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## ABSTRACT

A particular procedure of "aerial" triangulation on the external walls of the Coliseum is necessary to insert in an unique reference system their plotting.

A paper on this subject was presented at the 1989 CIPA Symposium in Rome, but it was not published, due to the inactivity of the CIPA organisation. The scientific and operative setup of this aerial triangulation, based on the projective bundles approach, is now reported here; it presents some interesting peculiarity, due to the variable elliptic curvature of the wall. Its results, characterized by a sub-centimetric accuracy, are also reported.

The procedure is then described to plot the whole wall on an unique reference plane, using a dedicated cylindric reference system. A table with a consistent portion of the plotting is finally annexed.

The present research is a part of the PROGETTO COLOSSEO of the University of Rome.
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1.     - Eoreword

In a paper presented at the XVI Congress of the ISPRS in Kyoto [Birardi et a., 1988J, the general setup of the photogrammetric survey of the Coliseum in Rome was introduced. We stated what follows:
1.1 - The plants of the external Northern wall E1, and of the first internal Southern wall E2 are perfect ellipses (see Table 1).

This assumption was based on the graphical measurement of a number of points on the external borders of the walls, taken from a good pre-existing aerophotogrammetric map, scale 1:500. With the program ELLIPSE, based on "best fitting" techiques, we obtained hence reliable values of the parameters of the said ellipses, and of the adjustment residuals.

Nevertheless, for a further confirmation of this assumption we have recently re-computed the best fitting ellipses using a good number of control points, determined on the walls by conventional ter-
rain procedures. We report here below the comparison between the two sets of parameters (schedule 1).

The little differences between the parameters of $E 1$ and $E 2$ mainly depend on the fact that the map measurements were done on the external border of the higher cornices, while the terrain measurements are effected on control points however placed on the walls.

Furthermore, the mean residual of the terrain E2 ellipse are almost halved as to the E1; in fact the surface of the $E 2$ wall is devoid of capitals, cornices etc., while the $E 1$ wall has plenty of them, on which the control points were located.

What above fully confirms the elliptic hypothesis. We hope that with this the vexata quaestio of the form of the coliseum's plant is finally defined.
1.2 - To get a plane representation of the whole wall on an unique cartographic plane, it is opportune to use a special

Schedule 1

| Ellipse | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Adj. } \\ & \text { pts } \\ & \text { (nr.) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Maj. semiax } \\ A \\ (\mathrm{~m}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Min. semiax } \\ B \\ (m) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Excentr } \\ e^{-2} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Perim. } \\ & \mathrm{L} \\ & (\mathrm{~m}) \end{aligned}$ | ```Mean adj. residual (m)``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E1 (map) | 27 | 95.505 | 78.910 | 0.317 | 549.23 | 0.30 |
| " (terr.) | 71 | 94.631 | 77.545 | 0.329 | 542.14 | 0.30 |
| E2 (map) | 34 | 80.681 | 63.844 | 0.374 | 455.53 | 0.38 |
| " (terr.) | 45 | 80.162 | 63.258 | 0.377 | 452.16 | 0.17 |

reference (shq), which we called "mean cylindric reference", or shortly "Coliseum reference" (fig. 1).

fig. 1
The reference mean cylinder is an elliptic right vertical cylinder, whose plant is the first or the second of the above said ellipses E1 and E2.

The transformation of the local cadastrial coordinates (ENH) into Coliseum coordinates (shq) is fully described in the Kyoto paper; we will not bring here the subject again.
1.3 - We obtained a very good topographic frame for the whole monument, with a local surrounding triangulation net.

This fundamental net consists of 8 points, placed on sound pillars with autocentering devices; the points were determined with millimetric accuracy by conventional procedures (Table 1, Annex 1).

Some other restricted densification nets, and the control points for the "aerial" triangulation on the walls, were derived frm this net. A sub-centimetric accuracy was obtained everywhere.

The operations for the nets, and their results are described in the Kyoto paper. We shall see later on, in the aerial triangulation adjustment (para 2.3), a reliable check of the controls' accuracy.
1.4 - For the photogrammetric takings of the walls two strips were planned, a lower one with horizontal photographic axis, and
an upper one with inclined axis. We hoped to carry out horizontal takings of the higher strip from an elevator carriage, and this we did at first; but unfortunately the carriage was no longer available, so that in the Northern upper strip we had only inclined takings.

The taking plan, carefully studied by Prof. Carlucci, provided large longitudinal and trasversal overlaps, in order to obtain double alternate strips and a strong aerial triangulation block. The takings were effected at a mean distance of 30 m , with a p31 wild camera, $f=100 \mathrm{~mm}$, autodiapositive colour film, photographic scale 1:300. Each taking was repeated twice, in the same position and attitude.

