cher) che l’origine di s. P. sia da riferirsi ad una fondazione dei Benedettini di Montecassino suggeriti all’invasione longobarda nel 577. Questo fatto non è però documentato altro che dal Chronicon Cassinese di Leone Marsicano agli inizi del XII sec. (PL 173, 491 s.), non trovando alcun riscontro, né in Gregorio Magno, che pure ricorda con precisione l’invasione longobarda di Montecassino, né in Paolo Diacono o in altre fonti che alludono agli avvenimenti in questione. In realtà il monastero lateranense, forse s. P. che ebbe come abate, almeno nella seconda metà del VI sec. il suo citato Valentinianus, discepolo di Benedetto e una congregazione di benedettini, potrebbe ritornare anche agli esuli dell’invasione longobarda di Montecassino e poi, con la ricostituzione del centro cassinese, nel sec. VIII, poté fornire un contingente di monaci per il suo ripopolamento. Il cenobio lateranense, identificato come s. P. è stato collocato post basilicam Salvatoris (Ferrari), così come sembrano indicare la menzione riguardante i donativi di Leone III (Lib. Pont. II, 15) e le frequenti indicazioni medievali relative ad una chiesa di S. Pancrazio (216, 220 VZ III; Hülsen, Chiese (1927), 409 s.). Al riguardo non si può essere più precisi.


M. Cecchelli

PANTEON. Greek Πάνθεον (Cass. Dio 53.27.2, 54.1.1, 66.24.2, 69.7.1; Sex. Iulius Africanus in POxy 412, 65 ff; Suidas 4.20 Adler); Latin Pantheon (CIL VI 896.2, 2041; Plin. nat. 9.121, 34.13, 36.38; Hist. Aug. Hadr. 19.10; Chronogr. a. 354 (271 VZ 1 Pantheon); Nat., Cur. Reg. IX; Amm. 16.10.14; Hier. chron. a. Abr. 2105, 2126; Cod. Theod. 14.3.10; Macr. Sat. 3.17.18; Oros. hist. 7.12.5; Lib. Pont. I, 317). A building in Reg. IX (Circus Flamininus) still standing between the Piazza della Rotonda, Via della Rotonda, Via della Palombella and Via della Minerva, first constructed by M. Vipsanius Agrippa (RE IX Vipsanius 2, pp. 1248-1250); the present structure, the best preserved ancient edifice in Rome, dates from the reign of Hadrian.

The pre-Hadrianic Pantheon. The inscription on the architrave friezes - M·AGrippa L·FCOSTERTIVM FECIT (CIL VI 896.1) - implies that it was completed in 27 BC, the year of Agrippa’s third consulate. Cassius Dio (53.27.1-2), however, lists the completion of the P, and of Agrippa’s other buildings in the Campus Maricius (basilica Neptuni and thermae Agrippae) under 25 BC. His date is usually preferred (Shipley, 56-58; Coarelli). In 22 BC some of the P’s statues were struck by thunderbolts (Cass. Dio 54.1.1). The fratres Aedes met in Pantheo on 12 January AD 59 (CIL VI 2041: this is the earliest mention of the P in our sources). It burned in the fire of AD 80 (Cass. Dio 66.24.2) and was restored by Domitian (Chronogr. a. 354; Hier. chron. a. Abr. 2105); under Trajan it was struck by lightning and destroyed again (Oros. hist. 7.12.5; Hier. chron. a. Abr. 2126).

