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One of the most influential images in Giovanni Battista Piranesi's *Prima parte di architetture, e prospettive*, a collection of engravings published in 1743, was the *Ponte magnifico* (Fig. 1). It shows a view through the archway on one of the short projections of a U-shaped bridge. Indeed magnificent, this bridge is adorned with freestanding columns, Doric on the lower level and Ionic on the upper, a colonnade, and a central feature that takes the form of a triumphal arch. Its functionality is uncertain: the main structure conceivably forms a kind of island in the middle of the lake, the bank to the side being reached, perhaps, by the side spans. But this hardly matters, since the essential quality of the bridge is its magnificence. Its origins in the designs by Andrea Palladio for the Rialto Bridge are well known (Fig. 2). Equally well known is the extent of its influence, which ranged from Canaletto's views of Westminster Bridge to works by Hubert Robert, Thomas-Jean de Thomon, Pierre-Antoine de Machy, and others. It undoubtedly contributed to a burst of invention on the theme of the triumphal bridge by artists associated with the French Academy in the 1740s, such as Ennemond-Alexandre Petitot, Nicolas-Henri Jardin (Fig. 3), and Charles-Michel-Ange Challe. Subsequently, monumental triumphal bridges became a common theme in the competitions of the academies, notably at the Accademia di S. Luca in 1777 (won by Bernardo Vittone), at the French Academy in 1774, 1779, 1783, and 1786 (the last won by Jean-Baptiste-Louis-François Lefebvre), and at the Royal Academy of Arts in London in 1776 (won by John Soane, with the first version of his *Triumphal Bridge*, revised in a more Neoclassical style in 1791).

Yet Piranesi (Fig. 1) called his bridge not a "triumphal" bridge (*ponte trionfale*), but a "magnificent" one (*ponte magnifico*). Given the contribution his design made to the "triumphal bridge" tradition, why did Piranesi himself embrace the idea of a *ponte trionfale*? In order to answer this question, it is first necessary to establish what made a bridge "triumphal." The idea of a "triumphal" bridge goes back to the Renaissance, arising from the topographical inquiries of Renaissance humanists and centered on the remains of the Pons Neronianus, a bridge over the Tiber located a short way downstream of the Ponte Sant'Angelo. By surveying the idea of the triumphal bridge and its representations from the Renaissance to Piranesi, by way of Flavio Biondo, Onofrio Panvinio, Pirro Ligorio, Nicolas Poussin, Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach, and Filippo Juvarra, this article will explore the ways in which the subgenre of the architectural fantasy may best be described as the "magnificent (triumphal) bridge" both grew out of, and kept its distance from, the antiquarian attempt to interpret the Pons Neronianus as the "Pons Triumphiatus." This exploration will show that Piranesi was as deeply involved with the archaeological problem of the triumphal bridge as he was with the fantasy genre of the magnificent bridge, and will reveal that Piranesi's archaeological investigation of the triumphal bridge played an important role in the creative process that resulted in the greatest antiquarian topographical fantasy ever made, the *Ichnographia*, the large map of ancient Rome made by Piranesi's book *Il Campo Marzio dell'antica Roma* of 1762.

The Pons Neronianus and the Renaissance Antiquarian Tradition

Just below the Castel Sant'Angelo the Tiber makes a sharp bend, changing direction more than ninety degrees, enclosing the area of the city to the northwest of the Oratory of the Filippini (Figs. 4, 6). This is the natural site for a bridge connecting the Campo Marzio to the Vatican, as the nineteenth-century engineers who built the Corso Vittorio Emanuele and the Ponte Vittorio Emanuele II recognized. Yet from the Middle Ages until the nineteenth century the crossing was by the Ponte Sant'Angelo, the former Pons Aelius, upstream and almost at right angles to the most direct crossing. In antiquity, however, there had been a bridge at the Tiber bend. A little upstream of the Ponte Vittorio Emanuele II, toward the Ponte Sant'Angelo, the remains of an ancient bridge are still visible at low water; before the building of the Tiber embankments they stood clear of the water (Fig. 5). There are good grounds for supposing that this bridge was built by Nero. At that time, the Vatican side of the river, the Ager Vaticanus, contained estates belonging to members of the imperial family, including Nero. Caligula had built there the circus known as the Circus Galeri et Neronis, used by Nero as a private racecourse, while Nero built a naumachia, a stadium for sea battles. Initially Nero's bridge would have been essentially private, the means by which the emperor could more easily reach his properties on the Ager Vaticanus. The Via Aurelia in this area may also date from Nero's reign. Nero's bridge, then, enabled the development of the Vatican area in antiquity. It would seem that it had collapsed by the fourth century, when the Regional Catalogues, lists of the buildings of Rome organized by region, were first compiled, as they do not mention it. During the Middle Ages it was usually known as the Pons Neronianus, although it had other names. In the Renaissance it was firmly identified as the Pons Triumphiatus, following Flavio Biondo's *Roma instaurata*, written in 1444–46 (first printed edition 1471). Biondo, who was well acquainted with the Regional Catalogues, may have taken the reference there to a via "triumfalis" to refer to the road from the bridge across the Ager Vaticanus to the area around the site of St. Peter's, and by extension applied it to the bridge. Biondo also states that certain ruins were part of a gateway to the bridge, thus initiating a tradition maintaining that there was an arch on one bank or the other. The Renaissance identification of the "Pons Neronianus" with the "Pons Triumphiatus" was thus
a consequence of the identification of the route from the bridge across the Vatican as the Via Triumphalis.

The Via Triumphalis
Determining the nature of the Via Triumphalis presents many problems. Some topographers have denied that a street of this name ever existed, but inscriptions referring to the "curator" of the Via Aurelia Nova, Via Cornelia, and Via Triumphalis confirm its reality. Since the Via Aurelia Nova and Via Cornelia were both on the right bank of the Tiber in the Vatican area, it can be assumed that the Via Triumphalis was there as well. Other inscriptions indicate the presence of brickyards associated with a street of this name. Filippo Coarelli has suggested that the name must predate the fourth century B.C.E., since it is unlikely that such a name would have been chosen following the building of the Via Appia, after which new roads took the name of the public official responsible for them.

Today, the Via Triumphalis is generally identified with the route known since the Renaissance as the Via Trionfale, a section of which still bears this name, which diverged from the Via Cassia at La Giustiniana near the "Tomb of Nero," descended Monte Mario, crossed the Prati di Castello, and entered the Vatican at Porta Angelica. It is then supposed to have crossed the Ager Vaticanus and the Pons Neronianus. At this point, Renaissance and later antiquarians conflate the issue of a road called the Via Triumphalis with the issue of the route followed by triumphal processions. Hence, nineteenth-
century excavators, to some extent still under the spell of the Renaissance topographers, identified remains near the Via del Pellegrino in the Campo Marzio as belonging to the Via Triumphalis. Rodolfo Lanciani, for example, in the *Forma Urbis Romae* (1893–1901) indicates it as a road running from the Pons Neronianus to the Theater of Pompey, the later part of which more or less follows the route of the Via del Pellegrino (Fig. 6).²⁵

If this was the route followed by Roman triumphs on entering the city, a number of topographical problems emerge. According to the ancient sources, the *pompa triumphalis* crossed the *pomerium*, the symbolic city boundary beyond which soldiers could not take their weapons, through a gate in the Servian Walls called the Porta Triumphalis. This gate can be identified with one arch of a double arch known as the Porta Carmentalis,²⁶ whose location is consistently indicated by the ancient sources as being near the Capitol. Present opinion locates it near S. Omobono toward the Foro
Boario. It is represented on a number of coins and reliefs, including the Aurelianic Adventus and Prefectio reliefs on the Arch of Constantine. This location corresponds to what is known about the location of the Republican pomerium. During the reign of Claudius, however, the pomerium was enlarged, taking in at least part of the Campus Martius, which since Republican times had undergone considerable development. This raises the possibility that the road from the Pons Neronianus crossed the pomerium before reaching the Porta Carmentalis, which would imply a new Porta Triumphalis, for which there is no evidence. On the contrary, the detailed account of the triumph of Vespasian and Titus in 79 C.E. by Josephus (The Jewish War, 7.123-27) makes it clear that the traditional Porta Triumphalis near the Capitol was still in use.

The boundary of the pomerium, identifiable from excavated cippi, or boundary markers, was changed again under Vespasian, and Coarelli has argued that the new boundary left an extrapomerial strip between the pomerium and the Tiber extending from the Pons Neronianus to the Porta Carmentalis, and that this area had strong triumphal associations. If so, the triumphal army might have crossed the Tiber at the Pons Neronianus and proceeded down the extrapomial strip to an area near the Porta Carmentalis. Richardson, on the other hand, prefers to confine the extrapomial area to one between the Porta Carmentalis and the Pons Aemilius (Ponte Rotto), which would thus have been the means by which the triumphal armies crossed the Tiber. Yet Josephus's account supports Coarelli's interpretation, as does the evidence of the cippi.

From the Renaissance onward, the identification of the route over Monte Mario and across the Pons Neronianus to the Capitol with the Via Triumphalis has encouraged the belief that the triumphal procession was in effect a procession leading from beyond the city to within it, a belief no doubt reinforced by ceremonial entries of Renaissance rulers that often took this form. In fact, although the area of the Campus Martius near the riverbank had particular significance for triumphs, the pompa triumphalis itself was more localized. It normally began at the Circus Flaminius in the Campus Mar-
tius and ended at the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus Capitolinus on the Capitol. Where the armies camped was relatively unimportant, provided, of course, that they did so outside the pomerium. In the case of the triumph of Vespasian and Titus, Josephus writes that the triumphal armies spent the night before not near the Palatine, as was apparently to be expected, but near the temple of Sis — that is, in the Campus Martius, probably in the Villa Publica. At dawn, Vespasian and Titus proceeded to the Porticus of Octavia, at the lower end of the Campus Martius, close to the Capitol. They ascended a tribunal in front of the porticoes there, which were crowded with soldiers. After the soldiers were dismissed to their customary banquet, Vespasian and Titus withdrew to the Porta Triumphalis and passed through it. They took refreshment, sacrificed to the statues of the gods that stood by the gate, and sent the pageant on its way, making a detour through the theaters — that is, the Theaters of Marcellus, Balbus, and Pompey — to give the crowds a better view. The procession ended at the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus Capitolinus.

