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Abstract: Triumphal arches, understood in the broad meaning of the term including the honorary arches and city gates, are one of the building types that encountered particular critical fortune in the Renaissance, studied as they were for their inscriptions but also for their architectural and sculptural features. Ciriaco d’Ancona was one of the pioneers of these studies, and, according to Ciriaco’s biographers, it was the triumphal arch in Ancona that ultimately triggered his interest for antiquity and Latin language. The paper explores Ciriaco’s interest for arches on both sides of the Adriatic as well as his role in interpreting, imitating, copying, emulating or quoting these specific antique models.
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The monumental passage, a gate or a triumphal-honorary arch marking the threshold and focusing on the kinetic of the observer, remains one of the central themes of the Renaissance art and architecture. The form of the 15th century gates and portals in Italy owes much to the inherited typological and iconographical amalgam of Roman urban gates and triumphal arches fused already in the late antiquity, the continuity of attention confirmed by sections on gates and arches of the Mirabilia Urbis Romae, usually presented in sequence. Nevertheless, the renovated interest in the ancient triumphal culture and related architectural structures on one hand and the change in military techniques and technology on the other imposed a new, more systematic, approach. While the defensive function of the Renaissance city gates required innovative solutions in response to the newly invented weapons, the parallel antiquary research focused on the ancient

* The present article is based on the paper delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Renaissance Society of America held in Washington 22-24 March 2012 within the session entitled Ciriaco d’Ancona and Visual Arts. I would like to thank the session organizers, Giada Damen and Robert G. Glass, for their input and precious help.

practice and models to be emulated. The present contribution investigates the role of Ciriaco Pizzecoli d’Ancona (1391-1452), the pioneer in the latter studies, in the formation of the Renaissance census of ancient gates and triumphal arches, as well as his role in interpreting, imitating, copying, emulating or quoting these specific antique models.

The notoriously fragmented sources on Ciriaco’s travels and findings in the Mediterranean fortunately do permit an insight into his meticulous accumulations of geographic, visual and verbal data on then surviving examples of arches and city gates (fig. 1). Moreover, Pizzecoli’s Mediterranean wide web of personal
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4 The present study is based primarily on F. Scalamonti, Vita viri, cit.; Kyriaci Anconitani
contacts revealed by modern scholarship had put him in the orbit of decision making on several occasions when arches were restored, moved or quoted within new structures in the mid-15th century, suggesting the importance of his role in the revival of the ancient type.

The Mapping of the Arches

A keen observer of ancient structures, but also a practical man who acted as mercantile and political agent, Ciriaco very often describes the walls of the cities he visits: whether impressive, like the city walls of Argos, ruined for their antiquity, like those of Vis or «recycled», as walls of Split, formerly the perimeter of the Diocletian’s palace5 (fig. 2). Once the urban limits, often the resource for epigraphic research, are put in place, the Anconetan traveler also pays attention to the gates, providing information on their position, size, building material or ornament. Many gates he recognizes as ancient or incorporating Roman triumphal or honorary structures, the latter also sometimes situated deeper into urban fabric. But it is the geographical vastness of Ciriacan census that remained unique, as well as his grasp of both visual and verbal information he gathered6.

Ciriaco’s interest in antiquities and the Latin language, according to his biographer Francesco Scalambotti, was triggered by examination of the Arch of Trajan in the early 1420s, as part of revitalization of the port of Ancona sponsored by the cardinal Gabriele Condulmer, future pope Eugenius IV (1431-1447) (fig. 3)7. As Augusto Campana and Stefano Casu have demonstrated, Pizzeccoli’s notions of the arch strongly influenced Renaissance visual reconstructions, including the idea of an equestrian statue of the emperor on its top, similar to the city’s protector Saint George, sculpted on the Loggia dei Mercanti by Giorgio