Remains of a pre-Hadrianic building, almost certainly Agrippa’s P, were found at the end of the 19th c. (Beltrami; resumé in de Fine Licht, 172-179). It was a S facing rectangular edifice with transverse cells, built of travertine blocks covered with marble, 43.76 m wide and 19.82 m deep, with 3 pronoes of undetermined depth and 21.26 m wide. The building had a number of features in common with Hadrian’s P: its main, N-S axis coincided exactly with that of the present building; the width of the cell was identical with the rotunda’s inner diameter; its depth it occupied the whole space of the present P’s pronao and intermediate block, so that the doorways of the two structures coincide almost perfectly. Column capitals in Agrippa’s edifice were of bronze (Plin. nat. 34.13) and the architectural decoration by Diogenes of Athens (RE V Diogenes 53) included caryatids and statues set on the pediment (nat. 36.38).
The P. was a part of the complex created by Agrippa in 29-19 BC in his horti in the central Campus Martius (Roddaz, 238-241). Its nucleus consisted of three buildings aligned from S to N: the thermae Agrippae, the basilica Neptuni and the P., flanked to the E by the Saepta Iulia, a work of Lepidus but embellished and dedicated by Agrippa (Cass. Dio 53.23.3), and to the W by the Stagnum Agrippae (Roddaz, 252-298). It seems that the P. and the basilica Neptuni formed a symmetrical complex of two similar buildings facing each other across a sumptuously paved piazza. The present basilica Neptuni (v.) has dimensions practically identical to the original P. and is positioned on the same N-S axis; thus Hadrian, who also rebuilt the basilica Neptuni (Hist. Aug. Hadr. 19.10) must have retained the latter’s original layout. The space between the two edifices, corresponding to Hadrian’s rotunda, was most probably an open, possibly round, piazza, as suggested by two layers of concrete, one 1.20 m thick, laid directly on virgin soil ca. 4 m below the present floor, the other 0.30 m thick, laid 2.45 m below the floor; undoubtedly a bedding for the marble, compass-oriented pavement. The layers probably belong to the P.’s earlier two phases, Agrippan and Domitianic.

It is sometimes argued that Agrippa’s P. was very similar to Hadrian’s in orientation and general layout (Loercke 1982; Wilson Jones). On this hypothesis, the pavement under the rotunda floor belonged to a round cella, the rectangular structure was a N facing porch, and the projection on its S side, traditionally identified as a S facing pronaos, was merely a link between the porch and the cells. This view seems rather unlikely: 1) The rectangular structure is too big for a porch, being 30% wider and 50% deeper than the pronaos of the giant among Augustan edifices, the temple of Mars Ultor (v. forum Augusti). 2) With a huge porch tangential to a round cella, the incongruous, hammerhead-like layout of Agrippa’s P. would go against everything we know of ancient design principles; there is no known parallel in Roman architecture. 3) A wooden roof spanning at least 43 m with no internal support, even if technically feasible in a round building, would have deserved a mention in Pliny, nat. 36.102. There, however, it is one of the temporary theatres that is put forward as a parallel of the wondrous roof of the Diviiborum (v.) which, after all, spanned no more than 100 Roman feet (ca. 30 m). Loercke (1982, 50) tries to circumvent this by hypothesising an open space surrounded by a circular portico, thus effectively returning to the traditional view (in public architecture open spaces are usually not in front of buildings but not at their backs).

The only report on the P.’s founding is post-Hadrianic, Cass. Dio 53.27.2-3: “[Agrippa] completed the so-called Pantheon. It has this name perhaps because, among the statues it received there were many effigies of gods, including those of Mars and Venus; or, as I think, because the vault resembles the heavens. Agrippa, in fact, also wanted to put there a statue of Augustus and to give his name to the building. When the latter would not accept either, he placed there the statue of the elder Caesar and in the pronaos those of Augustus and himself”. In this passage Dio says what he thinks Agrippa first wanted the P. to be, not what it eventually became, while the allusion to the cupola betrays his ignorance of the building’s history and raises the question of provenance of his information (historical documents or conjectures?). The existence of Augustus’ statue is corroborated by the prodigy of 22 BC (Cass. Dio 54.1.1: thunderbolts causing the spear to fall from its hand), that of Venus by Pliny’s report that the twin of the famous pearl with which Cleopatra had won her notorious bet with Antonius was cut in halves and set in the ears of the goddess’ colossal statue in the P. (nat. 9.121; Macr. Sat. 3.17.18).

A view, once prevalent, based on the literal meaning of “Pantheon” - a temple of all the gods (major? planetary?), like Greek pæstheia / dodekætheia - still defended by K. Ziegler (RE XVIII.3 (1949), 697-747; Kleine Pauly IV (1975), 468-474), is indefensible (see E. Will, ‘Dodekætheon et pantheon’, BCH 75 (1951), 233-246). Dio’s uncertainty about the meaning of the name and his failure to quote the etymological explanation (as in Suidas 4.20 Adler: velox
κωνον παντων των θεων) prove that "Pantheon" was only a nickname (his "so-called Pantheion" has a counterpart in Max. Sat. 3.17.18: in templo quod Pantheion dicitur).

