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ABSTRACT

BEYOND THE EMPEROR’S DISGRACE: RECONSTRUCTING THE ARCHITECTURAL, TOPOGRAPHICAL, AND LANDSCAPE DESIGN OF DOMITIAN’S ROME

Daira Nocera
C. Brian Rose

While Domitian’s damnatio memoriae led to the destruction of the emperor’s image, the massive architectural footprint he left on the city of Rome was indelible. Most scholarly assessments of Domitian’s building program emphasize the Flavian emperor’s continuity with Vespasian and his more retrospective connection with Augustan policy. On closer inspection, however, his architectural projects exhibit an undeniable thirst for innovation. This dissertation provides the first systematic analysis of the entire building program carried out by Domitian in Rome between 81 and 96 A.D., and repositions this emperor among the great urban planners. His building program is characterized by scale and lavishness as a reflection of his grandeur and by an unprecedented planning for crowd management and circulation in larger public spaces. The imperial complex on the Palatine — the palace, the Domus Tiberiana and the Vigna Barberini — responded efficaciously to the increasing needs of the imperial self-representation and bureaucracy and remained in use after Domitian’s death. Hyperbolic ornamentation met functionality. Traffic control was obtained by the use of original architectural forms such as a horsehoe shape and off-axis entry points in the Porticus Absidata in the forum Transitorium and the innovative solutions adopted in the stadium vestibule in the Campus Martius. The most “Domitianic” aspects of his building program can be identified in regulation of paths of traffic and topographical connections, sightlines and
vistas, innovation in architectural design, sensorial experience of Domitian’s Rome, special interest in libraries and horrea, and, last but not least, the importance of water features and landscape design. In conclusion, Domitian’s Rome was beautiful and opulent, functional and comfortable, a city for the emperor but also for the people. This city deserves to be examined and visualized in a way that is holistic, complete, and reflective of its patron’s innovative vision. New architectural and topographical designs aimed at beautification, but also at directing traffic and presenting the viewer with breathtaking vistas, made the Rome of Domitian eternal beyond the emperor’s disgrace.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

While Domitian’s damnatio memoriae led to the destruction of the emperor’s image, the massive architectural footprint he left on the city of Rome was indelible. The building program carried out in Rome by the three Flavians (AD 70-96), and in particular by the emperor Domitian, transformed the Julio-Claudian topography of the city in profound ways that set the stage for its Trajanic and Antonine phases. The devastating fires that occurred in AD 64 and 80, as well as the length of Domitian’s reign (AD 81-96), account for the extraordinary amount of construction that the emperor was able to implement. After that of Augustus, Domitian’s building program is the most extensive. It surpassed even that of Nero after the fire of 64, in part because the Flavians selectively erased large portions of Nero’s architectural additions. It is therefore surprising that no monographic treatment of the architectural and topographical significance of Domitian’s projects has ever appeared, in stark contrast to the extensive attention that has recently been devoted to the shaping of Rome by Augustus and the Julio-Claudians. The lack of scholarly attention to Domitian as builder and ornamenter of the city may strike one as surprising considering that works dealing with the Flavian age have recently multiplied.¹

This study will provide the first systematic analysis of Domitian’s building program and the changes that drastically impacted the urban fabric of Rome. Domitian’s reputation has been tarnished by the biased reports of philo-senatorial sources, and his contributions are usually seen under the broader umbrella of the Flavian legacy. One goal of this work is to explore the building program carried out by Domitian in Rome, identifying the singularly Domitianic elements that marked his interventions.

¹ More details on the state of Flavian scholarship will be provided below.
The last three decades have produced a high number of studies related to the Flavian age which are primarily based on literary sources. The adjective “Flavian” is frequently used in these works to address issues of politics, literature, and culture developed between 69 and 96 AD. Titus’ rule was too short to allow for an accurate assessment of his personal impact, but there were hardly two more different rulers than Vespasian and Domitian; therefore, Domitian’s reign demands a definition more nuanced than simply “Flavian.” A dedicated adjective, such as “Domitianic”, will therefore be used in this work.

Even a short survey of the titles that have been published recently will convey the renewed interest in this historical period of ancient Rome. Three volumes on Flavian literature edited by Antony Augoustakis were published in 2013, 2014, and 2016. A volume edited by Gesine Manuwald and Astrid Voigt with the title “Flavian Epic Interactions” was published in 2013, while Federica Bessone and Marco Fucecchi edited a work called “The Literary Genres in the Flavian Age: Canons, Transformations, Reception.” These are all collections of essays on authors who wrote fully or partially during the Flavian period, and they are just the latest additions to an already long list of authoritative studies.

An interest in Flavian architecture was propelled by a pivotal long article by Mario Torelli in 1987, called “Culto imperiale e spazi urbani in età Flavia. Dai Rilievi Hartwig all’Arco di Tito.” In this paper Torelli presented, for the first time, a survey of Flavian buildings and an analysis of the changing topography of Rome during the Flavian dynasty. A further step toward the interpretation of Flavian architecture was

---

3 This essay is in “L’urbs, espace urbain et histoire (Ier siècle av. J.C.-IIIe siècle ap. J.C.)”, published by the École Française de Rome, 563-582.
made by Robin H. Darwall-Smith, who published in 1996 a work entitled “Emperors and Architecture. A study of Flavian Rome.” While this book provided a complete survey of all monuments built during Flavian times, it was also mainly focused on literary and numismatic evidence.

A book that offered a more varied look at the dynasty, ranging from textual analysis to historical and architectural issues, was published in 2003 and titled “Flavian Rome. Culture, Image, Text”, edited by Antony J. Boyle and Willian J. Dominik. This is a collection of 25 essays that covered topics relating to the entire span of the Flavian dynasty. As one can infer from the title, the adjective “Flavian” leads the research approach, with some exceptions, such as the essay by Alex Hardie, “Poetry and Politics at the Games of Domitian” and the very interesting one by David Fredrik centered on the use of architecture for surveillance, which used several Domitianic buildings as examples.4

Between March 2009 and January 2010 a large, excellent exhibition on Vespasian was held in Rome, between the Colosseum, the Curia Iulia, and the Neronian Cryptoporicus on the Palatine, on the occasion of the two-thousandth anniversary of Vespasian’s birth. The catalogue that was published in 2009, under the supervision of Filippo Coarelli, represents a great overview of a large variety of topics involving both Vespasian and Domitian. In this volume there are several essays that focus on Domitianic architecture and architectural decoration and art, though the papers are generally very short, and thus the analysis is quite limited.


---

4 “Architecture and Surveillance in Flavian Rome”.
book by Zissos consists of six chapters arranged in a thematic way with papers that deal mainly with literary evidence and draw historical conclusions. The chapter by Alessandro Galimberti entitled “The Emperor Domitian” is a short summary of his rule, and it also mentions his building program, although not in a detailed way. Another essay in this volume by Andrew Gallia, called “Remaking Rome,” is a survey of some of the most significant buildings of the Flavians. In “Tradition und Erneuerung” the focus is mainly on literary, numismatic, and visual evidence, with the exception of the essay by Suzanne Muth, “Auftritt auf bedeutungsschweren Bühne: Wie sich die Flavier im öffentlichen Zentrum der Stadt Rom inszenieren,” where she looks at what the Flavians built in the core of Rome in order to analyze their mode of imperial self-representation.\(^5\)

These studies deal with the politics, literature, and culture of Flavian Rome in general, at the expense of more focused analyses of Domitianic architecture and topography. In fact, in his 1998 review of Darwall-Smith’s work on the Flavians, James C. Anderson pointed out that scholars are desperately in need of an architectural synthesis and topographical analysis of Domitian the builder.

To find a monographic treatment of Domitian as emperor we must look back to two articles published by Kenneth H. Waters in 1964 and 1969. In the first,\(^6\) the author tries to disentangle the family relationships between Domitian and his brother and father, while in the second,\(^7\) Waters identifies several commonalities between Domitian and Trajan, especially when it comes to the Dacian wars and financial administration. A more recent article published in 2011 by Everett L. Wheeler, called “Rome’s Dacian

---

\(^5\) This is an interesting short analysis of the issue of imperial image through architecture, though I disagree with Muth’s reading of Domitian’s intervention in the Roman Forum as following traditional paths, see section III.e on the Equus Domitiani.


Wars: Domitian, Trajan, and Strategy on the Danube, Part II,”8 offers a comparable view by showing similarities between the two emperors.

The first book on Domitian was published by Brian Jones in 1992.9 This work is an original historical analysis of the younger Flavian and his complicated political relationships, together with his administrative and military strategies, but it does not incorporate material culture into the analysis. A few years later, in 1997, Pat Southern published another interesting monograph on Domitian called “Domitian. Tragic Tyrant,” which added little to Jones’ previous work but has a short list of the monuments built by Domitian in an appendix.

Finally, though these are literary analyses, I would like to mention two recent volumes that focus on the comparison between Nero and Domitian. This research approach was generated by the recognition of the impact that Nero had on Rome’s literature, culture, architecture, and topography, and from which Domitian took inspiration. In 2014 a collection of essays called “Nero und Domitian: Medial Diskurse der Herrscherrepräsentation im Vergleich,” was edited by Sophia Bönisch-Meyer, Lisa Cordes, and Verena Schulz, and in 2017 Lisa Cordes published a book called “Kaiser und Tyrann: die Kodierung und Umkodierung der Herrscherrepräsentation Neros und Domitians.” In sum, although the Flavians have recently become a popular subject in scholarship, the relationship between Domitian’s building program and his political program has never been assessed, nor has its impact on the topography of the city.

In the meantime, new archaeological evidence regarding Flavian monuments in Rome has steadily accumulated. The excellent work carried out by the German and French teams within the Imperial Palace on the Palatine is gradually clarifying the

---

construction phases and their chronology—stripping away a Domitianic date from some sections while confirming it for others.\textsuperscript{10} The final stages of the long archaeological excavation by Clementina Panella on the northern slope of the Palatine and the \textit{Meta Sudans} have uncovered extraordinary data about the Flavian phases.\textsuperscript{11} Recent archaeological excavations in the hemicycle of the Circus Maximus confirmed a Domitianic intervention, and his completion of the arch there voted to Titus by the SPQR.\textsuperscript{12} A thorough examination of old and new evidence from Piazza Navona, which occupies the footprint of the Stadium of Domitian, led to the publication in 2014 of the volume “Piazza Navona, ou Place Navone, la plus belle & la plus grande,” edited by Jean-François Bernard. In this volume a few papers contributed original data to the understanding of the architecture of the stadium of Domitian in the Campus Martius and the nature of the games held there. In addition, a forthcoming volume on the Iseum Campense,\textsuperscript{13} the sacred precinct rebuilt by Domitian to Isis in the Campus Martius, will illustrate several aspects of the complex while dealing with issues of politics, religion, self-representation, power legitimization, and architectural design. Recent scholarship thus demonstrates that Domitian’s building program needs to be considered in its entirety.

A comprehensive analysis of such an extensive building program requires the use of a wide variety of evidence. We have traces of buildings that Domitian finished, started, and constructed \textit{ex novo}, as well as buildings that are mentioned in the sources but for which no evidence survives. Similarly, some of these buildings have been published;

\textsuperscript{10} For a summary of the results see Wulf-Rheidt, Sojc 2009.
\textsuperscript{12} See Pergola, Coletta 2014 and a forthcoming volume of the Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma.
\textsuperscript{13} “The Iseum Campense from the Roman Empire to the Modern Age: historical, archaeological, and historiographical perspectives”, edited by Miguel John Versluys and Kristine Bülow Clausen, forthcoming.
others have been studied but remain unpublished, and a few are either newly excavated or have received no documentation whatsoever. This project will, among other things, reflect on how these diverse sources demand a variety of archaeological and art historical approaches. At the end of the concluding remarks, a series of suggestions for critically important new research goals and projects will be provided.

From a methodological point of view the examination of Domitian’s building program will stem from a close examination of the archaeological and architectural remains, which will constitute the foundation of this analysis. Around this type of evidence, this study will weave the evidence of landscape architecture, visual culture such as architectural decoration, historical reliefs and statuary, and historical sources, including the literary record and epigraphy. The reproductions of Domitianic monuments on coin reverses also provide valuable information, especially regarding their figural decoration, as do some architectural drawings of the Renaissance and Baroque periods. Spatial analysis and space perception will lead the interpretation not just of single buildings, but of the architectural complexes that Domitian built, which will also be considered in their larger topographical context. Sightlines and routes between monuments will be included in the analysis in order to decipher the broad urban planning ideas. Finally, a look at the sensorial experience of Domitian’s Rome will enlighten one of the most distinctive aspects of the city under the last of the Flavians: the incessant construction activity and its impact on the experience of the citizens.

The organization of the chapters will be primarily topographical, targeting the districts in Rome in which there is evidence for Domitianic construction. This model of organization has been chosen because it will allow us to assess the extent to which Domitian may have manipulated the topography of Rome, and to chart regional variations in the city’s appearance. Since the relation between space and function is one
of the primary research questions of this work, a topographical arrangement will be the most effective framework for this discussion.

The choice of a topographical arrangement was made after a careful consideration of the alternatives, which include typological, chronological, and alphabetical arrangements. In previous works, specifically in Darwall-Smith's book, the arrangement by monument typology resulted in several flaws, already highlighted in Anderson's review. Anderson rightfully points out how the typological arrangement prevents the reader from getting a picture of what Domitian's Rome looked like and how it was experienced, which is one of the goals of my research. Anderson also suggests the topographical arrangement as the most suitable one, and mentions Mary Boatwright's work on Hadrianic building in Rome\textsuperscript{14} as an example of how successful this type of organization can be. In fact, a typological arrangement would lack a geographically coherent consideration of how the monuments impacted the topography of the city.

The chronological arrangement, which was considered as an alternative, presents other difficulties. Some buildings, such as the Forum Transitorium or the palace on the Palatine, were constructed over a long span of time. Most importantly, the dating of other buildings, such as the restoration of the Pantheon, remains uncertain. Since the relationship between space and function, and the ways in which architecture and landscape installations acted in different regions of the city are among the primary objectives of this work, a topographical framework will serve as the best mechanism by which the relevant evidence can be organized. The following provides an overview of the organization of the material by chapter.

As can be seen from fig. 1, which illustrates the content organization by district, chapter II includes the region of the Imperial fora and the Quirinal hill. Despite the

\textsuperscript{14} Boatwright 1987.
geographical distance between the fora and the Quirinal, the monuments built by Domitian on this hill, the *Ara Incendii Neronis* and the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, are included here due to the fact that the cut of the saddle between the Quirinal and the Capitoline was in fact planned and completed by Domitian, even if later occupied by Trajanic construction with credit for removal of terrain usurped by the inscription on the Column of Trajan. In a way, the massive work carried out in the region of the imperial fora had an impact on the Quirinal hill as well. In this chapter Domitian’s intervention will be analyzed in light of issues of continuation and innovation, both of which are discernible in his buildings. Domitian restored the temple of Venus Genetrix in the forum of Caesar, constructed his own forum (known as *Transitorium* or the forum of Nerva, since after Domitian’s assassination it was Nerva who inaugurated it in an act of spoliation), built a library and a hall with a water feature in his father Vespasian’s *Templum Pacis*, and, finally, started the construction of a massive second forum which featured a grand, monumental fountain now known as the “Terrazza Domizianea.”

Chapter III takes into consideration a large geographical area that includes the Capitoline hill, the Roman Forum, and the Valley of the Colosseum. The borders of this sector were set in light of some meaningful visual and topographical connections, and because of the similar thematic issues involved in the construction of some monuments, which I have labeled “dynastic language.” On the Capitoline hill Domitian was responsible for the restoration of the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, which suffered severe damage after the fight against Vitellius in AD 69. He then built two more temples to Jupiter, a small one to Jupiter Conservator and a larger temple to Jupiter Custos, though unfortunately the archaeological evidence for both is very poor.

