eigns might enter into a friendly agreement. It named the territories in central Italy over which the pope held sway, and it recommitted the emperor to their protection, as the pope's ally.  

Reading the design of the T-shaped church, S. Prassedse, in the long perspective of Charlemagne's political program, which is what Richard Kauflheimer taught us to do, not only elides the fact that the design of Paschal's church was new and startling in Early Medieval Rome, it does no justice to Rome's and the Republic of St. Peter's cultural and political independence of the contemporary Frankish Kingdom. Isn't it time, then, that we redescribed Paschal's program at S. Prassedse?

Charles McClendon has blazed the way here. He conjures for us a Pope Paschal poised in the Mediterranean world between two emperors in Aachen and Constantinople, and insisting on his independence of both. The image controversy, newly erupted in the Greek East with the reinstitution of Iconoclasm in 815, forms McClendon's major foil. He argues, I think convincingly, that Paschal presents himself at S. Prassedse as the champion of images against both emperors - versus the iconoclastic Greek Emperor Leo V, of course, but also against the Frankish Emperor Louis the Pious, sponsor of the long Frankish iconoclastic tradition that we see expressed in the Libri Carolini of the 790s right on down to the Council of Paris in 825, convened by Louis, that endorsed the Byzantine position. Thus we can understand why Paschal took such care to set up so many images of the saints and of Christ in S. Prassedse. McClendon calls attention to the complex stylistic play among them. If the presbytery mosaics mimic decorations from Rome's Early Christian past, which is a sign of the long and glorious role images have played in the church from the start, then the mosaics in the Zeno Chapel opening off the basilica's east aisle are stylistically right up-to-date, an exhibit of the most recent, most exciting experiments in the nexus between images and worship.

I have argued elsewhere, along with McClendon, that by presenting himself as champion of images at S. Prassedse, Paschal claimed a role as Christendom's sole orthodox leader. His sponsoring of Greek monks at S. Prassedse, very likely iconodules in flight from the wrath of the image-bashing Emperor Leo V, helped him make his case. Seen in this light, the title church on the Esquiline will embody a politics (Paschal's vaunting of the papal theocracy over the theocracies led by the Greek and Frankish emperors) that makes no contact whatever with any Carolingian renovatio program. Did Paschal's illustrious predecessors, Hadrian I and Leo III, really promulgate such a program in the Republic of St. Peter? Let me return to this important question just below.

If, then, McClendon argued that S. Prassedse provided a papal dissertation on image worship and reframed the Early Christian experience in light of the most up-to-date and new experience of worship focused by images, I will argue that something analogous happens in the architectural decoration of the church. Knowing how Paschal's architects disposed the liturgical furniture in the presbytery at the climax of their scene, Corinthian, columnar design permits such an assessment.
The liturgical arrangement