If "Pantheon" was a sobriquet, the building must have had some other meaning. Defining the Pantheon involves deciphering that meaning and explaining why the original appellation was supplanted by a nickname. According to the most widespread view, Agrippa's P. was a dynastic temple, dedicated to "the gods of the gens Iulia", Mars, Venus and Divus Iulius (Gilbert III (1890), 115 f.; Jacoby, 91-93). Dio's report would signify that the building was conceived as a temple for the worship of the living emperor and acquired its final ritual function, together with a politically correct nickname, through a redefinition (Coarelli). This view, however, is untenable because Mars was not "a patron of the gens Iulia" (R. Schilling, La religion romaine de Vénus (1954), 332 n. 3). Besides, it is doubtful that the P. was a public temple. Instrumenta sacra on marble reliefs in the Hadrianic P., quoted as the decisive argument by de Fine Licht (191), are no more conclusive than the presence of gods' statues in the cela. The identification, probably correct, of the P. with the vicae aedes in the prodygy reported by Suerones (Aug. 97.2; Shipley, 58) is no argument either, because in this case aedes clearly means "building". More significant is that the name of no god figures in the inscription on the Hadrianic P., nor doubt copied from the preceding edifice (Hist. Aug. Hadr. 19.9; see below); its absence makes it very unlikely that Agrippa's P. was an aedes publica (Ziolkowski). Still, Pliny called it templum (nat. 36.38) and the fratres Arvales met there, which suggests some sort of sacral status (locus inaguratus?).

If Agrippa's P. formed a symmetrical complex with the basilica Neptuni, this would suggest that they were built for a similar purpose and originally belonged to the same category of structures. Cassius Dio says that the οικος των Ποσειδονίων (basilica Neptuni) was a memorial for Agrippa's victories at sea (33.27.1), but in a different context (66.24.2) he calls it Ποσειδόνιον, "the temple of Neptunus" (contra L. Cordisci, LTUR I, s.v.), no doubt the one in Campo, known from a fragment of the fasti Fr. Aevi for 23 September (Inscr. It. XIII.2, 34 f.; Marti, Neptunio in Campo, Apol[linae ad theatrum Marcelli] and commonly, though mistakenly, identified with the god's temple in Circo Flaminio (Ziolkowski, Temples, 118). The P., a twin of the temple of Neptunus which commemorated Agrippa's victories at sea, could thus well have been the temple of Mars from the same fragment of the fasti Fr. Aevi, a memorial for his victories on land. (The temple of Mars in Campo, mentioned also by Cassius Dio under AD 9 (56.24.3) and by Augustan sources (Cons. ad Liviam 231; Ov. fasti 2.857-860), is commonly identified with the temple of Mars (Invictus) in Circo (v) but see Castagnoli, 'Campo Marzio', 115 n. 2, 133-137). The same results from the P.'s statuary: cult statues of Mars and Venus suggest a temple of Mars (Ziolkowski).

The temples of Mars and Neptunus in Campo were most probably Agrippa's sacra privata, which would facilitate their becoming, respectively, an ill-defined pantheion and a basilica. The change would have occurred between AD 9, when there was still a temple of Mars in Campo, and the first mention of the P. in 59, probably under Caligula, who forbade the celebration of the Sicilian and Actian victories of his deified grandfather (Suet. Cal. 23.1-2).