If the *pompa triumphalis* was a relatively localized procession, why was the road on the Vatican bank called the Via Triumphalis in antiquity? Recently, Coarelli has proposed that the name does not, in fact, refer to the route followed by triumphators, but had other origins. He suggests that it was a name given to the old Via Veientana, the road from Rome to Veii, when that name became redundant after the destruction of Veii in 396 B.C.E. The name Via Triumphalis would have seemed appropriate since the victor, Camillus, would have led his victorious armies along this route to his triumph, and since this road would have led directly to the Porta Triumphalis at the foot of the Capitol. (At this date the crossing of the Tiber would presumably have been effected by a ferry or ford.)

When Aurelian built the new walls of Rome he relocated the *pomerium* again to correspond with the walls, thus eliminating the extrapomerial strip. The walls now ran along the Vatican bank of the river past the Pons Neronianus, at which point there would necessarily have been an opening. Hence, as Coarelli suggests, Aurelian may have placed a new Porta Triumphalis in front of the Pons Neronianus, thus restoring the Porta Triumphalis to the sacred boundary of the city as it had earlier been when it was an opening in the Servian Walls. In essence, this is the state of affairs that interested Renaissance antiquarians: a Via Triumphalis that crossed the Ager Vaticanus and the Pons Neronianus and continued to the Capitol, and a Porta Triumphalis associated with the Pons Neronianus.

The Porta Triumphalis and Porta Triumphalis according to Renaissance Antiquarians

From Flavio Biondo onward, Renaissance antiquarians were convinced of the importance of the Via Triumphalis, and given the importance of the Pons Neronianus for this route, it is not surprising to find a steadily strengthening belief that it was a "pons triumphalis." This belief would be consolidated in the boldest possible way with the publication in 1748 of Giovanni Battista Nolli's *Pianta di Roma*, where the foundations of the bridge are clearly so labeled (Fig. 4). Opinions were more divided over the whereabouts of the Porta Triumphalis, given the problem of the location of the *pomerium* and the fact that the written sources indicated that it was near the Capitol. Most antiquarians, however, favored the view that it was associated with the bridge. In addition to Biondo, for example, both Lucio Fauno in 1542 and Bernardo Camuccio in 1569 located the Porta Triumphalis at the end of the bridge on the Vatican side, near S. Spirito in Sassia.

In Pirro Ligorio's small map of 1553, for the first time the Porta Triumphalis is given graphic form (Fig. 7). A "Porta Triumphalis" is shown on the Campus Martius side, associated with, but separate from, the "Pon. Triumphalis." On the Vatican bank is the Porta Aurelia, completely unrelated to the bridge. In his large map of 1561, the *Antiquae urbis imago* (Fig. 8), the Porta Triumphalis, although unlabeled,
again identifiable as the arch at the Campus Martius end of the bridge. Well aware of the late date of the Leonine Walls, Ligorio lined the right bank of the Tiber with a wall stretching from the Mausoleum of Hadrian to beyond the point where it meets the walls of Aurelian in Trastevere near the Porta Settimiana. Where this wall passes the Pons Triumphalis it is pierced by another arched gateway, identified as the Porta Aurelia, since both the Via Aurelia, from the southwest, and the Via Triumphalis, from the west, converge on this point. The Via Triumphalis forms a wide and undefined area labeled “Campus Triumphalis,” which curves around the west end of the Circus Gai et Neronis and then presumably heads off north toward Monte Mario. The continuation of the Via Triumphalis across the Campus Martius is indicated by the words “Via Triumplali,” somewhere in the region of the modern Via del Pellegrino. Ligorio, however, was not greatly concerned with clarifying routes, leaving the relationship between the road from the Pons Aelius and the Via Triumphalis unclear. Probably they are understood to meet after the road from the Pons Aelius had passed through the Arch of Gratianus and Theodosius. From there it would go by the Theater of Pompey. Ligorio was interested in the Regional Catalogues, at the time ascribed to “Sextus Rufus” and “Publius Victor,” to the extent that his 1553 map “can be considered as a publication of the catalogues,” but, as we have seen, the catalogues refer only to a Via “triumfalii” of unidentified location. Probably he followed Biondo’s lead in identifying the road across the Ager Vaticanus to the bridge of Nero as the Via Triumphalis and extrapolated its continuation across the bridge into the Campus Martius.

Perhaps more influential than Ligorio’s map in establishing the reality of the Pons and Via Triumphalis in the Renaissance imagination was Onofrio Panvinio’s map of 1565 (Fig. 9). Bearing the same name as Ligorio’s large perspective plan, it cut Ligorio’s speculations down to size, and it may have been more acceptable to those who distrusted the element of fantasy in Ligorio’s work. Unlike Ligorio, Panvinio was interested in routes. Like Ligorio, he walled the Tiber from the Mausoleum of Hadrian to the point where it meets the Janiculum, just past the bridge. Although he calls the bridge “Pons Vaticanus,” he is still thinking of the Via Triumphalis, since there is a “P.[orta] et V.[ilia] Triumphalis” in the wall on the Vatican bank, corresponding to Ligorio’s Porta Aurelia. There is no arch on the Campus Martius side of the bridge. Like Ligorio, Panvinio was uncertain about the route of the Via Triumphalis across the Ager Vaticanus. The road splits into three. The main branch, and the one retaining the name, crosses the Vatican hill past the end of the Circus Gai et Neronis, which is placed here instead of in the valley, and joins the Via Aurelia on the far side. The Via Aurelia is thus for Panvinio the more northerly route, skirting the back of
the Mons Vaticanus and running slightly to the north of the Meta Romuli, a Roman pyramid destroyed in 1499 in making the Via Alessandria, to enter its gate close beside the Mausoleum of Hadrian. In the Campus Martius, the Via Aurelia passes through the Arch of Arcadius and Honorius to rejoin the Via Triumphalis near the Villa Publica, here located on Monte Giordano, and from there goes past the Theater of Pompey.

How Panvinio understood the Via Triumphalis to have functioned is made clear in the series of engravings depicting a Roman triumph attached to the publisher Gian Giacomo de Rossi’s 1649 reissue of Étienne Dupérac’s 1574 map of ancient Rome that reflect Panvinio’s ideas. This triumph is based on those of L. Paulus, P. Africanus Aemilianus, Pompey, Julius Caesar, Augustus, Vespasian, Trajan, and other Roman emperors. It is shown starting at the Porta Triumphalis (last panel), understood to be located in the walls on the Vatican bank, with the adlocutio (address) of the emperor and a sacrifice taking place outside the walls. There is no indication of the Pons Vaticanus, even though this was marked on Panvinio’s map, implying that the bridge had no significance other than as the means by which the Via Triumphalis was carried over the river. The triumph culminates on the Capitol at the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus (first panel). Like all the maps of this period, it does not show a Porta Triumphalis at the foot of the Capitol.

Although employing a different framework, Dupérac in his small map of 1573 describes the same arrangement as Panvinio’s, but with greater clarity. His large map of 1574 (Fig. 10), although based on Ligorio’s *Imago urbis*, draws on other sources, including the first fragments of the Severan marble map of Rome, which began to emerge starting in 1562, and retains Panvinio’s “Pons Vaticanus” appellation, while clarifying greatly Ligorio’s treatment of the routes. The Via Triumphalis is for the first time clearly shown as a road crossing the Campus Martius. The Arch of Arcadius and Honorius is again located on the road from the Pons Aemilius, at a point shortly before it meets the Via Triumphalis. The Via Triumphalis continues past the Theaters of Pompey and Marcellus before losing its identity in the Forum Olitorium, which is here located between the Theater of Marcellus and the Capitol. Like Ligorio, Dupérac showed an arch with a pediment on the Campus Martius end of the bridge, but the gate in the wall corresponding to Ligorio’s Porta Aurelia is now apparently the Porta Triumphalis, following Panvinio, since the inscription along the route passing through it reads *ET PORTA ... VIA TR a M PHALIS*. The space between the walls and the Tiber implied in Ligorio is here made explicit, clearly depicting the Porta Triumphalis as structurally distinct from the bridge. The *pomerium* is indicated as being an open space on the Vatican side of the walls. In short, Dupérac modeled his map on Ligorio but followed Panvinio in locating the Pons Triumphalis in the wall on the Vatican bank, perhaps because of the nexus between the Porta Triumphalis and the *pomerium*.

At around this time there were a number of projects for rebuilding the Pons Neronianus, revivals of the project by Julius II to connect the Vatican to the Campo Marzio by way of the Via Giulia and a new bridge to be built on the foundations of the Pons Neronianus. A drawing by Dupérac of the Castel Sant’Angelo from the Dyson Perrins Codex, the “remnant of an illustrated manuscript guide to the city of Rome for the Holy Year 1575,” shows a project, prompted by the perception that the Ponte Sant’Angelo and Castel Sant’Angelo were flood hazards, to remove the arches of the Ponte Sant’Angelo near the Castel Sant’Angelo and extend the moat around the Castel Sant’Angelo (Fig. 11). This project necessitated the construction of a new bridge on the site of the Pons Neronianus that would feed traffic directly into the Borgo Nuovo. Dupérac’s drawing shows a gateway on the Vatican side of this bridge (the Campo Marzio side is not visible), which, however, seems to have been prompted less by triumphal imagery than by the need to suitably pierce a wall lining the Vatican bank.