5 Epigrammata reperta cit., on Argos see p. 5, on Vis and Split see p. 23.


Fig. 2 - City walls from *Epigrammata reperta per Illyricum a Cyriaco Anconitano*, ed. C. Moroni, 1660 (reprinted in Rome 1747).
Dalmata⁸. A passage of *Anconitana Illyriacaque laus et Anconitanorum Raguseorumque foedus*, echoed in Scalamonti’s entry describing the Anconetan’s study of the arch, includes comments on the building material (marble), the quality of its architecture and the ability of its architects (splendid arch, fine architects), and the mechanism of its patronage (the ancient Senate and people of Rome had dedicated it to the excellent prince), revealing interests analogous to those of present-day architectural historians⁹. A similar descriptive formula is found in Scalamonti’s entry on Ciriaco’s impression of the other Italian arch dedicated to Trajan, the one in Benevento: again, Pizzeccoli’s judgment of its forms is affirmative (fine and noble arch, highly ornate), while its patronage echoes that of the arch in Ancona: the ancient Senate and People of Rome dedicated it to a powerful prince¹⁰. Both ancient structures were incorporated into medieval defensive structures, the arch in Benevento serving as a city gate known as Porta Aurea.

A note by the slightly younger humanist of Fano, Antonio Costanzi (1436-1490), suggests that Ciriaco also stopped in Costanzi’s hometown and interpreted the inscriptions on the arch of Augustus for the locals¹¹. The ancient gate was one of the emblematic monuments of the city: when its upper part was destroyed in 1463 by the bombings of Federico da Montefeltro, its likeness, possibly based on a Ciriacan drawing, was sculpted on the side of the adjacent church and loggia of San Michele (fig. 4). Ciriaco is also the first to note the inscriptions on the Augustus gate in Rimini, which would become an important model for Alberti’s Tempio Malatestiano¹².
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Fig. 3 - Sebastiano Serlio, Trajan’s arch in Ancona, *Terzo libro, nel quale si figurano e si descrivono le antichità di Roma*, Venezia, 1540, p. CXXII.
While in Rome, riding on his white horse, Ciriaco visited various arches, which were already noted in earlier syllogae and *Mirabilia*\(^{13}\). Here a colorful story told by Scalamonti in relation of the arch of Septimius Severus should be remembered, as the inscription incited Ciriaco to formulate the question whether any contemporary prince is worthy of such an honor\(^{14}\). At that moment he was in the entourage of the Antonio Colonna († 1472), the prince of Salerno and nephew of Pope Martin V (1417-1431), so Ciriaco’s quick answer in a form of a laudatory poem was an understandable attempt to humor the young prince and his powerful uncle. Apart from the immediate personal favor, what should be put in focus here is the stimulus provided by the verbal and visual message of the ancient architecture, its imperial


\(^{14}\) F. Scalamonti, *Vita viri*, cit., pp. 47-50, 117-120.
connotations correctly understood, and the attempt to emulate the ancients with the production of a new art form, in which the existing columns served as a metaphor for the last name of the powerful family, the Colonnas.

In Verona Ciriaco counted the numerous openings on the Porta Borsari, noting its double entrance on the ground floor and twelve openings above, as well as the local material of which it was built\textsuperscript{15}. The gates of the Scaliger city are also mentioned in the \textit{Itinerarium} as royal, the triumphal connotations clear to the keen connoisseur of arches\textsuperscript{16}. A drawing of the monument by Felice Feliciano is to be found in the famous manuscript in Modena owned by Giovanni Marcanova, possibly deriving from a Ciriacan model\textsuperscript{17} (fig. 5).

Sometime in the early 1420s, Ciriaco visited Pula in Istria and judged «the city largely ruined», but found nevertheless evidence of the its noble past - a beautiful arch commissioned by aedil Sergius’ daughter Salvia Postuma\textsuperscript{18}. Again, through reading of the inscriptions, which dutifully appear in the syllogae deriving from Ciriaco, the patron(esse) of the arch was recognized, as well as her position in the society of the Roman colony. The arch was not an imperial one, but Ciriaco likely recorded its exquisite architecture with the innovative solution of paired columns framing the arch in a now lost drawing, as the drawings on f. 28v and 33r in the Marcanova sylloge seem to suggest\textsuperscript{19} (fig. 6).

