On a recent visit to London I had the privilege to meet Dr Ian Jenkins the current Curator of Greek and Roman Antiquities at the British Museum. Dr Jenkins is one of world’s leading authorities on the subject of the Ionic Frieze of the Parthenon in Athens. He is also a foremost historian of a great debate, whether collections of classical sculpture are to be properly considered as exercises in archaeology or exhibitions of art. His study of this subject amongst others is embodied in his Archaeologists and Aesthetes published in 1992 by the British Museum Press (unfortunately now out of print).

My purpose in visiting Dr Jenkins was to further some research I am undertaking in relation to an important but largely (if not almost entirely) forgotten artefact held in the Western Australian Museum. It is a plaster cast some 90 metres long occupying the top of the four walls of the Museum’s Hellenic Gallery. The cast is a full sized cast of the some 60% of the Ionic Frieze from the Parthenon in Athens. The original marbles, often referred to as ‘the Elgin Marbles’, have been held since the early 19th century by the British Museum. Very much the greater part of the Perth cast is of that part of the Frieze that Lord Elgin arranged to be taken from Athens and sent to London in the first decade of the 1800’s.

The Ionic Frieze is one of three of the major elements of the art of the Parthenon (see picture below). These elements are the Pedimental Sculptures (large sculptures in the round that occupied the East and West Pediments of the building), the Doric Frieze (92 separate high relief blocks that were fixed between triglyphs just below the pediments and along the north and south sides of the building) and the Ionic Frieze (the brilliant continuous low relief narrative in blocks that surrounded the top outside of the inner sanctum of the building). The Ionic Frieze was highly decorated and probably poly-
The Perth cast was acquired by the Western Australian Museum in the first few years of the 1900’s and was installed in the then new gallery, that seems to have been purpose built for it, in June 1908. A driving force in the acquisition was Dr John Hackett who was also responsible for bringing to Perth a large collection of casts of other pieces of classical art.

Some idea of the sense of importance that seemed to surround the acquisition and display of the Parthenon cast can be had from a report in the West Australian on 23 June 1908 on the opening of the new annex to the Museum in which the cast held pride of place:

"By the opening tomorrow of the new Art Gallery, Western Australia will at once redeem a long-standing promise to His Highness the Prince of Wales and attain an educational stage which should have been here many years ago . . . From the first floor landing swing doors give entrance to the Picture Gallery, 111ft, by 38ft, and 28ft, 6in in height to the square. . . . A special feature of the Picture Gallery is a frieze of casts of about 300ft, of the famous frieze of the Parthenon . . .”

The Perth cast of the Ionic Frieze is not the only cast of the Frieze. Along with the original sculpture that Lord Elgin arranged to be sent to London were moulds of much of the Frieze. From early after the British Museum acquired the art and the moulds from Lord Elgin in 1816 the British Museum was supplying plaster casts of the Elgin Marbles to eager institutions around the world. Elgin’s moulds in due course wore out and the British Museum commissioned replacements. Domenico Bruciani was a gifted Italian artist employed by the British Museum as a mould maker or formatore and he later established a cast making business, Bruciani & Co, near Covent Garden in London. It was from Bruciani & Co that the Western Australian Museum and Art Gallery through its Director, the geologist Bernard Woodward, acquired the Parthenon Frieze cast and other casts of classical art (and of later art, for example busts of Shakespeare, Milton, Lylle, and many others).