## 2. - The "aerial" triangulation

2.1 - Considering the big number of photogrammetric pairs necessary to obtain the complete coverage of the walls (about 150), we deemed it opportune to determine their control by a particular kind of "aerial" triangulation. I.e., an aerial triangulation in which the strips are the sets of terrestrial consecutive takings around the monument, as if they were taken by an aircraft who flew around it.

So, both in E1 as in E2 we have a block of two strips. Each block has about 80 photograms, with large overlaps and a large number of well determined control points. The fig. 2 shows their distribution on the Northern E1 wall; in E2 it is repeated almost with the same standard.
2.2 - At the beginnings we tried to operate by independent models, taking into account the variations of the $x$ distances due to the elliptic curvature of the referemce surface. But we were soon convinced that this was not a good approach, and we fell back on the projective bundle solution. In fact this is the only procedure which permits to adjust the E1 or E2 chainings in an unique block, as it does not require an unique reference plane, and accepts however inclined photograms.

fig. 2

To get an unique block it is opportune to leave the cadastral (EN) coordinates and to go onto canonic (XY) coordinates, referred to the axes of the mean ellipses. The height over the ground remains as the third $Z$ coordinate. A dedicated computation program easily performs this transformation, as the 5 parameters of the ellipses are known; and gives the new XY coordinates in the format needed for the block adjustment with bundles.
2.3 - For the chaining observations we used an analytical Kern DSR $11 / \mathrm{H}$ plotter. No correction for systematic errors was introduced. The phocal length (Wild P31 camera) is 99.66 cm ; the image size 12 x 86 cm .

The adjustment was performed with the excellent program PATB-PC by AckermannKlein [1988], with autocalibration and automatic gross error detection. For the E1 and E2 block computations, 25 resp. 14 iterations were effected. The result was superior to any expectation, as it appears from the here below schedule 2 .

The Annex 2 reports the results obtained for the control points. We must point out their exceptional quality, which shows the perfection of all the terrain and plant operations (fundamental net, its densification, intersections on the controls, instrumental observations, adjustment computations). The final accuracy of the controls assures a centimetric accuracy in the plotting.

## 3. - The plotting

3.1 - The above said canonic (XY) coordinates cannot be used for the plotting, except for the pairs which correspond to the vertices MN of the mean ellipse (fig. 3). In fact, we need that everywhere the instrumental $Y$ axis be normal to the ellipse, so that the $Y$ coordinate of a generic point $P$ permits to deduce its distance to the mean ellipse, i.e. its altitude $q$ in
the Coliseum reference (shq). Therefore we must give a rotation $\theta$ to the canonic coordinates of each pair, before plotting it; we obtain thus the "normal" coordinates ( $X^{\prime} Y^{\prime \prime}$ ).

We can assume a mean $\theta$ between the nadiral points of the two photos of the pair. This is not quite rigorous, as we should assume a different $\theta$ for each point P; but, as we shall see later, the normal ( $X^{\prime} Y^{\prime}$ ) coordinates are only transition coordinates to arrive to the Coliseum coordinates, and a little variation of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ has no influence on the final result. In fact, the purpose of the transition (XY) $\rightarrow$ ( $X^{\prime} Y^{\prime}$ ) is only to obtain that the $Y$ instrumental mouvement be quasi-normal to the monument's surface in the whole pair.

A dedicated program TRASFH1 computes the $\theta$ rotation for the central point of the pair, and effects the transformation from the canonic onto the normal coordinates. The normal coordinates thus obtained for the control points are used for the absolute orientation of the pair; its whole plotting results therefore expressed in its particular normal system. The observation is done in the usual way, and does not require special modalities.
3.2 - The last step is to transform the normal coordinates into Coliseum coordinates, i.e. to get the transition ( $X^{\prime} Y^{\prime} Z^{\prime}$ ) -> (shg).

This is effected by the program ELI, which:

- gives to the normal coordinates ( $X^{\prime} \mathrm{Y}^{\prime}$ ) a counter-rotation $-\theta$, thus reporting them to canonjc coordinates (XY);
- transforms these coordinates (XY) into Coliseum coordinates (sq).

The third coordinate, i.e. the height of the point on the ground, remains unchanged in the three references ( $Z=Z^{\prime}=$ h) .