In Zadar, the capital of the Venetian Dalmatia, Ciriaco described the antique arch decorating the so called Maritime gate erected by Melia Aniana to honor her husband, which at the time was surmounted by a sculpture of a one of Neptune’s tritons trumpeting\textsuperscript{20}. The arch was restored to its former beauty in the year of 553\textsuperscript{rd} Olympics (i.e. 1434) by Ciriaco’s friend, the learned abbot of the Benedictine monastery of Saint Grisogonus, Petar Kršava\textsuperscript{21}. Following the Battle of Lepanto, the elements of the antique structure were incorporated into the triumphal composition of the new Porta Marina, its upper part now somewhat altered and

\textsuperscript{15} \textit{Ivi}, pp. 86, 137.
\textsuperscript{16} \textit{Kyriaci Anconitani Itinerarium}, cit., pp. 27-28.
\textsuperscript{17} Modena, Bibl. Estense, MS 992 (a.L.5.15), fol. 124.
\textsuperscript{18} F. Scalamonti, \textit{Vita viri}, cit., p. 44.
Fig. 5 - Felice Feliciano, Verona, Porta Borsari, MS 992 (α.L.5.15), Modena, Bibl. Estense, fol. 124 (from Christian HUELSEN, La Roma antica di Ciriaco d’Ancona del secolo XV, Roma, Ermanno Loescher & Co, 1907, p.13, fig. 10).
the trumpeting triton missing\textsuperscript{22}. The three inscriptions from this arch, present in the Cyriacan collection published by Carlo Moroni in 1660, are legible in the attic of a triumphal arch drawn after Francesco di Giorgio Martini (1439-1501), the Sienese architect long active in the Marches, copied by someone missing the practical knowledge of Greek alphabet\textsuperscript{23} (fig. 7). What remains in Zadar are only the upper third of the pilasters flanking the archivolt, but it is still possible to conclude that Martini’s reconstruction is only very loosely based on the actual Roman arch, the attic and its decoration complete inventions, no marine divin-

\textsuperscript{22} \textit{Ibidem}.

ity present. Nevertheless, remains the fact that the inscriptions from the actual honorific arch are incorporated into Martini’s *all’antica* triumphal invention, in a series of examples of archeological reconstructions and *all’antica* creations by Martini, to be considered inspired by Cyriacan material.

Ciriaco also saw the arches and gates of the Greek lands, measuring the Lion Gate of Mycene, its drawing probably torn from ms. Ambros. Trotti 373. In Thessaloniki Ciriaco admired «a marvelous» arch «of Aemelius Paullus» which Michell and Bodnar identify as remains of Arch of Galerius, the structure clad with marble panels featuring sculptural relief celebrating the victory over Sas-
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Sanids. Scalamboni reports on the tetrarch in the city of Mytilene on Lesbos, «dedicated by the ancient ruler of the islands to Flavius Valerius Diocletianus, Constantinus, and the most noble Maximianus». In Nicaea (Izmir), the complex south gate incorporating the earlier arch, as noted by Michell and Bodnar, is mistakenly attributed to Tiberius Claudius Germanicus, the correct identification of the responsible emperor being Claudius Gothicus. Other gates of ancient Nicaea are not explicitly mentioned by Ciriaco’s biographer, but it is likely that he visited all monumental entrances of still existing city walls. In Athens, Pizzecoli read the inscriptions from the arch-gate of Hadrian, correctly identifying the honored emperor and the marble as the building material, judging its appearance «nobilissimum». Ciriaco also recognized the material of the royal gates in Alexandria, yellow Numidian stone.

The longest and the most interesting description is one relating to the Golden gate of Constantinople, erected by emperor Thedosius (fig. 8). Surviving today in a much altered form, the monument amazed the Anconetan with its marble towers and frontispiece. Ciriaco’s attribution of the antique sculptures appearing on the latter, of which only fragments survive in the Istanbul Archaeological Museum, to Phidias suggests that he judged their quality as excellent. The metal «arms flanked by beautiful columns» Ciriaco saw there, may have been the bronze city gates looted from Mopsuestia in Cilicia and installed by the Byzantine emperor Nikephorus II Phokas in 956. According to Scalamboni, these «arms» were of divine origin as they were wrought on behalf of Thetis by Vulcan for Achilles. The gate which served as the triumphal entrance to the city for centuries was thus described as precious for its antiquity, for quality of its spolia ornaments and for its divine connotations, both of the patron and the maker, all concepts dear to fifteenth century rulers and humanists.

