

1998

Review of *Il Palatino nel Medioevo: Archeologia e topografia (secoli VI-XIII)*, by Andrea Augenti

Dale Kinney

Bryn Mawr College, dkinney@brynmawr.edu

[Let us know how access to this document benefits you.](#)

Follow this and additional works at: http://repository.brynmawr.edu/hart_pubs

 Part of the [History of Art, Architecture, and Archaeology Commons](#)

Custom Citation

Kinney, Dale. Review of *Il Palatino nel Medioevo: Archeologia e topografia (secoli VI-XIII)*, by Andrea Augenti. *American Journal of Archaeology* 102 (1998): 213-214, doi: 10.2307/506166.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College. http://repository.brynmawr.edu/hart_pubs/3

For more information, please contact repository@brynmawr.edu.

IL PALATINO NEL MEDIOEVO: ARCHEOLOGIA E TOPOGRAFIA (SECOLI VI–XIII), by *Andrea Augenti*. (*Bull. Com Suppl.* 4.) Pp. 209, figs. 63, plans 31, map 1, tables 5. "L'ERMA" di Bretschneider, Rome 1996. Lit. 220,000. ISBN 88-7062-932-5.

The bibliography at the end of this volume contains 455 items, of which 217, nearly 48%, were published within the preceding 10 years. The breathtaking pace of archaeological investigation and discovery in this period puts a premium on synthetic works like this one, which allow us all to come abreast of new developments. For all the modesty of his authorial persona, Augenti has undertaken a work of considerable ambition: a collection and correlation of not only the archaeological, but also the written evidence for the history of the Palatine in the Middle Ages. Since archaeologists will not stop working, his synthesis will necessarily be ephemeral; nevertheless, it will have long-lasting positive effects. He has produced a useful and thought-provoking compendium for which he deserves our hearty thanks.

The book has two principal parts: a synthetic chronological overview, with separate chapters treating the sixth, seventh–eighth, ninth–10th, and 11th–13th centuries (11–123), and a catalogue of 64 individual sites and finds (125–54). The author begins with a discussion of whether the Augustan Regio X (Palatium) became part of the second ecclesiastical region or of the fourth. He dismisses another alternative, that the area was excluded from any early ecclesiastical jurisdiction, because it rests on an argument *ex silentio*. But arguments from silence are not always wrong, and it remains to be disproved that the Forum and the Palatine were somehow immune to the earliest claims for ecclesiastical administration. In any case, Augenti takes as his own demarcations the four streets bounding Regio X: the Sacra Via on the north side through the Forum; the Vicus Tuscus between the Forum and the Velabrum; a passage separating the Palatine and the Circus Maximus; and the road connecting the Circus with the Arch of Constantine. This definition is pragmatically effective, as most of Augenti's archaeological data come not from the summit of the hill, but from the slopes and the buildings aligned with them, like the Atrium Vestae. It does not necessarily follow that the area so defined retained functional, symbolic, or perceptual integrity throughout the period of his investigation.

A conspectus of the archaeological evidence is best obtained by a do-it-yourself collation of the volume's foldout plan and the catalogue, the numbers of which have been entered as findspots on the plan. Nearly all of the numbers in the palace proper are concentrated in the Domus Augustana, and most of those are in the hippodrome, whose remodeling in the Gothic period is fairly well known. Other finds include a seal of the exarch Paul (A.D. 723–726) discovered in a fill layer (?) in the lower peristyle (cat. 11), and a ninth (?) century arcosolium tomb and a painted niche in two rooms of the upper story (cat. nos. 64, 13), which may have belonged to the ninth-century monastery of San Cesario. No finds at all are indicated in the Domus Flavia. In the area of the mysterious Domus Tiberiana there are three, a robbers' trench and two tomb sites (cat. nos. 27, 29, 31). One of the latter (cat. 27), on the west side of the

Farnese Gardens that cover the imperial buildings, yielded remains of two adults laid out on the "ancient pavement" under a stratum datable to ca. A.D. 500. The other burial site is on the north, over a layer dating to the mid-sixth century. The robbers' trench on the same side predates the seventh century.