At the foot of the Capitoline hill a pair of buildings, perhaps begun by Titus but finished by Domitian, were built against the Tabularium: the so-called *Porticus Deorum*
Consentium and the temple of the Divine Vespasian. Other important interventions in the forum were the restoration of the Curia Iulia with the additions of splendid bronze doors, the completion of the horrea Vespasiani and the construction of the horrea Piperataria. One of the most extravagant monuments built by Domitian was certainly his colossal gilded bronze equestrian statue, celebrating his German triumphs, whose contours and iconography we know from the extensive description by court poet Statius, and whose size, location, and orientation made this an outrageous addition to a very traditional public space. On the eastern edge of the forum the Arch of Titus that Domitian had the SPQR vote for his now dead and deified brother along the Via Sacra complemented other crucial Flavian monuments in the Valley of the Colosseum with which it was in visual dialogue: the Meta Sudans, a monumental round fountain, and the Colosseum itself. The buildings in the Valley of the Colosseum were not Domitian’s projects originally but were instead conceived by Vespasian to fit his political agenda of giving back to the citizens the areas of the city appropriated by Nero after the fire of AD 64. Domitian completed these projects, in particular the Meta Sudans, the gladiatorial facilities known as the ludi, and the Moneta, the new state mint and a fully Domitianic project.

The construction of the imperial palace on the Palatine hill, variously discussed as Domus Flavia or, in part, Domus Augustana, has been considered Domitian’s greatest achievement in architectural design. Chapter IV will be dedicated to Domitian’s buildings on the Palatine, which include the imperial palace, the so-called Domus Tiberiana, the Vigna Barberini complex, and the so-called Forum Buildings. The analysis of the Domitianic phase of the emperors’ Palatine complexes will be preceded by an overview of the earlier interventions by Augustus, Tiberius, Claudius, Nero, and Vespasian. Recent archaeological investigations on the Domus Tiberiana, for instance,
have shown that the concept of a grand imperial residence was already in the minds of the Julio-Claudian emperors, although it is Domitian who was responsible for the realization of this vision. The analysis of the Palatine will entail a treatment of the architectural solutions and spatial manipulation adopted by Rabirius, Domitian’s architect, for which Martial remains the only source. In this chapter I will question the traditional division of the imperial palace into “public” and “private” areas, while suggesting an interpretation of the palace space as a multifunctional complex where the boundaries between public and private are more blurred.

The fifth chapter focuses on the Campus Martius, where a significant part of Domitian’s building activity took place. After Augustus’ urbanization of the area, Domitian’s intervention can be viewed as the second most extensive program of construction there. The stadium-Odeum complex defined the western edge of the Campus Martius together with the Theatre of Pompey, and they reveal the grand scale of Domitian’s plans for an entertainment center. The former structure’s impact on the topography is still maintained in the form of Piazza Navona. An analysis of the eastern complex of the Campus Martius is equally instructive in regard to the emperor’s attitudes toward religion and urban planning, and will include the reconstruction of the Iseum Campense, the Minerva Chalcidica, and the Porticus Divorum. In addition to these monumental complexes, Domitian intervened extensively in the central and southern sectors where the fire of AD 80 caused intense damage. A short description of the so-called Cancelleria Reliefs is included at the end of this chapter since they were discovered in the southern Campus Martius, but it is unknown to which building they belonged originally.

This new analysis will demonstrate the inadequacy of the broad label “Flavian” to define the architectural and topographical design of Domitian’s Rome. The
transformation of the city will then be viewed through different lenses which will help focus on how the city was perceived in terms of sightlines, vistas, space experience, and how the emperor dealt with urban vision on a large scale. This work repositions Domitian among the great urban planners. His program is characterized by scale and lavishness as a reflection of his grandeur and by an unprecedented degree of planning for crowd management and circulation in larger public spaces. The imperial complex on the Palatine — the 'Domus Flavia' palace, the Domus Tiberiana and the Vigna Barberini — responded efficaciously to the increasing need for imperial self-representation and bureaucracy, and remained in use after Domitian’s death. Here hyperbolic ornamentation met functionality. Traffic control was obtained by the use of original architectural forms such as a horseshoe shape and the off-axis entry points in the Porticus Absidata into the Forum Transitorium, and the innovative solutions adopted in the stadium vestibule in the Campus Martius.

As it will be shown, Domitian’s Rome proved how lavishness had become a necessary facet of imperial self-representation, while paying attention to the experience of the space, as well as traffic and crowd control. A holistic approach to describing and understanding this Rome is, therefore, necessary to finally give full credit to the complex urban plan that the youngest Flavian dynast envisioned for the city.
“Imperial fora” or “forums” is the modern designation of a series of public spaces built in the core of ancient Rome to the north of the Roman Forum, starting with the forum built by Julius Caesar between 54 and 29 B.C.\(^{15}\) to the last one built by Trajan between A.D. 106 and 113.\(^{16}\) These large areas were defined by a portico, usually on three sides, and a focal temple set against the rear wall of the complex. In ancient times the imperial fora were known by the names of their founders, such as *forum Iulium* or *forum Caesaris* for that of Caesar.\(^{17}\) The forum built by Augustus with a temple dedicated to Mars Ultor was known as *forum Augusti*\(^{18}\) and sometimes as *forum Martis*.\(^{19}\) The large garden area built by Domitian’s father, Vespasian, and dedicated to Peace (Pax), was known in ancient times as *Templum Pacis* (sanctuary of Pax) and only mentioned as *forum Pacis* in post-Constantine sources.\(^{20}\)

Therefore, by the time Domitian inaugurated his intense building program in the area of the Imperial Fora, the space was already a sophisticated advertisement of empire (fig. 1). The last of the Flavian emperors was, in fact, the fourth to mark the area with new lavish public buildings, after Caesar, Augustus, and Vespasian. Domitian’s intervention shows a clear continuation of the way previous emperors, in particular Augustus and Vespasian, left their signatures in the area coupled with a new approach to imperial self-representation. His buildings profoundly altered not only the topographical

\(^{15}\) See Delfino 2014 for a recent analysis of the sources and new archaeological data from the forum of Caesar.
\(^{16}\) Dio 68.16.3, 69.4.1; Vict. Caes. 13.5.
\(^{17}\) Platner & Ashby 1929, 226 with bibliography.
\(^{18}\) SHA, Hadr., 19.10.
\(^{19}\) Platner & Ashby 1929, 221 with bibliography.
\(^{20}\) Platner & Ashby 1929, 386 with bibliography.
profile of this region, but also must have transformed the general perception of the space, with changes in the extant orientation of the component buildings and the flow of movement.

Domitian was the emperor who, more than any other before and after him, left his mark on the area of the Imperial fora. Each sector of the Imperial Fora was involved in some kind of restoration, addition, or new construction during his reign. Certainly, the fires of AD 64, under Nero, and 80, during the short reign of Domitian's brother Titus, provided Domitian with the chance to show his generosity as a new ruler and restorer, but most of the projects carried out in the zone of the Imperial Fora are a testimony to an innovative urban plan that was meant to change the perception of the area forever. In the following sections I will describe and analyze the interventions by Domitian in the area of the Imperial Fora, moving through the topography in a counter-clockwise direction, starting with the Forum of Caesar and ending with Domitian's own forum and the monumental fountain known as the Domitianic Terrace. For each section a brief history of the excavations and the sources will be given.

As explained in the introduction, the two Domitianic buildings on the Quirinal Hill, the dynastic building known as the Templum Gentis Flaviae and the Ara Incendii Neroniani will also be included in this chapter, although they occupied a separate topographical location on the Quirinal hill. This hill, the birthplace of Domitian, was heavily impacted by the work he inaugurated in the area that would ultimately become the Forum of Trajan, which included the drastic cut in the saddle between the Quirinal and the Capitoline. As I will show, it is today unanimously accepted that Domitian completed a section of his second forum planned in the area later chosen by Trajan, who continued, largely, what Domitian had started. The Templum Gentis Flaviae
represented, perhaps, the acme of the celebration of the Flavian family, achieved through an innovative combination of architectural elements.

II.a The forum of Caesar

The *Forum Iulium* with its temple of Venus Genetrix is located to the east of the *Forum Romanum*, and it is oriented along a northwest-southeast axis (fig. 2). It consisted of a rectangular square surrounded by double-aisled porticoes that housed *tabernae* and framed the Temple of *Venus Genetrix* on the northwest end (fig. 5). In the Medieval period the forum complex was occupied by huts, and traces of agricultural cultivation during this period have been found quite recently. More refined residences, the so-called *Domus terrinae*, occupied the northeast sector of the forum and were built with reused architectural elements. In the Renaissance the region occupied by the Imperial Fora was radically transformed when an entirely new neighborhood was constructed by Cardinal Bonelli, also known as Cardinale Alessandrino, between 1566 and 1572. The project promoted a significant reclamation of an otherwise swampy area that was obtained through the construction of a massive new sewage system whose traces are today visible in several places. The Alessandrino quarter (fig. 6) was then partially demolished during the excavations carried out under Mussolini (fig. 7), but one if its main streets, the Via Alessandrina, is still functioning today and offers one of the best and most informative views over the remains of the fora of Augustus and Domitian.\(^\text{21}\)

\(^{21}\) Meneghini 2009.
II.a.1 Archaeological evidence and history of the excavations

The remains of the Forum of Caesar are substantial (fig. 2, in grey). Almost the whole southern half of the forum has been unearthed. The southwest *tabernae* and portico, the square, and the podium of the temple of Venus Genetrix are now visible. Three Corinthian columns and part of the entablature of the temple were reconstructed through anastylosis in the 1930s (fig. 5), with the column shafts restored according to the fashion of the time with round bricks. Thanks to the recent archaeological investigation carried out by the Municipality of Rome between 2005 and 2008, the northwestern short side has been partially uncovered and it shows today the Maxentian (AD 306-312) restoration of the floor in *opus sectile*.

The forum of Caesar was subjected to a massive spoliation starting in the 16th century that caused the erasure of the memory of the monument and its location. Once the forum was correctly located in the 19th century, it was excavated in several campaigns. Between 1924 and 1933 the fascist *Governatorato* carried out a large excavation and construction project to celebrate Rome as the capital city of Italy, also aimed at improving the traffic flow in the center of the city. On this occasion Corrado Ricci, one of the most influential archaeologists and art historians at the time, presented a very ambitious plan to uncover the area of the Imperial Fora. Budget limitations caused

---

22 The excavation was carried out under the field direction of Alessandro Delfino, and the author as trench and students supervisor for the 2005-2006 season. The study of the data was the subject of Delfino’s PhD dissertation which was published in 2014. The volume "*Forum Iulium, L’area del foro di Cesare alla luce delle campagne di scavo 2005-2008,*" by A. Delfino (Delfino 2014) represents a milestone in our knowledge of the area from an archaeological, geological, and historical point of view. Among the groundbreaking data gathered during the excavation there were traces of a fire which has been dated through Carbon 14 method to the early 5th century B.C., an archaeological confirmation of the sack by the Gauls mentioned only in the sources, Livy, 5.42.7; Plut., *Camillus*, 22.6.


24 Venuti and Canina identified some remains, but it is Lanciani who was able to place the forum on a map and provide accurate dimensions for it. See Delfino 2014 nn. 56 and 57, p. 8 and p. 12.

25 This section is a concise summary of the history of the excavations in the Forum of Caesar. For a thorough survey of the history see Delfino 2014, 1-29.
Ricci to reduce the areas to be excavated, and the project was realized between 1931 and 1934. Lamboglia and Fiorani carried out more excavations in the area between 1960 and 1970, focusing on architectural issues such as the intercolumniation of the porticoes. Tortorici and Morselli published the results of their campaign in 1989, which targeted the southern sector of the forum with regard to the relations between the *Forum Iulium*, the *Curia*, and the *Forum Transitorium*.

In 1991 M. Amici published her monograph about the forum with a reconstruction of the whole monument and a detailed analysis of the *tabernae*. Starting in 2000, a series of excavation campaigns were undertaken on the occasion of the Jubilee year (fig. 8). A synthesis of the excavation campaigns carried out in the Imperial Fora between 1991 and 2007 was published by Meneghini and Santangeli Valenzani in 2007.\(^{26}\) Finally, thanks to the recent publication of the excavation carried out in the Forum of Caesar in 2005-08,\(^{27}\) it has been possible to establish a clear and sound construction phasing of the forum.

**II.a.2 History of the forum and Domitianic intervention**

The first of the Imperial Fora was begun by Caesar in 54 BC, as a sanctuary precinct in Republican style, and work continued until 46 when the temple, built on the southeastern end, was dedicated to *Venus Genetrix*.\(^{28}\) The first inauguration of the forum occurred in 46 BC, when the temple and most of the *tabernae* were still incomplete. Caesar’s plans for his forum included the construction of a new senate meeting house, the *Curia Iulia*, which was built on the southern corner as an appendix to the precinct overlooking the *Forum Romanum* and just off the Via Sacra. Dio tells us that in order to

---

\(^{26}\) See Delfino 2014, 22, n. 118.  
\(^{27}\) Delfino 2014.  
\(^{28}\) Delfino 2014, 255.
justify the demolition of the Republican Curia Hostilia, a temple dedicated to Felicitas was begun in the place of the old curia,\(^{29}\) (fig. 4).\(^{30}\) Right before Caesar's assassination in 44 the Senate granted him permission to build a new curia, which extended the forum by 20 m toward the south, but Caesar's death put a halt to the construction.\(^{31}\) In 42 BC, Octavian resumed the work with the demolition of the Templum Felicitatis, most likely still incomplete. From 42 to 29 BC, the year of the inauguration of the forum by Octavian, the construction proceeded with the completion of the Curia Iulia and the rearrangement of the southeastern short side of the porticoes; the Temple of Venus was also largely completed.\(^{32}\) The Forum Iulium was then the first porticoed area in the heart of ancient Rome that was dominated by a temple against the back wall, and planned by an individual whose family name the complex carried. The only similar complex erected at Rome prior to Caesar's forum, with less emphasis on the temple building and the family connection, was the theatre and portico complex of Pompey in the Campus Martius, with the small temple of Venus built right at the top.\(^{33}\) The Curia Iulia, though an integral element of Caesar's vision was, in fact, a feature of the Roman Forum.\(^{34}\)

The next significant intervention in the forum was carried out by Domitian, who probably decided to restore the areas of the forum that were damaged by the fire of 64 A.D. (fig. 3). The Chronographer of 354 indicates that Domitian was the restorer of the

---

\(^{29}\) Dio 44.5.2. According to Dio the temple was planned by Caesar but built by M. Aemilius Lepidus. See also E. Tortorici 1995, s.v. “Felicitas, naos”, LTUR II, 245-46.

\(^{30}\) Ibid.

\(^{31}\) Ibid.

\(^{32}\) Delfino 2014, 253-56

\(^{33}\) See the discussion of the theatrical complexes in the Campus Martius in chapter V, section b.1.