Back in Campania, Ciriaco also examined the gate of Capua, a medieval monument erected by Frederic II (1194-1250) based on the Roman arch in Beneven-

27 *Ivi*, p. 84.
30 F. Scalamboni, *Vita viri*, cit., p. 17.
to, which the humanist from Ancona knew well\textsuperscript{32}. Drawings which may be a copy of Ciriaco’s original survive in Florence and Vienna, the former by hand of Francesco di Giorgio Martini, who, as was demonstrated in the case of Zadar arch, most probably had access to Cyriacan material, revealing Anconetan interest in recording a structure that uses medieval language to conceive a message of the new king whose pretensions are legitimized by the ancient heritage\textsuperscript{33}.

Therefore, Pizzecoli’s topography of ancient arches and gates goes beyond not only \textit{De portis urbis} and \textit{De Arcubus} sections of \textit{Mirabilia}, but also Flavio Biondo’s philological reconstructions of ancient Rome, enriched as it is with the examples from Marche, Campania and Veneto. Moreover, there are two arches

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{32} F. Scalamonti, \textit{Vita viri}, cit., pp. 97, 143.
\end{itemize}
from the Eastern coast of Adriatic, at least six arches in Greece and Asia Minor, which represent, together with gates of Alexandria, a most notable catalogue of this architectural type. Its extraordinary richness is exalted if compared with, understandably, more italocentric topography of arches drawn in the second part of the fifteenth century by Giuliano da Sangallo (c.1445-1516), who had access to Ciriaco’s material. The Florentine architect concentrated on the arches in Rome (ten examples), enriching the topography with examples seen in person during his visit to the south of France and northern Italy, but significantly enough, the Italian arches outside of Rome he reproduces, those in Ancona and Benevento and the monumental gate at Fano, are those central to Ciriaco’s quest. Trajan’s arch in Ancona remains one of the central examples for Sebastiano Serlio (1475-c. 1554) as he reproduces it as an exemplar of the Corinthian order in his Fourth book of 1537, considering it a perfect model for temporary structures, while in his Third book (1540), in order to represent arches outside of Rome, he chooses the six «Ciriacan» examples: Ancona, Benevento, Pula and two gates and an arch in Verona. Obviously, the sources of the drawings and even inscriptions by later architects are not to be identified only with material deriving from Ciriaco, but the important phase of the Renaissance research towards the geography of this ancient type is to be recognized in the Ciriacan census, with later recalibration of the focus to peninsular and western examples, given the improbable accessibility of military structures such as gates in the East after the Turkish conquest.

In terms of analysis of a type, Ciriaco knew arches with one or three openings and was even able to recognize a tetrapyle arch. His observations on building materials reported by Scalamonti are rather consistent when talking about these structures, as marble, local or even Numidian stone are dutifully noted, maybe reflecting Vitruvius or Pliny the Elder or simply Ciriaco’s merchant’s eye for costly materials. Ornament is also mentioned, statuary and relief sculpture above all – in the case of the Golden gate of Constantinople, even an attribution to Phidias is provided, evidently to be read as a praise for the reuse of ancient sculpture of supreme value. Ciriaco also suggested

35 S. Serlio, Regole generali di architettura, Venezia, 1537, pp. LVII-LIX.
36 Id., Terzo libro, nel quale si figurano e si descrivono le antichità di Roma, Venezia, 1540, pp. CXIII-CXVII (Benevento), CXXII-CXXV (Ancona), CXXVI-CXXIX (Pula), CXXX-CXL (Verona: Arch of Gavii, Leoni Gate, Borsari Gate).
reconstructions of the original form of the ancient buildings he saw, using legitimate scientific methods – in Ancona the position and the identification of the sculptures on the attic are reconstructed based on the inscriptions below and examination of the attic. Finally, as collector of inscriptions Ciriaico must have particularly liked the arches as speaking architecture, whose verbal messages perfectly explained not only the *raison d’être* of these memorial structures but also the mechanisms of their patronage. In the broad terms, his inquiries and methods differed little from those of present day architectural historians, maybe with slightly different intentions.

*Manipulating the Arch: Restoring and Borrowing*

Ciriaco was a well-connected man: he knew the humanists of his day and served kings and princes, as well as the pope. He interacted with Venetian and Ragusan nobles, highly positioned clergy, bishops and abbots – and all these people were eager to show him beautiful things. All these people were also protagonists, either as restorers, commissioners or creators of the building and decorative programs realized in the mid-Quattrocento that used the motif of the classical arch.