Now as I mentioned above, Krautheimer suggested that Paschal I could have arranged six fancy columns over the altar-grave in S. Prassede’s presbytery (indeed, the six columns that now support the Modern choir lofts there) so that they would recall the famous baldachin with six fancy columns that Constantine set up over the tomb of Peter at the Vatican. But evidence that has come to light during the last dozen years, mainly in the work of Sible de Blaauw, does not support Krautheimer’s hypothesis. This began to be apparent to art historians generally when the festivities for Josef Engemann appeared in 1991 with Sible de Blaauw’s paper on the papacy in Early Medieval Rome and the use of porphyry. De Blaauw argued there that Pope Paschal I set up liturgical furnitures in Roman churches that followed the most up-to-date and new designs of his predecessor, Pope Leo III. Thus if S. Prassede’s splendid interior scenic Corinthian orders reminded Romans in the early ninth century of Early Christian examples in the city, these orders also featured, at center, an altar shrine set out in the newest style. That is what the ample remains of porphyry from that shrine show. One notes first of all how Cardinal Pico della Mirandola’s ciborium, finished in 1734, incorporates four porphyry column shafts, each 2.65 meters high (fig. 1). These must have come from the preceding ciborium at the site, and ultimately from the ciborium that Paschal I erected here. The four shafts survived through all the Medieval and Modern remodelings in and around S. Prassede’s presbytery. Not just the porphyry columns remain from Paschal’s presbytery, but also a good deal of dark-red marble, a rossando, similar in appearance to porphyry, which Cardinal Pico reused in the steps leading up to his presbytery. These marble blocks, which doubtless served as steps in Paschal I’s presbytery, did not just look like porphyry; they must have counted as ‘porphyry’ in Paschal I’s program for S. Prassede. When Cardinal Pico della Mirandola dug up the presbytery floor in 1729 in his search for relics, a large piece of a stairway’s step made of porphyry (or rossando?) turned up in the rubble in front of the old altar. We know, moreover, that the apse of the ninth-century church was revetted with colored marbles, and among them, many pieces of porphyry. Finally, a prominent cornice made of rossando ringed the apse below the famous mosaic in the conch. Now Pope Leo III, as scholars have long been aware, used porphyry in ceremonial buildings in Rome extensively. More recently, De Blaauw argued that Leo III used the precious dark-red stone most publicly and impressively at the shrine to Peter at the Vatican, which that pope quite thoroughly rebuilt. De Blaauw showed convincingly, collecting and analyzing the documentary sources, that by 808-809, Leo III had replaced Gregory I’s ciborium over Peter’s altar-grave and provided a larger, more splendid one lifted on columns with porphyry shafts. Moreover, Leo revetted the front of the apsidal podium with porphyry, set up porphyry balustrade plaques in the presbytery, constructed stairways of seven steps in porphyry leading up to the apsidal podium, and revetted the walls, and paved the floor of the vestibule in front of Peter’s confessio with porphyry slabs. The presence of porphyry and porphyry-like rossando in S. Prassede suggests strongly that Paschal must have imitated Leo III’s shrine for Peter of 808-809 in constructing the presbytery at his new church in 817-819. The hypothesis is enhanced, moreover, by the report we have in the LP that Paschal also provided silver embellishments for the ciborium canopy and the altar block (the propitiatiorum) at S. Prassede, and that he put gilded doors on the confessio. Rich décor in silver and gold is exactly what marked Peter’s shrine as magnified by Leo III in the early ninth century. Thus, taking into account the Early Medieval balustrade plaques, and fragments of plaques, found buried in the floor of the church when its pavement was renewed in 1914, and considering as well the four remaining white marble arches from a ciborium cupola, now hung by brackets on either side of the stairway passage leading up from the street to S. Prassede’s atrium, I have attempted at a reconstruction of the Paschalian presbytery and choir by intervening in Spencer Corbett’s famous thirty-four-year-old isometric drawing (fig. 10). The six surviving fancy columns plus the Early Medieval entablatures found with them in 1729, I conclude, must originally have been set out in a pergola, or screen, which ran across the front of the nave, spanning the distance between the spur walls at the west of each nave colonnade (these are the walls that merge at right-angles with the east wall of the transept). The pergola framed scenically a tall, narrow ciborium with porphyry columns much as the pergola columns did at Peter’s shrine in the Vatican from the time of Gregory I (590-604) onward. The ciborium in the sketch is based on the surviving ciborium arches at the site, and on the four, 2.65 meter high, porphyry columns reused in the church’s eighteenth-century baldachin. The choir, marked off by balustrade plaques, is based on examples of such choirs that we can reconstruct in Rome’s Early Medieval churches. Thus at the northern climax of the church’s scenic columnar design, the white marble of the pergola would have played off against the dark-red purple porphyry, and the dark-red marble in the presbytery - in the columns from the ciborium crowning the altar, in the stairways leading up and down to the shrine of the martyrs and confessors, and in the splendid revetment of the apse wall below the glowing mosaic in the conch. My reconstruction reflects first of all Benedicto Aloisi’s notice that the façade of S. Prassede’s old altar-grave had a large round-headed niche, something very like a fenestella confessionis. The niche measured 99 cm. wide (4 palmi romani) and 134 cm. tall (six palmi), and its top rose to the ‘foot’ of the main altar’s fancy, High Medieval altar frontal composed of a Cosmatesque mosaic. When the old altar-grave at S. Prassede was torn down in 1729, its frontal mosaic was saved and reused to decorate the front of the altar at the back of the present ring crypt: it measures 84 cm. in height and 173 cm. in width and now decorates an altar block rising some 101 cm. (with a 198 cm. wide mensa). Thus the niche in question must have extended down below the mensa of the historic altar-grave by some 230 or 240 cm. It could not have opened in the altar proper, but in the so-called camera delle reliquie, which was found in 1729 below the old altar block (which bore the just mentioned Cosmatesque mosaic). This niche must have functioned as the shrine’s fenestella confessionis. True enough, this ‘window’ did
removed to reveal the niche had been put there recently. But the earth below the niche's marble floor, they said, had been in place for a long time: it was compact and hard, difficult to excavate, and it ran eastward from the altar-grave proper as far as the balustrade located near the triumphal arch. Thus I conclude that there must have been, in Paschal I's day, a paved area immediately in front of the altar grave, a confessio, located at a level considerably below the presbytery floor. This level can be readily deduced. The present level of the nave floor conforms to that of the early ninth-century church, and it lies at 183 cm. above the floor of the old ring crypt. If one assumes that the height of the ceiling of the old east-west corridor of the crypt (that backed up against the camera delle reliquie) was the same height as the ceiling of the ringing corridor, then that ceiling rose some 17 cm. above the nave floor level. Let us estimate that the stones forming the ninth-century presbytery floor rose some 35 cm. above the level of the ring crypt's ceiling, a safe guess that would include any decorative paving. This would mean that the original ninth-century presbytery floor was located about 52 cm. above the nave floor, some three easy steps up. If we add about 15 centimeters for the dais beneath the altar and ciborium which sat on top of the presbytery pavement, this would mean that the pavement of the fenestella confessionis and confessio would lie at about 84 cm. below nave level—that is, at a level some five easy steps down. I summarize this in the measured reconstruction drawing showing a (partial) longitudinal section of the presbytery and nave looking south (fig. 11). Please note that the floor in the transept and the attached three-aisled basilica, as reconstructed (fig. 10), runs at the same level throughout, except for the area above the crypt, which is elevated—just as in Leo III's St. Peter's. Worshippers might enter the ring-crypt at the sides of the low presbytery podium much as worshipers did at St. Peter's from Gregory I's day onward.
One can be quite sure about the placement of the dramatic and startling six-column pergola, because four of the five blocks of its original architrave still survive, having been reused in the walls beneath the present eighteenth-century choir lofts. On the presbytery’s north flank today, the architrave breaks two times only - once over the middle column, and once more over the column in the presbytery’s north-east corner (fig. 4). This means that the north flanking wall of the presbytery has three blocks in its architrave. The longest block, whose west end is embedded in the plaster rendering of the west transept wall, measures about 305 cm. (and it reaches out over the middle column in the screen). The next block buttled to it measures some 256 cm. in length (and reaches out over the column in the presbytery’s north-east corner). A third block - is it in the same marble as the other two? - measures about 59 cm. in length (with its eastern-most end embedded in the plaster rendering of the east transept wall). What is striking is that the architrave on the presbytery’s south flank has a very similar series of blocks. Reading from east to west along the entablature of the wall supporting the south choir loft, we have first a very short block, whose east end is embedded in the plaster of the east transept wall, and which reaches out over the column in the presbytery’s south-east corner. Next comes a block measuring 258 cm. in length, then buttled to it over the middle column comes a longer block measuring about 303 cm., which reaches out over and beyond the column in the presbytery’s south-west corner. Finally, we see a short piece of the architrave, which was made of plaster, and which butts up against the transept’s west wall. The following schematic plan of the presbytery shows the lengths of the architrave blocks that survive from Paschal I’s pergola:
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What is at first mystifying - and this is key - is that there are two long architrave blocks measuring about 304 cm. in length each, and two shorter blocks measuring about 257 cm. How might these be arranged reasonably in a single, straight, six-column-long screen that would fit inside S. Prassede? How, in other words, might the six surviving fancy columns in S. Prassede have stood in a pergola like the one in front of Pope Leo III’s shrine to Peter at the Vatican? If we take the length of the shortest architrave block as marking the space between column axes in a hypothetical pergola of six columns with equal intercolumniations, we can lay out a screen such that the central axes of the bracketing first and sixth columns lie at some 12.85 meters from each other. If, further, we put the two, preserved, long architrave blocks (each about 304 cm in length) at either, extreme end of our hypothetical pergola, and if we hypothesize that there were originally three architrave blocks of the shorter length (about 257 cm. each) in the middle, the resulting pergola would measure just about 13.79 meters.