The maps of Ligorio, Panvinio, and Dupérac established the main possibilities subsequently followed. Later maps usually noted a gate on the Vatican end of the bridge, either in the walls or attached to the bridge, and less often, following Ligorio, also one on the Campus Martius end. The name of the gate changes according to the topographical point of view; sometimes it is the Porta Triumphalis, following Panvinio, or the Porta Aurelia, following Ligorio. The way this gate and bridge should be visualized is best indicated by an illustration in Giacomo Lauro’s popular compendium of antiquarian images, *Antiquae urbis splendor*, published in Rome, 1612–28 (Fig. 12), versions of which appeared in guidebooks, such as those by de Rossi and François Desene. Here, following Ligorio, Lauro places a conventional threepassage triumphal arch on the Vatican bank, which is not
11 Dupérac, Castel Sant’Angelo, from the Dyson Perrins Codex. New York, Pierpont Morgan Library ms M.1106, fol. 6 (photo: Joseph Zehavi)

Physically connected to the bridge. The bridge itself seems to be modeled on the Ponte Sisto, enriched with parapet statues.

Early-seventeenth-century opinion, essentially corresponding to Panvinio, is summed up in Antonio Bosio’s Roma sotterranea (first published posthumously in 1634). Bosio placed the Porta Trionfale on the Vatican bank of the Tiber, close to the Ponte Trionfale (Pons Neronianus), on the site of the Ospedale di S. Spirito:

The Porta Trionfale, which no longer exists, originally stood in that part of the city where the Ospedale di S. Spirito is found, as the writers on Roman antiquities affirm. It stood almost on the bank of the river, where there was a bridge likewise called “Trionfale” that debouched almost at the gate, the remains of which can be seen today in the middle of the Tiber.

Bosio gives a description of the triumph based on Josephus’s account of the triumph of Titus and Vespasian, as he might that the Porta Triumphalis referred to by Josephus was near the Capitol. He makes clear, nevertheless, that the city was entered only after crossing the bridge and, citing Biondo, identifies as Via Trionfale the route from the Capitol only as far as the temple of Apollo and the site of St. Peter’s on the Vatican bank. The name Via Trionfale, he argues, was particularly appropriate for this route since it led to the Vatican cemetery where Saint Peter and his successors were buried. This “closed” reading of the Via Triumphalis would be of some significance for Piranesi, as discussed below.

Elizabeth Cropper and Charles Dempsey have argued that Bosio’s understanding of the Pons Triumphalis is reflected in Nicolas Poussin’s The Sacrament of Ordination (Fig. 13). Anthony Blunt had identified the city in the background as a representation of Caesarea Philippi in Palestine, the historical setting of the event. Poussin, he argued, drew on various sources to create a historically accurate image of Caesarea. The bridge was based on Palladio’s reconstruction of the Roman bridge at Rimini, while the pyramidal structure may have been based on a tomb near Jerusalem, as recorded in an engraving in Giovanni Zuanardi’s Il devolissimo viaggio di Gerusalemme (Rome, 1587) or possibly on Roman tombs on the Via Appia. Cropper and Dempsey, however, argue that while Poussin was well aware of the historical setting, in order to draw out the significance of the event for the doctrine of the Apostolic succession and the authority of the Roman Church, he made Rome the symbolic setting. The monuments should therefore be read in terms of Bosio’s account of the ancient topography of the Vatican. The bridge is the Ponte Trionfale, and it is based on the bridge in Marcantonio Raimondi’s engraving after Raphael’s Massacre of the Innocents, the sources for which are indubitably Roman; the pyramidal building is Bosio’s Tomb of Scipio Africanus, that is, the Meta Romuli; the round building is the Castel Sant’Angelo, restored as an imperial tomb; and the buildings at left are the temples of Apollo and Mars on the Vatican Hill. Hence, the site where Christ hands the keys to Saint Peter is the site where St. Peter’s would be erected; the tall pier marks the tomb of Saint Peter; and the letter “E” with which it is inscribed refers to Ecclesia, the Church.

While Poussin was concerned more with symbolic than spatial relations, it may be worth exploring the setting of Poussin’s painting from the perspective of cartographic antiquarian topography. In order to do so it is necessary to establish where the river runs. Glimpses of water can be discerned behind Christ’s right leg and the Apostles at left; if this is a continuation of the Tiber, it places the Meta Romuli
on the wrong side of the river. However, if the river is understood to go behind the group of reclining figures on the hillock and behind the pyramidal building, as is perhaps more likely, the pyramidal building would be located on the Vatican bank, as was the Meta Romuli. Even so, the relationship between pyramid, bridge, and mausoleum makes more sense if the bridge is understood to allude to the Pons Aelius rather than the Pons Triumphalis, given that the Meta Romuli in most maps is located between the Pons Triumphalis and the Mausoleum of Hadrian.

Typologically, not all of Poussin’s buildings appear to be correct for the purposes they are asked to serve. Of the two buildings on the hill, only one is pedimented, and therefore definitely a temple. The pyramidal building, which has the form of a cubical building with a pyramidal roof and entrance porticoes, differs from the iconographic tradition of the Meta Romuli. Usually, as in the fresco in the Sala di Costantino by Raphael and Giulio Romano (Fig. 14), it takes the form of a pyramid without a base.66 Likewise, Ligorio and Lauro show it as a simple pyramid in their perspective plans. While a number of mapmakers, beginning with Mario Cartaro, give the Meta Romuli a base, and some provide both a broad base and an additional stage below the pyramid,67 none shows it with a portico or relieving arch, which, as Dempsey has pointed out, are features derived from Ligorio’s representation of a tomb on the Via Asinaria in the Antiquae urbis image.68

Blunt’s identification of the model for Poussin’s bridge with the Augustan bridge at Rimini as reconstructed by Palladio is more convincing than a connection with the bridge in
the Marcantonio print and its Roman models, the Pons Cestius and Pons Fabricius. Admittedly, Poussin would have received no help from Palladio in representing the Pons Triumphantalis, as Palladio in the Quattro libri made no attempt to reconstruct it, merely referring to "The Triumphal [bridge], the piers of which are to be seen opposite the church of Santo Spirito." Yet if Poussin intended the bridge to allude to the Pons Triumphalis, it is perhaps surprising, given the strength of the antiquarian cartographic tradition, that he did not show the Porta Triumphalis. Thus, while Poussin's clustering of elements—bridge, hill, pyramidal building, and mausoleum—demands to be read as referring in a general way to the Vatican and Tiber bend area, in the detailed realization of the setting Poussin actively avoided re-creating the ancient buildings in the area in the way that Raphael had done (Fig. 14), perhaps for fear of undermining the status of the painting as an istoria set in Caesarea.70

The Pons Triumphalis is discussed in the midcentury anti-
quarian studies of Alessandro Donati (1639)71 and Famiano Nardini (1665),72 both of which went through reprints in the eighteenth century.73 Donati, unlike most of his predecessors, questioned the location of the Porta Triumphalis near the Pons Neronianus. He shows the bridge at the Tiber bend with an oversize fortified gateway, emphatically labeled "Porta Triumphalis a multis falso hic posita" (Porta Triumphalis by many falsely placed here) (Fig. 15). He locates the Porta Triumphalis instead in a wall between the Tiber near the Foro Boario and the foot of the Capitoll, adjacent to the Porta Carmentalis.74 Nardini, however, maintained the by-now widespread view of Fauno, Camuccii, and Panvinio that the Ponte Trionfale was at the end of the bridge on the Vatican side.75

Carlo Fontana draws on these and other earlier sources in his Tempio Vaticano, published in 1694 but largely complete by 1687.76 Fontana devotes chapters to the Ponte Trionfale and the Porta Trionfale, with parallel Italian and Latin texts.77 His map of the Vatican area, engraved by Alessandro Specchi, takes the earlier traditions into account and develops them (Fig. 16). The "Strada Trionfale" is shown, as in Ligorio, as a rather indeterminate area between the Tiber and the Circus Gai et Neronis that extends around the foot of the Vatican Hill before forking, the upper fork evidently leading to Monte Mario. On this, Fontana imposes a straight street rendered by a dotted line between the Monte Mario road and the bridge. He allows a generous space between the wall connecting the Mausoleum of Hadrian and the Ponte Trionfale and the river, after which the wall hugs the river closely. The road from the Ponte Trionfale meets the road from the Pons Aelius at a piazza in front of the Arch of Arcadius and Honorius. The Porta Trionfale is developed as a proper city gate with two round towers. It has no distinguishing features other than what are apparently continuations of the parapet onto the right bank all the way to the Mausoleum of Hadrian, along the lines of the large Dupéral map.

Fischer von Erlach and the "Bridge of Augustus"

It will be apparent that, to this point, the Pons Triumphalis was no ponte magnifico. At best it was a plain bridge with no distinguishing features other than the association with a triumphal arch or gateway in the city wall, which was not necessarily placed on the bridge itself. The potential for elaboration implicit in the "triumphal" designation remained latent, perhaps because, with the exception of Ligorio, most of the writers and mapmakers here discussed were antiquarians rather than creative artists. The first hint we have of the possibilities inherent in the appellation "triumphal bridge" is found in Carlo Fontana, an architect and Bernini's most important successor. Less interested in intricate arguments about the ancient sources and happy to summarize the arguments of his predecessors, he allowed himself to paint a word picture of the Pons Triumphalis. He described it as the largest bridge in Rome, groaning under trophies, statues, and memorials:

The Ponte Trionfale was adorned with such noble, and veneration-worthy, statues, trophies, and memorials, left by the Triumphantors to record their own victories, that it is difficult to fully conceive of its richness and magnificence. . . .78

[The Romans] valued this bridge more than the others, because it was destined for the numerous passages of the Triumphantors; whence it can be argued that it was not only
more adorned than the others, but that it was also the largest, being composed of seven arches.\textsuperscript{79}

While this verbal account of the magnificence of the Pons Triumphalis may have contributed to an emerging interest in magnificent bridges, when the magnificent triumphal bridge emerged in the eighteenth century it would not necessarily be associated with the Pons Neronianus.