The two earliest examples involve the restoration of ancient structures: the works at the port of Ancona saw Ciriaico as the direct supervisor, while the restoration of the Zadar arch was sponsored by Ciriaico’s close friend and dated in terms of Greek Olympiads, a fact that may suggest that the inscription and/or even the impulse may have been given by Pizzecoli.

It seems that Ciriaico was also present in Ferrara when a pedestal for the equestrian monument to Niccolo III d’Este (1393-1441) called the *Arco del cavallo* was erected, with Leon Battista Alberti (1404-1472) acting as a judge.37 The solution of a triumphal arch surmounted by an equestrian statue, as discussed by Casu, is similar to Ciriaico’s idea of the original form of the Arch of Ancona.38 Another possible occasion of contact between Alberti and Ciriaico is in Rimini, where an inscription in Greek deriving from the Neapolitan temple of Castor and Pollux as read by Ciriaico appears on the side of Alberti’s Tempio Malatestiano, and the gate of Augustus was used as the main theme of the façade and echoed in the series of arches around the body of the earlier church, merging the theme of ancient and Christian triumph.39 The significance of the use of the antique
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38 Id., “*Veluti Caesar triumphans*”, cit.
arches both as models and study cases in Alberti’s architecture is well known and amply studied, so it is important to return to these records of possible contacts between the antiquarian and the humanist-architect when discussing Ciriaco’s role in the rediscovery of this architectural type.

The first permanent arch of the Renaissance, the Aragonese arch in Naples, in my opinion, is also strongly influenced by Ciriaco: he examined all three visual models for Alfonso’s arch, the arches of Pula, Benevento and the gate of Capua and was in personal contact with both Alfonso and humanists of his circle, who must have been responsible for the building and sculptural program of such a noble structure, which, when described, echoes Scalambotti’s report on Ciriaco’s impression of the Golden gate of Constantinople (fig. 9). Significantly enough, Ciriaco may have also been responsible for the exchange of the artists between the two Adriatic shores, because while in Dubrovnik, he composed a laudatory epigram for architecto parthenopeo Onofrio de la Cava (active 1426-1479), constructor of the aqueduct and the fountains and restorer of the Rector’s palace, as well as other inscriptions in Rectors’ palace, where, as Stanko Kokole has shown, Pietro di Martino da Milano (c.1410-1473) used Ciriaco’s visual material. Both masters were later involved in the erection of the marble arch in Naples (fig. 10).

Analogous roles and mechanisms involving Ciriaco are attested for in other art forms: in 1446 he composed a laudatory epigram commissioned by Andrea Donà il Cavaliere (c.1395-after 1466), son-in-law of the Doge Francesco Foscari (1423-1457), for the reconstruction of the Venetian arsenal in Heraklion, Crete, comparing it to similar antique structure. Ciriaco was also involved in composing the inscriptions for Gattamelata monument in Padua, and may have provided Donatello with drawings of Parthenon frieze.

«Illae triumphales de marmore sublevat arcus», wrote the humanist Porcellio Pan-
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Fig. 9 - Napoli, Arch of Castel Nuovo (photo J. Gudelj).
doni of his Anconetan friend\textsuperscript{45}, and, as we have seen, the verse can be taken rather literally. Ciriaco d’Ancona must have been a major connoisseur of this particular building type in the first half of the fifteenth century, aware of the vastness of the Roman Empire and able to decipher the meaning and patron of particular antique arches, in other words, capable of constructing the history of these highly symbolic urban objects. He also had, in my opinion, a decisive role in, to use Margaret Ann Zaho’s expression, the process of personalization of the antique triumph\textsuperscript{46}, as his readings of the antique examples always identify the patron or the dedicatee, while his loud question of the possibility of recreation of such an honor is a central one of the process. A variety of answers to this question in the second quarter of the fifteenth century, here presented with a clear preference for architecture, regularly suggest Ciriaco’s involvement in both saving the antique monuments that otherwise might perish and emulating the ancient practice as he was able to decipher it.

\textsuperscript{45} On the relationship between Ciriaco and Porcellio see M. Miglio, Scritture, scrittori e storia: Città e corte a Roma nel Quattrocento, Roma, Vecchiarelli, 1993, pp. 59-60.

\textsuperscript{46} M.A. Zaho, Imago triumphalis: the function and significance of triumphal imagery for Italian Renaissance rulers, New York, Peter Lang, 2004.