3 shorter architrave blocks (257 cm. x 3) = 7.71 meters
2 longer architrave blocks (304 cm. x 2) = 6.08 meters

total length of the pergola = 13.79 meters

Now this is just the width of the nave of S. Prassede from the inside faces of the original northern spur walls of the nave colonnades: in fact the measurement between the bases of the first columns in each nave colonnade, which were set in place between 817 and 819, and which I take as a near equivalent for the location of the inside faces of the spur walls in question (now hidden by Cardinal Borromeo’s relic display lofts built in the sixteenth century), is precisely 13.76 meters (measured flat and level across the nave floor).

I summarize all this in fig. 12, a sketch in which I lay out such a pergola with the six fancy columns. This pergola would fit precisely in the space available, and its two long architrave blocks would make perfect sense, since they would extend
over the capitals of the first and sixth columns in a perfectly reasonable way to
engage the western spur walls of the nave colonnades. I elevate the fancy
columns on fifty-centimeter-high pedestals much as the fancy columns in the
Zeno Chapel at S. Prassede were elevated. Finally, the surviving pieces of the
original cornice for this screen - four were reused in the entablatures of the eight-
teenth-century choir-loft supporting walls - help confirm my hypothesis in that
at least they too weakly reflect the pattern of the hypothetical architrave - as the
following schematic plan shows:
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Of course, cornice blocks in an entablature need not be cut precisely to column
axes as architrave blocks must be. Still this series of cornice fragments helps bear
out the pattern I perceive in the architrave blocks of the pergola I reconstruct.
Could Paschal I's builders have actually erected this screen at the top of their
nave? It would have been quite thoroughly in harmony with the elaborate, scenic,
Corinthian orders still in situ all around it. Since all this hypothesis requires is that
we suppose one block of the original five-block architrave to be missing, a block
measuring about 257 cm. in length, and since we really do have six columns to
accommodate, I conclude with confidence that originally, in Paschal I's basilica of
S. Prassede, the six surviving fancy columns, the four surviving architrave blocks,
and the four surviving pieces of cornice with vegetal candelabra were all once part
of a pergola with five equal openings that stretched across the nave next to the tri-
umphal arch. This screen, part of an elaborate Corinthian, scenic confection, helped
focus a worshiper's attention on the celebrant behind the altar - and indeed
also the occupant of the papal throne, which must have risen impressively in the
apsidal synthonon behind the ciborium of the church's altar-grave.

Papal ceremony and its liturgical setting in Early Medieval Rome

Paschal I rebuilt the Early Christian *titulus sanctae Praxedis* in the image of the
great patriarchal basilica of St. Peter's at the Vatican. This architectural rhetoric
extended not only to the Corinthian orders framing the papal display space, but
to the arrangement of the liturgical furniture at the spiritual focus of the sanctu-
ary as well. If in the composition of the Corinthian orders at S. Prassede Paschal
invoked Early Christian, fourth- and fifth-century splendors (at the Lateran
basilica, St. Peter's, S. Paolo il lato, and S. Maria Maggiore), in the choir and pres-
bytery he made a more specific reference to the décor of his predecessor,
Pope Leo III, both in the manner in which he set up the church's altar-grave,
ring crypt, and confessio, and in the way he combined white and red marble
there, and glistening silver and gold.