There are at least two other Ionic Frieze casts in Australia, one at the University of Melbourne and the other at the Women’s College, University of Sydney. The Perth cast is nonetheless important for a variety of reasons, however, since space here does not afford a full analysis of the significance of the Perth cast the following points will have to suffice. First, the cast is itself a work of art. The importance of casts and the skills of cast making are widely celebrated not least in such permanent exhibitions as that in the Victoria and Albert Museum in London. Indeed, the privately funded and now internationally recognized exhibitor of Parthenon casts in Basel, Switzerland, the Sculpturhalle, is making a catalogue of Parthenon Frieze casts that are held in institutions and private collections around the world. And this introduces a second reason for the importance of the Perth cast. The original marbles have to a degree deteriorated. The Perth cast is of the marbles as they were when the mould for the cast was made. A cast can thus preserve detail that in the course of time might be lost from the original. The mould for the Perth cast was made some time in the latter half of the 19th century and subject to how well the mould was made, its condition when the cast was taken and the skill with which the cast was made, the Perth cast may be an important record of the condition of the original art well over a century ago. A third reason is that the cast affords an opportunity to visitors to the Museum in Perth to examine a physical facsimile of the original art, art of major international significance, held in the British Museum. This after all is what caused Dr Hackett and the Western Australian Museum and Art Gallery to acquire the cast in the first place. That is not to say that the way the cast is displayed in the Museum is necessarily technically or aesthetically satisfactory. It is displayed as it is displayed in the British Museum (see picture below), which, in exchange for the benefactions of Lord Duveen who funded the Duveen Gallery in which the Elgin Marbles are displayed, was obliged to meet Lord Duveen’s conditions for the style of the exhibition.
Parthenon itself (although I hasten to point out that there is still
scholarly debate about the original ordering of the Frieze blocks,
albeit that there is a great deal more known today than there was
in the early 1900’s when the Perth cast was installed). The de-
bate about the proper display of the Ionic Frieze relates to the
issue of whether the Marbles are about archaeology or about art.
That debate in turn relates to the debate about whether the Mar-
bles should be in London or in Athens. The importance of these
debates attests also to another reason why the Perth cast is im-
portant. Its physical presence in Perth is a reminder of issues
that are of major international significance both in politics and
in academic circles.

Another of those issues is the relativisation of culture. I am
grateful to Dr Ian Jenkins whom I mentioned at the outset of this
article for having drawn my attention to a watercolour of the
British painter James Stephanoff (1787-1874) entitled 'An As-
semblage of Works of Art and Sculpture and Painting'.

Stephanoff’s 1845 painting would have it that the history of art
is of a progression to higher levels of perfection. This is a per-
spective that brings to mind the ideal forms of Plato, Hegelian
dialectics and notions of teleology in biological evolution. In
Stephanoff’s painting oriental Indian and central American in-
digenous art appear at the bottom and there is then a progression
upward until at the very top there is the art of the Parthenon. In
this perspective indigenous art is inferior to classical art. This
brings me back to the Hellenic Gallery of the Museum of West-
ern Australia. Today the Gallery is given over to a display of
indigenous Australian art and artefacts. The Parthenon Frieze
cast, unlit, looks down upon the indigenous exhibits, a silent
witness to a shift in cultural values since the day its inaugura-
tion to the Museum was a cause of great celebration and Aus-
tralian indigenous art was, in general, not on the agenda..

What then is the perspective that the Hellenic Gallery ex-
presses? Is it the Stephanoff perspective, a perspective that was
prevalent throughout the 19th century and into the 20th? The
answer is 'no'. The Stephanoff perspective no longer has cur-
rency with institutions such as the British Museum, and art, like
everything else, is assessed against its 'postmodernist' context
rather than some illusionary, or at least illusory, absolute value.

There are three other possible messages. One is that the Parthe-
non Frieze cast is simply a decorative feature in the Gallery—a
mere cornice. Indeed, it would not be surprising if many of
those visitors to the Gallery who happen to look up and see the
Frieze cast think no more of it than that it is some sort of Aus-
tralian baroque, especially featuring as its does all those horses
and men wearing funny looking hats. Perhaps the naked figures are
thought to be Aborigines and the whole thing is thought to be a
narrative of indigenous resistance or submission to colonial in-
vasion!

Another perspective is that the cast juxtaposed with the Indige-
nous art represents a contest of cultural heritage. The cast may
in this view be seen as consigned to the darkness above, a dis-
carded symbol of a colonial past that must give way to what had
been a neglected indigenous cultural heritage.