The Hadrianic Pantheon. Bricks with stamps, almost all dating from Hadrian's reign (J. Guey, 'Devrait-on dire: le Panthéon de Septime Sévère', MEFR 53 (1936), 198-249; Bloch), showed that the "restoration" (Hist. Aug. Hadr. 19.9-10) was in fact built from scratch. The inscription, which misled generations of scholars into believing that the rotunda was Agrippa's work, conforms to Hadrian's general rule with regard to buildings he restored: esse omnis propriis auctorum nominibus consecravit. The majority of brick-stamps date from 123-125, especially 123; the building's completion thus probably took place during Hadrian's stay in Rome in 125-128 (H. Bloch, AFA 63 (1959), 225-240) and anyway well before his death in 138 (Cass. Dio 69.7.1; see below). W. D. Heilmeyer (1975, 316-347) thinks that the construction started soon after the destruction of the preceding structure, still under Trajan, and that the
P's project should be attributed to Apollodorus of Damascus. Restoration of a *templum Agrippae* by Antoninus Pius (Hist. Aug. Pius 8.2), if it really concerns the *P.*, must have been a minor repair; so, apparently, was the work carried out in 202, known from the inscription on the pronao's front, which states that Severus and Caracalla PANTHEVM VETVSSTATE CORRVTVM CVM OMNl CVLTl RESTTTVERVNT (CIL VI 896.2). Other mentions of the *P* are: Cassius Dio's anachronistic reference to its cupola (53.27.2-3; see above), Ammianus Marcellinus' report on the impression the building made on Constantius II during his visit to Rome in 357 (16.10.14) and the Regionary Catalogues (Car., Not. Reg. IX). In 608 the emperor Phocas, at the request of the pope Boniface IV, turned the *P* into the church of *s. Maria ad Martyres* (v.; Lib. Pont. 1. 317).

Hadrian's reconstruction radically altered both the *P*'s architecture and the surrounding topography. The building was rotated 180 degrees with the doorway at the pivot, while at the same time it was expanded enormously along its longitudinal axis. The new N facing façade occurred at what had once been the back wall of the cells, leaving enough space between it and the entrance to the rotunda for a deep pronao and an intermediate block. The new round cells occupied the whole of the former piazza between Agrippa's *P* and the *basilica Neptuni*. Freed from the rest of Agrippa's complex, the Hadrianic *P* became an autonomous link in the chain of buildings in the north-central *Campus Martius* on the 8 side of the *vica Tecta* (v.). The approach from that street, ca. 60 m wide and 150 m long, was framed to the W by the *thermae Neroneianae* and to the E by the *templum Matildae*. A good part of it was occupied by a large forecourt paved with great slabs of travertine, probably covered with marble, surrounded on three sides by a portico. The columns of the portico were scaled-down imitations of those of the pronao, made of the same material (shafts of grey granite with bases, capitals and entablature of white marble) and stylistically similar, with a diameter of ca. 1 m.

The forecourt length is not known. The N side of the portico is made either to align with the N façade of the *thermae Neroneianae* (thus in Lugli - Gismondi), or to reach the house opposite the *P*'s façade, where some structural remains, sometimes linked with the enigmatic "Arcus Pietatis" (a monumental entrance to the forecourt from the N?), were found. The former possibility would result in a rectangle of ca. 120 to 60 m, the latter in a square ca. 60 m to a side. As remains of a travertine pavement were also found in the Piazza della Maddalena, it has been suggested that the forecourt, 120 m long, was divided by a transverse wall with the "Arcus Pietatis" (v.) in the middle or had in its centre a free-standing arch (de Fine Licht, 25-29; De Maria, Archi ornari (1988), 398 f.).

The pronao is a Corinthian octostyle, 34.20 m wide and 15.62 m deep. It stood on a podium raised 1.32 m above the level of the forecourt from which it was reached by five marble steps. On both sides of the pronao, opposite the first intercolumniation, there were small flights of four steps, 2.65 m wide. The sides of the podium and the pronao's floor were covered with marble and granite laid out in a geometrical pattern, circles and squares. The back columns were arranged in four rows forming three aisles, a wide central one leading to the doorway and two narrow lateral ones ending against large niches in the intermediate block. The column shafts were unfluted monoliths of Egyptian stone with entasis, those in front of grey granite from Mons Claudianus, the others of red granite from Syene; bases, capitals and entablature were of white pentelic marble (total height 14.15 m, diameter 1.48 m at the base). The back columns at the E side, already missing in the 16th c., were replaced with the present ones of grey granite by Alexander VII; the front column on that side was replaced with the present one of red granite by Urban VIII. The front entablature of white marble consisted of the architrave with an inscription added by Septimius Severus and the undecorated frieze bearing "Agrippa's" inscription. The pediment, steep (23 degrees) and very shallow, was decorated with bronze figures tentatively reconstructed by L. Cozza as an eagle in a wreath with ribbons fluttering towards the sides. The pediment and the intermediate block were connected by two
parallel walls borne by arches stretching from piers erected above the two inner rows of columns. These walls, and the architrave cornices on both sides, supported the roof truss made entirely of bronze, from which the aisles' vaulted bronze ceilings were suspended. For the present situation (no ceiling, wooden roofing and roof tiles visible from below) we are indebted to Urban VIII who took down all of the pronaoi's bronze to cast 110 guns for Castel Sant'Angelo.