The (shq) coordinates are the final ones, which are employed for the graphical or numerical representation of the whole wall, reported onto an unique reference

## Schedule 2

| Block | Sigma Image (microns) | naught <br> Terrain <br> (m) | Con <br> Hori <br> ( nr | ls <br> Vert. <br> (nr) | Mean resid. Horiz (m) | e cont Vert. (m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E1 | 5.88 | 0.001 | 71 | 71 | 0.003 | 0.003 |
| E2 | 6.71 | 0.001 | 58 | 58 | 0.004 | 0.003 |


fig. 3
plane. Their efficiency is emphasized by the following considerations:

- Table 2,a) is a direct plotting in the original normal coordinates ( $X^{\prime} Y^{\prime \prime} Z^{\prime \prime}$ ); here a protruding capital appears strongly twisted. After the transformation $\left(X^{\prime} Y^{\prime \prime} Z^{\prime}\right) \rightarrow(s h q)$ the Table $2, b$ ) is obtained, in which the capital's distortion is completely eliminated.
- Table 3 shows the plotting of some very far pairs (about 50 m ), reported to the coliseum system. The perfect alignment of borders and cornices demonstrates the perfect coplanarity of the pairs' representations. The distance $d=47.8 \mathrm{~m}$ between 2 control points, measured on the map, exactly corresponds to the value $\mathrm{Ds}=47.84 \mathrm{~m}$ obtained from the computation,

After all, the Coliseum (shq) coordinates appear to be quite reliable.
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The observations for the determination
3.3 - The Table 4 reports the complete AUTOCAD plotting of 4 pairs, which cover the so called "Valadier's rampart" and its surroundings.

The plotting was obtained from the relevant numerical files; the control points, and their residuals, are reported on the drawing. But we deemed it unsuitable to transcribe the heights $q$ - which are implicit in the numerical data of each line - and to draw the contours. If necessary, it is always possible to draw them on a separate transparency; but we guess that the numerical files are the only useful item utilizable in any research. Starting from these files, in a separate paper Paoluzzi and Rosina present at this Congress the compressed computer graphics representation of these pairs; while the static situation of the Valadier's rampart is described in another paper by croci et a.
3.4 - If it is possible to get adequate funding, the plottings of the whole E1 and E2 walls will be collected in an album, format $A 3$, scale $1: 100$; the relevant numerical data will be reported in floppies, annexed to the album.

The remaining items - i.e. the horizontal map, the internal survey, plants, sections, etc - will follow, always depending on the available funds.

All the above geometry constitutes the basis for any further collateral study on the Coliseum's architecture, statics, materials, archaeology, etc. Something is already presented in this Congress; we hope that much more may be carried out in the next future.

Rome, April 1992
of the controls were effected by Dr. G. Maruffi, and Technicians O. Evandri and M. Gaeta.

The plottings were done by the firm GEOGRAEICA of Elorence. Eng. Carlucci finally cared for the AUTOCAD plotting of the pairs which are presented here.

To them all goes our sincere gratitude and our thanks.
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Results obtained in the adjustment of the octagonal primordial net, with a. - bi-dimensional + height approach (Bencini- Birardi's program); b. - tri-dimensional approach (Ferrara- Giannoni's program); c. - tri-dimensional approach on $8+3$ points (id.id).
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in units of terrain system
horizontal control points
pornT- 10
5023
5033
5043
5043
5053
5063
5073
5083
5093
5103
5113
5123
5133
5143
5153
5163
5173
5183
5193
5203
5213
5223
5233
5243
5253
5263
5273
5283
5293
5303
5313
5323
5333
5343
5353
5363
5373
5383
5393
5403
5413
5423
5433
5443
5453
5463
5473
5483
5493
5503
5513
5523
5533
5543
5563
5583
5593
5603
5613
5623
5663
5673
12261
12301
12341