A third perspective is that the juxtaposition represents a view
that there can be equally valid alternative expressions of the
human response to the human condition in its various incarnations.
In this perspective the juxtaposition can be seen as represent-
ing complementarity between classical and indigenous tradi-
tions in art.

There are deep ironies in the presence of the Parthenon Frieze
cast in the Hellenic Gallery of the Museum of Western Australia
juxtaposed with what is a significant display of indigenous art
and artefacts. One of the ironies is that the spirit that led to ac-
quision of the cast, the spirit indeed that led to the formation of
a Museum in Perth in the 1860’s, is the same spirit that came to
recognize, value, and to exhibit indigenous art even in a way
that can, whether intentionally or not, be construed as displac-
ing, or being in some way opposed to, classical art. Our classical
heritage and the value it gives to curiosity, to the need to nurture
aesthetic values, to suspended judgment, to critical thought, and
to the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, is what gave rise to
the phenomenon of the museum, the very name deriving from the
Greek, mouseion, abode of the muses—thinkers.

There need be no sense in which the Hellenic Gallery is seen as
representing or standing for a notion of contested heritage. It
should be seen as standing for a notion of complimentary heri-
tage. The cast and the exhibition of indigenous art do not detract
from each other. The meaning of each is augmented by the pres-
ence of the other.

With the centenary in June next year of the opening of what is
now the Hellenic Gallery it would be a fitting thing for the
Frieze cast to be illuminated and its provenance and significance
publicised. To that end I am preparing a publication and any
relevant correspondence would be welcome.
There are over 460 temporary Roman camps in Britain of which at least 225 lie in Scotland. Some 70% of all camps known in Britain have been discovered through aerial survey or through scrutinizing existing collections of air photographs. This figure includes practice camps of which over 50 are known in Wales.

The Roman fort at Raeburnfoot in Dumfriesshire in southern Scotland (see map opposite) has been known since the early 19th century and subject to small-scale excavations in the latter part of that century and the middle part of the 20th century. The fort was confirmed from the finds as likely to be Antonine (mid 2nd century AD) in date although a Flavian (late 1st century AD) precursor was suspected. The fort lies close to a Roman road whose destination is unknown but possibly was intended to link up with Dere Street in the vicinity of the Roman complex at Trimontium (Newstead).

The Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland (RCAHMS) carried out a survey of the area in the 1990s, re-surveying the Roman fort and discovering a Neolithic bank barrow on the plateau above the fort, close to a later post-medieval field system (published in RCAHMS 1997 Eastern Dumfriesshire: an archaeological landscape, TSO, Edinburgh).

In 2003, a routine assessment of recent aerial photographs of the area (see photograph opposite) identified additional linear earthworks on the plateau, reminiscent of the outline of a Roman marching camp. A field visit confirmed this identification in 2004 and the site was subjected to detailed topographical survey using a differential Global Positioning System in July 2005. The air photographs and field visits confirmed that there were indeed the remains of a Roman marching camp of some 13 hectares (33 acres) on the moorland.

Temporary encampments of the Roman army are known in a variety of categories, the most common being the marching or campaign camp. These are enclosures temporarily occupied by a tented force on campaign or otherwise away from base. There is some evidence from classical sources for the perimeter of the camp to be only demarcated by stakes and palisades but these leave little or no archaeological trace. Fortunately in Ro-
The probable oblique traverse on the south-west side was utilised as a later drain, but the north-west and north-east gates provided a useful opportunity to study their form. The north-east gate of the camp appears to have been deliberately sited on the mound of the bank barrow, using the higher, drier ground for one of the principle roads into the camp. Both north-west and north-east gates possessed external clavicula and oblique traverse ditches but neither demonstrated any evidence for accompanying internal clavicula ramparts. However, although any south-east gate was not visible due to the later land improvements, a curious semi-circular earthwork lay inside the camp diametrically opposite the north-west gate of the camp. Although this had also been modified by the field system, it seems likely that this feature originated as an internal clavicula rampart. This suggests that, indeed, ‘Stracathro-type’ gates may have had internal claviculae, as suggested by Roy’s plan at Dalginross. Furthermore, as is also possible at Dalginross, the level of defensive features employed may have differed from one gate to another, the consistent factor being the provision of an external clavicula and oblique traverse.

