

well as the triumphal celebrations consequent on its successful completion. They are invaluable to the historian and antiquary, not only for the light they throw on the actual events of the campaign, but for the information they afford us as to the military costume and methods of warfare. They are not, like Greek architectural sculpture, artistic compositions, but are really more like those of Egypt and Assyria, a collection of scenes and episodes commemorating actual events."*

To the same type of monument belongs the even larger column of Marcus Aurelius, depicting the wars with the Marcomanni and Quadi, and with the Sarmatians. An earlier example of the narrative style of Roman war sculpture is to be found in the reliefs illustrating the triumph after the capture of Jerusalem on the Arch of Titus. Less satisfactory are the relief bands over the entrances of the Arch of Septimius Severus, commemorating his victories on the eastern frontier of the Empire.

From the decline of the Roman Empire to the beginning of the nineteenth century the history of the sculptured war memorial presents nothing but blank pages. It is true, the Gothic period, the Renaissance, the Baroque, have left us countless equestrian and other statues, and imposing tombs of individual warlike princes, generals and condottieri. But these are personal tributes to great men, and cannot be regarded as war memorials in the true sense of the word, however mighty the warlike achievements of the honoured person may have been. With the dawn of the nineteenth century came a period of feverish activity as regards the production of monuments commemorative of war. Not only the capitals, but every second-rate provincial town in France, Germany, Italy and Belgium, were provided with imposing war memorials in marble and bronze, which rarely rise above mediocrity (where they are not downright

ridiculous like the preposterous confections of the Siegesallee, or Avenue of Victory, in Berlin), and which at any rate, provide no landmarks in the history of glyptic art. The Arc de Triomphe de l'Etoile, begun by Napoleon I. in memory of his victories, and completed in the reign of Louis Philippe, certainly has upon its façade one of the greatest achievements of modern sculpture, the "Marseillaise" with the figure of Bellona, by Rude, and many other meritorious groups and reliefs; but as a whole it reverts to the type of the Roman triumphal arches, just as the Vandôme column, with its spiral band of bronze reliefs cast from the metal yielded by 1200 Austrian and Russian cannons, and representing Napoleon's campaign of 1805, is a frank imitation of Trajan's Column. Rauch's equestrian monument of Frederick the Great, with his generals, in Berlin, may be mentioned as a modern war memorial of considerable merit, but has no more significance for the evolution of art than, say the Crimean Memorial in Waterloo Place.

The fact is, that the gradual change in the methods of warfare, the invention and improvement of firearms, the disappearance of pageantry, the enormous growth of the armies engaged in deadly conflict, have placed the subject of war almost beyond the scope of the sculptor's art, unless it be treated in an abstract, allegorical, imaginative way. War is no longer a hand to hand struggle, showing up the beauty of the human body in action, which has always been and always will be, the chief concern of glyptic art. The long distance fighting of the present day, when death-dealing shells are sent across mountains by an invisible foe, defies the sculptor's efforts; nor can it be maintained that rifles and bayonets and all the other paraphernalia of modern war lend themselves particularly well to plastic treatment. The painter's brush has become a far more satisfactory medium for the interpretation of war ever since warfare had

* H. B. Walters: *The Art of the Romans*.