\(^{34}\) As an example of one of the first forum-like areas, the Porticus Metelli, should be mentioned. It was built by Quintus Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus in 143 B.C following his triumph in Macedonia. The complex was the first quadriportico in ancient Rome enclosing a older temple dedicated to Juno Regina built by Aemilius Lepidus in 179 B.C. and to which Metellus added a temple to Jupiter Stator.
Curia Iulia, as do the other ancient sources.\textsuperscript{35} Most likely, he also began the restoration of the porticoes and the Temple of Venus Genetrix,\textsuperscript{36} later restored by Trajan and celebrated in a joint inauguration with the Column of Trajan on May 12, 113 A.D.\textsuperscript{37} Trajan's intervention in the Temple of Venus was radical, and it might have concealed the previous restoration by Domitian. The plausibility of this assumption lies in the several surviving examples of Domitianic restoration for buildings damaged by the two most extensive fires that occurred before his accession, in 64 and 80 A.D.\textsuperscript{38}

The most impressive intervention to be attributed to Domitian on the northern edge of the forum was the cut of the saddle between the Capitoline and the Quirinal Hills, just behind the Temple of Venus Genetrix. The impetus for this major intervention has been attributed to Trajan for years, since the project seemed to have been intended to create the space for the largest forum of all, that of Trajan. However, recent examination of the archaeological evidence\textsuperscript{39} and the geological profile of the hill, together with new discoveries made at the foundation and sewage system levels\textsuperscript{40}, has conclusively shown that the cut was completed by Domitian for a new grand project, the shape and purpose of which remain unknown.\textsuperscript{41} Despite the elusive nature of the new project, this attribution has significant consequences for the overall meaning of Domitian's intervention in this region that will be analyzed later under the rubric “the Domitianic Terrace” and in the conclusions. Part of the slope between the two hills had

\textsuperscript{36} Delfino 2014, 5.
\textsuperscript{37} Anderson 1984, 56; Meneghini 2009, 50; Delfino 2014, 5.
\textsuperscript{38} Among the buildings restored by Domitian after a fire there is the Curia Iulia, the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline (see chapter III on the Roman Forum and The Capitoline hill), the Circus Maximus (see chapter IV on the Palatine), and the entire southern sector of the Campus Martius (see chapter V on the Campus Martius).
\textsuperscript{39} Vitti, Bianchini 2017, the two authors re-examined the preexisting foundations beneath the Markets of Trajan and found confirmation and new evidence for a large intervention by Domitian.
\textsuperscript{40} Bianchi 2010, 382, n. 22.
\textsuperscript{41} Tortorici 1993, 7, 12-15, 18; Bianchi 2010, 379-402; Longfellow 2011, 51.
already been cut at the time of the construction of the *tabernae* for the Forum of Caesar.\textsuperscript{42} The completion of the cut was carried out by Domitian, who likely started the construction of the retaining wall on the Capitoline side finished later by Trajan.\textsuperscript{43} The thorough geological analysis of the area has allowed us in recent years to finally understand and accurately measure the extent of the cut not just in this region, but in the entire valley of the fora.\textsuperscript{44}

Significant modifications occurred on the southwest side of the forum for different reasons. The restoration of the *Curia Iulia*, and the addition of bronze doors,\textsuperscript{45} was likely made necessary by the damage caused by the AD 64 fire. It is puzzling that thus far there are no archaeological traces of an earlier restoration of the *curia*. There are no mentions in the sources of repairs undertaken by Vespasian; therefore, we have to assume that several areas remained unrepaired until the time of Domitian.\textsuperscript{46} The construction of the *Forum Transitorium* started around the years 85-6,\textsuperscript{47} and it drastically modified the topography of the *Argiletum*, a Republican neighborhood and a street that connected the Subura in the north with the Roman Forum. The *Forum Transitorium* did alter the southeast side of the porticoes in the Forum of Caesar. The northwest wall of the *Forum Transitorium* was built against the southeastern short side

\textsuperscript{42} Bianchi 2010, 379.
\textsuperscript{43} Bianchi believes that the elevation of this wall was built in AD 110 by Trajan. Despite the presence of Domitianic brick stamps on the ledge, she sees the ledge and the elevation of this wall as a unitary construction unit implying that Trajan used Domitianic bricks for the construction. However, she also thinks that traces on the hill side of the wall indicate that a temporary wooden structure might have been built by Domitian right after the cut in preparation for the wall construction that was delayed until Trajan’s project began, Bianchi 2010, 385. For a more recent analysis of some remains and the dating to Domitianic times see Bianchini-Vitti 2017, 22, footnote no. 60.
\textsuperscript{44} See Delfino 2014, 30-47 for a detailed survey of previous studies and a report on the most recent analyses.
\textsuperscript{45} For more details on those door see section III.a on the Roman Forum.
\textsuperscript{46} We could explain the choice for allocating funds and force to repair and maintain a certain building or area with the extent of the damage. Therefore, it is possible that the Curia Iulia did not suffer severely from the fire of AD 64, see below for more observations on this point.
\textsuperscript{47} See below section II.c.
of the Forum of Caesar, its end wall (fig. 3). As a result, only the last three columns on the southern corner of the portico, toward the Curia Iulia, must have remained visible in the resulting triangular space formed by the curia, the Forum Transitorium, and the Basilica Aemilia (fig. 3).

The archaeological traces in this area are complicated by the survival of later Diocletianic structures. The southern short side of the Forum of Caesar became embedded in the wall of the new Domitianic forum and was decorated with marble slabs between the columns whose traces are visible in the later Diocletianic wall. The wall of Domitian's forum did not completely obliterate this side of the forum of Caesar.

Toward the Curia Iulia the presence of a marble block on the stylobate of the Forum of Caesar’s colonnade suggests that a short section of the columns were transformed into semi-columns and embedded in a marble revetted structure. This structure can probably be identified with the arch visible in the Renaissance drawings by Antonio da Sangallo and Baldassare Peruzzi depicting the area of the church of Sant’Adriano, formerly the Curia Iulia. The manner in which the fora of Caesar and Domitian communicated is yet to be established, for the more recent archaeological excavations have not recovered clear data related to this issue. The northwest wall of the Forum Transitorium was most likely pierced in several places to grant access to both the Forum of Augustus and that of Caesar. Considering the relation between the walls of the Caesarian and the Domitianic forum, it is possible to imagine equally functional solutions in which the Caesarian forum could have been accessed through one central door or two placed on either side of the central axis.

49 Ibid.
Domitian's interventions in the zone of the Forum of Caesar, then, were a mix of repairs due to the AD 64 fire and new construction projects. As already mentioned, it is puzzling that Domitian seems to be the first one to carry out restoration work for the damages caused by the 64 fire. One reason could be that the extent of the damage in the area of the Forum of Caesar was not as serious as the accounts provided by the sources such as Tacitus or Suetonius.\footnote{Tac. Ann. XV, 38-43; Suet. Nero; Dio LXII, 18, 2.} This idea has already been postulated by Sablayrolles in his useful catalogue of the fires that occurred in ancient Rome.\footnote{Sablayrolles 1996, Appendix VII, 771-802.} The author points out that, thus far, the archaeological evidence in the area affected by the fire does not match the catastrophic tones expressed by the sources.\footnote{Sablayrolles 1996, 790-92.} Therefore, it is plausible that the repairs in the Forum of Caesar were, like those at the Curia Iulia, set aside until Domitian's reign. Finally, the massive work carried out in the saddle between the Quirinal and the Capitoline Hills and the changes caused by the construction of the Forum Transitorium had a strong impact on the topography of the area.

II.b The Vespasianic Templum Pacis

The Templum Pacis was one of the most elaborate public spaces built by Vespasian as a testament to the renewed peaceful age that he had allegedly inaugurated upon his accession in AD 69.\footnote{The construction of the Templum Pacis is mentioned by Flavius Josephus in the Bellum Iudaicum, VII.5.7. In his description he highlights the speed at which it was built and the grandiosity that characterized the project. Pliny too states his admiration for the building that he defined as the most beautiful and largest of all (Nat. Hist., I.14.2.3). Suetonius (Life of Vespasian, XVIII), Pliny (Nat. Hist. XXXVI.20, and XXXIV.84), Statius (Sil. 4.3.17, 4.1.13), Procopius (Bellum Gothicum, 4.21), Pausanias (6.9.3), and Juvenal (9.22-26) all mention the presence of precious works of art that were probably displayed inside the porticoes. The statue bases, whose remains have been uncovered in between the two rows of euripi, have been dated from at least Hadrianic times (Corsaro 2014b, 319-20; Meneghini 2014, 284).} The construction project was financed by the booty gained in the Jewish wars and the sack of Jerusalem in 70, in which Vespasian's son...
Titus stood out as the main protagonist. This space celebrated Vespasian’s legacy as well as that of Titus, but Domitian’s subsequent intervention was significant. During Domitian's rule he added the southern hall overlooking the Via Sacra, which might be identified as the Library of Peace mentioned by the sources. He also built a small apsed building, perhaps a nymphaeum, against the southern long side and accessible from the Basilica Aemilia, and finally, and most significantly, shortened the space by rebuilding the northwest wall in order to fit his own forum. In the next paragraphs I will discuss Domitian's intervention in the *Templum Pacis*.

The location chosen for this monumental space was charged with meaning as it was built over an area previously occupied by building projects that Nero started after the AD 64 fire. Giving back to the people of Rome large parts of the city that the previous emperor had appropriated for his own Domus Aurea was one of the foundations of Vespasian’s building program in the core of the city. The program culminated with the construction of the Flavian Amphitheatre, the *Meta Sudans*, the *Baths of Titus*, and the *Templum Pacis*. The *Templum Pacis* consisted of an almost square open space, separated by the Argiletum from the forum of Augustus and of Caesar, surrounded by porticoes with a sacred precinct dedicated to Peace embedded into the southeastern side (fig. 3). This area was not a proper forum in the sense that it did not provide a space for common forum activities such as political meetings, financial transactions, and trials. It was instead conceived as a public sacred space aimed at reminding the citizens of Rome of the peace that the emperor instituted both in the city and in the provinces. We also know from literary sources that the *Templum Pacis* was a sort of open-air museum,

---

55 Flavius Josephus, *Bellum Iudaicum*, IX.
56 See more details about Vespasian’s agenda in section III.j.5 on the Valley of the Colosseum.
57 Gell. 16.8.1-4; 5.21.9-13; Galen 19.21 Kühn; 8.495 Kühn.
with statues outside and perhaps also inside, along with painted masterpieces. The complex may also have been used for scholarly debate, perhaps in conjunction with the library known to have been there. One of the most unusual features of this space were the two sets of *euripi*—long shallow water basins that demarcated the space between the porticoes and guided the visitor along axial paths of movement (figs. 3, 7). These basins were flanked by raised beds for plants which, at least in the complex’s Late Antique phase, have been identified as rose bushes. They must have provided a soothing, refreshing effect to those who were strolling here.

II.b.1 Archaeological evidence and history of the excavations

A significant portion of the whole complex is still underneath Via dei Fori Imperiali (fig. 8), and our knowledge of the architecture of the *Templum Pacis* has been based mainly on surviving fragments of the so-called *Forma Urbis*, known in the Severan copy of the massive marble wall-map of the city at the Templum Pacis, which show Vespasian’s addition to the Imperial Fora. However, thanks to the recent excavations, the remains are today substantial and can easily be viewed from several spots along Via dei Fori Imperiali. The southwest corner of the square, part of the connecting wall with the *Forum Domitiani*, traces of the *euripi*, and the steps of the southern portico on the long side stand out between Via dei Fori Imperiali and the entrance to the archaeological area on Largo della Salara Vecchia. Impressive remains of the temple cella and the well-preserved *opus sectile* floor are visible along Via dei Fori

---

58 Joseph, *b. Iud.*, VII.5.7; Plin. *NH*, XII.94; XXXIV.84; XXXV.102,109; XXXVI.27, 58; Paus. VI.9.3; Iuv. IX.23.
59 See *infra* the debate about the identification of one of the southern halls as the library of the complex, section b.4.
60 Celant 2005.
61 FUR slab VII-10 and VI-5.
Imperiali between the church of SS. Cosmas and Damian and the Basilica of Maxentius (fig. 10).

Our understanding of the Templum Pacis changed significantly, thanks to the excavations carried out by the Soprintendenza Comunale and the Soprintendenza Statale starting in the year 1998. They involved three different areas (fig. 8): the forum of Caesar, the forum of Trajan, and the Templum Pacis, under the direction of E. La Rocca, who was, at that time, the Soprintendente for Cultural Heritage in the Municipality of Rome. The excavation data deepened our understanding of the architecture of the Templum Pacis complex, and also shed light on the construction phases and additions that can be securely attributed to Domitian and Septimius Severus.

II.b.2 The Templum Pacis and Domitian

Area B of the excavations carried out in 1998-2000 and 2004-2006 revealed the traces of Domitian’s significant modification of the northern side of the square, including the entrance wall from the Argiletum which was designed to create sufficient space for his own forum. Specifically, the northern side of the Templum Pacis was moved toward the south, creating the almost square shape of the complex that we can

---

63 I was fortunate to take part in the 2004-2006 excavations in the Templum Pacis as the final stage of the internship required to complete the graduate program in Classical Archaeology with the University of Genova, Italy. On that occasion I worked under the supervision of Dr. Alessandro Delfino, to whom I owe an enormous debt in terms of knowledge acquired and growth as a field archaeologist. During this excavation we uncovered clear traces of the AD 64 fire just underneath the paving of the Templum Pacis, see Corsaro 2009 for a summary of the results.
64 This side of the Templum Pacis complex has been now thoroughly analyzed and scholars seem to accept the Vespasianic phase of the Templum as a regular square precinct whose northern side was cut and moved toward the south by Domitian to make space for the construction of the Forum Transitorium. Anderson 1984, 112-13; Corsaro 2009, 193; for a slightly different interpretation see Viscogliosi 2009, 203-08.
Domitian rebuilt the southern side of the perimeter with a colonnade *en ressaut*, similar to that in the *Forum Domitiani*, whose columns had smooth shafts in Africano marble. While the rest of the square probably displayed a beaten-earth floor, on this side Domitian paved the square with Carrara marble slabs (fig. 9) that were rectangular in shape and measured 1.4 x 0.85 m. The dating of the marble paving to Domitianic times is supported by ceramics found under the slabs that date to the end of the 1st century AD, which were recovered in one of the most recent excavation campaigns.

This small excavation trench also yielded another interesting set of data: three massive brick structures were uncovered and stratigraphically interpreted as later than the original Vespasianic foundations of the square. These brick structures were subsequently covered by several layers of soil that served as preparation for the Domitianic marble paving on this side. Therefore, the brick structures could conceivably belong either to a second Vespasianic or a first Domitianic phase. Stratigraphic evidence reveals that these structures must belong to Domitianic times as they share a stratigraphic relationship to a large foundation related to the *Forum Domitiani*. It seems that Domitian had several different projects in mind when he started the construction of his own forum, and the connecting passage with the *Templum Pacis* must have been reshaped during the building process. Finally, an excavation trench in

---

65 In the original project by Vespasian, the complex was shaped as a regular square. Flavian foundations uncovered underneath the *Forum Transitorium* prove the hypothesis generated by mirroring the dimensions of the side porticoes of the *Templum Pacis* on the northern side. The plan was then perfectly symmetrical and the four *exedrae* resulted typically equidistant from the building axes, Corsaro 2009, 193 and 2014, 263.
66 Corsaro 2014, 259.
67 Ibid.
68 Ibid.
69 See a more detailed description of these changes in progress in the dedicated section in this chapter, II.c.
the northwestern corner of the western portico of the Templum revealed Domitianic interventions relating to the access to the Templum from the Forum Domitiani.\textsuperscript{70}

\textit{II.b.3 The Domitianic apsed hall in the eastern side of the Templum Pacis}

During the excavations carried out in 1996-97 and 1999 by the Soprintendenza Comunale in the Templum Pacis, remains of a Domitianic structure were found along the northwest side (fig. 3).\textsuperscript{71} The structure identified as a nymphaeum by Rizzo is embedded in the wall of the Templum Pacis, but it overlooks the Roman Forum toward the Basilica Aemilia and it will be considered again in the analysis of the Domitianic Roman Forum in chapter III.

The structure has been dated to the Domitianic period based on brick stamps,\textsuperscript{72}, and it is now clear that he substantially intervened in the Templum Pacis on nearly every side.\textsuperscript{73}

The plan of this apsed hall consists of a rectangle measuring ca. 17 m along the short side to the northeast, with two irregular long sides. The short side features an apse whose radius is ca. 11 m. The northwest side is 30 m, while the southeast wall is only 23 m long. The difference in length is due to the odd position of this building—it is literally stuck among three preexisting buildings. While the back wall is embedded in the northwest side of the Templum Pacis, between the northwest exedra and the southeast side of the Forum Domitiani, the front is determined by the alignment of the northeast

\textsuperscript{70} During the 2004-2006 excavations a spoliation pit was identified and dated to Renaissance times, Corsaro 2014, 259.
\textsuperscript{71} It is noticeable that the structure is briefly described by S. Rizzo, who was the director of the Imperial Fora office at the time, in the excavation report published in the RM, 108, 2001, pp. 215-243.
\textsuperscript{72} Rizzo 2001, 243.
\textsuperscript{73} See description of Domitian’s intervention in the Templum Pacis in the sections above and below this one.
side of the *Basilica Aemilia*, which is positioned at an angle of $17^\circ$ toward the south from the *Templum Pacis*.