The pronaoi is connected to the rotunda by a massive structure of brick-faced concrete reminiscent in construction of a triumphal arch: two huge piers supporting a barrel vault, with its back concave to match the curve of the drum. This intermediate block is as wide as the pronaoi and as high as the drum of the rotunda (30.40 m); its depth varies from 4.65 m in the middle to 9.35 m at the sides. The opening in the middle matched in width and height the central aisle of the pronaoi whose bronze ceiling continued without interruption as the intermediate block's vault. On either side of the opening there is an absidial niche; in these niches most probably stood the statues of Augustus and Agrippa mentioned by Cassius Dio. Stairways in the piers give access to the intermediate block's upper stories and from them to chambers in the upper part of the rotunda.

As a link between the pronaoi and the rotunda, the intermediate block was meant to harmonize with both. Its lower part conformed stylistically with the pronaoi and the upper part with the rotunda. The walls facing the pronaoi were covered with marble; so were the side façades up to the lowest cornice which was an exact copy and continuation of the pronaoi's entablature. The four fluted marble pillars, joined by bases and capitals to the intermediate block and aligned with the four rows of the pronaoi columns, were copied in eight pilasters in the side façades and the sides of the central opening, two to each wall. They are as high as the pronaoi columns and identically proportioned. The sections of the walls between the pilasters were decorated with two friezes depicting festoons and religious utensils. Whether all the extant relief plates date from Hadrian's time is a matter of dispute (Herdejürgen). The upper half of the intermediate block is optically bonded with the rotunda by two upper cornices, common to both structures. Originally, the two were also covered with a similar coating of plaster and stucco. The façade of the intermediate block was decorated by a cut-off pediment practically identical to that of the pronaoi which, incidentally, screened so effectively that the former was visible, and still is, only from great distance. Remarkably, the only constructional link with the rotunda is the foundation, laid down as one piece for the whole building; above the plinth the two structures are only bonded in the lower part of the elevation.

It has recently been suggested that the pediment of the intermediate block is a vestige of the original project in which the columns in the pronaoi would have had shafts of 50 Roman feet rather than 40 as at present (Davies - Hemson - Wilson Jones; Wilson Jones). In the original design the pronaoi's entablature would have continued as the middle cornice of the rotunda, and the pronaoi and the intermediate block could have been covered with the same roof. The pronaoi would thus have blended smoothly with the rotunda and there would have been no need for the intermediate block as a separate unit as high as the rotunda (the awkward projection of its upper corners from behind the pronaoi's roof would thus have been avoided). An argument for this hypothesis is the fact that the intermediate block is not bonded with the rotunda: the bricks of the former run up against the latter (which must have been built first; Cozzo) which result in a clearly visible dilatation. This indicates that at a certain moment the work on the projecting part of the P. was suspended and resumed when the rotunda had already been completed — a sure sign of a change in the original design, probably due to shortage of 50 feet monolithic shafts of Egyptian granite against a very tight time schedule (Wilson Jones).
Internally, the main hall of the Pantheon has a form of a cylinder covered by a hemisphere. The height of the cylinder, 21.72 m, is equal to its radius. The radius of the hemisphere is 22.04 m; to compensate for the difference, the centre of the hemisphere occurs at the height of 21.40 m. The total height of the interior, 43.44 m, is thus equal to its diameter (Pelletti). Externally, the drum raises to 30.40 m above the socle, which results in a very shallow dome.