In his \textit{Entwurf einer historischen Architektur} of 1721, Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach depicted a bridge that is generally considered to have begun the eighteenth-century tradition of the magnificent triumphal bridge (Fig. 17).\textsuperscript{80} Fischer's bridge is undoubtedly triumphal, since a Roman triumph is shown crossing it, complete with elephants, which are given monumental form as statues on top of the arch. Fischer, however, identifies the bridge not with the Pons Neronianus but with a bridge of Augustus on the Via Flaminia. This, he says, was a bridge that the emperor had built over the Tiber on the Via Flaminia leading to Rimini "in order to make the entry of the triumphators more brilliant [\textit{pour rendre l'entrée des triumphants plus éléante}]." On it was erected a triumphal arch in Augustus's honor.

Fischer's sources were Suetonius and Dio Cassius. Suetonius described various works of Augustus, which included the rebuilding of the Via Flaminia. Suetonius associated the Via Flaminia with triumphs, albeit indirectly, but says nothing about a bridge:

and to control the floods he widened and cleared out the channel of the Tiber, which had for some time been filled with rubbish and narrowed by jutting buildings. Further, to make the approach to the city easier from every direction, he personally undertook to rebuild the Flaminian Road all the way to Ariminium (Rimini), and assigned the rest of the high-ways to others who had been honoured with triumphs, asking them to use their prize-money in paving them.\textsuperscript{81}

The bridge comes from Dio Cassius:

In the year already named, perceiving that the roads outside the walls had become difficult to travel as the result of neglect, he ordered various senators to repair the others at their own expense, and he himself looked after the Flaminian Way, since he was going to lead an army out by that route. This road was finished promptly at that time, and statues of Augustus were accordingly erected on arches on the bridge over the Tiber and at Ariminium; but the other roads were repaired later, at the expense either of the public (for none of the senators liked to spend money on them) or of Augustus, as one chooses to put it.\textsuperscript{82}

Both passages seem to be referring to the Via Flaminia close to Rome but outside the city's walls, which points to the Pons Milvius, the next bridge upstream from the Pons Aelius, as the bridge in question.\textsuperscript{83} Fischer may have meant this bridge, but he does not specify. In any case, this bridge had an iconographic tradition of its own, with four equal arches as well as subsidiary arches and flood openings, as well as a gateway on one end, as represented, for example, by Piranesi in his \textit{Veduta del Ponte molle sui tevere due miglia lontan da Roma}

from the \textit{Vedute di Roma}.\textsuperscript{84} On the other hand, Augustus had built another bridge to carry the Via Flaminia, but it was at Rimini and not on the Tiber.\textsuperscript{85} This, perhaps significantly, had a gateway at one end that was sufficiently like a triumphal arch for Piranesi to include it in the \textit{alcune vedute di archi trionfali ed altri monumenti} (1748).\textsuperscript{86} A well-known bridge, it had been drawn in detail by Palladio, who ignored the gateway. Palladio stated explicitly that it had five arches, whereas Fischer showed seven, and he wrote at length about the spurs, which Fischer omitted.\textsuperscript{87} It seems unlikely, therefore, that Fischer was thinking of the bridge at Rimini. The vagueness of Fischer's topographical reference can probably be explained by the fact that he made his engraving in Vienna, at a physical distance from Rome, which he had not visited since his stay there as a young man between 1671 and 1687, and based it primarily on texts and coins, at an intellectual distance from the Roman topographical tradition.

Fischer's reliance on coins is clearly indicated in the top left of the plate, where the source coin is illustrated. A coin of Augustus shows what is presumably a square superstructure, with arches on the two faces in view, pilasters or columns, and
an entablature but no roof. The chariot drawn by elephants is plainly the source for Fischer’s elephant chariot, as are the two stringcourses of the parapet and the seven arches. Georg Kunth suggests that Fischer could have seen an original in the imperial coin collection in Vienna and in Charles Patin’s *Introduction à la connaissance des médailles* of 1667. The use of this coin may explain the originality of the design, which is the first to place a triumphal arch on the center of the bridge. The archaeological *pons triumphalis* tradition always placed the arch at one end, as did most Roman examples, a design that makes sense both structurally and defensively. Although coins of this type had long been known to antiquarians, they had not prompted representations of similar bridges; Fischer may have been alerted to the motif by his representations of Chinese bridges in the same volume.

Fischer’s triumphal bridge (Fig. 17) consists of three main elements. The first is the roadway, which flows smoothly onto the banks on either side. The roadway is not designed as something to be viewed; it can be experienced only in crossing it. This is emphasized by the landscape artist’s device of the long S bend, which commences at the lower left corner and sweeps across the bridge, bending the parapets like rubber, to curve away to the right in the distance beyond the bridge. The second element is the bridge proper, which is simple and functional. It consists of little more than seven arches, diminishing in height away from the center, decorated with alternating projecting voussoirs. These are left floating with respect to the moldings of the parapet, which more or less follow the heights of the arches. The piers have plinths and rusticated bands, without the spurs on the piers to part the waters normally found on Roman bridges.

The third element is the superstructure, the only component that aspires to magnificence. Its plan appears at first sight to be a rectangle extended on the axis of the bridge, but the logic of the closely coupled arch-and-order articulation means that it must in fact be square. Triumphal arches normally have attics, but Fischer was aware that a triumphal bridge needs a different kind of termination. Triumphal arches privilege the frontal faces over the sides, since the archway is primarily a means of passage. In a triumphal bridge, however, the side faces are to some extent in competition with the frontal faces. In Fischer’s bridge, while the frontal arches are still means of passage for the triumphator, the existence of the side arches implies passage at right angles to the crossing, that is, the passage of the river itself through the bridge. (The river as a directional force opposed to the barrier of the bridge, which makes way for it by opening into archways, is vividly realized in Fischer’s view of the Pons Aelius, Fig. 18, which shows a galley passing through the central archway.) The four-sided triumphal arch thus marks the symbolic midpoint of the river, where the center of the transverse movement of the triumph meets the center of the river’s flow. The side arches also function potentially as viewing arches: arches for those on the bridge to look from and for those on the banks upstream and downstream to look at. These factors make the attic normally found on triumphal arches less suitable as a terminating feature. There is also the “practical” and visual need to reduce the weight of the superstructure. Here, Fischer proposed a simple concave-sided roof platform, not suggested by the coin, which helps to improve the visibility of the crowning sculpture.

Although the superstructure responds to the longitudinal extension of the bridge by reaching out with freestanding columns with projecting entablatures (in contrast to the pilasters with shallow entablature projections of the side faces), this is about as far as Fischer went toward integrating superstructure and bridge. As his caption makes clear, it is a triumphal arch erected on a bridge rather than a triumphal bridge.

If Fischer created the eighteenth-century magnificent triumphal bridge tradition, he also consolidated the tradition of representing the Pons Aelius (Fig. 18). For this, too, he referred to coins, as Raphael had done before him. He gave this bridge statues on tall columns and a greater definition by emphasizing the steepness of the side ramps. He also physically separated it from the Mausoleum of Hadrian, which he depicted in a form based on Antonio Labacco’s 1576 engraving.

Both of Fischer’s images were fundamental for the subse-
quent triumphal bridge and ponte magnifico traditions. Paolo Posi's 1755 temporary structure built for the annual Chineia festival in 1755, recorded in an etching by Giuseppe Vasi entitled *Un ponte trionfale ornato con reperti della città di Ercolano, Prima macchina for the Chineia of 1755*, engraving by G. Vasi (photo: Rome, Istituto Nazionale per la Grafica, FC 13095, by permission of the Ministero per i Beni e le Attività Culturali).

**Fischer von Erlach and Filippo Juvarra**

On its publication in 1721, Fischer's *Historischen Architektur* provided an immediate stimulus to fantasy architecture. One of the first to respond was the Sicilian-born architect Filippo Juvarra (1678–1736). First architect to Vittorio Amedeo II of Savoy, king of Sicily and Piedmont, he had lived in Turin for seven years by 1721, although he had spent the previous ten years, from 1704 to 1714, in Rome. Perhaps because he had been exposed to the antiquarian triumphal bridge tradition during his Roman years Juvarra found Fischer's bridge particularly appealing. An architectural capriccio produced in Rome in 1704 reveals the topographical foundations of his invention (Fig. 20). The capriccio shows a bridge attached to a monumental centralized building based on the unit of Pons Aelius and Mausoleum of Hadrian, and the pyramid beyond is topographically in the right position for the Meta Romuli relative to these monuments. The arch on Juvarra's bridge, however, makes it a triumphal bridge. Although we might pedantically count the arches of the bridge and thus conclude that the triumphal arch, like Fischer's, is in the center of the bridge, this may be to miss the point. Seen as an impressionistic image, the arch is at one end, on the city side. It must therefore be derived from the Pons Triumphalis tradition, rather than being an anticipation of Fischer, who, as we have seen, was coming from quite another direction.

In 1721, the year of publication of the *Historischen Architek-
Juvarra made set designs for Ormisada, an opera by Apostolo Zeno produced in Vienna. As Mercedes Viale Ferrero has proposed, the mass of antiquarian detail in the stage directions is difficult to explain without postulating that Zeno was aware of the Historischen Architektur, as when he writes of a “noble bridge of marble outside the greater gate, adorned with obelisks and guglie.”