The shape, function, and location of this building are a little puzzling. It may have been intended to serve the *Basilica Aemilia*, which appears to be the only building that had access to it, but if so, it could have been better planned to complement the orientation of the Basilica. In fact, looking at the plan (fig. 3), it is evident that the off-centered position would have been easily perceived by the visitor walking along the Basilica’s axis, which would have caused him to turn by $17^\circ$ to gain access to the complex. It appears that the apsed hall was not accessible from other directions. The northwest side is parallel to the southeast side of Domitian’s Forum, from which it is separated by almost 8 m. This forms an 8 x 30 m corridor in between the *Forum Domitiani* and the apsed hall, which is virtually all lost and unusable space. The southeast wall was likely visible from the Roman Forum, but a different orientation, aligned with the *Basilica Aemilia*, for instance, would not have had a much different visual impact on this side. Considering the other brilliant solutions adopted by Domitian’s architects in cases of limited and oddly shaped areas in the fora region, it is strange that less effort seems to have been put into the construction of this building. However, one could argue that the long and narrow shape might have mitigated the off-center position.

During the 1999 excavations 52 fragments of a luxurious porphyry *labrum*, fountain basing, dated to Severan times, were found nearby (fig. 11). All fragments were recovered in secondary contexts along the northwest wall of the *Templum Pacis* as part of a medieval and Renaissance wall that used the fragments as building material;

---

74 In particular, the project for designing the *Forum Transitorium* represents the peak of this architectural approach. However, the cutting of the saddle between the Capitoline and the Quirinal could also be seen as an example of the resources and designing ideas that Domitian had at his disposal.

therefore, no fragment was found in situ. S. Rizzo hypothesized that the *labrum* was located in the apse of the Domitianic hall based on its find spot, and grounded her identification of the building as a nymphaeum solely on this. To support her hypothesis, Rizzo mentions Procopius' description of an ancient fountain that he saw at the entrance of the *Templum Pacis*. However, Procopius' texts state very clearly that the fountain was in front of/before the square. Since it has been shown that the apsed hall was most likely built to serve the *Basilica Aemilia* and had nothing to do with the *Templum Pacis* other than its apsidal side, other than being embedded into the Templum's side wall, it seems unlikely that the fountain mentioned by Procopius was located inside this hall.

The interpretation could take two different paths. If we place the *labrum* outside the Domitianic apsed hall we may identify it with the fountain mentioned by Procopius. Alternatively, if we assign the *labrum* to the inside of the hall, then we will have to imagine another fountain seen by Procopius at the entrance of the *Templum Pacis* of which no archeological evidence remains. Therefore, Rizzo's hypothesis that the *labrum* was originally located in the apsed hall and was, at the same time, identifiable with the fountain seen by Procopius needs to be revised. Moreover, Ambrogi's analysis of the *labrum* indicates the exceptional high quality of the object which she compares to another *labrum* in porphyry at the Museo Archeologico Nazionale of Naples, as well as another example from Potsdam, in the castle of Klein-Glienicke. Ambrogi also mentions the recovery of the fragments of white marble slabs belonging to a fountain *impluvium* in the *Templum*. Since it is not possible at this time to match the two slabs

---

77 Rizzo 2001, 240.  
with the porphyry fragments, Ambrogi remains cautious about their original location. However, she insists on the luxurious aspect of this porphyry basin,\(^80\) which would make its use in the inconspicuous apsed hall a little out of place.

A recent hypothesis suggests that the \textit{Templum Pacis} was, in fact, adorned with fountains and water features in addition to the well-known \textit{euripi}. Data for this hypothesis came from the construction works for the C line of the subway where a georadar investigation revealed the presence of a large structure that matches a rectangular feature on slab 15 of the \textit{Forma Urbis}.\(^81\) While this structure was previously identified with the altar of the goddess Pax,\(^82\) the location of this structure with regard to the underground water and sewage channels led Meneghini to hypothesize a fountain served by the water system. This hypothesis needs further archeological support; however, the presence of the \textit{euripi} in the \textit{Templum Pacis} seems to suggest a strong water context for the entire complex. Therefore, it seems plausible to imagine Septimius Severus adding a porphyry \textit{labrum} to the Flavian complex rather than to the small, hidden Domitianic apsed hall.

The recovery nearby of two high quality fragments of architrave decorated with Victories slaying bulls led Rizzo to assign these two pieces to the decoration of the apsed hall as well. A more recent analysis of the decoration and dimensions of the fragments, however, resulted in a new interpretation of the pieces that are now securely assigned to the decoration of the \textit{Templum Pacis’} portico,\(^83\) suitable décor for a triumphal monument.

\(^{80}\) Ibid.
\(^{81}\) Meneghini 2014, 284.
\(^{82}\) Carettoni \textit{et al.} 1960, 73; Meneghini, Santangeli-Valenzani 2007, 65; Tucci 2009, 158.
\(^{83}\) Pinna Caboni 2009, 198, 446; Pinna Caboni 2014, 304.
In conclusion, the apsed hall was certainly built under Domitian in relation to the Basilica Aemilia. Rizzo's identification as a nymphaeum was based solely on the hypothesis that the Severan porphyry labrum came from this building. However, the fragments of the labrum were not in situ and therefore their provenance cannot be ascertained. Moreover, no piping system has been recovered that would justify the supply of water for this building. To overcome this difficulty Rizzo hypothesizes that there could have been piping in the area that was not excavated or that we could imagine an aerial system that ran on top of the wall of the Templum Pacis that was shared with the Forum Domitiani,84 but that remains very speculative. Thus, while the dating of this building can be secured by the archaeological evidence based on brick stamps, its function remains elusive.

II.b.4 The Domitianic southern hall in the Templum Pacis

Recently, another Domitianic intervention in the Templum Pacis had been identified by P. L. Tucci, who has long been studying the architecture of the Templum Pacis. His doctoral thesis focused on the remains underneath the 6th century church of SS. Cosmas and Damian,85 which was built on the southern corner of the Templum Pacis. Tucci had already convincingly suggested a different reconstruction of the portico architecture in the 2009 catalogue of the exhibition Divus Vespasianus. In a recent article,86 Tucci analyzes in detail the archaeological remains of the southern halls of the

84 Rizzo 2001, 240.
86 “Flavian Libraries in the city of Rome,” Tucci 2013. The argument presented in the article has been elaborated with further photos and archaeological evidence in a talk that Tucci has delivered in several venues. I had the chance to attend his talk in the Department of Classical Studies of the University of Pennsylvania on September 11, 2014. The title of the talk was “The Templum Pacis and its Library.” I am grateful to Prof. Tucci for sharing his thoughts after the talk.
Templum Pacis (fig. 3). Based on masonry analysis he convincingly dates the hall overlooking the Via Sacra to the Domitianic period, and using less conspicuous but still substantial evidence, he identifies the same apsed hall as the library of the Templum Pacis. This hypothesis is in evident opposition to the interpretation put forward by R. Meneghini in the catalogue of the exhibition "La Biblioteca Infinita." According to Meneghini, the library of the Templum should be identified as the hall west of the Forma Urbis room, which was transformed in Severan times by the addition of a foundation for a wall to divide the room in half.\textsuperscript{87} This new room shows traces of seven niches along the wall that vary in depth from 20 to 60 cm. One of the deeper niches revealed signs of shelves that were built in a later phase, perhaps in Late Antiquity or Medieval times. While Meneghini admits that the size of the niches and the fact that they were revetted in marble does not match the hypothesis that they were used to encase shelves for books, he also insists on placing the library in this room by hypothesizing mobile—maybe wooden—shelves along the walls in between the niches rather than in them.\textsuperscript{88} The adjacent apsed hall underneath the church of SS. Cosmas and Damian is interpreted by Meneghini as an auditorium on the grounds of similar, though much later, structures in Alexandria.\textsuperscript{89}

In Tucci’s article it is evident how the masonry phases embedded into the basilica of SS. Cosmas and Damian can be easily identified as Flavian or Severan. He explains how the different brick courses, the different types of tuff used in the opus quadratum—Tufo Lionato during Flavian times and Lapis Albanus (peperino) for Severan restorations—and the evidence of the different lifting devices leaves no doubt as to the

\textsuperscript{87} Meneghini 2014, 295.  
\textsuperscript{88} Meneghini 2014, 295.  
\textsuperscript{89} Meneghini 2014, 296.
dating of the remains.\textsuperscript{90} Based on these criteria Tucci has been able to identify the lower elevation of the southern hall as Flavian.\textsuperscript{91} Moreover, the two southernmost halls of the Templum seem to have been constructed at the same time, and it is possible to observe that the lower Flavian brick courses in the room right behind the \textit{Forma Urbis} hall were built above the marble revetment of the Vespasianic floor; therefore, this phase should be dated to Domitian's reign.\textsuperscript{92} Tucci's hypothesis also takes into consideration Renaissance drawings by Peruzzi\textsuperscript{93} depicting part of the southern hall overlooking the Via Sacra that was later demolished by Pope Urban VIII in the mid-17\textsuperscript{th} century. The drawings clearly show the use of different types of tuff coinciding with the Flavian and Severan interventions.\textsuperscript{94} This dating appears to be grounded on solid archaeological evidence and reassesses the Severan restoration carried out after the fire of AD 192 as a mere reconstruction of preexisting structures with minor modifications to the layout.

The second part of Tucci's article deals with the interpretation of the function of the southern hall, wherein he expands on his reading of the archaeological remains underneath the church published in the 2013 article. In his current work he examines the traces visible on the structures underneath the church and concludes that the niches for books are clearly recognizable in the apsidal hall that is dated to Domitian's reign. Considering that the previous Vespasianic hall did not feature niches, we should conclude that the addition of the library was part of the Domitianic project.\textsuperscript{95} The existence of the Library of the Temple of Peace is securely attested in the textual sources. Two mentions by Aulus Gellius, who wrote in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century AD, indicate the presence

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{90} Tucci 2013, 279.
\item \textsuperscript{91} Tucci 2013, 280.
\item \textsuperscript{92} Tucci 2013, 283-83. The evidence for the Domitianic phase comes primarily from an unpublished photo taken in the 1940s in which the construction over the marble facing is shown.
\item \textsuperscript{93} Uffiz, Arch. 382-3.
\item \textsuperscript{94} Tucci 2013, 283-84, fig. 15.4.
\item \textsuperscript{95} Tucci 2013, 284-85.
\end{itemize}
of a library within the complex of the Templum Pacis. In the first one he mentions a personal visit to the "Library of Peace" to read Aelius Stilus' work on axioms, while in the second he reports a friend's suggestion to check a specific volume held in the library at the Templum Pacis.\textsuperscript{96} Around the same time, Galen mentions the Templum Pacis twice as a place for scholarly debate.\textsuperscript{97} Though he does not refer to the library specifically, it appears that not only the Templum Pacis complex but many other storage areas along the Via Sacra contained books and documents that were destroyed by the fire in AD 192.\textsuperscript{98} Since all these references are dated to later times, it is crucial to match these data with the archaeological evidence to understand whether the library can be dated to the Flavian period or later.

Libraries can leave very distinctive archaeological traces—these are the niches used to keep rolls on shelves or within cabinets. It is possible to establish standard measurements for the niches, since they were usually 60 cm in depth and around 3 m in height.\textsuperscript{99} There are two halls with niches in the southeast corner of the Templum Pacis. The one just beyond the Forma Urbis hall was modified in Severan times with the addition of nine rectangular niches whose depth varies between 20 and 60 cm.\textsuperscript{100} The only ones that could have been used as armaria are 60 cm deep, but the traces of marble revetment exclude this hypothesis.\textsuperscript{101} The apsed hall on the southernmost corner, overlooking the Via Sacra, is almost entirely embedded into the church of SS. Cosmas and Damian, and only scanty archaeological evidence can be gathered there. However,

\textsuperscript{96} Gell. 16.8.1-4; 5.21.9-13.
\textsuperscript{97} Galen 19.21 Kühn; 8.495 Kühn.
\textsuperscript{98} For a very detailed discussion of Galen's mentions of the library and the description of the fire see Tucci 2013, 291-300.
\textsuperscript{99} Tucci 2013, 282-84.
\textsuperscript{100} Meneghini 2014, 296.
\textsuperscript{101} Meneghini 2014, 296-7. To overcome the difficulty Meneghini here hypothesizes wooden shelves in between the niches and in the middle of the room.
Tucci’s analysis of the masonry has convincingly dated this hall to Domitian’s reign. In addition to his 2013 article, Tucci showed photographic evidence\textsuperscript{102} of partial remains of a niche whose depth could have been 60 cm, considering the overall depth of the wall. While the archaeological evidence is scarce, the similarity in plan between the apsed hall and the Domitianic version of the library of Apollo on the Palatine seems to strengthen Tucci’s interpretation.\textsuperscript{103}

The Palatine library was first built by Augustus as an addition to the sacred area dedicated to Apollo next to his own house (fig. 12).\textsuperscript{104} It has now been clarified that the Augustan project consisted of a single apsed hall,\textsuperscript{105} which housed the library and whose shape also suggests its use for senate meetings and public recitations.\textsuperscript{106} The surviving remains belong to the Domitianic intervention,\textsuperscript{107} which included the construction of a twin hall that perhaps was divided into Greek and Latin sections as became standard for later examples, such as the libraries in the Forum of Trajan or in the Baths of Caracalla.\textsuperscript{108} The Domitianic libraries are almost-square apsed halls (19.5 m x 17.5), featuring a large niche in the middle of the shallow apse and 14 niches\textsuperscript{109} for rolls whose measurements match the standards known for ancient libraries (3.8 m high, 1.65 m

\textsuperscript{102} Tucci 2013, 283 and Tucci October 2014, talk delivered at the University of Pennsylvania.

\textsuperscript{103} Tucci 2013, 286-300.

\textsuperscript{104} Suet. Aug. 29.3; for a summary of the construction history, archaeological and textual references see Dix & Houston 2006, 680-85.

\textsuperscript{105} Iacopi and Tedone 2005-06, 351-78. Until this important recent reanalysis of the surviving remains it was unclear whether the two halls were already included in the Augustan phase or belonged to the Domitianic intervention; see, for instance, Dix &Houston 2006, 683.

\textsuperscript{106} Dix & Houston 2006, 683. Augustus’ well known fragile health and his late age often caused the Senate to travel to the Palatine and join the emperor close to his own house. See Dixon & Houston 2006, 683, nn. 83 and 84 for ancient textual references about this use of the hall.

\textsuperscript{107} Iacopi and Tedone 2005-06, 351-78.

\textsuperscript{108} The Domitianic version of the Palatine library is the first known example of the double hall format. Based on the evidence for Republican examples, it is not possible to establish if this arrangement continues an early tradition, see Dix & Houston 2006, 674, n. 26.

\textsuperscript{109} This is the number given by the drawing in Iacopi and Tedone 2005-06 tav. 2; for some reason Dix & Houston list 18 niches with no specific reference, Dix & Houston 2006, 283.
wide, and 60 cm deep). The southern hall in the *Templum Pacis* features an almost identical shape with a very similar shallow apse and a nearly square plan (18.35 m x 19.15 m, fig. 10). The niches were slightly smaller and they amounted to a total of 40.

The connection between Domitian and libraries is echoed both in the sources and in the archaeological evidence. Suetonius tells us that Domitian made a large financial and logistic effort to restore the libraries affected by the fire. Since Suetonius uses the singular for the fire (*incendio*) it is safe to assume that he refers to the AD 80 fire that destroyed the library in the *Porticus Octaviae*, which was likely restored by Domitian. Not only did the emperor restore the buildings, but he also sent agents to Alexandria to hunt for copies in order to restore the collections.