The drum rests on a ring of concrete 7.30 m wide and 4.50 m deep, projecting 1.10 m above the level of the forecourt. Its wall, notionally 6.25 m thick, made of concrete faced with brick, contains cavities arranged on three levels, marked by the three cornices on the outer face of the drum. On the lowest level there are eight large apertures, the entrance and seven exedrae opening to the inside on the rotunda’s main and diagonal axes. The four diagonal exedrae are trapezoidal, the other three apsidal. In front of each side exedra there is a pair of columns set in line with the wall; the architraves superimposed on these columns are continuations of a cornice running round the interior and marking the top of the lower zone. The exedra opposite the entrance has no architrave and the columns at its sides stand away from the wall. All these apertures are two storeys high, each of the six side exedrae being topped above the architrave by a sort of unfloored chamber. Above each exedra there is a third storey room accessible from the attic of the intermediate block. The sections of the wall between the apertures act as eight huge piers onto which stress is directed by two superimposed rows of large discharging arches (internal span of 11.80 m). These go through the whole thickness of the wall and form ceilings above the exedrae and the rooms above. In each of the piers, on floor level there is a semicircular room reached through a small door from the outside, and overhead two cavities marked on the façade by two rows of smaller relieving arches (internal span of 5.35 m).

Radially, the drum is reinforced by an array of transverse walls and arches joining the two brick faces through the concrete core. The columns of the side exedrae also act as load-bearing elements taking weight, via the architraves, from upper zones of the drum. The drum can thus be described both as a series of piers connected by curtain walls and as two concentric circular walls joined by transverse walls; a structure comparatively light and incredibly strong, an “artificial monolith”. The rotunda’s stability is further enhanced by a judicious use of building materials, which get lighter with height, from travertine caementa in the foundation to light volcanic stone in the cupola.

Internally, the cupola is divided in its lower part into 28 vertical rows of coffers, five in a row; the upper part is a plain ring surrounding an oculus of 8.92 m in diameter. Externally, its lower part is hidden by the upper storey of the drum, 8.40 m high. The visible dome raises in seven stepped rings and continues to the oculus as an even shell whose curvature follows that of the corresponding segment of the inner hemisphere. The thickness of the cupola diminishes from 5.90 m at the lowest ring to 1.50 m at the upper shell. Structurally, it is an upturned bowl of concrete with no reinforcement apart from the arches and walls of the upper drum. It has been suggested that the high stress induced by the stepped rings was offset by cracks which appeared almost immediately in the cupola, acting as a series of arches, and that this effect had been foreseen by the builders (Mark - Hutchinson).

The façade of the drum was originally coated with plaster and stucco; marble was used only for the plinth and a narrow band of veneer above it. Above the upper cornice, the circular ledge round the cupola’s stepped rings and the lowest of these steps were also covered with marble slabs, still intact. The rest of the dome was covered with bronze plates removed by Consuls II in 563 except for those round the oculus, which are still in situ. The present covering of lead plates dates from the time of Gregory III (731-741). The marble portal, crowned with a frieze and a cornice, is as high as the columns of the pronaoi and 7.53 m wide (opening 11.75 to 5.95 m). The present bronze doors, roughly worked and completely out of proportion with the opening, come from some other ancient building.
The rotunda floor is slightly convex; its apex, a couple of metres NW of the centre, is ca. 30 cm higher than the lowest part by the SE wall. The floor is of multicoloured stones, marble, porphyry, basalt and granite, laid in a pattern of alternating diagonal rows of circular and square panels set into squares. Vertically, the rotunda is divided into three zones by two cornices whose height corresponds to that of the lower and middle cornices of the façade. The lowest zone, 13.10 m high, is organized into eight recesses (the entrance and the exedrae) alternating with eight solid masses (the piers). The recesses are flanked by two-sided pilasters; in front of the piers there are prostyle aediculae on high bases with pediments alternately triangular and segmental. Both architectural elements and recesses are entirely made of or covered with multicoloured stone of highest quality, mostly white marble, pavonazzetto, giallo antico and porphyry.