77.646
89.565
$\mathbf{x} \quad \mathbf{z}$

| 24.302 | 26.928 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 33.556 | 27.144 |
| 35.345 | 37.428 |
| 35.050 | 48.960 |
| 45.911 | 49.094 |
| 46.282 | 37.278 |
| 46.312 | 27.170 |
| 55.762 | 26.603 |
| 55.750 | 37.168 |
| 55.310 | 49.341 |
| 63.216 | 48.628 |
| 63.623 | 37.231 |
| 63.579 | 26.544 |
| 69.820 | 26.919 |
| 69.805 | 37.519 |
| 69.438 | 48.873 |
| 73.927 | 48.413 |
| 74.376 | 37.435 |
| 74.364 | 27.033 |
| 75.479 | 63.854 |
| 76.788 | 49.129 |
| 77.237 | 37.250 |
| 77.233 | 26.020 |
| 77.495 | 64.213 |
| 78.190 | 49.238 |
| 78.622 | 37.304 |
| 78.522 | 26.850 |
| 77.503 | 64.103 |
| 71.882 | 49.225 |
| 78.307 | 37.444 |
| 78.228 | 26.571 |
| 76.250 | 26.893 |
| 76.274 | 37.541 |
| 75.908 | 49.278 |
| 75.779 | 63.824 |
| 72.293 | 49.288 |
| 72.709 | 37.516 |
| 72.604 | 26.470 |
| 67.321 | 26.863 |
| 67.361 | 37.248 |
| 67.110 | 49.363 |
| 60.032 | 49.488 |
| 60.478 | 37.635 |
| 60.353 | 26.629 |
| 51.685 | 26.640 |
| 51.670 | 37.290 |
| 51.389 | 49.056 |
| 41.953 | 45.413 |
| 41.713 | 35.431 |
| 41.645 | 25.941 |
| 36.010 | .26.006 |
| 36.036 | 35,377 |
| 37.014 | 45.418 |
| 30.102 | 26.122 |
| 26.905 | 45.509 |
| 23.876 | 35.599 |
| 23.840 | 25.961 |
| 17.393 | 26.010 |
| 17.430 | 35.510 |
| 10.737 | 35.549 |
| 10.740 | 26.002 |
| 66.088 | 70.797 |
| 44.718 | 70.716 |
| 23.530 |  |




to leave the cadastral (EN) coordinates and to go onto canonic (XY) coordinates, referred to the axes of the mean ellipses. The height over the ground remains as the third $Z$ coordinate. A dedicated computation program easily performs this transformation, as the 5 parameters of the ellipses are known; and gives the new XY coordinates in the format needed for the block adjustment with bundles.
2.3 - For the chaining observations we used an analytical Kern DSR $11 / \mathrm{H}$ plotter. No correction for systematic errors was introduced. The phocal length (Wild p31 camera) is 99.66 cm ; the image size 12 x 86 cm .

The adjustment was performed with the excellent program PATB-PC by AckermannKlein [1988], with autocalibration and automatic gross error detection. For the E1 and E2 block computations, 25 resp. 14 iterations were effected. The result was superior to any expectation, as it appears
from the here below schedule 2 .
The Annex 2 reports the results obtained for the control points. We must point out their exceptional quality, which shows the perfection of all the terrain and plant operations (fundamental net, its densification, intersections on the controls, instrumental observations, adjustment computations). The final accuracy of the controls assures a centimetric accuracy in the plotting.

## 3. - The plotting

3.1 - The above said canonic (XY) coordinates cannot be used for the plotting, except for the pairs which correspond to the vertices $M N$ of the mean ellipse (fig. 3). In fact, we need that every-
where the instrumental $Y$ axis be normal to the ellipse, so that the $Y$ coordinate of $a$ generic point $P$ permits to deduce its distance to the mean ellipse, i.e. its alti-

Schedule 2

| Block | ```Sigma Image (microns)``` | naught Terrain (m) | Con <br> Hori <br> (nr | 1 s <br> Vert. <br> ( nr ) | Mean resid. Horiz (m) | cont Vert. <br> (m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E1 | 5.88 | 0.001 | 71 | 71 | 0.003 | 0.003 |
| E2 | 6.71 | 0.001 | 58 | 58 | 0.004 | 0.003 |

titude $q$ in the coliseum reference (shq). Therefore we must give a rotation $\theta$ to the canonic coordinates of each pair, before plotting it; we obtain thus the "normal" coordinates ( $X^{\prime} Y^{\prime}$ ).
fig. 3
We can assume a mean $\theta$ between the nadiral points of the two photos of the pair. This is not quite rigorous, as we should assume a different $\theta$ for each point P; but, as we shall see later, the normal
( $X^{\prime} Y^{\prime}$ ) coordinates are only transition coordinates to arrive to the Coliseum coordinates, and a little variation of $\theta$ has no influence on the final result. In fact, the purpose of the transition (XY) $\rightarrow$ ( $X^{\prime} Y^{\prime}$ ) is only to obtain that the $Y$ instrumental mouvement be quasi-normal to the monument's surface in the whole pair.

A dedicated program TRASFH1 computes the $\theta$ rotation for the central point of the pair, and effects the transformation from the canonic onto the normal coordinates. The normal coordinates thus obtained for the control points are used for the absolute orientation of the pair; its whole plotting results therefore expressed in its particular normal system. The observation is done in the usual way, and does not require special modalities.
3.2 - The last step is to transform the normal coordinates into Coliseum coordina-

TABLE 2


TABLE 3