The library of Apollo on the Palatine has been securely dated to the Domitianic period by archaeological evidence. The area of the *Templum Pacis* was not affected by the AD 80 fire; therefore, the Domitianic hall was a deliberate addition perhaps connected to the disappearance of the *Atrium Libertatis*, which was built by Asinius Pollio between 39 and 28 BC and housed the first public library in Rome. This hypothesis depends, however on the location of the *Atrium Libertatis*, which is still a hotly disputed matter among scholars. If we accept the most common opinion, which is that the *atrium* was located on the saddle between the Capitoline and the Quirinal, just
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110 Dix & Houston 2006, 683.
111 Tucci 2013, 286-87.
112 Ibid.
113 Suet. *Dom*. 20, "quanquam bibliothecas incendio absuntas impensissime reparare curasset, exemplaribus undique petitis missisque Alexandream qui describerent emendarentque."
114 Dio Cass. 66.24.
115 Dix & Houston 2006, 685-88.
116 Tucci 2013, 277.
117 Dix & Houston 2006, 675. For the existence of the library in ancient sources see Isid. *Orig*. 6.5; Ov. *Trist*. III.1.72, Plin. *NH* VII.115; XXXV.10; Platner & Ashby 1929, 84.
118 See Dix & Houston 2006, 673-80 for a concise but complete description of the *Atrium Libertatis* with reference to textual and archaeological evidence and the scholarly debate around its location.
beyond the Temple of Venus Genetrix, then the destruction of it must be attributed to Domitian. As has been stated earlier,\(^{119}\) it is today an accepted fact that the area later occupied by the Forum of Trajan, including the cutting of the saddle, was not only begun but carried out completely by Domitian in preparation for a building project whose details and purpose are unknown, even though the inscription on the Column of Trajan usurps credit for the massive earth removal plan.\(^{120}\) Most likely, the disappearance of the Atrium Libertatis caused Domitian to provide a new location for its collection of books and, perhaps, the documents as well. Therefore, Tucci’s interpretation appears to be a valid explanation and, despite the scarce archaeological evidence, it is plausible to identify the library as the apsed hall in the southern corner of the Templum Pacis. Moreover, the parallel between this hall and the Palatine Library seems to be consistent with another link visible in the shape of the Forum Domitiani and the Stadium of the Imperial Palace on the Palatine that will be addressed in the following section. This hall in the Templum Pacis would have served the purpose of a library while also providing a suitable area for scholarly debate as attested by the sources,\(^{121}\) and if the room beside it, see above, is correctly identified as an auditorium space, that would complement the site’s association with literary creation and performance.

\(^{119}\) See the discussion of the attribution of the cut in the saddle in the section dedicated to the Forum of Caesar and to the Domitianic Terrace further below.

\(^{120}\) This project will be discussed at the end of this chapter. See fig. 1 with hypotheses about the extent of this second forum.

\(^{121}\) This connection between the destruction of the Atrium Libertatis is postulated at the beginning and toward the end of Tucci’s article from 2013.
II.c The Forum Domitiani

Two years after Nerva was raised to power in AD 96 following the assassination of Domitian and the emperor’s subsequent damnatio, he completed and inaugurated this forum which was, in fact, planned and almost completely built by Domitian, who was assassinated before he could see it finished; the temple that it graced was for Minerva, Domitian’s especial patron goddess, a deity presiding equally over arts of peace and of war. Therefore, the forum was named after Nerva, though it was also known as the Forum Transitorium in Late Antiquity to suggest its connecting role in the urban traffic circulation flows, previously held by the Argiletum, which the new forum had replaced. Below I discuss how the forum’s strange end module, the Porticus Absidata, channeled visiors’ movement. In order to give credit to the planner of the forum, the complex will be called here Forum Domitiani or Domitian’s Forum.

The complex lies between the Fora of Augustus and Caesar on one long side, and the Templum Pacis on the other, while the Subura, a middle/low class neighborhood was situated to the north-east (fig. 3). The Forma Urbis shows some of its footprint, or is my memory off. It is oriented along the same northeast-southwest axis as that of Augustus, and it displays an unusual shape and unusual dimensions. As it will be shown further on, the deliberate shape and dimensions of the Forum Domitiani bear striking similarities with the stadium-graden of the imperial palace on the Palatine hill, reinforcing the idea of the same authorship for both projects, namely, Domitian’s court architect Rabirius. The space left over from previous construction in this region was

122 Morselli, Tortorici 1989, 61, footnote no. 185.
123 Suet. Dom. 15; Cass. Dio LXVI.1
124 Suet., Dom., 5.
125 SHA. Alex. Sev. 28.6; 36.2 (Alexander Severus is said to have placed here statues of previous emperor); Pol. Silv. 545; Cassiod. Chron. 140; Eutrop. vii.23; Hier. a Abr., 2105; Serv. Aen., VII. 607. It may be called Caesareum Forum in CIL VI.0097 = 33960 (cf. Mart. I.117.10).
limited and awkwardly shaped. For that reason, the planning of this forum required a new topographical and architectural approach that would drastically change the role of this area and how it was experienced.

In order to fully appreciate the implications of the construction of this forum it is crucial to take a step back to understand how the area functioned before Domitian's intervention. The region has been thoroughly studied by Tortorici, whose monograph, *Argiletum*, is today our most comprehensive source for the area. Before the construction of the *Forum Domitiani*, or any imperial forum, the area housed an important Republican commercial neighborhood within the valley to the east of the Roman Forum. Most likely a street ran through the area in between the VIII and the IV Augustan region, and the traces of *basoli* (road slabs) and the remains of the travertine *crepido* (step) that were found along the southeast side of the Curia seem to confirm this. According to the literary sources it appears that this area was arranged in two sectors defined by the road in between. The southeast side, toward the Velia and the Palatine, might have housed large commercial venues such as the *Forum Piscarium* (or *Piscatorium*), the *Forum Cuppedinis*, the *Forum Coquum*, and the *Macellum*. The Flavian poet Martial's detailed description of the area, suggests that other smaller businesses occupied the rest of the neighborhood. Shoemakers and booksellers had their shops in the *Argiletum*, and if one wanted to buy Martial's book, he could just follow the

---

127 Before Tortorici's study the term *Argiletum* was specifically associated with a street following Lanciani's reading of a passage in Livy according to which Numa Pompilius built a temple to Ianus "*ad infinitum Argiletum*," (Liv. I, 19, 1-2).
128 Tortorici 1988, 34.
129 See the sources in Tortorici 1988, 37,nn. 84 and 85.
specific directions to the bookshop of Secundus that the poet gives in his second book of epigrams.\textsuperscript{130}

The \textit{Argiletum} extended all the way toward the area later occupied by the Forum of Caesar that was, at this point, a more residential quarter mainly occupied by senatorial properties. It is a very well-known fact that Cicero might have paid the incredible sum of 60 million \textit{sestertii} to appropriate the space for Caesar.\textsuperscript{131} The fire of AD 64 reached several spots in this area, leaving archaeologically documented traces in the \textit{Templum Pacis} and in the southwest side of the Forum of Domitian. After the fire Nero began an ambitious building program that resulted in the construction of the \textit{Domus Aurea} but remained incomplete in some areas.

The construction of the \textit{Forum Domitiani}, begun around the years 85-6, revealed a clear intent to regularize the area between the Forum of Augustus, \textit{Templum Pacis}, the \textit{Subura}, and the Roman Forum, and it radically transformed the topography of this area. The dating of the forum lies primarily in the mention of this building as the “Palladium Forum” in an epigram by Martial from Book I, which has been dated to the very beginning of Domitian's reign in AD 81.\textsuperscript{132} For the construction of the forum the area was first leveled using the debris left over after the fire of 80,\textsuperscript{133} and then an important modification was carried out to the northwest wall of the \textit{Templum Pacis},\textsuperscript{134} which was intruding into the already limited space. In fact, a recent re-examination of the archaeological evidence and the traces on the communicating wall between the \textit{Forum

\textsuperscript{130} Mart. II, 17, 1-3.
\textsuperscript{131} The number is narrated in a famous letter to Atticus, Cic., \textit{Ad Att.} IV, 17, 7. According to Suetonius (\textit{Caesar}, 26, 2), Pliny (Nat. Hist. XXXVI 25, 103), Cassius Dio (XLIII 22, 1-2) the sum was one hundred of \textit{sestertii}. Delfino discusses the implications of the different versions, Delfino 2104, 2.
\textsuperscript{132} Mart. \textit{Epigr.}, I, 2; Howell 1980, 5-6. The Palladium is a reference to any statue of Minerva (Pallas Athena), as well as to the famous statue of Minerva at the Temple of Vesta.
\textsuperscript{133} Tortorici 1988, 44.
\textsuperscript{134} Corsaro 2009.
Domitian and the Templum Pacis have allowed A. Corsaro to accurately measure the extent of the modifications on the Templum Pacis that Domitian’s architect was forced to carry out to fit the new complex into the area. The northwest wall of the Templum Pacis was not the only hindrance to the ambitious architect’s plan. Recent archaeological evidence has shown that the plan of the Forum of Augustus consisted of a rectangular square with four, instead of two, exedrae, two per side. The foundation trench of the southwest exedra is visible from Via dei Fori Imperiali, and was uncovered during the excavations carried out in 2004. At the foundation level it has been observed that a sewage channel in the Forum Domitiani abuts the curved foundation of the southeast exedra, which means that while the exedra was demolished at the square level, the foundations were maintained when possible.

Once the area was leveled and cleared of intruding structures, the forum began to be built, around AD 85-6. It consisted of a narrow and long rectangle (46 x 122 m) with gently curved short ends and long sides decorated with a colonnade en ressaut, a clever device to exploit all of the limited available space to give the aesthetic effect of colonnades (fig. 14). The square was dominated by the Temple of Minerva on the northeast end, whose dedicatory inscription was preserved until 1606 when Pope Paul V demolished the remains for materials to build his famous fountain, the Acqua Paola, on the Gianicolo Hill (fig. 13). Unfortunately, today nothing remains of the temple with the exceptions of some sections of the podium. Some information about the figural decoration of the temple, however, might come from a drawing by the Anonymous Destailler, an Italian draughtsman active in the second third of the 16th century.

---

135 This idea had already been postulated by Anderson (Anderson 1984, 112-13), but A. Corsaro’s thorough analysis of the evidence confirmed and defined the intervention, Corsaro 2009.
136 Carnabuci 2010.
137 I owe this information to E. Bianchi who personally explored the sewage channel and identified the foundation.
drawings by the Anonymous Destailler, published by von Blanckenhagen (fig. 59), indicate an extremely rich decoration of the architrave and the cornice in perfect Domitianic style, with the eye-glass motifs between the dentils that typify Flavian architectural ornament. More importantly, the architrave seemed to have been decorated with a gallery of sacrificial instruments that is strikingly reminiscent of the decoration partially preserved in the temple of the Divine Vespasian in the Roman Forum. Above the colonnade, the entablature was decorated with a frieze depicting deities and scenes from myth; the extant portion famously shows the myth of Arachne, a contest in which Minerva prevailed, and where the mythic scenario dwelt at length on women engaged in traditional household activities such as spinning and weaving, crafts typically believed to be protected by the goddess. The attic was instead decorated with panels, evidently one to each bay, that showed personifications of the provinces or of subject peoples (fig. 16). Prior scholarship thought the panel still in situ over the Arachne episode showed Minerva herself, given the figure’s costume (woman in helmt and long robe carrying shield) but excavations have given us a panel, also meant for the attic of a bay here, that is plainly an ‘ethnic’ personification of a non-Roman people.

The extant section of the frieze shows the myth of the punishment of Arachne set in a weavers’ workshop (fig. 15). The decorative program of the forum has been

138 Von Blanckenhagen 1940, 23, 41, tav. 8, fig. 28; De Angeli 1992, 141, footnote no. 385.
139 Blanckenhagen 1940, 41. More details on the decoration of the frieze in section III.b.2 in the context of examples of decoration with sacrificial instruments.
140 See Wiegartz 1996.
141 This myth is only found in Ovid, Metamorphoses VI, and the representation on the frieze of the forum Domitiani lacks several details given in Ovid.
extensively analyzed by E. D’Ambra; a discussion of the potential significance of the forum program within Domitian’s building program will be provided further on.

The means of passage between this forum and those of Augustus and Caesar to the west has yet to be understood. Access between Domitian’s Forum and the Templum Pacis has been identified in several spots along the communicating wall. The entrance from the Roman Forum at the lower end, however, can only be reasonably postulated since the archaeological evidence is unclear. An interesting solution was used for the entrance from the Subura, behind the temple of Minerva. Here a horseshoe shaped porticus was built to conceal the encumbering northeastern exedra of the Forum of Augustus, masking the off-center position of this entrance and providing an effective tool for traffic control (fig. 17). This so-called Porticus Absidata is the perfect example of the novelty employed by Rabirius, the court architect, in the construction of Domitian’s Forum.

The odd shape of this forum is different from any prior one in that it has two curved sides, the short ends of the long portico. and I associate it with the shape of the Stadium in the Imperial Palace on the Palatine (fig. 19). It has been shown that the architect had two other choices at his disposal (fig. 20), one of which would have provided almost the same efficient usage of the limited space. If the choice of the

---


143 See supra, section II.a.

144 See further on and Nocera 2015 for a detailed description of this building, a new 3D reconstruction, and more details of the analysis of the building. The idea of this porticus as a toll for traffic control was found in a short comment by D’Ambra, 1993, 31, and also posited by Gros in 2001.

145 The structure is mentioned in the Notitia (Reg. IV) and in the Ordo Benedicti of the 12th century, Platner & Ashby 1929, 419.

146 The name of Domitian’s architect is mentioned in one epigram by Martial, Mart. Epigr. 7.56: astra polumque pia cepisti mente, Rabiri//Parrhasiam mira qui struis arte domum//Phidiaco si digna loui dare templa parabit//has petet a nostro Pisa Tonante manus.

147 Nocera 2015.
Stadium shape was intentional, it must then have been also meaningful. As I will mention in the conclusions, the stadium shape was Domitian’s favorite⁴⁸ and it is one of many examples of innovation in architectural design. Nonetheless, it is important here to point out that the connection between the fora region and the Palatine seems to be reinforced also by the presence of the Domitianic Library in the *Templum Pacis* discussed in the section above.

### II.c.1 Archaeological evidence and history of the excavations

Today the archaeological remains of the *Forum Domitiani* amount to traces of the foundation and *in situ* marble decoration of the *Porticus Absidata*, the podium of the Temple of Minerva, two standing columns on the southeastern side of the portico (the so-called Colonnacce) with a short segment of the decorative frieze on the entablature, two fragmentary reliefs from the attic with personifications of provinces/peoples, one still in situ mostly intact, foundations of the southwestern side of the square with substantial remains of the *Cloaca Maxima*, and two Republican houses underneath the curved foundation on the southwestern side. After the extensive spoliation and massive construction that each forum underwent during medieval and Renaissance times,⁴⁹ the first discoveries in this area can be dated to the years between 1877 and 1880 when a new sewage channel was built in the Alessandrino quarter. On this occasion, some peperino tuff blocks, a travertine block, and fragments of marble decoration were uncovered and interpreted as pertaining to the *Porticus Absidata*, the feature behind the Minerva temple mediating access to the road to the *Subura*, together with a post-antique

---

⁴⁸ Domitian built three stadium-shaped buildings in Rome: a proper stadium in the Campus Martius, a stadium-garden in the palace, and his forum. In addition to this, a stadium, likely for *venationes*, was built in his villa at Castel Gandolfo, see Lugli 1922.

⁴⁹ See the section dedicated to the forum of Caesar, II.a, for a mention of the Alessandrino quarter built above the Imperial Fora.
burial. Between 1890 and 1891, during the construction work for a sewage channel in Via Cavour, several discoveries were made, among which was part of the southeastern side of the Forum of Domitian. The first occasion for a proper archaeological investigation of the forum presented itself with the project for the construction of the Via dell’Impero under Mussolini. Work began in May 1926 when the section around Tor de' Conti, on the northeastern corner, was demolished and the area in front of the Colonnacce was excavated together with the podium of the Temple of Minerva. Continuous excavation work was carried out until October 1932, when the new Via dell’Impero was inaugurated (fig. 20). Between 1936 and 1940 additional campaigns were conducted by A. Bartoli and A. M. Colini, who uncovered more remains of the temple, the Porticus Absidata, and the two curved foundations on the southwestern side.