This reconstruction of S. Prassede's choir and presbytery resonates with anoth-
er, with Sible de Blaauw's reconstruction of Paschal's remodeling of the presby-
tery of S. Maria Maggiore in 822-823. The Dutch scholar argued that Paschal
I pulled out all steps to put a copy of Leo III's Peter shrine inside Sixtus III's
famous basilica. According to De Blaauw, remnants of foundation walls found
alongside S. Maria Maggiore's thirteenth-century transept show that originally in
the fifth century, the basilica on the Esqueline had a wide ambulatory which ran
behind its apse, and furthermore, that communications between the nave and
ambulatory must have proceeded not only through the basilica's side aisles, but
via a screen of columns that ran around the apse proper. This bold, but plaus-
ible reconstruction of the fifth-century basilica's interior allowed De Blaauw to
redescribe Paschal I's remodeling project there. Reassessing each line of the I.P.'s
account of it, then coordinating the results with the seventeenth- and eighteenth-
century reports on excavations carried out in S. Maria Maggiore's choir, De
Blaauw deduced that Paschal must have raised a high podium in the apse, then
extended it out into the old fifth-century ambulatory behind the apsidal colon-
nade. That must have been where Paschal moved the papal throne. The six-col-
umn pergola of porphyry columns that the LP describes, complete with its
balustrade, also in porphyry, must have stood out in the nave in front of the high
apsidal podium. My fig. 13 summarizes these results; I base it upon the sketch
that Spencer Corbett provided in the Corpus Basilicarum. Thus, if De Blaauw's
reconstruction be accepted, it looks very much as if, at S. Maria Maggiore, some
three and four years after he built S. Prassede, Paschal I all but repeated the choir
and presbytery he had installed in the nearby title church (fig. 10). It is striking that this title church should copy one of the great patriarchal basili-
cicas that had come, in the course of the sixth and seventh centuries, to anchor
the new-fangled, papal, rational liturgy. S. Prassede, moreover, copied the great-
est of these special station churches, the church at the tomb of Peter. Paschal I's
motive in carrying out such a program at S. Prassede must have been to reframe
and recapture that paramount display place in Rome. If formerly that space had
served to glorify both popes (in the stationary liturgy) and kings (most notably
Charlemagne at his coronation as emperor), now Paschal took fuller possession
of it for himself transforming this overdetermined stage set for political display
into a purer kind of spectacle, into a more general celebration of papal leader-
ship in the city. By using the 'Early Medieval Petrine chancel' in its latest iter-
ation as created under Pope Leo III in 808-809 for the focus of the scenic orders

---

Judson J. Emerick
inside the title church of S. Prassede, Paschal effectively reframed the entire history of Christian architecture in the city down to his day. Thus Paschal did not really undertake to 'renew Early Christian, Constantinian Rome.' Like his predecessor, Leo III, he appears to have tried to replace that Rome, or better, to retell its story so that as pope, he would appear more fully in possession of the leadership there. Popes led in the Republic of St. Peter having created this new state out of the old Imperial Duchy of Rome quite for themselves. Rather than see Hadrian I and Leo III as subordinate to Charlemagne, and as working closely with him to celebrate and even renew an ancient Rome clothed in glory by Constantine, its first Christian emperor, scholars more and more now see both popes acting throughout their reigns to press their monarchical independence of the Frankish ruler, and force their powerful northern ally to accept a role as 'friend of St. Peter.' Moreover, Leo III, who was especially dependent on Charlemagne for political and military support, went to great lengths to assert his sovereignty in the Republic of St. Peter - something that scholars now begin to argue, can be seen clearly in, for example, the famous mosaic decorating the apsidal wall of Leo III's banqueting hall at the Lateran (datable 799). Redescribing its iconography recently, Manfred Luchterhand concluded that Charlemagne was indeed honored in imperial fashion there (already before his crowning as emperor in 800), but also shown as equal to the pope as ruler. The original mosaic, argued Luchterhand, did not draw parallels between Constantine and Charlemagne, but presented the latter mainly as friend and defender of Peter. The notion of a 'Carolingian renovation' in Rome, that is, the idea that Popes Hadrian I and Leo III joined with the Frankish king to promote a renewal of Constantine's Christian Rome, can no longer be taken for granted. Thinking like this one might say that Paschal repeats a 'papal' not an 'imperial' St. Peter's at S. Prassede; he reinvokes the great Vatican basilica because it had become so important a stage under Leo III for the display of papal power. Paschal must have deemed this political, architectural rhetoric effective because, if Sible de Blauw's reconstruction of it be accepted, he wielded it at least one more time - in the choir and presbytery of S. Maria Maggiore. We deal, then, with a new architectural motif. I might call it the 'Early Medieval Petrine chancel' or the 'Paschalian liturgical stage set.' It looks to have done much the same work as the contemporary papal stational liturgy. That liturgy trumped long ritual traditions in Rome and erased old differences between sanctuaries (between the cathedral and the cemetery basilicas, for instance; or between the imperial dedications and the papal) by knitting all the churches in the city together, both the great patriarchal basilicas and the ancient tituli, as equally effective display spaces for papal leadership.
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1 LP 100 c. 8-11. See also Davis 1992; and Davis1995. The new church stood near the old, which reportedly was too decrepit to restore.
2 Geertman 1975, 80-81.
3 On the sovereign Republic of St. Peter, which had already emerged as an autonomous political entity in central Italy by the reign of Pope Gregory III (731-741), see Noble 1984.
4 Public processions and communal worship of all sorts must also count as significant pre-Moder mass media; but only buildings, and of course, also, their arrangement in urban plans, might keep images before people over time.
5 If S. Prassede’s main longitudinal axis runs from the entry in the facade at the southeast to the apse at the north-west, I will treat it here (as undoubtedly its planners did) as if it ran due east and west. Liturgically speaking, then, S. Prassede was oriented.
8 Caperna 1999, chap. 1, 29-58: “La Basilica di Pasquale I”.
9 CBCR 3 1967, 256 fig. 226.
10 Caperna 1999, 16 (plan), fig. 20 (longitudinal section), fig. 147 (plan of presbytery), fig. 148 (elevation of the presbytery’s south flank), and fig. 149 (longitudinal section of the presbytery).
11 LP 100 c. 9 (transl. author); Sansterre 1983 1, 33-34, 38.
12 LP 100 c. 9 (transl. Davis 1995).
13 Mauck 1987, spec. 825-826.
14 Nilgen 1974. Lines 1-37 of the inscription survive on the upper, original portion of the plaque, and lines 38-57, on the bottom. The date July 20, 817, comes from the upper portion (in lines 8-9). See also Davis 1995, 10-11, who did not cite Nilgen’s study, and whose précis of the inscription’s content drawn from the transcription made by Duchesne in LP 2, 64, is useful. Did Paschal I undertake this translation in stages, with multiple processions? Nothing in the LP or the inscription in question would preclude it. In that case, the procession of July 20, 817, would have inaugurated the series; see Nilgen 1974, 25.
15 Mauck 1997 argued that the translation ceremony exploited a Roman, Early Medieval antiphon, In paradisum, from the funeral liturgy, and that this text directly influenced the choice of imagery for the mosaic decorating the triumphal arch. See now also Dyer 1995, spec. 94-99. Dyer accepted Mauck’s premise that the iconography of the mosaic was inspired by words chanted in the translation ceremony, but went on to argue that a funerary antiphon could not easily have been used in this instance (the liturgies for funerals and for honoring the relics of martyrs were quite distinct). He
cited instead, as possible inspiration for the imagery in question, some Early Medieval Roman antipods for the translation of relics at the dedication of a church.