‘Stracathro-type’ camps are only currently known in Scotland with some 18 now recorded. Whilst none are securely dated, evidence from their proximity to dated forts and distribution suggests that they belong to the Flavian invasions of Scotland in the latter part of the 1st century AD. Whilst there has been a tendency to ascribe them to the campaigns of the governor Agricola, subject of a biography by Tacitus, it is not possible to confirm such a specific attribution. However, whilst their exact date remains unknown, it is possible that they represent the work of a single senior tribune or camp prefect (praefectus castrorum) of a legion.
The site of Bath attracted people from an early date because of the hot springs that flow there. By the Iron Age it had become a place of religious significance to the inhabitants of that part of Britain. The Romans too were attracted by the springs and the deities associated with them. Soon after their invasion (AD 43) these drew Roman settlers and builders too, and it was then that this probable sacred Iron Age spring was transformed into a monumental religious site with buildings of a type and scale quite unlike the simple structures of earlier periods.

The Physical Remains of the Temple

It was not until 1790, when extensions were built for the Pump Room, that physical evidence of a temple in Bath was found. The discovery on this occasion of a flight of steps and sculptural fragments beneath the Pump Room was later supported when part of the temple podium was found during construction work from 1867-9. These incidental discoveries generated sufficient material to indicate the presence of a temple.

A thorough investigation of the temple site was not possible, however, because of the presence of modern buildings and streets on top of the site. Despite this obstacle, subsequent archaeological work has allowed the temple’s structure and development to be reasonably reconstructed. The tetrastyle temple sat about 1.5 m above the surrounding ground level, on a concrete podium. It occupied the principal east-west axis of a temple complex consisting of a large area of open space around the temple. The space included a sacrificial altar, as well as various dedications, inscriptions and monuments.

The initial period of construction has been stylistically dated to the Neronian or early Flavian period (50s-70s AD) and included the building of the temple, temple precinct and the reservoir for the spring. The temple was later remodeled in a second building phase, with small rooms, probably shrines, flanking the stairs. An ambulatory was also built, running behind the shrines and around the temple. In a third period, there was some rebuilding of the ambulatory wall and maybe some re-flooring of the ambulatory itself.

The temple front and the column capitals were richly decorated with acanthus leaves, volutes, flowers and bunches of fruit. The centre of the temple’s sculptured pediment was occupied by an imposing gorgon, enclosed in a shield (pictured below). The shield is surrounded by two wreaths of oak leaves and is held by two Victories, one on either side. The Victories’ toes balance on globes, and below each lies a helmet. The left helmet is shaped to appear like a sea-creature and is usually seen as a dolphin. On the right side, the helmet has a hand serving as its crest, clutching at the talons of the little owl perching on the helmet. The apex of the pediment was occupied by a sun or star, and the corners were probably filled with tritons. The iconography of the pediment is clearly classical, excepting the central gorgon. Classical gorgons were female and the temple of Sulis-Minerva’s bearded and moustached gorgon is male.

The identity and nature of the deity of the temple, Sulis-Minerva

He is carved in a Celtic style, and it is possible that he may represent a conflation of a classical gorgon with a Celtic deity, or a Celtic version of the classical gorgon.


Kirstie Nicholson
Minerva, a point of contention. A female deity, she is a combination of the Roman goddess Minerva (see the bronze Minerva below) and the Celtic deity Sulis.

Minerva was an important Roman deity. She was primarily a goddess of wisdom, trade and crafts although she was strongly identified with the Greek goddess Athena and absorbed many of Athena’s qualities and attributes, such as her warrior aspect. Minerva may have had a healing aspect, evidenced by a temple in Gaul to Minerva Medica. This would associate her with the hot spring water, known for its therapeutic qualities. Alternatively, her war aspect may have been used to advertise the Roman military presence in Britain and many of the dedications at Bath are by soldiers though it was not a military site.