Not until the 1980s were the excavations in this area resumed, under the direction of E. Tortorici and C. Morselli for the University of La Sapienza in Rome. These campaigns were crucial in furthering our understanding of the relations between the Curia, the Forum Transitorium, and the Forum Iulium, but also the Basilica Aemilia and other sectors of the Roman Forum. The last archaeological investigation in this area was conducted in 1996-97 by the Soprintendenza ai Beni Culturali of the municipality of Rome and by the "Istituto di Topografia di Roma e dell’Italia Antica" of La Sapienza, University of Rome. Three excavation trenches were opened in the southern sector of the forum where underground structures were identified, built in opus reticulatum with

---

150 Morselli, Tortorici 1989, 103.
152 Morselli, Tortorici 1989, 53.
155 "Curia, Forum Iulium, Forum Transitorium," 1989 is the result of these excavation campaigns.
floors in *opus spicatum*. These were interpreted as *ergastula*, slave lodgings, pertaining to a Republican *domus* dated to the 2nd and 1st centuries BC with mosaic floors (fig. 23).

An interesting discovery made during these campaigns was related to the presence of square concrete foundations scattered all over the area, which have been dated to Neronian times based on stratigraphic evidence and similar building technique recognizable in other foundations uncovered between the Via Nova and the *Clivus Palatinus* (fig. 24). These foundations belonged to the grand urban restoration plan initiated and never completed by Nero right after the fire of 64. Nero's project likely included a massive building in this area that could have been structured as a colonnade founded over these solid pillars. The ceramic remains discovered in the *ergastula* belong to assemblages used to fill in the spaces created by the hypogean structures. These ceramic finds belong in great part to amphorae of very selected types such as the Spanish Dressel 20 or the Italian Dressel 1. Such types of pottery were effectively and extensively used in northern Italy and Southern France for drainage purposes as their fabric allows for the circulation of air and prevents humidity. Numerous comparanda also show how amphorae fragments could have been used as foundation bases for heavy loads. Therefore, the analysis of these finds proves the intention of creating a solid base for a large building and an effective drainage system. The results of the last archaeological campaigns should be published soon by the Soprintendenza of the Municipality of Rome.

**II.c.2 Domitian’s Forum: reconstructing hypotheses, historical context, meaning**

---

156 Santangeli Valenzani, Volpe, 1986, 41.
157 The study of this amphorae assemblage from one of the *ergastula* was the subject of my graduate thesis completed in 2007 at the Università degli studi di Genova, Italy. Two articles from the thesis were published together with results from other ceramic assemblages from the fora, Nocera 2013; Nocera, Rinaldi 2013.
158 Nocera 2013.
The Forum of Domitian has been studied by several scholars who have suggested
different construction phases and reconstruction plans. A fragment of the *Forma Urbis*
provides valuable data for the reconstruction of the plan.\(^{159}\) This fragment shows the
northeast side of the square where the cella of the temple, with columns to the sides and
an apse in the back, are visible together with the *Porticus Absidata*. Remains of
pavonazzetto columns confirm the image on the Forma Urbis, though there are no
archaeological traces of the apse. Peter H. von Blanckenhagen produced the first
reconstruction plan of the forum in 1940, in which he postulated a first phase
contemporary with the construction of the *Templum Pacis*, therefore Vespasianic, with
straight short sides and a temple pronaos and cella at the same elevation as the rest of
the square.\(^ {160}\) In a second phase, he postulated that the temple pronaos and cella were
raised, while the short sides were curved to better exploit the available space.\(^ {161}\)

Von Blanckenhagen’s hypothesis was very speculative as far as the internal
organization of the square is concerned. He inserted a four-way arch (*Ianus
Quadrifrons*) in the center for which no archaeological or textual evidence exists (fig.
25), and attributed the construction to Vespasian on the grounds of a passage by
Aurelius Victor that cannot be interpreted with certainty as referring to this forum.\(^ {162}\) For
over twenty years von Blanckenhagen’s study remained authoritative, until Heinrich
Bauer started a long analysis of the remains, which resulted in new and more accurate
reconstructions and interpretations.\(^ {163}\) Bauer focused on the *Porticus Absidata* and the

\(^{159}\) FUR, tav. XII, 16°.

\(^{160}\) Blanckenhagen 1940, 9-57, 116-68, fig. 3; Cfr. Morselli, Tortorici 1989, 56-68, for the sources and
reconstructing hypotheses for the forum”.


\(^{162}\) Aur. Vict., De Caes. 9, 7: “Namque Romae Capitolium, quod conflagravisse supra memoravimus, aedes
Pacis, Claudii monumenta, amphitheatri tanta vis, multaque alia ac forum coepta seu patrata”.

\(^{163}\) Bauer 1976-77.
two short ends, and despite more recent critical reviews of some of his interpretations, his studies remain the best architectural analysis of the monument. One of his hypotheses focused on the two curved foundations on the southwest side of the forum, whose building technique is very similar to that of the Temple of Minerva. This observation led the German scholar to suggest a first construction phase in which a temple was built on the southwest side, looking toward the *Subura*. This hypothesis was grounded on ambiguous literary sources, and the mention of a temple to *Ianus Geminus* in the Roman Forum, between the *Curia* and the *Basilica Aemilia*, in a few sources.

Bauer reconstructed a Corinthian hexastyle temple that co-existed with the Temple of Minerva on the opposite side, as in the Forum of Ostia. This reconstruction, though intriguing, has been dismissed after archaeological investigation during the 1980s revealed stratigraphic evidence that proved that the temple foundations on the southwest side were built and abandoned in Flavian times. Substantial damage (earthquake? static failure?) was observed on these curved foundations, which has been suggested as a possible reason for the change in the project; however, there is no evidence that places the occurrence of the damage in Flavian times—it could therefore have taken place anytime after that.

The accepted construction campaign for the Forum of Domitian is now understood as comprising two phases. In the first phase, the architect planned to build the temple on the southwest narrow side, looking toward the *Subura*. For unknown reasons the project was then modified to accommodate the temple dedicated to Minerva.
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165 Morselli, Tortorici 1989, 51; Viscogliosi 2000, 64.
166 Morselli, Tortorici 1989, 50-51.
167 Viscogliosi 2000, 64.
on the opposite side between the northeast exedra of the Forum of Augustus and the Porticus Absidata. As previously mentioned, the access to the forum from the Roman Forum is unclear. Bauer hypothesized the existence of a Vicus Iani in between the two curved foundations that would have managed the flow between the Roman Forum and the Forum of Domitian. He also envisioned a tetrapiylon (reminiscent of von Blanckenhagen’s invented quadrifrons arch mentioned above) that managed the communication between this forum, that of Caesar, the Curia, and the Basilica Aemilia. A thorough examination of five Renaissance drawings by Viscogliosi, however, allowed him to suggest a less complicated solution in which the same pseudo-colonnade employed along the long sides was utilized here, resulting in two arches, placed side by side, that are especially visible in the drawing by Palladio. The two curving walls on the Roman Forum end would have also helped increase the vistas in effect from within, while they were an elegant variation on the orthogonal relations between straight lines typical of the other Imperial forums.

The entrance on the opposite side, the Porticus Absidata, is a unique structure whose horseshoe shape allowed the architect to solve several issues. Viscogliosi’s careful observation of the in situ remains of the foundations allowed him to conclude that this building belonged to the first phase of the forum, in which case, since the very beginning, the access from the Subura was intended to be through the Porticus Absidata. The architectural analysis of the porticus by Bauer remains unsurpassed as far as the reconstruction of the plan is concerned. However, his hypothesis for the elevation was unsatisfying and has subsequently been questioned. A recent reconsideration of the
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168 Viscogliosi 2000, 68.
169 Viscogliosi 2000, 85-86.
170 Bauer 1983.
171 Richardson 1992, 311.
archaeological evidence allowed the author to produce a 3D model in which the new reconstruction of the *porticus* as a hypaethral structure responds more accurately to the evidence while positioning the building in a broader social and architectural context (fig. 18).\(^{172}\)

The use of the *Porticus Absidata* as a toll for traffic control can be observed when analyzing the axes of its entry points (fig. 21). The only axial visual line is C, which ends up against one side of the trapezoidal room. The intended entry points into the forum are here indicated by axes A and B, which correspond to entrances 2 and 1, neither of which would have allowed for a view of the forum. Instead, the visitor would have entered the porticus either through the central area or through the other entries, and then would have turned one or more times before walking into the trapezoidal room which would finally lead into the forum. The winding route and narrow passages would have allowed for easy management of the traffic.

In addition to that, Heinrich Bauer identified a cut into the foundation covered with traces of *opus signinum*, which proves that the central area of the porticus was turned into a basin (fig. 18).\(^{173}\) The lack of stratigraphic data prevents us from dating the transformation into a nymphaeum with certainty. However the comparison with contemporary Flavian or specifically Domitianic buildings, such as the shallow *euripi* from the neighboring Templum Pacis, the monumental fountain known as the "terrazza Domizianea,"\(^{174}\) and the decorative water facilities of the Flavian palace, allowed the author to tentatively date the transformation in the second building phase of the *Forum*  
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\(^{172}\) Nocera 2015.

\(^{173}\) Bauer 1983, 117.

\(^{174}\) See the next section of this chapter for a description and analysis of the Domitianic Terrace,
Domitiani. The water basin would have been an effective way of exerting further control on the size and speed of the crowd’s movements.

The motivation behind this unusual architectural design might be found in the intention of separating topographically the infamous neighborhood of the Subura and the grand, neat space of the forum. An effective image of the Subura as a less than desirable place to go or live comes from Juvenal, who depicts this area as unpleasant and dangerous. The intention for control appears even more evident if we compare the entrance to the Forum Domitiani from the Roman Forum on the opposite side, here indicated with no. 4, (fig. 21). Despite the doubts about the exact shape and hypothetical presence of an arch, this entrance seemed to have been more than twice as wide (6.46 m over the 3 m for entrances 1 and 2, fig. 21) and would have allowed for a large crowd to pass through. Moreover, the slightly oblique access point would have provided a quite sensational vista of the temple of Minerva and the colonnade. While the vista element is to be expected there since this was the front entrance, the difference in width between the two access points appears to have been functional as well. It seems as if a larger crowd coming from the Roman Forum was provided with a more inviting entrance than the crowd coming from the shady Subura. A comparison with the neighboring Forum of Augustus further corroborates this point.

The Forum of Domitian and the Forum of Augustus shared the boundary with the Subura but two different solutions for accessing the fora were employed. Two large straight entrances (fig. 3) allowed the visitor to pass from the Subura into the Forum of Augustus. The steps at the entrances were about 4.20 m wide and led down several
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175 Nocera 2015.
176 Juv., III. 1-9, "Quamvis digressu veteris confusus amici laudo tamen, vacuis quad sedem figere Cumis destinet atque unum civem donare Sibyllae. ianua Baiarum est et gratum litus amoeni secessus. ego vel Prochytam praepono Suburae; nam quid tam miserum, tam solum vidimus, ut non deterius credas horrere incendia, lapsus tectorum adsiduos ac mille pericula saevae urbis et Augusto recitantes mense poetas?"
meters in the piazza of the forum. The Forum of Augustus served multiple official purposes, such as legal and notorial activities, and it is logical to assume that a larger crowd would have passed through and occupied the space on a daily basis; therefore, wider entryways are not surprising. Nonetheless, this element further strengthens the idea that form and function were inextricably linked in the architecture of the *Porticus Absidata*, which successfully served as liminal space between the *Subura* and the Forum.

The surviving architectural decoration of this forum amounts to only one bay supported by the so-called Colonnacce and part of the attic above it at the northeastern side (fig. 12-14). This section of the frieze has been analyzed by Eve D'Ambra in 1993. In addition to this, the above-mentioned Renaissance drawing published by von Blanckenhagen should represent a section of the temple’s frieze with a series of sacrificial implements, which, surprisingly, D'Ambra does not discuss.

These in situ fragments, plus another one in the Markets of Trajan, represent approximately 6% of the whole decoration. The depiction of domestic female activities has been seen as being at odds with the usual forum imagery of war and peace, which are, of course related themes, such as one finds in the Forum of Augustus. While the depiction of female activities is certainly not typical, I would warn against the reading of the extant portion of decoration as key for the whole forum program. Since the surviving sector of the frieze constitutes such a small part of the decorative program it would be highly speculative to guess which themes were employed in the rest of the frieze, apart from the reasonable hypothesis that additional myths applicable to Minerva were also used.

---

177 See section III.b.2 for more details on the frieze.
178 D'Ambra 1993, 25, here D'Ambra refers to the FUR and some late illustrations of the temple but she does not mention this drawing with the sacrificial instruments.
A look at the nearby Forum of Trajan confirms the danger of this methodology. The attic decoration has been reconstructed as a gallery of portraits with alternating female and male figures who belong to the imperial family. This differs from the *Summi Viri* gallery in the Forum of Augustus, which consists of male figures exclusively. In the absence of archaeological evidence for the presence of female figures, we would likely have assumed that the gallery of portraits in the forum of Trajan consisted of male figures only based on the Augustan example. The feminist approach taken by D'Ambra highlights the predominance of feminine themes as opposed to the usual decorative subjects for the Imperial Fora. However, a gender-themed approach fails to encompass the larger building program in the Imperial Fora region. The decorative program in the forum of Caesar, for instance, was focused on the cult of *Venus Genetrix*, a feminine deity *par excellence* whose creative force is emphasized by the use of the epithet *Genetrix* for the first time. The front of the temple was complemented by the Appiades fountains, of which the closest comparison can be seen in a marble sculptural group from the Louvre showing a group of three nymphs supporting a basin.  

The *Templum Pacis*, while it originated from a conquest and was funded by the booty gained in the sack of Jerusalem, was dedicated to another female deity, albeit a personification. The only forum where the decorative program was fully centered on a male deity was that of Augustus, whose dedication to Mars Ultor enhanced the war context by adding the concept of vengeance for Caesar's murder, first, and later also revenge upon Parthia for prior defeats. And even here Venus and Fortuna occupied a prominent place in the pediment flanking Mars, as depicted on the Villa Medici relief. The theme of peace following victory was indeed present, as was a strong female element in the attic caryatids. The identification of the panel above the frieze in the *Forum*  

---

Domitian as a province personification, coupled with an additional panel representing the same subject, indicates that an extensive series that an extensive series of subject peoples were represented there, not unlike the province personifications in the Aphrodisias Sebasteion. We know that the Forum of Augustus next door similarly used images to map the empire, not only the heads of western Celtic Jupiter and African Jupiter Ammon on the shields of the attic bays, but also some kind of display of inscriptions, tituli, associated with images of gentes, somewhere in the portico.\textsuperscript{180}

The forum of Domitian was the smallest of all, displayed an unusual shape, was not used for the typical forum activities, and employed innovative architectural solutions. Yet despite the smaller scale and less assuming role, the construction of this forum continued and augmented much of the imagery in the adjacent Imperial Fora\textsuperscript{181} and was surely as much frequented as the others it linked.

II.d The Domitianic Terrace

Our understanding of Domitian's intervention in the area of the Imperial Fora changed significantly when E. Tortorici published his analysis in 1993 of the archaeological remains brought to light by C. Ricci during the excavations carried out for the opening of the Via dell’Impero under Mussolini between 1924 and 1931. These remains, known today as the Domitianic Terrace, Terraza Domitiana, presented several interpretative challenges, some of which are still unresolved. However, Tortorici's article was influential for our understanding of the topographical development of Domitian's intervention.