17 CBCR 3 1967, 288.
18 Compare the reconstruction drawings of Old St. Peter’s in CBCR 5 1977, pls. V and VI, and fig. 229, and in Krautheimer / Curci 1986, figs. 21 and 22, to Corbett’s reconstruction drawing of Paschal’s S. Prassede in my fig. 1.
19 Krautheimer 1980, 123-137, esp. the concluding paragraph on 137.
20 Krautheimer 1980, 124-134.
21 Shortly before Krautheimer published his Rome, Profile of a City, Per Jonas Nordhagen had argued cogently that the mosaics in question at S. Prassede could not have had a Roman, Early Christian, fourth- or fifth-century model, and that instead, they went back to the mosaics that Pope Felix IV installed at SS. Cosma e Damiano between 526 and 533, see Nordhagen 1976. See also Maria Andaloro’s comments in Mattheia 1987, 279-280.
22 Krautheimer followed Beat Breck closely here; see Breck 1972-1974. Of course, as an example of the Middle Byzantine decorative schema, the schema in the Zeno Chapel dates very early - to that first break in Iconoclasm between 787 and 815. For more, see Mackie 1989.
23 Krautheimer did not comment on the unusual iconography of S. Prassede’s triumphal arch, nor mention the frescoes that Paschal installed inside S. Prassede’s transsept wings. A few fragments of them survive inside the church’s eleventh-century bell tower, which was formed from the walls of the early ninth-century transsep wings to the north; see Mattheia / Andaloro 1987, 175 figs. 141 and 142; and 282-283 figs. 22-24. These depicted the arrest and execution of the Early Christian martyrs whose remains were enshrined beneath S. Prassede’s high altar, but in a contemporary manner with no special technical or stylistic links to any Early Christian examples.
24 Krautheimer 1980, 134-137. N.B.: S. Paolo f.l.m. had both imperial and papal patrons. Brought to completion first during the reign of Emperor Honorius (395-423), S. Paolo was damaged in the early 440s and extensively restored by Pope Leo I (440-461).
26 CBCR 3 1967, 245-248. It is likely that these capitals were Corinthian. Consider that four capitals at the ends of the nave colonnades, the ones engaged with the spur walls at the façade and triumphal arch, still survive, and that three of them (at the NW, SW, and SE corners of the nave) are Corinthian; only one at the NE corner is Composite. The builders responsible made these colonnades from reused parts. No supplies of capitals ready-to-hand for reuse must have been limited. That the builders of S. Prassede set up these Corinthian capitals at the spur walls that anchored their colonnades at least suggests that that type was what they strove for throughout. All four capitals at the nave’s spur walls are different in design and manufacture; the NW spur wall has a pilaster capital; the other three have capital columns. N.B.: all four spur walls are covered in Modern stucco.
26 Caperna 1999, chap. 4, 107-122: “Abbellimento e ruolo dell’antica nella sistemazione settecentesca del presbiterio”.
28 The mere removal of the marble plaques in giallo antico and pavonazzetto that formed the pilasters decorating the late fifteenth-century presbytery flanking walls revealed the fancy columns; see Aloisi 1729, 59r. No mortar had been thrown up against the columns when they disappeared inside the pilasters. Attached to each of these pilasters, said Aloisi (61r), was a huge marble impresa of Cardinal Pallavicini (and, ibidem, Pallavicini’s coat-of-arms appeared at the center of the two vaults in the transsept wings that supported the choir lofts). Upon seeing the newly discovered colonnades (the columns and their entablatures), Cardinal Pico changed his plan for a new presbytery. Aloisi wrote (63v) that the Cardinal “ordinò che [the six columns] fossero ripulite col rimodernare l’Architравo, e Cornice, e poste sopra li suoi zoccoli per ciascheduna, e così scoperte, et isolate fossero venute a fare un teatro allogandosì ancora il Presbiterio.” The colonnades were in fact incorporated in new walls beneath choir lofts. Aloisi wrote of them that (63v) “Ambedue poi li dette muri nuovi furono tirati addietro, non solo per ingrandire il Presbiterio, ma anco per metterli in sesto, e drittrì, essendo che gli antiichi erano storti, e disuagli.”
29 Apollonio Ghetti 1661, 44; Caperna 1999, 115.
30 In 1729 the six columns were set up upon tall pedestals, each articulated as two plain ‘blocks’. The lower blocks (about 45 cm. tall in the south colonnade; about 42 cm. high in the north) are made of mortared rubble and faced with a thin veneer of a variegated, dark black marble; Aloisi 1729 described them as having been made of Africano (66v). Aloisi did not mention the upper blocks, which vary between 19 and 20 cm. in height: these were made of a solid white marble with gray veins (Hyemettia, Proconnessian, or Dolomitic marble). Their sharp edges and smooth surfaces attest to their newness: they must have been set up in 1729.
31 All six underwent this shortening process together, doubtless for use together in the same original context. Of course, one cannot know how many times this set of six columns had been reused before they ended at S. Prassede.
32 Aloisi 1729, 60v: “Eravi sopra di esse [the six fancy columns] il suo Architравo che veniva a posare sui Capitelli anche essi gotici, quale facesse due facciate, et era alto palmo uno e mezzo; largo palmi due. Fu poi ridotto all’altezza di un palmo, e un sesto, e alla larghezza di un palmo, e tre quarti, per ciascheduna parte. Sopra detto Architравo posava la Cornice di marmo alla gotica lavorata con varj fogliami, era larga palmi tre, e un terzo, che poi fu ridotta alla larghezza di due palmi (60v) aver- do pienamente e due facciate et faceva la cornice stata mezzo in corrispondenza del detto muro [that is, the walls] beneath Cardinal Pallavicini’s choir lofts.” Ibidem, 66v-67r: “furono rimessi in piedi le sei consapate Colonne sopra li suoi zoccoli fatti di nuovo di Africano, e tirati su li suoi muri col porfi sopra il suo antico Architравo che di sopra si disse, riaggiustato alla moderata [sic] e sopra l’Architравo un fregio Pavonazzetto, e dopo il fregio (67r) la sua Cornice alla gotica, ripristina ancor essa, e ridotta in migliore struttura.”
33 CBCR 3 1967, 256 fig. 226.
34 For example, the columns from the fourth-century martyrrium in Old St. Peter’s, reused again in 1729, and reused in New St. Peter’s as well before the next note.
35 Ward-Perkins 1952, spec. 24-31 and pls. II-V: Abbeville 1989, 166-181. The columns in question have richly decorated Asiac bases and luxurious Composite capitals. Each of their shafts has four zones that alternate between spiral fluting and inhabited vine-scroll ornament, and each zone rises from an acanthus ring or a double-acanthus ring.
36 Scholars have generally treated the luxurious baldacchino of Constantine’s Vatican shrine as an architecture of cuprice and fantasy. But the luxury we see there - and see in the fancy columns from S. Prassede as well - is normal for Corinthian orders, a feature marked in them right from the start under Augustus (31 B.C.-14 A.D.). For a sustained argument on just this issue, see Emerick 1998, chap. 7. N.B.: Corinthian orders have no standard capitals; Augustuan Corinthian capitals, variants of all sorts on that schema, and Composite, Ionic, and Doric capitals all appeared in them.
37 Bauer 1999.
40 CBCR 1 1937, 42-61; see now Barry 1999, spec. 45-46 and notes 8-16 for the litera-
ture on the building’s fortunes during the Middle Ages. LP 98 c. 4, says only that Pope Leo III restored the roof of the titulus of S. Anastasia.