The middle zone is a cylinder surmounted by the rotunda’s upper cornice, broken by vaults over the entrance and the opposite exedra, and by fourteen niches and window-like openings above the piers and the side exedrae. Its decoration, essentially two-dimensional, consisted of an ornamental coating of highest quality stone. The present stucco decoration of large framed panels filling the spaces between the windows and the niches crowned by heavy pediments, executed in 1747-52 (or slightly later) in replacement of the original one, till then intact (Micheli, Pasquai), incongruously emphasizes the lack of cohesion between the respective rhythms of the drum and the cupola. The original decoration, clumsily and inaccurately reconstructed by A. Terenzio in the SW section of the zone, consisted of pilasters with porphyry shafts and multicoloured narrow rectangular panels in between, four pilasters between each niche and window. The railing of strongly coloured pilasters, slender and densely packed (64 in all) against the dazzling background, created an effective buffer zone between the two mighty, if visually somewhat conflicting, parts below and above.

As there are no structural reinforcements in the cupola, the 140 coffers, apart from further lightening the structure, must have been just decoration. Attachment hooks at the bottom of the bronze, collar-like cornice of the oculus indicate that the latter was surrounded on the inside by a band of bronze, possibly reaching as far as the uppermost ring of coffers. The coffers and ribs between them were certainly decorated too, as witness numerous finds of mortar holes and fastening cramps. The present “clean” state of the cupola’s inside, with absolutely no trace of paint or plaster, suggests that it was entirely covered with bronze plates.

It has long been known that architecturally the Hadrianic P., while quite different from sacral edifices, was very closely related to central halls of secular structures of the day, especially imperial palaces. We also know that Hadrian used it as one of his audience halls, see Cass. Dio 69.7.1: “he transacted with the senate all the important and most pressing issues, and adjudicated with the help of leading men, now in the Palace, now in the Forum or the Pantheon, and in many other places, on a tribunal to make his acts public”. We still find it being used in a similar way in 368 or 370, when an imperial constituio was read in Pantheo (Cod. Theod. 14.3.10). All this considered, describing the Hadrianic P. as a “temple” makes very little sense (Godfrey - Hemsoll). As a meeting place of the senate it certainly was templo effistum, but this is all that can be said about its sacral status. The author of the Historia Augusta did not consider it an aedes sacra either, witness Hadr. 19.10: [Hadrian] Romae instauravit Pantheum, Saepta, Basilicam Neptuni, sacras aedes plurimas, Forum Augusti, Lavaurum Agrippae. The best, or safest, definition of Hadrian’s P. is thus: a free-standing imperial aula.

In the light of this definition, the traditional “cosmic” interpretations of the P.’s architecture, especially of the rotunda’s interior, seem widely off the mark (a recent sample of such interpretations in Loeccke 1990). They all are based on Cassius Dio’s personal explanation of the building’s name, not shared by his contemporaries and, as we have known for the last hundred years, simply mistaken (as admitted by one of the partisans of that interpretation, de
Fine Licht, 198-226, esp. 198 f.). Much more convincing is a recent analysis by G. Martines, who notices that the main spatial relationship in the P., that between the drum and the cupola, is an architectural elaboration of the *symmetria* between a sphere and a cylinder of equal diameter demonstrated by Archimedes. The second most striking feature of the cupola - and a traditional nightmare of "cosmic" interpretations - is its division into 28 rows of coffers. De Fine Licht (200 f.) raises, and rejects, a lunar interpretation of this unusual number. He also notices that 28, being equal to the sum of its divisors, is a perfect number according to Euclid's definition, but does not pursue the argument since "28 seem to have no direct relation to the other proportioning of the building" (196). Martines proposes the most satisfactory solution of the question: as the P.'s drum and cupola embody the Archimedean most perfect geometrical relation between the sphere and the cylinder, so, through the choice of 28, one of the extremely rare perfect numbers, in the division of the cupola's circumference the neo-Pythagorean arithmetical perfection is attained as well. That the lore of numbers was known to the architects of the day is shown by the fact that the difficult division of a circle into sevens is not limited to the P.: cf. the staircase of the *columna Traiana* in which there are 14 steps for each turn of the spiral. To an extent, the P.'s interior might be interpreted "cosmically", but only as the visualisation of the archetypes which the Demiurge used to shape the world.


A. Ziolkowski