\textsuperscript{180} Velleius 2.39.2; Nicolet 1991, 42-43.
\textsuperscript{181} A more detailed analysis of the impact of the Forum Domitiani will be provided in the conclusive section of this chapter, II.g.
II.d.1 Archaeological evidence and history of the excavations and studies

Remains of the structure are today clearly visible from Via Alessandrina, looking to the right of the Markets of Trajan. These remains are embedded in the wall of the headquarters of the Knights of Malta (fig. 26); other parts are accessible from the interior of the house, and it is possible to reach the lower level from an extremely narrow passage in the Forum of Trajan.¹⁸² The so-called Domitianic Terrace is today interpreted as a monumental nymphaeum that served as the terminal fountain of an aqueduct, most likely the Aqua Marcia. Lugli was the first to provide a description and to attempt an interpretation of the structure.¹⁸³ However, the odd shape and the difficulty presented by the later constructions led him to dismiss the building as "strange," with a function that was impossible to establish.¹⁸⁴ Lugli was also convinced that this building had a strictly functional purpose and was not decorated, and suggested that it might have abutted the saddle between the Quirinal and the Capitoline Hills that, at the time, was believed to have been excavated by Trajan to build his own forum.¹⁸⁵ In his 1993 article Tortorici was able to finally establish the extent of Domitian’s intervention in the area by confirming that the cut through the saddle was at least initiated, if not even completed, by Domitian, to carry out the construction of a large public space—perhaps a second forum.¹⁸⁶ This idea had already been postulated by several scholars,¹⁸⁷ and today it has been unanimously accepted that the major intervention on the slope between the Capitoline

¹⁸² I am grateful to Dr. R. Menehini for giving me access to the remains through this passage in July 2014. The autopic inspection of the building was extremely useful to the understanding of otherwise very elusive remains for they are incorporated into the forum and the Malta Knights’ house.
¹⁸³ Lugli 1946, 276-78.
¹⁸⁴ Lugli 1946, 276.
¹⁸⁵ Ibid.
¹⁸⁶ Tortorici 1993, 7, 12-15, 18; for B. Longfellow this project was clearly aimed at the construction of a second and larger forum, Longfellow 2011, 51.
¹⁸⁷ Ricci, 1930, 181; Colini, 1933, 255; Anderson 1984, 55 ff, 98, 147 ff, 180; Giuliani 1986, 137 ff.
and the Quirinal was not just begun but also completed by Domitian.\textsuperscript{188} This fact has heavy implications for the extent and significance of Domitian’s programmatic intervention in the region of the Imperial Fora. These implications will be discussed in the conclusions; for now, suffice it to say that, despite some of the evidence for Domitian’s building program in the area which has been known for some time, it has also been under-studied within the larger context of a building program carried out by an emperor.

The remains of the fountain consist of a trapezoidal core of concrete covered by bricks with a slightly concave façade (fig. 27). This façade is oriented along a north-south axis and overlooks the west, toward the Forum of Trajan. This orientation differs from the existing Imperial Fora, which are all aligned or perpendicular to one another along a northwest-southeast axis (fig. 3). The monumentality of the nymphaeum is evident in its dimensions, with a 22.60 m high and a 23.75 wide façade. The design of this structure is unique for a public fountain, while the orientation poses some interesting questions about Domitian’s project for this large area that will be addressed later on in this chapter. Several “cappuccina” water outlets are visible on the left side of the façade, while the right side is obliterated by Trajanic structures and is therefore harder to read.

The arrangement of these outlets is irregular and it does not seem to follow any particular pattern. The building’s façade defies the Roman rule of symmetry, and it was visually separated in two vertical sections where the left side was pierced by the water outlets, and the right side was further articulated by two levels, each of which featured two niches. A recent investigation of the remains with the goal of understanding the hydraulic system led to the hypothesis that there were extensions on both sides of the

\textsuperscript{188} Bianchini, Vitti 2017, 22; Meneghini 2009, 117; Bianchi 2010, 379; see also a discussion of this issue in the section dedicated to the Forum of Caesar in this chapter.
fountain that would counteract this asymmetry.\textsuperscript{189} There are no traces of these extensions, which could, of course, have been demolished by Trajan later;\textsuperscript{190} however, as we will see later, an even more recent analysis of the archaeological evidence of the Markets of Trajan has revealed certain traces of the project that Domitian started in this area and never completed.\textsuperscript{191} The niche on the upper level is semicircular in plan with a diameter of 8.71 m and a depth of 4.41 m, and roofed with a semidome (fig. 26). In the lower level a smaller rectangular opening, 5.58 m wide, is centered along the axis of the upper niche. The orientation of its inner walls is oddly off axis—this is quite evident in the plan (fig. 27), in which the walls are rotated toward the south by 10\textdegree.\textsuperscript{192}

A brick monumental staircase was built on the ground level starting with a trapezoidal ledge that seems to counteract the unusual orientation of the inner walls of the rectangular opening. Only seven steps, with a tread of 38 cm and a riser of 20 cm, are visible today, due to the construction of Trajanic structures abutting them. An irregularly shaped cut is visible almost in the middle of the stairs due to a later intervention. The steps show no traces of revetment. The rectangular opening is closed in the back by a brick wall that interrupts the staircase, leaving a trapezoidal ledge. A circular opening with a diameter of 1.15 m is visible in the floor of the upper niche and has been interpreted by Tortorici as a means through which the water would fall down and create a sort of waterfall. In his view, the steps in the lower level would have created the well-known effect of a water staircase, more common in domestic architecture,\textsuperscript{193} for which we have many examples in Pompeii and in Hadrian's Villa. An off-center rectangular cut

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{189} Bianchi et al. 2015, 150-51.
\bibitem{190} Ibid.
\bibitem{191} Bianchini, Vitti 2017, 653-664, fig. 593.
\bibitem{192} Tortorici 1993, figs. 15 and 17; fig. 25.
\bibitem{193} See Longfellow 2011, 53-54 for a discussion of water staircases in Rome and their derivation from domestic examples in Pompeii.
\end{thebibliography}
is also visible on the steps, and it has been interpreted by Tortorici as drainage for the water falling from the circular opening.¹⁹⁴

Until recent times this monument had been studied only by Tortorici and Longfellow.¹⁹⁵ Recently, E. Bianchi, L. Antognoli, and E. Santucci presented their analysis of the hydraulic system of the fountain in light of their explorations, which proved the operation of the building during the reign of Domitian.¹⁹⁶ More significantly, Marco Bianchini and Massimo Vitti published in 2017 a thick volume documenting the analysis of all known archaeological data, documentation of brick stamps, new architectural survey, and 3D reconstructions that were conducted during a span of thirty-five years. The result is an excellent monograph on the Markets of Trajan which finally clarifies the grand construction plan that Domitian had envisioned for this sector.¹⁹⁷ These results will be discussed in more detail further below.

II.d.2 Analysis of the building and new interpretation of the remains

A closer look at the remains and a survey of the many examples of Roman Imperial fountains highlight several issues with the interpretation of the functional aspects of the fountain and its role in this area. The main issue lies in the reconstruction of a water staircase,¹⁹⁸ supposedly fed by the circular opening in the floor of the upper niche (fig. 27). This niche is only accessible from the Knights of Malta headquarters. No in-depth archaeological investigation was ever undertaken inside, and several restorations were carried out both on the floor and in the walls during the 1930s. There

¹⁹⁴ Tortorici 1993, 18.
¹⁹⁵ Tortorici 1993; Longfellow 2011.
¹⁹⁶ Bianchi et al. 2015.
¹⁹⁸ This idea is posited by Longfellow, 2011, 53, following Tortorici’s hypothesis of water coming down the round hole.
is no evidence whatsoever that water pipes or conduits were inserted in the walls or floor of this niche, thus raising the question about how the water was fed into the round hole.\footnote{Longfellow is mistaken when she talks about a "channel located in the pavement of the upper niche" that would carry the water, Longfellow 2011, 53. This observation is not footnoted, nor does she mention seeing this channel personally. Perhaps she refers to Tortorici's description of a semicircular opening in the ceiling if the upper niche that he hypothesizes contained water conduits. And yet no proper archaeological evidence has ever been found.} Moreover, the off-center position of the round hole would make the water hit a random spot on the stairs while missing the beginning of the staircase (fig. 27).

An examination of surviving water staircases allows us to identify several characteristics of this feature while providing many more reasons why this hypothesis seems untenable. I will only mention a few examples, listed in chronological order. In Pompeii the Praedia of Julia Felix (II4, 3, fig. 28), the House of the Granduca (VII 4, 56), the House of the Centenary (IX 8, 3.7. fig. 29), the House of the Large Fountain (VI 8, 22), the House of Marcus Lucretius (IX 8, 3.7, fig. 30), the Villa of the Mosaic Columns, and the House V-iii-11\footnote{Praedia of Julia Felix (II4, 3), House of the Granduca (VII 4, 56), House of the Large Fountain (VI 8, 22), House of Marcus Lucretius (IX 8, 3.7), Villa of the Mosaic Columns, House V-iii-11. See Neuerburg 1965 figs. 48, 115, 121, 122, 123, 127; Longfellow 2011, 53, n. 81 on page 223.} feature a water staircase that usually stems from a semicircular niche covered in mosaic and housing a statue. The steps are always revetted in marble, and the water would emerge from one or more outlets located at the base or in the center of the back wall of the niche to mimic a natural water spring in a grotto.\footnote{Neuerburg 1965, 90.} In Rome the Auditorium of Maecenas (fig. 32) falls into the category of \textit{exedra} nymphaeum, with a more \textit{assuming} water staircase built within a stepped hemicycle. Here the water would flow from holes visible in the uppermost step, later filled in with mortar.\footnote{Neuerburg 1965, 99.} A grand water staircase can be seen in the northern side of the octagonal room in the Domus
Aurea (fig. 33). The core of the stair occupies a rectangular niche and rises to fill the
niche in its total height. The revetment is not preserved, but it was most likely marble.203

After the Domitianic period water staircases remained common. An elaborate
example can be seen in Hadrian's Villa in the triclinium at the end of the Canopus (fig.
34). Here four water staircases were inserted into rectangular niches framing the
semicircular dining area equipped with a large stibadium. Several other water effects
were employed in this luxurious area, making the water a key element in a sensuous
dining experience. The 4th century House of Cupid and Psyche in Ostia testifies to the
continuous use of water staircases in domestic environments (fig. 35). The nymphaeum
in the viridarium was decorated with colored marble, polychrome mosaics, and a small
water staircase. In this particular case the slope is articulated like a ramp with
overlapping marble slabs for a gentler waterfall effect.204

Looking at these examples it is possible to identify some common characteristics
for water staircases. It appears that the purpose of this feature was to break down the
water flow, thus generating smaller cascades falling from one step to the other. The
visual aspect could have been enhanced by the use of colored marbles, while the acoustic
effect of the steadily flowing water would have created a soothing repetitive sound
similar to that of a Japanese Zen fountain. The steps were usually covered in marble, and
the water was always fed by one or more openings situated in various positions such as
the back of the niche, the center of the niche, or the uppermost step. Neuerburg has
specifically examined the location of water outlets inside niches and concluded that the
usual location was at the bottom or in the center of the niche wall.205 In four instances,206

203 Neuerburg 1965, 99, 200, figs. 44, 45.
204 See Neuerburg, fig. 189.
205 Neuerburg 1965, 97.
the water outlet was placed in a higher spot; however, there are no known examples of water falling directly from the ceiling, especially from a height of 5.77 m, as has been suggested for the Domitianic Terrace. From such a height the water would come gushing down and create a wide-radius splatter. An experiment conducted with the help of some students at the University of Pennsylvania207 allowed me to measure the radius at up to 4.92 m, which would have fallen almost 2 m off the façade.208 Whether in domestic contexts or in monumental settings, Roman fountains followed certain functional criteria, one of which was the management of the flow in order to avoid getting the passer-by and the surroundings wet.209 Therefore, several elements argue against a decorative function for the staircase: 1) the fact that the staircase is slanted and shows no traces of revetment; 2) the height between the steps and the circular hole in the ceiling, which would have caused a large splash; 3) the off-center position of the hole; and 4) comparison with well-known water staircases. All of these confirm that we cannot interpret this feature as a water staircase. The uniqueness of this fountain’s design need not force us to imagine messy or impractical solutions.

The dismissal of the staircase as a decorative element must necessarily mean that it was a functional passage which has, in fact, been recognized in the recent analyses of the monument.210 A drawing by I. Gismondi dated to the years 1930-31211 shows a reconstruction of the façade of the nymphaeum with a functional staircase (fig. 36).

---

207 The experiment was conducted on Sunday, October 26 at Gregory College House. I am very grateful to Yeni Brima, Victoria Green, Derek Standlee and Melissa Sosa for their enthusiasm and the accuracy they pursued during the test. We threw water on a hard surface targeting a specific point and then we measured the radius of the water splash. The water was thrown from a height of 4 m versus the 5.77 m of the Domitianic Terrace.
208 Considering that the height of the terrace is almost 2 meters higher than the building used for the experiment, this is an underestimate.
210 Bianchi et al. 2015, 150-51; Bianchini, Vitti 2017, 251-52.
211 The drawing is published in Meneghini 2009, 114, fig. no. 129.
Gismondi’s drawing is correct in reconstructing the staircase extending beyond the visible remains, since the difference in elevation between the last visible step and the ground is 6.24 m, but the number of steps and their arrangement is incorrect. A reconstruction of the staircase and the size of its extension from the nymphaeum and down to the walking level have been attempted by Bianchi et al., who hypothesize a combination of steps and landing platforms of which there are traces on the inner walls (fig. 37). This reconstruction gives us an idea of the imposing and monumental aspect of this fountain, and confirms more solidly the scale of the area that must have extended in front of it. If we accept the hypothesis of the water staircase, we would have to imagine a water collector at the foot, and a way in which the water would fall into this collector from a height of 6.24 m.

The interpretation of the staircase as a functional feature is, in fact, well-grounded on archaeological evidence. After close examination, it appears that the niche in the lower level was in fact a vaulted passage that was later closed by the insertion of a back wall. The stratigraphic relation between the vault and the back wall is certain and illustrated in the photos in fig. 38. The examination of these remains is complicated by the fact that only the front side is accessible, but it is possible to hypothesize that the staircase was meant as a passage into the area behind the fountain that led into the Subura and housed an apsed hall. The back of the building was documented by I. Gismondi in 1930 (fig. 39), and showed several other water channels that are today covered by modern mortar. The space behind the fountain was limited, and the
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212 Bianchi et al., 2015, 150-51, fig. 10a-b.
213 This gives even more weight to the idea that Domitian must have completed the cut of the saddle between the Quirinal and Capitoline Hills to gain enough space for this monumental project.
214 This is not an unlikely solution for those who accept the idea of the staircase as a decorative one.
216 Tortorici 1993, 16-17.
orientation of the buildings does not explain why the walls of the passage are not straight but form an angle toward the south. The back wall was either built by Domitian, as an afterthought, or by Trajan.\textsuperscript{217} Dating the back wall is difficult since there are no visible brick stamps. Trajan built several structures all around the Domitianic Terrace and tabernae abutting the late Republican house, overlooking the Subura. Once these tabernae were built, the passage into the Subura from the Domitianic Terrace ceased to exist. Therefore, it might be more plausible to attribute the closing of the lower passage in the Domitianic nymphaeum to Trajan. The analysis carried out by Bianchini and Vitti has uncovered more Domitianic foundations behind the nymphaeum,\textsuperscript{218} to the east, which would confirm the idea that the staircase led to an unknown sector. More details about these Domitianic foundations will be provided in the conclusions.

The other problematic aspect is represented by the circular opening in the floor of the upper niche. The whole structure was heavily restored in the 1930s, and this opening shows many signs of this modern intervention, which makes the reading of it quite complicated. It is impossible to distinguish between the restoration and the original masonry around the hole, and it is therefore difficult to say whether the opening was part of the original project, or a modern intervention or repair. Most likely both the circular opening and the cut into the stairs occurred in modern times.

A reconstruction of the nymphaeum’s façade is bound to be unsuccessful. As Bianchi \textit{et al.} showed, the arrangement of the water outlets does not necessarily reflect the water effects on the façade.\textsuperscript{219} The situation is further complicated by the later interventions by Trajan which might have destroyed any diagnostic feature of the

\textsuperscript{217} This hypothesis has been suggested to me by Meneghini during a conversation after my visit to the remains. It is impossible to prove it at this stage, but it is a plausible explanation for the stratigraphic relation between the stairs and the back wall.

\textsuperscript{218} Bianchini, Vitti 2017, 657-64.

\textsuperscript{219} Bianchi \textit{et al.}, 2015, 144-151.
monument's finished facade. It is possible to imagine the monument's vertical division as a means to separate the water wall from the two arched openings. Most likely this feature was the only functioning one at the time of Domitian's death and was completely dismantled by Trajan's architect, together with the decommissioning of the aqueduct's end, when the construction of the new forum began.\textsuperscript{220} This nymphaeum must have been quite a spectacular sight, and it is more than plausible that a large space was open in front of it to allow the viewer to enjoy the vista fully (fig. 3).\textsuperscript{221} The scale of this fountain must have provided the site with a grand spectacle that reminded every citizen of Rome of the generosity and the power of the emperor.