43 McClendon 1996, 103-106.

44 Noble 1984, 299-308.

45 McClendon 1996.

46 See also above, page 42.


48 See above, note 11.

49 De Blauw 1994 (originally Ph.D. diss., 1987, in Dutch, for the University of Leiden).

50 De Blauw 1991, an elegant study boiling down into small compass some key issues that take many pages in its author’s Ph.D. thesis.

51 Aloisi 1729, 446-v, commented only briefly on the columns from the old ciborium, even though Cardinal Pico would save them for reuse: “...d’aver trovato che li Pecchistalli delle due Colonne d’avanti [of the old ciborium at the center of the transept] erano ambedue sotto terra, e quelli dalla parte di dietro posti mezzi sopra l’antico pavimento, e mezzo ne rimanevano fuora, è questa il motivo per cui il Sig.re Cardinale Pico sin dal primo giorno che venne a prendere possesso di questo suo nuovo (44v) titolo ... in vedere le due Colonne dell’Altare maggiore, e specialmente quelle d’avanti al Presbiterio senza base, e come poste semplicemente sopra il pura pavimento, deliberò di volerli rassettare...” Were the four porphyry columns in question re-manufactured before being set up in the new ciborium in the early 1730s? Their elegant entasis and polished surfaces might show as much; but it is equally possible that columns made of such durable material could survive quite intact from Ancient Roman Imperial times. At 2.65 meters in height, they are each precisely 9 Roman feet high.