The deity Sulis is known only from her conflation with Minerva at Bath and is presumed to be an older, Celtic deity who was worshipped at the springs. However, it must be remembered that all evidence of Sulis comes from the Roman period inscriptions, so, while her pre-Roman existence can be presumed, it is not substantiated with material remains. It is generally agreed that Sulis was a goddess of the thermal springs at Bath, and would have principally been worshipped as a healing deity. It seems that Sulis-Minerva came about from an organic process and was considered a single composite deity, presiding over the springs.

Spring Deposits

The largest of the three hot water springs at Bath, now called the King’s Bath spring, was the centre of worship for the cult of Sulis-Minerva. The spring was contained in a reservoir in the south-eastern corner of the temple complex (see map below). Visitors to Bath would have sought the sacred spring as a means of communicating with the deity, in prayers of thanks and pleas for aid.

The religious activities involving the spring are evidenced by the ritual deposits excavated from the site. Worshippers threw objects into the spring to Sulis-Minerva, as a gift or pledge. The hot water bubbling up from the depths of the earth was regarded as an Otherworldly space, inhabited by the goddess. The large variety of objects reflects the different motivations for deposit, and the range of people visiting the spring. At Bath we have a number of metal, particularly pewter, vessels, jewellery, coins and some more peculiar items, such as a pair of ivory breasts and a catapult washer.

The site of Bourbonne-les-Bains (North-Eastern France) in ancient Gaul is a site comparable to that of Bath. A thermal spring, later developed into a bath complex, was the site of religious activity, as evidenced by the exceptionally large deposits of coins in the spring. The Roman army seems to have played a pivotal role in the history of Bourbonne-les-Bains. The large quantity of imperial coinage found in the spring there suggests that it was frequently visited by legionaries, and its bath houses were constructed for the primary purpose of serving the military posted in the region. The sharp decline in coin deposits after about a century suggests that at this point the main force was moved elsewhere. Bath also served as the primary bath-house for troops stationed in Britain and would have been visited regularly by legionaries. The large amount of imperial coinage, military themed deposits (such as the catapult washer) and military inscriptions found at Bath indicate the major role the Roman army may have played in the temple and spring complex’s construction and daily ritual.

Function

The temple complex at Bath would have been visited by the local population, as well as by a wider population of travelers and tourists to the Bath region. During the period of Roman occupation Bath was most likely a centre for recreation and religion, rather than an urban settlement. People visited Bath in order to seek divine aid or favour from the reigning deity, Sulis-Minerva. This would include visits for personal reasons, as well as participation in the events and ritual of a religious holiday or festival. Most commonly, people would visit in order to exhibit thanks to the deity, or to fulfill a vow to her. These could take the form of the setting up of an altar, a sacrifice, a donation to the temple or depositing an offering in the spring.

The complex built up around the sacred spring of Sulis-Minerva would have been considered an important religious site, presumably with a wide reputation. As a place of singular prestige and importance, it would have attracted the visits of wealthy Romans, as well as providing a religious focus for the local populations around Bath. The phenomenon of the thermal springs would have ensured its popularity and visitors would have enjoyed bathing in the waters, as either a form of relaxation or with healing of a particular ailment in mind. The conflation on two goddesses, the Celtic Sulis and the Roman Minerva attest to the previous Iron Age significance of the springs, yet the nature of the goddess is still difficult to determine. Most likely she was a merged combination of both deities seen as presiding over the spring.

Further reading:

In spring last year when exploring south-east Turkey I was fortunate to be shown a Roman bridge by the owner of a medieval caravanserai in the nearby village of Hantepe.