To be sure, this is hardly a description of Fischer’s bridges, but it is in the same spirit. Even more significant was the staging of Zeno’s Flavio Anicio Olibrio, first performed in Venice in 1707–8 and restaged in Turin in 1722 as Ricimero, with music by Francesco Gasparini. It was performed first in the Teatro Carignano and subsequently, with sets by Juvarra, in the much smaller court theater called “del Rondô.” The stage directions for scene 4 make reference to “the Campus Martius triumphally adorned with a throne and a magnificent bridge over the Tiber” and a “street that leads to Rome, with the remains of ruined buildings.” The first set expressed the grandeur of ancient Rome, the second its decadence. These sets were suppressed in the performance in the court theater because of the limitations of the stage, although Juvarra made drawings for them (Figs. 21, 22). Viale Ferrero associates a third drawing in a similar style, inscribed “Tower on the Tiber in Roman territory,” with stage directions for the same performance that prescribe a view of a “Remote part of the city with tower on the Tiber.” This shows in the foreground a round tower, and the Mausoleum of Hadrian and a pyramid or obelisk beyond. Viale Ferrero has interpreted the set as conveying the same message as the two suppressed sets: the glorious past of Rome represented by the antique monuments, modern barbarism represented by the (medieval) tower, with the river between symbolizing the irrevocable passing of time.

The design for the “street that leads to Rome, with the remains of ruined buildings” depicts a number of monuments, the nearer of which hint at a decrepit state (Fig. 21). The columns in the middle ground display cracks, drum divisions, and weeds, and the juxtaposition of elements implies an uncoordinated cityscape resulting from accretions over time. The drawing includes a pyramid that seems to intersect a section of wall, which suggests a connection with the Pyramid of Cestius rather than with the Meta Romuli, although Juvarra normally makes no distinction in the form of the pyramid itself. For a scene showing Rome in decline, an allusion to the Pyramid of Cestius is appropriate since it most often carries this association. Although restored in
1659–63, it continued to be visualized as a damaged and weed-encrusted structure throughout the eighteenth century, as numerous paintings by Giovanni Paolo Panini demonstrate. Conversely, the Meta Romuli, having been destroyed in 1500, had no tradition of representation as a ruin. When it appears it is represented in a complete form, either derived from one of the early reconstructions going back at least to Filarete’s bronze doors or as a crystalline abstraction, and it normally appears only in images of an ideal or restored ancient Rome. There is also a column of the type represented by Trajan’s Column and a temple that, according to Viale Ferrero, may be derived from an imperial coin, similar to the reconstruction of Trajan’s Forum by Fischer von Erlach. While the temple at the right of Fischer’s reconstruction of Trajan’s Forum, reversed, might well be the source for the temple on the left of Juvarya’s drawing, the connection is tenuous and cuts across the presumed intention to represent the Rome of ruins, that is, medieval or modern Rome.

The design for “the Campus Martius triumphally adorned with a throne and a magnificent bridge over the Tiber” (Fig. 22) shows in the foreground, on the near bank of the Tiber, a structure composed of Solomonic columns like those Gian Lorenzo Bernini used for the baldacchino in St. Peter’s, which are iconographically appropriate for a throne. On the far bank can be seen a monumental building with a broad niche between corner towers that derives from, and may allude to, the Vatican Belvedere. In the middle ground a bridge connects the two banks. That this “magnifico ponte sul Tevere” adorns the Campus Martius “trionfalmente” and is associated with a building based on the Vatican Belvedere rather than the Castel Sant’Angelo indicates that it alludes to the Pons Triumphalis rather than to the Pons Aelius.

Here, for the first time, the Pons Triumphalis is represented as a bridge of real magnificence. It is embelished with paired columns on the piers, parapet statues, what look like trophies, and a tall statue-bearing column, located on what is evidently the central span of a five-arch bridge and presumably matched by another on the opposite parapet. These columns undoubtedly derive from Fischer’s Pons Aelius. The figure statues, too, were probably suggested by the Pons Aelius in its modern guise as the Ponte Sant’Angelo, adorned with statues by Bernini and his school in 1667–72, although they are already present in Lauro’s Pons Triumphalis (Fig. 12). In the absence of a properly magnificent iconography for the Pons Triumphalis, Juvarya not surprisingly turned to the Pons Aelius.

The Pons Aelius, however, interested Juvarya less than the combination of mausoleum (Mausoleum of Hadrian) and pyramid (Meta Romuli). An example can be seen in one of his stage designs for Gaius Bruto. These designs were prepared by Juvarya, and probably colored by someone else, for a handwritten musical codex commissioned by Emperor Joseph I of Austria, with Cardinal Alessandro Albani playing an intermediary role. The emperor, however, died in 1711 before he could receive it, and it was delivered to his successor, Charles VI. Scene 12 represents Livia’s garden on the banks of the Tiber. The garden occupies the foreground, with the mausoleum of Hadrian–Pons Aelius unit on the other side of the river. Beyond it, and only slightly less important, is a tall pyramid on a base, similar to Cartaro’s or Dupérac’s Meta Romuli, in front of a cypress-clad Vatican Hill. (The mausoleum and pyramid are loosely connected by a series of arches, which may have been suggested by the passageway between St. Peter’s and the Castel Sant’Angelo, but may possibly imply Juvarya’s awareness of the Pons Triumphalis, if we invoke our knowledge of the actual topography to suppose that the river passes behind the mausoleum and reaches almost to the pyramid before turning back again to the left.) Another set design that emphasizes the mausoleum-pyramid unit, but seen from the other side (or in reverse), is a set for Titus and Berenice for the Teatro Capranica, Rome, in 1714. In an architectural fantasy in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, set free from the necessity for topographical allusion, Juvarya developed this unit into one in which pyramids flank the mausoleum to create a monumental, symmetrical structure (Fig. 23). This invention would not be lost on Piranesi, as will be discussed below.

Filippo Juvarya: “Triumphal” Bridge into “Magnificent” Bridge
Juvarya produced at least one other design for a bridge that was both magnificent and triumphal (Fig. 24). This comes from a sketchbook, now in the Dresden Kupferstichkabinett, containing forty-one drawings he executed in pen and wash dedicated to Augustus the Strong of Saxony in 1732, although according to Albert Erich Brinckmann at least some of these drawings were executed earlier.
A strong presumption of topographical reference can be posited for this bridge, given that a capriccio in the same set is based on the Tiber Island (Fig. 25). That the Tiber Island is the source is made clear by an earlier drawing by Juvarra in an album in the Tournon collection, Turin, where the topographical elements are more explicitly indicated. In the mid- to late first century B.C.E., part of the island on the downstream side facing the Campo Marzio was modeled in travertine and tufa as the prow of a trireme. The Tournon album drawing shows a view of the island in antiquity from upstream on the Trastevere side, with versions of the Pons Cestius on the right and the Pons Fabricius on the left, the stern of the ship correctly facing upstream. In the background, in the correct topographical relationship, is the Theater of Marcellus. An obelisk forms the mast, as was common in views of the Tiber Island in antiquity. The nearer building, on the upstream side, consists of a squarish structure with a pitched roof ending in a three-quarter rotunda with a dome and bold volutes making the transition from the dome to the entablature of the colonnade (or pilastrade), which may be based on the temple of "Jupiter Licaonis" in related engravings of the Tiber Island by Étienne Dupérac and Giacomo Lauro. On the downstream side in Juvarra's drawing, corresponding to Dupérac's and Lauro's temple of Aesculapius and the modern Ospedale di S. Bartolomeo, is a stepped structure with, apparently, four symmetrical porticoes.

Juvarra's Dresden capriccio (Fig. 25) seems to present the ship from the downstream end, as it shows the projecting oar platforms found in representations of antique galleys and which are present in the ancient travertine and tufa prow. The emphatic treatment of these platforms and the indications of shields and brackets on the prow link it to a drawing of the island from downstream by Giovanni Antonio Dosio, which formed the basis for engravings in guidebooks beginning with Bernardo Gamucci's Le antichità della città di Roma. In Juvarra's drawing the oar platforms appear to support a dangerously oversize building that displays the entwined snakes of Aesculapius above the pediment. This building has elements of both the quadruporticoed and the domed buildings in the Tournon album drawing; it displays colonnades on two sides and an apse on the third. The other end of the island contains a more templelike structure with a full pedimented portico, two towers, and a frieze inscribed with the name of Aesculapius.

It seems likely that the view of the bridge in the other
Dresden drawing (Fig. 24) has a similar degree of topographical reference. The steeply sloping ends of the bridge, necessitating flights of stairs, undoubtedly derive from Fischer's Pons Aelius (Fig. 18), but whereas Fischer is vague about the roadbed on the sides, which presumably takes the form of a ramp, Juvarra turns these into steps, making it like a Venetian bridge. There is no connection with the Pons Aelius, however, in the two arches on the bridge. That these arches are triumphal is made clear by the frieze on the nearer of the two, which refers to Vespasian, whose joint triumph with Titus was well known from Josephus's account, discussed above. The further arch might thus be presumed to refer to Titus. Trophies composed of shields and perhaps flags crown each of the prominent attic pedestals, confirming the triumphal imagery. In the background is a pyramid. Although this may be no more than a generic antique reference, the relationships match the topographical template of the Meta Romuli and the Pons Triumphalis seen from upstream on the Campus Martius bank. It is likely, therefore, that the idea behind this capriccio is the Pons Triumphalis rather than the Pons Aelius. If so, it seems that Juvarra was still searching for a way of representing a bridge that was both triumphal and magnificent. In doing so he returned to the idea stated in the Washington drawing (Fig. 20) of placing a triumphal arch on the bridge. But whereas a single arch must be situated either at one end of the bridge, which results in an asymmetrical design, or over the central arch, which is structurally dubious, twin arches, justified by the double triumph of Titus and Vespasian, can each be located symmetrically over piers. Although a bridge associated with two arches or gateways is found in the tradition derived from Ligorio, these are never both placed on the bridge proper. A precedent for this idea, however, exists in an engraving by Pietro Sante Bartoli, which Giovanni Pietro Bellori used on the title page of his In fragmenta vestigiis veteris roman, 1673 (Fig. 26), and the watercolor on which it was based, by Pietro or his son Francesco (probably the former).<sup>123</sup> This, in turn, was based on a now-lost Roman wall painting discovered in 1668 in the Baths of Titus. The engraving is currently believed to be a view of the Port of Antium.<sup>125</sup> It shows a pier with seven arches extending into the water. Erected on the pier are two double triumphal arches placed transversely with crowning statue groups, two lesser arches supporting statues of horsemen aligned with the length of the pier, and four honorific columns. Although the painting represents a pier rather than a bridge, it bears similarities to the magnificent bridge tradition of the Pons Aelius, especially Fischer von Erlach's engraving (Fig. 18). During his Roman period from 1671 to 1687, Fischer was in contact with Bartoli and therefore probably knew the image;<sup>126</sup> Juvarra, too, may well have known it.<sup>127</sup>