52 Five such campaigns appear in the documentary record: in 1073-1087 under the titular Cardinal Benedicto Caiio (restoration of the crypt); in 1447-1455 under Pope Nicholas V (restoration of the church); in 1489-1503 under the titular Cardinal Antoniottio Pallavicini (presbytery re-paved, transept choir lofts built); in 1560-1566 under the titular Cardinal Carlo Borromeo (extensive restorations, especially in the presbytery); and the latest in 1728-1734 under Pico della Mirandola (presbytery dug up and entirely rebuilt). There were surely others now undocumented; see CCBR 3 1667, 235-237. Again, precious columns, or parts of columns, once linked with altars in Roman churches tend to stay at or near those altars no matter how many times they might be reused there.

53 As Josef Deér argued forty and more years ago: Deér 1959, 138-140.

54 Aloisi 1729, 42v: “...furono trovati alcuni pezzi di scalini di marmo ... e specialmente uno di porfido alto due palmi, e lungo cinque (45 x 112 cm)...”

55 Aloisi 1729, 22v-v: “...era tutta la tribuna composta di varie sorti di marmi coloriti, cioè di pezzi di porfido, di granito, di marmi oscuri...” Aloisi, 59v, reported that there were thirty pieces of porphyry in all in the apse. This material was removed in 1729, sold, and replaced with new marble revetment and/or stucco.

56 Aloisi 1729, 64v: “L’altra poi del Cornicione antico fù, che essendo ornata la Tribuna di un Cornicione di marmo rosso, largo un palmo, e un quarto [28 cm.]; et altrettanto alto per quello che porta l’aggretto in fora, si discorreva, che se tornava meglio, e il lascierei stare il vecchio, o pure levato. Alcuni erano di porfido, e ritocandolando dove era guasto; Altri dicevano che sarebbe stato bene il levare...” In the end the cornice stayed. But not for long. Apolloni-Ghetti 1961, 55-56, recounted how in 1786, Pope Pius VI removed the precious red marble hoping to reuse it to fashion some tables for the Museo Pio Clementino and the Bibliotheca in the Vatican. A stucco cornice was fashioned to replace the old marble one in S. Prassede’s apse.

57 Deér 1959, 138. See, for example, the notices in LP 98 c. 10 (porphyry columns in the Triclinium at the Lateran palace) c. 39 (porphyry fountain in the second Triclinium which sat alongside the Lateran basilica), c. 58 (porphyry chandelier at the high altar of S. Paolo f. l. m.), and c. 65 (porphyry columns in the baptistery of St. Peters located in the north exedra of the north transept).

58 De Blauw 1991, 41-42; De Blauw 1994, 543-544. Leo III moved Gregory I’s Vatican ciborium to S. Maria Maggiore (LP 98 c. 86) where its four columns must still survive, most likely among the ten porphyry columns that Ferdinando Fuga reused in decorating S. Maria Maggiore’s Cappella delle Reliqie. Indeed, De Blauw argued, Gregory I’s columns must have been used first at Peter’s shrine at the Vatican by Constantine himself. (Is this the one exception that proves De Blauw’s rule regarding “la continuità di luogo e funzione” of precious materials associated with important altar-shrines?)

59 Remains of the balustrade appeared in the sixteenth-century breaking up of the podium when New St. Peter’s was being built.

60 This marble still survives at New St. Peter’s in the steps leading up to the apse floor.


62 De Blauw 1991, 44.

63 LP 100 c. 10: “...he provided a silver canopy weighing 910 lb; he also wondrously adorned the holy altar’s propitiatorium with silver sheet. He beautifully embellished and gilded her confessio, with its grills, walling it inside and outside, weighing in all 300 lb...” (transl. Davis 1995).

64 LP 98 c. 66: “Over the high altar in St Peter [Pope Leo III] provided a canopy with its columns of fine silver-gilt, with various representations, beautifully and marvelously decorated, weighing over all 2704 lb. 3 oz...” LP 98 c. 87. “In front of the confessio of this prince of the apostles, [Leo III] provided angels of fine silver-gilt on the right and left... and two other angels of fine silver-gilt which stand on the great beam over the entrance to the vestibule on the right and left close to the Savior’s gold image... there too, 4 other smaller angels of fine silver-gilt... 6 columns of fine silver-gilt at the entrance to the vestibule... a great arch of fine silver-gilt, over the entrance to the vestibule...” (transl. Davis 1992). Thus the chroniclers in the LP make the similarity of Leo III’s and Paschal I’s gifts of silver and gold to holy places in Rome evident rhetorically. The actual silver and silver-gilt surfaces of the two shrines in question (Peter’s and Praxedis’s) made the same case visually.

65 CCBR 3 1667, 111-130. Palmi: I counted out four rather well preserved platei, and some fragments of ten other such plaques in cat. nos. 58-73 as attributable to the time of Paschal I; one quite well preserved balustrade plaque, which she attributed to the fifth century, cat. no. 54, was presumably reused by Paschal’s architects. All these are immured today in S. Prassede’s Cappella del Cerrozzo in the transept’s north wing.

66 Already claimed as parts of Paschal I’s ninth-century ciborium cupola by Baldaccio 1941, 293-294, fig. 10. Claimed thus also by Caperna 1999, caption, fig. 163. The four marble arches were set up by Cardinal Pico’s remodelers in the stairway-corridor which leads up from the street to the atrium of the church. Compare CCBR 3 1667, 257, note 5: Richard Krautheimer argued that the four marble arches were too small for the baldacchin of S. Prassede’s main altar.

67 I thank heartily the architect, Johannes Knoops, whom I met at the American Academy in Rome in June 2000 while finishing this study, for discussing this reconstruction with me, and for taking such care in providing a rendering of it.

