructions where necessary and fitting; the Pantheon, the Basilicae of Matidia and Marciana, and the Temple of the Deified Trajan may stand as examples of this. The creations of the past were restored, maintained, re-built where necessary, for example, the Baths of Titus, again the Pantheon, the Forum of Augustus, and the ridge or dyke that may have been a measure to protect the monumental agglomeration in the central and southern areas of the Campus Martius. The past could be edited to lessen the excesses of prior *principes*, the demonumentalisation of the Palatine approaches may spring to mind, but also the partial burial of the Ara Pacis Augustae may have lessened the bombast of the Augustan schema laid out in the northern Campus. The example of the past could be an inspiration for new work, one may think here of the symmetries between the Mausolea of Augustus and Hadrian, but it is here also that the divergence between the Hadrianic and Augustan templates for the role of the *princeps* becomes evident.

The Mausoleum of Augustus was a familial, dynastic concern. Hadrian's Mausoleum was not. With no descendants to follow him, the Mausoleum was to accommodate members of the principate who would, in time, follow; not members of a dynasty. In the same vein, the renovation, re-building and re-editing of past monuments was effected so as to be anonymous to posterity, the individual *princeps* was not in evidence, the principate was. It was also to be a principate, the principal residence of which had been de-monumentalised, re-configured to fit better within the city that surrounded it. This was most evident in the re-alignment of the north-eastern façade of the Palatine complex that faced out over the Forum Romanum. It was to be a principate whose function was to serve Rome and her needs, not a principate that used the city to serve the individual *princeps'* desire for glory. Roma was now to be worshipped at Rome, not the principate, and certainly not a *princeps*.

A cycle was complete, a new conception for the role of the *princeps* had been evolved. However, the more things had appeared to change the more they were to remain the same. The *princeps* was still *supra leges*, still bound only by precedent and custom. Hadrian's successor would, as had Augustus', prove himself to be independent from the example set. In an uncanny re-playing of history Antoninus Pius would build little at Rome, a temple to his adoptive and deified father his main project. The emperor was still what the emperor did, which was still largely dependent on who the emperor was. Rome as the stage had been set, the

play had been written, rehearsed, and revised, but there was still room for the players upon that stage to interpret their role at will, still, within the restrictions of the system, room for the individual.