The bridge (pictured below) was undergoing restoration by a team from the Turkish highways authority but has apparently never been studied or published in a scholarly review. It lies 19km NNE of Diyarbakır (38 degrees 04'02" N; 40 degrees 08'28" E) and crosses a tributary of the Tigris called the Deveçeidi (“Camel crossing”) river. There are two other ancient bridges nearby: the one 7km to the north-east (Halil Viran Köprü), near the confluence with the Tigris, is an early medieval bridge from the Artukid period and was built originally in 1218; the other 6.5km to the south-west (Sultan Murad Köprü) near the modern highway leading north from Diyarbakır to Elazığ and Malatya, is apparently Ottoman. (These two other bridges, but not the Roman bridge, are described on page 285 of Tom Sinclair’s “Eastern Turkey: an architectural and archaeological survey”, Volume 3, but there is an unfortunate confusion over the names).

The Roman bridge, now called by local people ‘Kara Köprü’, carries a road (see picture below) eight metres wide which rises to a plateau to the south along a beautifully paved section that is initially almost perfectly preserved. Its course can be traced on Google Earth for most of the way back to Diyarbakır and was followed on foot for a couple of kilometers. A further, poorly-preserved and smaller bridge takes the road over a gully near the hamlet of Sançar which is largely built from the paving stones taken from the road. Its course south is ploughed up for some sections but it is clearly visible from space.

The course of the road to the north of the bridge seems to pass through a hilltop fort but has not yet been traced on the ground. It continues to the village of Şırbetin or Kalkar where there are two well-known tombs of the early 16th century and another ancient caravanserai. From there the ancient road is likely to have continued north-west to the Taurus passes near Ergani-Maden, although a branch road must have gone to the ancient city of Eğil (once called Carcathocerta and capital of the kingdom of Sophene). The modern town has a splendid citadel perched above the Tigris, which is unfortunately dammed near this point with the reservoir now covering some of the fine freestanding stone tombs of a royal dynasty.

The Roman road and the bridge may have been built by the emperor Constantius II, who is know to have fortified the city of Amida (today Diyarbakir). Although there were stories of a now vanished inscription on the bridge, there is today no written evidence concerning the date of its construction. Apart from the road, ‘Kara Köprü’ appears to be Roman on grounds of style (rounded arches, triangular breakwaters, road rising slightly towards the middle, size of stone blocks and minimum road width of about 4m50). The restoration project has added stone parapets by analogy with the Roman bridge at Kiakhta, which is still in use and lies 120km to the ESE, but it is not certain that

![A Roman Bridge by the Tigris — Anthony Comfort](image)
The paved road makes a zig-zag as it rises to the ridge to the south. It is in fine condition (see picture above right) with no apparent rutting and occasional low steps as it climbs gently up the hill. The absence of signs of wear is surprising. The purpose of such a road and bridge must have been to improve communications with Melitene and with the rest of Anatolia and no doubt the primary intention was to facilitate movement of troops and supplies to the Roman eastern frontier with Persia from the north-west. In fact troops and supply wagons may have approached to more often from Antioch and the west rather than from the north-west, but there are so far no known traces of paved roads heading towards Diyarbakır from the west, that is, from Şanlı urfa (ancient Edessa), neither directly via Silvërek nor indirectly via Mardin. The latter road certainly existed and was a part of the major route between Melitene (now Malatya) and the Tigris, before continuing over the crest of the Tur Abdin (known as Mount Masius in antiquity) to Nisibis and lower Mesopotamia, which is known to have existed from the Peutinger Table. This route was always important for trade right back to Assyrian times, as well for strategic reasons, and it is therefore surprising that there are few signs of the Roman road being heavily used. Possibly, the route along the Tigris via the Artukid bridge of Halîl Viran and the caravanserai at Hantepe was preferred locally by commercial caravans even in the late Roman period. Or perhaps the road was well-covered with gravel and sand and thus protected from the wheels of passing vehicles.

A stone bridge such as this one was clearly constructed with wheeled vehicles in mind but caravans of pack animals might prefer an unpaved surface, providing it was easy to cross the Devegeçîdi river at another point. The moment at which carts were replaced by camels is much debated but there is now general agreement that some carts at least continued in use right up to the time of the Arab invasions and even beyond. On the other hand, long-distance commercial caravans carrying high-value items such as textiles and spices were probably always carried by pack-animals.