68 See the study by Federico Guidobaldi, “Struttura e cronologia delle recinzioni liturgiche nelle chiese di Roma dal VI al IX secolo”, in this volume. No choir balustrade
of the kind in question (Guidobaldi's type 'a lastre marmoree e pilastriini'), built between the sixth and the ninth centuries, now survives in situ in a Roman church. But Guidobaldi has reconstructed one such choir - an early sixth-century example from S. Clemente - from its many parts reused in the twelfth-century church at the site.

69 Aloisi 1729, 32r: "... eco che immediatamente sotto il piede di detto Paliotto [the Cimbantes mosaic] comparisce un tabernacolo centinato da parte d'avanti alto palmi sei, e largo palmi quattro..."

70 Baldracci 1941, figs. 5 and 6, for measured drawings that show how the pre-Modern altar sat immediately on top of a vaulted chamber for relics.

71 Aloisi 1729, 44v: "... dall'istesso tabernacolo [the fenestella confessionis] delle tre imagini trovate, a piedi del quale vi era il suo pavimento di marmo, e poi intorno intorno alzato il muro che faceva volta, sopra di cui vi posava la predella di legno, quasi muro alto da sei [134 cm.], in sette palmi [156 cm.] essendo poi distrutto [this masonry supported a wooden stage, or predella, to the east of the old altar-grave; Aloisi interprets this convincingly as a modification carried out here long after the old altar-grave had been erected to accommodate a celebrant with his back to the congregation in the nave], videsi rovinare la terra riportata, il che non segui quando si disfece il piano di marmo sopra di cui posavano le tre imagini, essendo che esso era tutto un masso, parte di cui essendo stati costretti a disfare li fondamenti dal nuovo Altare, ci volse della gran fatica, e del gran tempo a levarlo, e si vide che arrivava verso la Balustrada." The balustrade in question was the bronze one built by Cardinal Carlo Borromeo between 1560 and 1566.

72 Paschali I's vita in the LP 100 c. 10, mentioned a confessio at S. Prassede.

73 The floor level of the old ring crypt is guaranteed by the early-ninth-century marble revetment of its rising walls, which stands on top of the crypt floor. That floor sits at just about the same level as the new floor does in the east-west corridor of the crypt built in the early eighteenth-century. My measurement of the height of the nave floor relative to the pavement of the ninth-century ring crypt was made by sight from the eighteenth-century east-west crypt corridor. It should be valid within one centimeter, plus or minus.

74 The ring crypt's ceiling must date to 817-819 judging from the stucco decorations of Early Medieval date that still adhere to it.

75 Compare CBCR 3 1967, 256, fig. 226 (Corbett's reconstruction of Paschali I's S. Prassede). By suggesting that the podium over the ring-crypt originally extended eastward to the triumphal arch, Spencer Corbett divided S. Prassede's transept in three parts (at least as far as floor levels were concerned). But this kind of 'tripartite transept' is quite un-Constantinian. The transept at St. Peter's, for example, is continuous - and its floor level matches that of the attached five-aisled basilica.

76 In my fig. 10, I suggest that the lost north stairway down to the crypt be reconstructed to resemble the largely preserved (and recently reopened) entry to the south. On the entryways to the crypt in the early ninth century, see Baldracci 1941.

77 See Aloisi 1729 in note 32 above.

78 The odd pattern of architrave blocks in the entablatures from each eighteenth-century choir-left supporting-wall proves unequivocally that the eighteenth-century builders of these entablatures struggled to reuse old architrave parts.

79 Of course, at the Vatican in the early ninth century, two six-column-long screens, one in front of the other, stood in front of the altar-grave; see De Blauw 1994, fig. 25.

80 Fig. 11, my hypothetical longitudinal section of the choir and presbytery, shows the spur wall of the south nave colonnade extending some 84 cm. east from the east wall of the transept. This is my estimate of its extension based on the location of the half-capital that crowns this spur wall (I presume only that the capital is in situ). This

width is more than enough to accommodate the pergola that I hypothesize must have engaged the spur wall in question.

81 The three fancy columns on the south flank of the present presbytery now measure 344 cm. high, while the three on the north flank measure 350 cm. This makes it almost certain that, at one time or another, whether from the start or in some context of reuse, one set of three served in one colonnade, and the other set in another (probably side-by-side in a single context). The columns probably came to the building site with sections removed from the lower portions of their shafts (already discussed above) and in two sets of differing heights. Paschal's architects, I deduce, must have lifted each of these columns on the opposite pedestal to make them serve together as supports for a single entablature. Again: this is precisely how the same architects dealt with columns of differing heights inside the Zeno Chapel. In fig. 12, a schematic drawing, I show all six columns at 350 cm. in height, rising from pedestals 50 cm. high. The entablature of the pergola in fig. 12 rises 70 cm., which is, of course, hypothetical. Aloisi 1729 (as in note 32 above) saw this entablature, but did not give any indication of its height.


83 LP 100 c. 31; De Blauw 1994, 382-394 and fig. 17.

84 CBCR 3 1967, 53, fig. 54.

85 In moving Gregory I's ciborium, with its porphyry columns, from the altar-grave of Peter at the Vatican to the presbytery of S. Maria Maggiore in 808-809 (see note 58 above), Leo III might well be credited with having initiated the project at S. Maria Maggiore that Paschal I finished. S. Prassede's pergola in white marble, with columns decorated with acanthus rings, came closer to the pergola at St. Peter's than the pergola Paschal I arranged for S. Maria Maggiore. But at least this latter pergola was in porphyry, the precious stone especially associated with Leo III's shrine to Peter at the Vatican.