Juvarra was evidently much taken with the formal possibilities of bridges at the time when he produced the Dresden capriccio. The complex geometry hinted at in the spurs of the piers in the Dresden drawing (Fig. 24) is found in a more fully developed form in a capriccio based on the Pont du Gard, part of a sketchbook at Chatsworth dating from 1729.<sup>128</sup> Another of the Chatsworth capriccios introduces a new theme, a central feature embedded in an arcaded superstructure extending the length of the bridge (Fig. 27).<sup>129</sup> Venetian in spirit, this recalls Palladio's experiments with the Rialto Bridge, but his temple front has been replaced with a feature crowned with an attic and trophies, arguably of triumphal significance, and a sarcophagus. Juvarra's solution insists on magnificence, but with the central feature embedded in the arcade, the idea of a freestanding triumphal arch erected on a bridge is played down. The triumphal idea is further played down by the shift from arcades to a straight entablature, the narrowness of the passage down the length of the bridge, and the invisibility of the central feature when approached from this direction. The principal interest of the bridge instead resides in its distant view from the banks, in keeping with Juvarra's practice of designing buildings scenographically, from the outside in.<sup>130</sup> The antiquarian triumphal bridge, the result of topographical inquiry, has become the magnificent triumphal bridge. The essential features of Piranesi's *Ponte magnifico* are already present.
Piranesi and the Pons Triumphalis

The other fantastic and exotic architectural forms—such as a pharos and "Egyptian" pyramids—in Juvanna's Chatsworth drawing, as well as the wide range of architectural references found throughout the Chatsworth sketchbook, suggest that Juvanna had taken his cue from the radically expanded set of architectural possibilities established by Fischer von Erlach's *Historischen Architektur*. For Juvanna, the magnificent triumphal bridge was only one of several themes to be elaborated into a fantastic paper architecture that demonstrated the artist's power of creative invention. Piranesi, on the other hand, approached the problem from a very different perspective. Unlike his contemporaries and successors, he had a clear understanding of what the term "triumphal" really signified. Immersed in the archaeological and antiquarian literature on ancient Roman topography, as well as intimately acquainted with the sites themselves, he would have been aware that his Palladian "ponte magnifico" (Fig. 1) owed little to the antiquarian triumphal bridge tradition.

Indeed, he had good reasons for rejecting outright the antiquarian tradition of the Pons Triumphalis. This tradition rested, as we have seen, on the identification of the remains of the Pons Neronianus with the Pons Triumphalis. Piranesi knew these remains well, and rejected the tradition of identifying them with the Pons Neronianus, and hence with the Pons Triumphalis. In the *Antichità romanee* of 1756 he writes that the piers of the Pons Neronianus, "having been examined by me many times," are to be dismissed on the grounds that they do not bear the slightest indication of being the ruins of a bridge, since they consist of a kind of "meta rotonda" and the remains of a building ("rimasuglio di abitazione") that could not possibly have formed the piers of a bridge.\(^{132}\) In plate xlv of the *Campi Marcii* of 1762 (Fig. 28) he makes a more detailed study of these piers.\(^{133}\) This rarely reproduced plate is not often discussed in the context of the bridge.\(^{134}\) Piranesi's Figure iii (bottom) shows a perspective view of the piers, on which is superimposed his Figure ii, the left half of which gives details of the masonry, including a block with a large pierced lug that projected from the tallest pier near the right bank, and the right half of which shows plans of the remains of the piers. One can see from these plans why Piranesi was skeptical about these being the piers of a bridge. Most of the other bridges have the rounded end of the piers on the downstream side, the upstream side being wedge-shaped to better part the waters, even if the section above normal water level was rounded, as on the Pons Aelius, as Piranesi himself shows it in the previous plate.\(^{135}\) The uneven spacing of the piers and the ruinous structures between them undermined for Piranesi their identification with the piers of a bridge.\(^{136}\)

The remains of the Pons Neronianus as Piranesi knew them are vividly depicted in Gaspar van Wittel's views of the Tiber. One composition looks downstream, toward S. Giovanni dei Fiorentini (Fig. 5).\(^{137}\) The Via Giulia, seen down its length, ends unsatisfactorily in a grassy slope across which meandering paths lead down to the river. Its misalignment with the piers of the Pons Neronianus is vividly conveyed. We see one low pier near the left bank, a second higher pier, various pier remnants, resembling stones in the water, and a third pier, higher than the rest, partly obscured by a floating mill, near the right bank. These are also depicted in the Nolli map (Fig. 4).\(^{138}\) Bernardo Gambarini and Andrea Chiesa's section showing flood levels, which adopts an exaggerated vertical scale, reveals how the two tallest piers were still above the high-water level of April 1742, while the other pier and "stones" emerged above water only at the low-water level of August 1744.\(^{139}\) It discloses that the deepest channel lay between the two highest piers, while the channel between the right bank and the tallest pier acted as the millrace for the floating mill.\(^{140}\)

Looking at van Wittel's and Piranesi's views and plan gives us an idea of what Piranesi meant by a "meta rotonda," for the piers appear to be composed of circular turretedlike structures to which diverging walls are appended rather than
forming a series of coherent piers. Piranesi does not enlighten us as to how they would constitute part of a building other than a bridge.\footnote{141}

Having dismissed the claim of the Pons Neronianus to be a bridge, and hence to be the Pons Triumphalis, Piranesi located the Pons Triumphalis upstream of the Pons Aelius. He had already reached this opinion by the time of the Antichità romane in 1756, where it is shown in his Tavola topografica di Roma, which illustrates the routes and destinations of the aqueducts of Rome (Fig. 29).\footnote{142} The reasons for this move are made clear in plate xiii of part 4 of the Antichità romane (Fig. 50),\footnote{143} and in plates vi\textsuperscript{4} and xlv, figure 1 (Fig. 28), of the Campo Marzio, where Piranesi identifies as part of the Pons Triumphalis a trapezoidal structure that formed part of the foundation of the Teatro di Tor di Nona.\footnote{145} This jutted out into the Tiber and was visible in summer, when the water level was low. The archaeologist D. Marchetti excavated this structure just prior to its destruction during the building of the Tiber embankments in 1890 and made a graphic reconstruction.\footnote{146} Its wedge shape is visible in old photographs of the river side of the Tor di Nona at low water.\footnote{147} Already by the 1824 edition of Ridolfino Veruti’s Accurata e succinta descrizione topografica delle antichità di Roma, Piranesi’s identification was being questioned.\footnote{148} According to modern au-
The Ichnographia

Piranesi's "scientific" archaeology, then, discouraged him from conflating the magnificent bridge with the triumphal bridge. Yet he was anything but unresponsive to the creative possibilities of the antiquarian triumphal bridge tradition. Rather than fastening on the triumphal possibilities of the ponte magnifico, he focused on the creative possibilities of triumphal topography. These he developed in the Ichnographia, the large foldout plan that forms part of the Campo Marzio (Fig. 31). The only real precedent for this supposed reconstruction of a large part of ancient Rome was Pirro Ligorio's 1561 Antiquae urbis imago (Fig. 8). Although based on topographical research, especially the study of coins and the Regional Catalogues, Ligorio's bird's-eye view of ancient Rome is largely imaginary, the fantasy of an antiquarian architect impatient with the limited data at his disposal who wanted to represent ancient Rome as the ancient Romans would have represented it. While Ligorio felt free to invent what he did not know, his project aspired to antiquarian truth. His ancient Rome was an ideal construction, but it was one that was not expected to be mapped onto the reality of the physical Rome of his own day. Piranesi, however, working two hundred years later, had a much better knowledge of the archaeological evidence of the site, and it was therefore a more polemical act to produce a map of Rome that claimed to be, and indeed was, based on archaeological research, and yet freely contradicted that research. The Ichnographia uses archaeology and the example of the Severan marble map of Rome as the basis of not an imaginative reconstruction of
ancient Rome but the greatest antiquarian topographical fantasy ever made. The nature of this transformation of archaeology into fantasy is nowhere better illustrated than by Piranesi’s handling of the Pons Triumphalis and the Via Triumphalis. In order to appreciate the thinking that lay behind his rendering of these features, one needs to understand the creative process that underpins the *Ichnographia*.