Simply looking at the distribution of this evidence on the plan, it is easy to imagine that the regular imperial visitations of the fifth century, documented in written sources from Honorius (403) to Theoderic (500), were staged principally in the Domus Augustana, the part of the palace in closest conjunction with the Circus Maximus. The combination of palace and circus accords well with what we know of the practices of imperial display in late antiquity, and it resembles the situation of the Great Palace in Constantinople. Presumably—although Augenti is rightly cautious about the significance of the badly described find of the exarchal seal—the Byzantine government that destroyed and succeeded the Gothic one took up residence in those same buildings. It is equally easy to imagine that while imperial representation was concentrated in this area of the palace, the northern zones toward the Forum were, literally and figuratively, let go. This would explain the burials on the periphery of the Domus Tiberiana, and the mid-fifth-century "stratum of abandonment" in the precinct of the Temple of Elagabalus (present Vigna Barberini) in the northeast sector, which subsequently also became a site of burial (cat. 55). Neglect or de facto alienation of the Domus Tiberiana would also explain the ecclesiastical occupation of its quondam vestibule, possibly as early as the sixth century, and the subsequent use of this building (S. Maria Antiqua) as a showcase for papal pictorial advertisements, including some messages opposed to the interests of the exarchy. In other words, it seems possible that, in late antiquity, imperial authority turned its face toward the Circus and the zones beyond it to the south and east, leaving the Forum at its back for occupation and displays by other forces, including the church.

Augenti's reading of this evidence is slightly different, upholding the integrity of all three imperial Domus through the Gothic War, after which the Domus Tiberiana was abandoned, and the residence of the Byzantine dux was confined to the Domus Augustana (46). This chronology allows him to introduce the theory of a slow but inexorable "Christianization" of the Palatine (45; cf. 76 fig. 36), marked by the foundations of S. Anastasia (fourth century), S. Maria Antiqua (sixth century), S. Teodoro and S. Cesario (ca. A.D. 600). But S. Anastasia and S. Teodoro stand unequivocally outside the functional boundaries of the palace, while S. Cesario, mentioned in a dubious document of the sixth century and again in 603 (41–42, 50), was probably what later parlance would call a palatine chapel, thus a dependency of the palace rather than an outpost of a competing institution. In my view, the evidence for ecclesiastical infiltration of the imperial zone is weak to nonexistent before the Carolingian period, when the palace was abandoned and the site became suitable for monks. S. Cesario was endowed with a Greek monastery before A.D. 827 (64), and a Benedictine church and monastery, S. Maria in Pallara, were founded by two lay donors on the site of the Temple of Elagabalus (65). The German kings who claimed imperial dominion shunned the Palatine entirely, except perhaps for Otto III (983–1002), who

issued two privileges in a monastery that may have been S. Cesario (74). Meanwhile, the bellicose families who terrorized the city in the 10th and 11th centuries began to encamp around the edges. In an especially interesting chapter, Augenti shows how the Frangipane dominated the Palatine in the 11th and 12th centuries by making strongholds at strategic points along the roads below it, leaving the summit to monks, micro-agriculture, and “a massive work of spoliation” (107) of the ruins.

One quibble: the author (40) perpetuates the myth that S. Maria Antiqua took its name from an ancient icon now in S. Francesca Romana (S. Maria Nova). There is no good evidence for this connection, only a fleeting reference in the *Liber pontificalis* (L. Duchesne ed. [Paris 1886] I, 419) to an “*imaginem antiquam*” that, in context, seems to have belonged to a monastery near the Lateran. Since the purported association of the icon with S. Maria Antiqua has been the basis for further speculative conclusions about both church and icon, its *damnatio memoriae* is overdue.

DALE KINNEY

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY OF ART
BRYN MAWR COLLEGE
BRYN MAWR, PENNSYLVANIA 19010
DKINNEY@BRYNMAWR.EDU

DOWN FROM OLYMPUS: ARCHAEOLOGY AND PHILHELLENISM IN GERMANY, 1750–1970, by *Suzanne L. Marchand*. Pp. xxiv + 400, figs. 35. Princeton University Press, Princeton 1996. \$39.50. ISBN 0-691-04393-0.