There are other ancient bridges in the region which were first discovered by a team of archaeologists investigating the areas to be inundated by the Ilisu dam back in the late 1980s. This dam is now going ahead after a lengthy delay and much evidence may disappear before it can be properly studied. The area is of great importance to historians and archaeologists dealing with the Assyrian period but it was also the site of a major confrontation lasting several centuries between Rome and Persia. There are many castles and monasteries as well as roads and bridges in this area, but much of the historical geography of the two centuries before the Arab invasions remains to be elucidated and the region deserves to be better known.

Exeter, 6 March 2007

Hadrian in the *Campus Martius* (Field of Mars)

Kevin O’Toole

Whether it is for his wall in Britain, for his arch in Athens or for any one of a number of other structures in the former provinces of imperial Rome, the Emperor Hadrian (AD 76—138) remains famous today as a builder from one end of Europe to other. It is however in Rome itself where his legacy as a builder is especially significant.

We have no direct knowledge of what Hadrian, a great benefactor to Athens (see RAG Vol 1 Issue 1) thought about the Parthenon, however it is clear enough from his Temple of Venus and Roma (c AD 123—135) (picture of model lower left) that he thought that the Greek temple dedicated to Athena Parthenos was, at least in significant respects, worth copying. Like the Parthenon, the Temple of Venus and Roma, was also constructed on an elevated platform (stylobate). Hadrian’s Temple also copied a feature which when the Parthenon was built in the mid-5th BC was unique in a Greek temple. Thus, like the Parthenon, the Temple of Venus and Roma also had two self-contained chambers (although in the Parthenon it was a secondary, or back-room). Like the Parthenon, the Temple of Venus and Roma had formal entrances at both ends of the inner temple. The Temple of Venus and Roma, near nothing of which still stands today, occupied a prominent position near the Colosseum and just east of the Forum. It was a decastyle (10 columns across, the Parthenon is octastyle) however in all essential respects it was a unmistakeable reference to the classical peripteral Greek temple. It was Hadrian’s ‘Parthenon’ in Rome.

Hadrian played a direct role in the design of the Temple of Venus and Roma and it may be that Apollodorus of Damascus, who had made his name as Trajan’s architect, was murdered by order of Hadrian for mocking Hadrian’s efforts.

It was however farther west of the city in the Field of Mars (the Campus Martius) where Hadrian left his most enduring Roman legacies in architecture, albeit that it cannot be certain that Hadrian played any direct role in the design of the buildings there.

The early history of Rome, the Field of Mars, was a swampy area to the west of and outside the Servian Wall surrounding the city, and bordered to the west by the Tiber. By the arrival of Hadrian, the area, although still outside the city walls (the Aurelian Wall would not be built until the latter half of the 3rd century) had long been an important part of the city, at least for entertainment, with the theatres of Pompey, Marcellus, and Balbus, and the Circus Flaminius.

It was for this area that Hadrian commissioned the Saepta Julia (A) (a large open space surrounded by a portico used for electoral purposes), the new Pantheon (B), the rebuilding of the Basilica of Neptune (immediately behind the Pantheon) and the Basilicae of Marciana and Martidia (C). Hadrian would also be remembered by his mausoleum on the right bank of the Tiber (picture of model in *Museo della Civiltà Romano* at right) and the bridge, the Aelian, connecting it with the Field of Mars.
The modified bridge is still in use today and the mausoleum by degrees has become Castel Sant’Angelo.

These buildings formed a constellation of civic buildings and monuments including the Arch of Trajan, the Baths of Nero, the Baths of Agrippa, the Stadium of Domitian (which today is recalled by the Piazza Navona).