The importance of the Severan marble map’s inspiration to the *Ichnographia* cannot be overstated. The marble map is both incomplete and a linear abstraction, and from these two factors arose the possibility of the *Ichnographia*. Incompleteness provided the stimulus to invent what lay between the fragments. Linear abstraction suggested that this invention could be achieved by graphic means, in particular, the plan. As a graphic abstraction, the plan is a potential field for purely formal invention, as Piranesi well knew. As a starting point for the process of invention he began with a kernel of fact, often based on a highly selective response to the archaeological data. The principal kernel in the area associated with the Pons Triumphalis is the unit of Pons Aelius, Mausoleum of Hadrian, and Meta Romuli (Fig. 32). This triad, as we have seen, was central to the antiquarian vision of the area. It was given perhaps its most powerful visualization by Raphael and Giulio Romano in the *Adlocutio of Constantine* in the Sala di Costantino in the Vatican (Fig. 14). In the *Ichnographia* the Mausoleum of Hadrian ("Sepulchrum Hadriani") and the Pons Aelius ("Pons Aelius Hadrianus") are readily identifiable, and, in the position relative to these where we would expect to find the Meta Romuli, there is indeed a pyramid ("Pyramis," adjacent to the word "Agrippinae" or "Horti Agrippinae").

Piranesi then developed this kernel according to certain formal principles, such as axiality and symmetry. Since the position of the Meta Romuli with respect to the main axis of the Mausoleum of Hadrian and the Pons Aelius was contrary to the principle of symmetry, Piranesi multiplied the pyramids so that they formed part of a symmetrical pattern, like Juvarra before him (Fig. 23). He placed a second pyramid
symmetrically across the stem of the canal leading to a triangular *stagnum* (pool). This larger unit is duplicated by symmetry about the main axis of the Pons Aelius. In this way, invented complexes expand away from the kernel.

Initially, these kernels are completely unrelated in their main axes, a feature common to Roman complexes such as Hadrian’s Villa, which Piranesi had studied closely. Eventually, of course, they run into other such complexes expanding from different kernels. Hence, the left side of the Mausoleum of Hadrian–Pons Aelius complex, which is developed as a huge compound defined by *euriptus* (water channels) that embraces the Horti Domitiae and the Bustum Hadriani, collides with another complex developed around an axis radial to the arc of the Tiber bend that is identified as the Horti Agrippiniane. Beyond is another kernel, the Circus of Nero, long known to be more or less in this position. Also known to be somewhere in this area was the Naumachia of Nero (“Naumachia Neronis”), which Piranesi placed on axis with the Circus. Its octagonal enclosing *euriptus* demands a similarly shaped *euriptus* on the other side of the Natatio–Horti Agrippiniae axis. This produces an awkwardly shaped boundary to the Area Martis and the Templum Martis, which Piranesi filled rather clumsily with *tabernae* (shops). Their clumsiness follows from their nature as filler; Piranesi is driven not by a fresh idea but by the need to fill the space. But this requires yet another odd-shaped *euriptus* on the other side of the axis running through the Horti Domitiae at the lower end of the Mausoleum of Hadrian–Bustum Hadriani compound. This in turn sets the limit to one side of a semicircular Viridarium (pleasure garden), which mirrors a semicircular garden on the opposite side of the Mausoleum of Hadrian–Bustum Hadriani compound, the limits of which are also determined by the Tiber bank (Fig. 31). The Tiber bank would also have determined the limits of the Mausoleum of Hadrian–Bustum Hadriani compound itself, as is revealed by the way the right corner of the defining *euriptus* is set hard against the bank. Nearby, the *euriptus* forms a projecting lug that encloses a triumphal arch. This has its counterpart on the other side of the main axis, where it can be seen to be generated by one axis of a rectangular Stagnum Neronis, the other axis of which is placed on the axis passing through the Naumachia Neronis and the Templum Martis. On the Tiber side, however, Piranesi has had to adjust the placement of the upper side of the lug to make it fit as tightly against the Tiber bank.
32 Detail of Fig. 31 showing the Tiber bend area
as the main corner of the compound. This adjustment reveals how the process of expanding symmetrical invention had to be adapted to the occasional irregular constant (here, the Tiber bank). Piranesi’s procedure is inorganic in the sense that it does not respond well to the site. The riverbank, rather than generating ideas, constrains them. Individual buildings are developed with line and compass, inspired by the complex plans of buildings at Hadrian’s Villa. All possible symmetries are explored, but the most common is bilateral symmetry.

To be sure, the interlocking of expanding complexes in all areas of the map is not so tightly integrated as it is on the Vatican bank. As one moves toward the Pincio and Via Flaminia and the Valle Giulia (Fig. 33), individual units seem to be disposed almost at random, as if Piranesi had a collection of formal ideas that he scattered over the ground and left where they fell. They remain self-contained, as the urge to expand out from the kernel wanes; correspondingly, the individual geometries of these buildings are often more inventive.

Piranesi’s procedure of formal invention in plan form did not presuppose a concern with the elevation. Every plan, of course, has implications for the elevation, and no architect, least of all Piranesi, can draw a line without some idea of what it will be like in vertical extension. Piranesi, in fact, developed the elevations of the *Ichnographia* in several plates, including the frontispiece, which shows the area under discussion (Fig. 34). It is significant, however, that those areas that he chose to illustrate generally have the most conservative plans and the clearest typological identities, such as the Pantheon and its surroundings or the Theaters of Balbus and Marcellus. The more over plans, such as the Sepulchrum Agrippae (Fig. 33), seem to defy vertical elaboration, reading instead as purely graphic designs.

Piranesi and the Tiber Bend

Piranesi’s archaeological ideas concerning the Pons Triumphalis had important consequences for the formal elaboration of the *Ichnographia*. If the remains of the Pons Neroniatus were not the remains of the Pons Triumphalis, or the remains of a bridge at all, there was no need to take them into account in the *Ichnographia*. This relieved him of any constraints on the architectural elaboration of the river bend. Piranesi saw that it had richer possibilities than as a site for a bridge. The curvature of the site—Piranesi was undoubtedly thinking of the deep cutaway reaching to the Ospedale di S. Spirito as it was drawn by Nolli (Fig. 4)—suggested the possibility of developing a kind of amphitheater of steps leading down to the water along the lines of Alessandro Specchi’s Porto di Ripetta, one arc of which intensifies the curve of the river, the other opposing it. These arcs of steps are extended on the wider, outside bank as long, curved prongs, and on the short bank as tight stubs; together, they powerfully express the opposition of expansion and contraction of a bent pipe. Barriers (*repangula*), are placed within the arcs to maintain the banks of the river proper, forming sheltered backwaters for swimming (*natatio*). This feature provides an introduction to the graphic fantasy of the Horti Agrippinae.

Being wedded to his archaeological opinion that the Tor di Nona wharf was the Pons Triumphalis, Piranesi was not likely to ignore it, and he represented it as a trapezoidal abutment, with a matching one on the opposite bank (Fig. 32). Its angle to the river and its location only a little upstream of the Pons Aelius evidently discouraged him from making it the kernel of another grand complex like the Natatio–Horti Agrippinae or Mausoleum–Pons Aelius complexes. Instead, he used it as the defining feature of the route of the Via Triumphalis. The Via Triumphalis, indicated by a dotted line, crosses the Pons Triumphalis and threads its way around the back of the
Mausoleum of Hadrian and the Porticus Hadriani, which surrounds it, and proceeds through an Arch of Trajan into the Area Martius and up to the Temple of Mars. On the Campus Martius side of the river the Via Triumphalis ("Via Triumphi ubi dicebatur recta") runs the length of the stadium to meet the river shortly before the Pons Ianiculensis, that is, the Pons Aurelius, rebuilt as the Ponte Sisto in 1473-75. In the Tavola topografica di Roma from the Antichità romane (Fig. 29), the "Via Trionfale" appears to cross the Pons Aurelius to the Trastevere bank, which suggests that Piranesi was aware of the problem of the pomerium discussed above. In the Ichnographia, however, the Via Triumphalis turns ninety degrees on meeting the river to pass through the lower Campus Martius, going past the Hecatostylon, Porticus Philippae, Stationes Nocturnae, and Forum Holitorium, and ending at a Porta Triumphalis at the foot of the Capitol, close to the Temple of Janus and the Theater of Marcellus (Fig. 31).

Piranesi’s route displays a considerable leap of the imagination with respect to the topographical tradition. As we have seen, most writers had imagined the Via Triumphalis as the means by which Roman emperors would enter the city in triumph, ending at the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus Capitolineus on the Capitol. In such accounts there is an indeterminate sense of movement from without the city to within, as is implied by the assumption that the Via Triumphalis was the road across Prati and Monte Mario. Piranesi, by contrast, turns the Via Triumphalis into a self-contained route within the city. As it must, it terminates on the Capitol, presumably at the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus Capitolinus, but it starts at the temple of Mars, on the Vatican side of the river. Only Bosio had hinted at such self-containment, but his interpretation was colored by associations with the cemetery where Saint Peter was buried and with the Christian significance of triumphs. Piranesi turned the city in on itself, his version of a triumph constituting a ritual movement from one side of the city to the other, not an entrance to it. That feature most symbolic of entrance, the triumphal arch, is to be found only at the foot of the Capitol, where the ancient texts place it. But this Porta Triumphalis is only a label; it is not developed architecturally. There are no indications of arches associated with the Pons Triumphalis, only piers and abutments, with no hint of a superstructure (Fig. 32). Piranesi’s bird’s-eye view (Fig. 34) shows a simple bridge, lacking the statues on tall columns of the Pons Aelius. A pair of statues marks the far side of the bridge, but the bridge itself carries only a pair of low ornaments, probably trophies. Piranesi seems to have been uninterested in its possible elevations: his Pons Triumphalis is most emphatically not a ponte magnifico.

It was therefore Piranesi’s archaeological researches of the 1750s that led him to pass up the opportunity to fuse the Pons Triumphalis with the Palladian ponte magnifico that he had developed in 1743. His interest in the Pons Triumphalis led him instead to develop the urbanistic possibilities of the route of the Via Triumphalis, which had been given its most enduring visual form in the maps associated with Panvinio. The topographical Pons Triumphalis resurfaces on at least one occasion, in 1767, in the unrealized commission of Charles-Louis Clérisseau from Filippo Farsetti to lay out a garden at S. Maria di Sala near Padua in the style of Hadrian’s Villa, where the main road crossing his property would have represented a Roman consular road that would have crossed a canal on a triumphal bridge. One wonders whether Clérisseau, well acquainted with Piranesi’s ideas, would have followed his lead and designed a sober bridge or allowed his fantasy full flight; one suspects the former, as Farsetti was an admirer of the architectural theorist Carlo Lodoli and “by far the most important figure behind the neo-classical movement in Venice.”