Marchand's great virtue is that she is neither an archaeologist nor German, but an American Germanist. Christopher Stray is her philological parallel. This gives her the needed distance so that she sees German archaeology in context as part of contemporary politics and cultural history. We have something other than a series of digs. Rather, archaeology is treated as part of philhellenism. Further, and to her credit, she not only reads published German accurately, but can control unpublished, handwritten archival material. There the important information lies, in the private letters of pre-telephone correspondents, or the minutes of confidential meetings. Her range is wide: from Winckelmann through my teacher, Werner Jaeger. Schliemann was the exception. Excavations normally were financed by the state. Wilhelm II's fascination with archaeology was crucial. There are excellent remarks on the invigorating contribution of archaeology to an arid philology at the end of the 19th century. The breakdown of the Hellenocentric view of antiquity to include the East is set against contemporary foreign policy. She misses Goethe's influential *Maximen und Reflexionen* no. 763, that lurked behind Wilamowitz's question “Is Egyptology worth a man's life?” We have useful emphasis on governmental funding, museums, school reform, popular reception of finds, and much else that an archaeologist will find new and stimulating. A welcome bibliography concludes the volume, but often she is ignorant of republication in *Kleine Schriften* and of corrected reprints.

I note three fundamental flaws in the book. Numerous men, many little known to readers, are discussed. Their dates ought consistently to have been provided at first mention. This yields chronological context. Better still would have been a *Personenregister* at the end. Next, repeatedly, crucial source citations are given in the form of “X. quoted in Y.” Typical, for example, are 18 ns. 49–50; 19 n. 55; 41 n. 8; 47 n. 32; 104 n. 90; 126 n. 27; and 135 n. 59. The reader should not be required to track down references: that is the author's task. Or translations are cited instead of the original text: e.g., 15 n. 38; 16 n. 40. That is unfortunate in a book intended for an international audience. Most pernicious is the repeated intrusion of the author's ideology: a mixture of political correctness and German-bashing. One recalls those who dismiss Plato because he bought and sold men. She regrets (xxiii) the lack of women in German academia, alleging that “there was no German equivalent of Jane Harrison or Amelia Edwards.” She has never heard of Margarete Bieber, not to speak of the brilliant Platonist, Eva Sachs. Repeatedly she uses the words “elite” and “elitist” as terms of reproach. The Germans must be reprimanded because they had schools that educated brilliant students well. She utterly misrepresents the *Gymnasien*. Sons of the ruling class regularly avoided humanistic preparatory schools for the *Ritterakademie*. Wilamowitz, to the disgust of his father, attended *Pforte*; his three brothers the *Ritterakademie* in Brandenburg. How can one speak of “the hated academic elite” in Germany (329)? They were/are far more respected and better paid than in America. We are told of the sexagenarian Carl Robert's bizarre attempt to join up in 1914 (239), but nothing of Diels's disgust with the war speeches of Wilamowitz and Meyer. I could go on.

There are inexplicable gaps. She ignores the vast role of academies in directing German classical scholarship. One thinks of *IG*, *CIL*, and *CMG*. She does not understand that a reason for the preponderance of Protestant scholars over Catholic ones was that pastors produced sons; celibate priests did not. Hence many German classicists until recently were pastors' sons. There is nothing on the hospitality of German universities to Jewish professors before 1933, in contrast to their exclusion in the United States until 1933.

If I were to write a history of nuclear physics in America, I should ask a nuclear physicist to vet mercilessly my penultimate draft. It is a pity that Marchand's manuscript was not read by competent referees. One finds appalling gaffs: *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecorum* (75); Pauli-Wissowa (76); Herrman Usener (140)! She cannot cite German noble names correctly (e.g., p. 165, correct to Karl Freiherr von Stein). She is ignorant of fundamental secondary literature. And there are errors of fact that cause the informed reader to query the author's competence to draw cogent conclusions. Here are 12: 1) Gladstone “produced a multi-volume commentary on Homer” (17); 2) F.G. Welcker “avoided the perilous trip” to Greece (52) (his two-volume Greek diary was published in 1865); 3) “Life is short; art is long” is attributed to Goethe rather than Hippocrates, *Aph.* 1 (75); 4) Wilamowitz, aged 23 and without a job, is called an “establishment figure” (126); 5) Rohde was Ritschl's student at Leipzig, not Bonn (130); 6) Paul de Lagarde was an Old Testament scholar, not “a German philologist” (134);