The Pantheon is no doubt the building in Rome with which Hadrian is most famously associated. The consensus of opinion is that a temple to all the gods was commissioned for the present site of the Pantheon by Marcus Agrippa in c 27BC. Agrippa’s Pantheon was destroyed in the fire of Rome in AD 80 whereupon it was rebuilt by Domitian. Hadrian commissioned the present building in AD 118 or thereabouts. When it was completed it was in many ways the apotheosis of a revolution in architecture in Rome that was facilitated by Roman competence and versatility in the use of concrete. The arch was turned through 360 degrees and by the early 2nd century AD, Rome was resplendent in domed and semi-domed structures. However, the scale of Hadrian’s Pantheon required special solutions to the problem of safely dissipating the forces generated by the massive dome; forces that have been held in check now for over 1800 years (although not without some fine cracking in the dome). In the drawing below arches built within the walls and acting as buttresses to the weight of the dome can be seen.

The finishes to the external surfaces of the building have been long removed (for example, the originally gilded bronze of the dome and bronze from the pronaos was at different times removed to make weaponry). However, the Pantheon was not made so much to be admired from the outside as to overawe by the elaborations of its inside. In this it is to be distinguished from the Greek temple which spoke from its external surfaces.

The pronaos of the building with its 16 Egyptian granite columns is perhaps an unfortunate detraction from the conceptual purity of the building as spherical; hence the equivalence of the height and diameter of the rotunda. The dome covers a space of some 54,000 cubic metres and it is a larger dome than those of Michelangelo’s St Peter’s, Brunelleschi’s Duomo and Wren’s St Paul’s.

The inside is illuminated by an oculus some 8 metres in diameter at the very summit of the dome. It is an open vent to both light and air and the only natural source of light to the interior. It illuminates a floor of marble opus sectile, and a harmonious arrangement of three layers in the vertical plane; a first layer of alternating piers and exedrae with columns of yellow marble from Numidia, a layer above that of false windows alternating with slabs of purple porphyry and green marble and, finally, five concentric rows of lacunars or coffers leading inexorably to the oculus.

Thus, Hadrian’s Pantheon is the opposite of his ‘Parthenon’. The linearity in the horizontal and vertical planes of the Temple of Venus and Roma becomes curvilinear, the vertical lines fold into a dome, the rectilinear becomes the spherical and the temple speaks not from its external, but from its internal, surfaces.
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Recent and Forthcoming

National Archaeology Week
20-27 May was devoted to promoting archaeology nationwide. Here in WA there was a series of events including opportunities to promote Roman Archaeology. On Friday 25th a series of short lectures at the Maritime Museum In Fremantle included one by David Kennedy (“Counting on the Romans”). The following day visitors to the museum could visit “stalls” setting out the “wares” of the various branches of archaeology in the state. RAG was again represented.

Public Lectures

From time to time invitations come in asking for a talk on Roman Archaeology to various groups – PROBUS and schools in particular. Our Treasurer, Maire Gomes (winner of a prize in 2006 for her first class Honours performance not least the dissertation on Roman villas in Portugal) is to give a talk on our behalf to the University of Third Age on Friday 17th August.

David Kennedy gave a lecture in April in Amman, Jordan on “Ten Years of Aerial Archaeology in Jordan”. He also contributed two lectures to a “Workshop on Aerial Archaeology” he jointly ran with Dr Bob Bewley at Umm Qeis (Gadara) in Jordan. The same visit to Amman was the opportunity to participate in a moving ANZAC Day ceremony held annually amidst the remains of the Roman Temple of Hercules on the citadel in Amman.

The success of a course on “The Roman Army” offered through University Extension last Spring (almost 70 enrolled) is the incentive to consider a follow-on. It would likely be at much the same time (November) and will probably be devoted to the logistics of warfare or everyday life in the Roman army.

Friday 8 June at 10.00, UWA: Martina Mueller will be presenting a “Proposal Workshop” for her PhD thesis (“Replicating the Ancient World”). The talk itself will be 20-30 minutes and will be interesting as Martina sets out some examples of replicas of baths buildings, forts, and so on. Those wishing to attend, contact David Kennedy.
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