Insofar as the eighteenth-century ponte triunfale tradition has roots in Roman topography, they lie in the Pons Aelius
nearby, which being still standing and recorded in ancient coins, had a much richer tradition of imagery. This was always available to be fused with the enduring image of the Palladian bridge, as occurs most emphatically in a Canaletto capriccio based on the Mausoleum of Hadrian–Pons Aelius idea, in which the bridge has taken on a neo-Palladian aspect (Fig. 35). But the attractiveness of the triumphal bridge theme would lie in its freedom from the constraints of anti-quarian topography, and in this respect Piranesi was out of step with most of his contemporaries and successors.
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150. Piranesi, Lithographie antiquipes sive, from Piranesi, 1762, folding plate, 55 by 46 in. (1350 by 1170 mm). Faccio, no. 493. The interpretation of the Ichnographia has proved to be problematic. As a plan purporting to be a representation of part of Rome in the late empire, it ought to be of interest to archaeologists, but its manifest fantasy precludes this. As a reservoir of formal ideas that contributed to the work of French Neoclassical architects, it has received sympathetic treatment by architectural historians, but this approach distacts attention from the question of the genre to which it belongs. In order to make sense of it historians have adopted an extraneous range of approaches. Among the most important are the "negative" interpretations by Tafuri, "G. B. Piranesi: L'architettura come 'utopia negativa,'" in Bernardi Vitruvius e la disputa fra classicismo e barocco nel Settecento: Atti del convegno internazionale (Turin: Accademia delle Scienze di Torino, 1979), 2: 295–319; and the "positive" interpretations by Wittke, "L'architettura di Piranesi," and B. Battico's account of his work ("Il Piranesi—Vico—Il Campo Marzio: Foundations and the Eternal City," M.A. thesis, McGill University, School of Architecture, 1996), and Marcel Bauwart's account of it as a "medium of measurement" of the "topographic" art of Piranesi, "La carta topografica del Campo Marzio dell'antica Roma: Eine Skizze," in Architektur und Erinnerung, ed. Wolfram Martini (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2000), 71–102. All of these are significant for understanding what I would argue is a Piranesi's "Fan-tasia" and the Graeco-Roman controversy, in Piranesi e i Francesi: Collage Roma a la Villa Medici, 12–14 May 1976, ed. Georges Brunel (Rome: Edizioni della Sapienza, 1977), 295–301, figs. 157–58; and John Wilson-Ely, "Introduction to Observations on the Leto, Pantheon, and Portico of Jove," in Piranesi: A Prospect to a New Treatise on the Introduction and Progress of the Fine Arts in Europe in Ancient Times, by Giovanni Battista Piranesi, trans. Caroline Brannish and David Brits (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2002), 25–33.

151. Burra (in n. 45).

152. The marble map appears, for example, in pl. xxx of the Campo Marzio (Ingham chirostica toposquum theatrum, in Piranesi, 1782, 144 by 9 by 6 in. (365 by 235 mm); Faccio, no. 52). See John Pinto, "From Urbis Romanae: Fragment and Fantasy," in Storica (in n. 56), 134–46, pp. 78–78.

153. The latter on other occasion is well noted. In the background of a set design for a musical drama by Antonio Otoboni of 1713 that depicts the funeral of Pompey appears a cluster of four steep pyramids, both allied to Egypt and the funeral (Sesta Malatina: Gran Tempio a Lato con Statua del ditto menso di Pompeio, or Grotta Brancaleone). See also Hans Volkmann, "Pompeii," in Piranesi: A Prospect to a New Treatise on the Introduction and Progress of the Fine Arts in Europe in Ancient Times, 25–33.

154. W. L. Donaldson and John Fitch, Hudson's Hill and Its Legacy (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 246–65. Piranesi engraved the plan of the temple in a style very similar to that of the Ichnographia, as a marble slab complete with metal clamps at the edges; it was not published until many years after his death by his son Francesco.

155. Serge Cornard, "De l'architecture de Claude-Nicolas Ledoux, considérée dans ses rapports avec Piranesi," in Bruno (as in n. 150), 161–86, esp. 168–79, interprets Piranesi's "architectural" forms as imitations of Greek cult buildings. According to the plan of the Tempio di Marte in the frontispiece and the Atrium of the Temple of Mars, Grotta Brancaleone, is a temple of St Peter, which it corresponds topographically. Similarly, the radial forms and near-elliptical elements surrounding the vestibule, together with the circular form above, may be read as the holy, arms, and head of an angel that alludes to the Castel Sant'Angelo on the same axis of the "skies" of the Tempio di Mars, the laterally arranged heads of a man when combined with the rounded forms, including two circular columns of the Busto Hadrianus above, the same circular forms also forming the heads of twin figures. Such readings support the phallic character of the plan of the Busto Caesaris Augustus, given that the French Neoclassical
architect Claude-Nicolas Ledoux, inspired by Piranesi, designed an explicitly phallic plan for his Oikomen. However, the possibility of such readings is more likely to be an unintended side effect of Piranesi’s creative process than a reflection of Piranesian hermeneutics. I would argue instead that Piranesi allowed himself to employ curved forms and so develop plans uncommonly by functional or programmatic intent, driven by graphic, spatial, and topographical ideas rather than by symbolism. The psychology of the perception of such graphic fantasies is such that the viewer is predisposed to project representational meaning of an anthropomorphic kind into them, particularly as they contain more curved, biomorphic forms than is customary in architectural plans, and they employ the same bilateral symmetry as the human body. Piranesi may well have responded subconsciously to the possibility of such readings, but the design of the Iconographia would not have been generated by them.

156. See, for example, Fasolo’s diagram of the geometric basis of the Aula Regina of the Horti Domitiae. Fasolo (as in n. 150), fig. 24.

157. Piranesi, 1762, frontispiece. Ficacci, no. 484.

158. Piranesi, Elevazione del Pantheon, e degli altri edifici che gli eran vicini, 6% by 11¼ in. (170 by 287 mm), from Piranesi, 1762, pl. 48. Ficacci, no. 554.

159. Piranesi, Elevazione de’ Teatri di Basso, e di Marcello gli altri edifici ch’erano loro vicini, 4¾ by 11½ in. (110 by 287 mm), from Piranesi, 1762, pl. 48. Ficacci, no. 552.

160. The Iconographia can therefore be considered the sole example of a new subgenre—the ico-

161. The Temple of Mars precinct has a polygonal shape generated by the various water channels, or current. The left-hand current in turn is generated by the Naumachia Neroniana, on the other side of the Natrix axis.

162. Richardson, 297, s.v. “Pons Aurelius”; Steinby (as in n. 31), 106–7, s.v. “Pons Aurelius.”

163. There may be a second pair closer to the Campus Martius back, but this is hidden behind the tablet bearing the title. The schematic rendering of these trophies is reminiscent of those that appear in Juvencus’s design for Reichenau (Fig. 22) and on the bridge in fol. 38 of the Turin album (see n. 112 above).

164. For Fasolo, see Francis Haskell, Patrons and Painters: Art and Society in Baroque Italy (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1988), 361–64.

165. The project is known from a letter in 1767 from Johann Joachim Winckelmann to Charles-Louis Clerisseau, who by then had returned to France (Winckelmann, Briefe, ed. W. Rehm, 4 vols. [Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1952–57], vol. 3, 544–49, no. 925, at 545; also Winckschulischen Briefe 1747–1768, in Johann Winckelmanns Samtlche Werke, vol. 11 [Ostarchiv: Otto Zeller, 1965], 514–15, quoted in the original French and in English translation in Thomas J. McCormick, Charles-Louis Clerisseau and the Genesis of Neo-Classicism (New York: Architectural History Foundation; Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1993), 112–15, 254–55), and from a footnote by Hendrik Jansen, the first editor of Winckelmann’s letters (Winckschulischen Briefe 1747–1768, 514 n. 1), quoted in McCormick, 112–15, 254–55: “Cette route étoit bordée dans une partie par un canal de deux cent toises de longueur, sur laquelle auront été placé le pont triomphal” (This road was to be bordered in part by a canal 200 toises long over which a triumphal bridge was to have been placed).

166. Haskell (as in n. 164), 361–64.

167. Canaletto or follower, Copririco with a Canal and a Bridge, a Large Circular Building, and Venetian Masts, W. G. Constable and J. G. Links, Cana-

168. Ance di Herlit, Deans ansia d’architettura e di decorazione, Donatino Gustave Henstuk, Ancienne collection Ed-


170. The Temple of Mars precinct has a polygonal shape generated by the various water channels, or current. The left-hand current in turn is generated by the Naumachia Neroniana, on the other side of the Natrix axis.

171. Richardson, 297, s.v. “Pons Aurelius”; Steinby (as in n. 31), 106–7, s.v. “Pons Aurelius.”

172. There may be a second pair closer to the Campus Martius back, but this is hidden behind the tablet bearing the title. The schematic rendering of these trophies is reminiscent of those that appear in Juvencus’s design for Reichenau (Fig. 22) and on the bridge in fol. 38 of the Turin album (see n. 112 above).
Author/s:  
Marshall, David R.

Title:  
Piranesi, Juvarra, and the triumphal bridge tradition

Date:  
2003

Citation:  

Publication Status:  
Published

Persistent Link:  
http://hdl.handle.net/11343/34941

File Description:  
Piranesi, Juvarra, and the triumphal bridge tradition