This nymphaeum has been interpreted as the terminal feature of the Aqua Marcia by Tortorici, who analyzes the path of this aqueduct and reconstructs in the Domitianic Terrace a typical "mostra d'acqua."\textsuperscript{222} While this nymphaeum was unique in its design, it was not the first monumental one in Rome. An even grander one was in fact built by Nero on the eastern slope of the Celian hill as part of his \textit{Domus Aurea}. Nero took advantage of the substructures underneath the unfinished and damaged temple of \textit{Divus Claudius} to build a nymphaeum whose façade stretched for 167 m and overlooked the lake in the valley of the later Colosseum.\textsuperscript{223} The monumentality of this nymphaeum was unprecedented and would remain unsurpassed; however, it fell into the category of domestic water features which would typically display more luxurious and monumental aspects as opposed to street fountains.\textsuperscript{224} Nonetheless, the visibility of this nymphaeum

\textsuperscript{220} Tortorici 1993, 15; Longfellow 2011, 52.
\textsuperscript{221} Tortorici 1993, 18; Longfellow 2011, 52.
\textsuperscript{222} Tortorici 1993, 18-22.
\textsuperscript{223} Coarelli 2002, 202-04; Longfellow 2011, 28-30.
\textsuperscript{224} Longfellow 2011, 26-8.
might have been influenced by the civic fountains that began to populate the city under the Flavians,\textsuperscript{225} and would culminate in the Domitianic terrace.

The novelty of the Domitianic terrace lies in the fact that it was a public building. The expression of imperial power was further emphasized by the statuary display that has been hypothesized based on literary sources. Two epigrams by Martial could refer to this feature.\textsuperscript{226} Whether or not Martial mentioned this fountain, it is more than plausible to hypothesize a statuary group in the upper niche. The scale of the niche and its depth, 4.41 m, suggest the presence of a large group that was probably placed close to the edge to allow the viewer to see the group while climbing up the stairs. While the Domitianic Terrace will remain mysterious in many of its aspects, more layers of interpretation were added here in light of a reexamination of the archaeological evidence and comparanda.

\textsuperscript{225} Longfellow 2011, 30.
\textsuperscript{226} Mar. Epigr. 9.18, 11.96. In the first epigram Martial refers to his own house in Rome and the noise coming from a monumental fountain. Considering that Martial’s home was on the Quirinal it is likely the he’s referring to this Domitianic fountain. In the second epigram Martial mentions a “Martian fountain” where, i.e., a captive German might have been represented as a sculptural group. See Tortorici 1993, 22 and Longfellow 2011, 56-8 for a discussion of the epigrams and hypotheses for the statuary group in the fountain. In light of the above discussion about the absence of a water staircase, Longfellow’s suggestion for a statue depicting a captive German in relation with the water flow seems untenable.
II.e Imperial Cult Revisited: the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*

Suetonius tells us that Domitian converted his family house, located “ad malum Punicum” in *Regio VI*, into a “Templum Gentis Flaviae” (fig. 41).\(^{227}\) a lavish dynastic monument and a *sepulcrum* whose significance and function were unprecedented.\(^{228}\) The date of the dedication, between AD 92 and 95, is based on a passage in Martial.\(^{229}\) As Robin Darwall-Smith points out, the building served three purposes: the monumentalization of Domitian’s birthplace, a temple to the Flavian family, and a dynastic mausoleum.\(^{230}\) The *Templum Gentis Flaviae* was located inside the *pomerium*\(^{231}\) and for that reason it represented a break with Roman tradition, which forbade sepulchres within the sacred boundary.\(^{232}\) It has been convincingly argued that before the completion of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, members of the imperial family must have been buried in the Mausoleum of Augustus as a temporary solution.\(^{233}\) Once the monumental structure was completed, the ashes of Vespasian,\(^{234}\) Titus, Julia, Titus’ daughter, Flavius Sabinus, Vespasian’s brother, Flavia Domitilla, either the wife or daughter of Vespasian, and Domitian’s son with Domitia Longina, who died

---

\(^{227}\) Suet., *Dom.*, 1.1.


\(^{229}\) Mart., XI, 1, 3, 20; Torelli 1987, 562; for Coarelli the inauguration is not later than AD 92-93, Coarelli 2014, 196. La Rocca indicates the year AD 94 as the latest for the dedication, La Rocca 2009, 228.


\(^{231}\) Three pomerial *cippi* of Claudius were found in areas that mark the border beyond the location of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, La Rocca 2009, 228.

\(^{232}\) The only noticeable exception to this ancient rule was the presence of the tomb of C. Publicius Bibulus at the foot of the Capitoline hill still visible in front of the right side of the so-called Vittoriano.

\(^{233}\) Panciera 1994, 81-86.

\(^{234}\) Mart., IX, 34.
prematurely, were placed in the new Flavian monument. After Domitian’s death, his nurse Phyllis secretly performed the cremation ritual and mingled his ashes with those of Julia inside the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, to save his remains from the disgrace of the *damnatio memoriae*.

The monument can be located through scant archaeological evidence and some surviving elements of the decoration in the western corner of the later Baths of Diocletian on the Quirinal hill. However, its exact layout still eludes us (fig. 42). Also highly problematic is its fate after Domitian’s *damnatio memoriae*. This is complicated by the evidence from late antique sources that suggest the building’s survival, whereas archaeological traces within the Baths of Diocletian seem instead to indicate the area’s demolition. Undoubtedly though, the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* embodied a completely new concept for a dynastic mausoleum that needs to be examined in light of the larger Domitianic vision for celebrating the Flavians, which included the *Porticus Divorum* in the Campus Martius, the Arch of Titus on the Via Sacra, and the temple of the Divine Vespasian in the Roman Forum. In the next paragraphs I will discuss the archaeological evidence and provide a partially new visualization of the most convincing hypothesis for the remains’ reconstruction.

**II.e.1 Archaeological evidence and history of the excavations**

---

235 La Rocca 2009, 228 with bibliography.
236 Suet., *Dom.*, 17.3.
238 *Chronogr. a. 354* 146M; Valentini Zucchetti 1940, 108, 5; 171, 10; *SHA, Tyr. Trig.*, XXXIII, 6; *SHA, Claud.*, 3.6.
239 My plan of the building stems in large part from Anna Tartaro’s study of the Baths of Diocletian with the addition of the precinct, Tartaro 2017, and Coarelli’s hypothesis for a centrally planned building, Coarelli 2014.
While both Suetonius\(^\text{240}\) and Dio\(^\text{241}\) mention a house of Vespasian, likely the birthplace of Domitian, neither provides any topographical indications about it. However, two archaeological discoveries furnished solid data for the location of the house of T. Flavius Sabinus, Vespasian’s brother (fig. 42). In 1521 a travertine cippus was uncovered in the vineyard of Cardinal Jacopo Sadoleti, bearing an inscription with the name of Flavius Sabinus.\(^\text{242}\) In addition, a lead pipe with the name of Sabinus\(^\text{243}\) was found during construction work carried out at the end of the 19\(^\text{th}\) century for the Methodist church of St. Andrew, on the corner between Via Firenze and Via XX Settembre. It has often been said that this was Domitian’s birthplace, confusing the property of Sabinus with that of Vespasian.\(^\text{244}\) We must imagine, however, that Vespasian had his own house, most likely not far from his brother’s. In order to identify a possible house of Vespasian, it is important to mention the discovery of remains belonging to a domus dated to the Julio-Claudian period by Daniela Candilio in the area corresponding to the north-western corner of the Baths of Diocletian.\(^\text{245}\) Given its location overlooking a main vicus and close to the house of Flavius Sabinus — about 150 m to the northeast — this could likely be the house of Vespasian mentioned by the sources, and the birthplace of Domitian.\(^\text{246}\)

\(^{240}\) Suet., Vesp., 5.7.
\(^{241}\) Dio. 66.1.3.
\(^{242}\) CIL VI, 29788= ILS 5988, see La Rocca 2009, 225, footnote no. 26 with bibliography.
\(^{243}\) CIL XV, 7451.
\(^{244}\) Torelli thinks that the house of Sabinus was the one converted into the Templum Gentis Flaviae, Torelli 1987, 568; for Coarelli and La Rocca instead, we need to think of a house owned by Vespasian, Coarelli 2009, 93, note no.307 with bibliography; La Rocca 2009, 228.
\(^{245}\) Candilio 1990-91.
\(^{246}\) Coarelli considers this as a certain interpretation, Coarelli 2009, 94. However, as Tartaro noticed, we do not have any information about the owner of this house, Tartaro 2017, PhD dissertation, 85. Therefore, this is just a hypothesis, though highly likely. Titus was instead born in a different house, Suet., Tit., 1.1, the first Roman house of Vespasian likely close to the area where Septimius Severus would later build his Septizodium, Coarelli 2009, 93.
While this is just a hypothesis, it is strengthened by the fact that the house’s remains lie in the area later occupied by a section of the northern portico of the Templum Gentis Flaviae (fig. 53, small blue circle), thus confirming Suetonius’s remark that the temple dedicated to the Flavians originated from Domitian’s family home. Remains of this temple, both structural and decorative, were uncovered during the 19th and 20th centuries on separate occasions. The surviving traces of walls suggest a large, monumental precinct located between the church of San Bernardo, Via Romita, and Piazza della Repubblica on the Quirinal hill. The area corresponds to the western corner of the Baths of Diocletian built between AD 298 and 306. A head of Titus belonging to a colossal statue was recovered in the late 19th century during the construction carried out for the new Ministry of Finance, located between Via XX Settembre and Via Pastrengo (fig. 43). In 1902 Giuseppe Gatti published many of his results, including the discovery of a large concrete platform along Via Orlando.

Among the most important finds were a series of fragments of architectural decoration dated to the time of Domitian and known as the Hartwig-Kelsey Reliefs. These pertain to a structure – likely an altar’s precinct – included within the portico of the Templum Gentis Flaviae (figs. 44-48). These fragments were dispersed throughout the antiquarian market and were recovered in two separate groups. The first group of nine fragments was retrieved by Paul Hartwig in 1901 and donated to Rome’s National Museum. We know from a short report by Hartwig that these fragments were discovered during construction work in piazza della Repubblica, where they were looted by the

---

247 The Baths’ dedication occurred between 305 and 306 as testified by the dedicatory inscription (CIL VI 1130). The text mentions Maximian, Maxentius’ father, as the person responsible for the construction project in the name of Diocletian, see Crimi 2014 for a recent analysis of the inscription.

248 Gatti 1902, 200.

construction workers and disseminated on the market.\textsuperscript{250} The second group, which included six fragments, was acquired by Prof. Kelsey between 1900 and 1901 and brought to the Kelsey Museum of Archaeology in Ann Arbor (Michigan) where it remains today. A thirteenth fragment, an architectural element with griffins, is known from a record in the archives of the Soprintendenza as belonging to a professor from Florence, but it disappeared in the 1960s.\textsuperscript{251} Another fragment depicting a head of helmeted legionary and today exhibited in the Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology of the University of Pennsylvania might likely pertain to the Hartwig-Kelsey series.\textsuperscript{252} These fragments form a coherent group, as evidenced by the type of marble, the carving technique, and most of all, a join between two fragments from the Rome and Ann Arbor series.\textsuperscript{253} Only on the occasion of two exhibitions, in Rome in 1994 and Ann Arbor in 1996, were all the fragments exhibited together. Casts were also made, allowing for a more comprehensive study of the complete set.

The Hartwig-Kelsey fragments include elements of the architectural decoration such as fragments of entablature and capitals, as well as figural fragments. Among these are two male torsos, one nude and the other draped in a mantle, which formed two male caryatids supporting the entablature (fig. 6). The other fragments are part of a state relief including at least two scenes: a sacrifice and a historical event (figs. 7-8). These fragments consist of the head of a flamen priest wearing the characteristic galerus, a spiked helmet, standing in front of a temple identified as the temple of Quirinus on the Quirinal (fig. 5). The temple is represented with Tuscanic columns topped by the entablature, and a complex pedimental scene involving episodes of the foundation of

\textsuperscript{250} Paris 2009, 460.  
\textsuperscript{251} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{252} Bald Romano 2006, 252-255.  
\textsuperscript{253} Ibid.
A fragmentary head of a bull might be part of the previous scene with the *flamen*, likely involving a sacrifice. A second state relief included a head of Vespasian with the *corona civica* (fig. 4), a head of a soldier, and another male and female head. This relief has been reconstructed as a historical event, perhaps an *adventus* or *reditus* of Vespasian, in which he would have been shown surrounded by a soldier, the *Genius Populi Romani*, and a Victory.\(^{255}\)

In addition to these elements of architectural decoration it is important to mention that four brackets employed in the decoration of the *natatio* of the Baths of Diocletian have been attributed to the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* on stylistic and technical grounds.\(^{256}\) These brackets are quite large in size, about 0.5 m in height, and are decorated with eagles holding a thunderbolt.\(^{257}\)

In the early 1950s, during construction activity in Palazzo Feltrinelli and in the nearby church of San Bernardo, Diocletianic foundations were clearly identified as cutting through earlier structures.\(^{258}\) These earlier walls were running in two parallel stretches with a semicircular exedra on the southwestern side, with a contemporaneous sewage channel in the same building technique of *opus caementicium*. Felletti Maj, the archaeologist who supervised these excavations, suggested the presence of a portico and was able to date the channel to Flavian times based on stratigraphic relations with other sewage channels nearby.\(^{259}\) Additional Diocletianic walls were identified in the late 1950s, together with earlier structures belonging to a portico with an exedra and

\(^{254}\) Paris 2009, 465, with bibliography.


\(^{256}\) Candilio 1990-1991.

\(^{257}\) Ibid.

\(^{258}\) Felletti Maj 1952, 35, 37.

\(^{259}\) Felletti Maj 1952, 37; Gatti 1892, 430.
travertine pillars that appear to have been cut by the walls of the Baths of Diocletian. Between 1983 and 1987 Daniela Candilio explored the area underneath the so-called Aula Ottagona of the Baths of Diocletian and other areas along Via Parigi. Further stretches of the earlier portico were uncovered during these excavations, together with another semicircular exedra symmetrical to the one already brought to light.

Daniela Candilio’s work helped to piece together all the previous remains, revealing a portico with at least two semicircular exedrae surrounding a central platform suited for a monumental complex (fig. 49). The scale of these remains is notable. The portico, perhaps a quadriportico, would have measured 123 m on one side, and one side of the central platform would have been about 47 m. The late Flavian date was based on analysis of the brick work and brick stamps. The identification of these remains with the Templum Gentis Flaviae seems to be the most fitting given the scale and location of the structure. This identification has now been accepted unanimously as it takes into consideration the archeological evidence together with other discoveries such as the colossal statue of Titus and the Hartwig-Kelsey fragments.

II.e.2 The shape of the Templum Gentis Flaviae and its fate after Domitian’s death

While the archaeological evidence, paired with the literary attestations, has yielded crucial data for identifying the topographical location of the templum, many uncertainties remain regarding its layout. It is not possible to reconstruct the exact shape of this monumental Flavian complex, although the hypothesis formulated by Filippo

---

260 Piccini 1960.
263 La Rocca 2009, 224.
Coarelli in 2014 and supported by Anna Tartaro in 2017 for a centrally planned building seems to be most plausible.

Before these recent hypotheses, other reconstructions were suggested by several scholars. The idea of a *Templum Gentis Flaviae* as an imposing decastyle temple was based on an image on a *sestertius* by Domitian but it was then superseded by the interpretation of the numismatic image as a rare representation of the façade of the Domus Flavia on the Palatine.\(^\text{264}\) The archaeological discoveries only shed light on the area covered by the portico, with at least two symmetrical exedrae and surrounding a central massive platform, but nothing of the focal building inside the precinct survives. Eugenio La Rocca has hypothesized that the portico must have featured other exedrae on the model of the Traianeum from Italica (Spain) and the library of Hadrian in Athens which included a portico with alternating rectangular and semicircular exedrae (fig. 50). However, as Tartaro points out, the archaeological excavations did not reach the areas of the precinct where we would expect other exedrae, and we thus have no evidence for those.\(^\text{265}\) It is not necessary to imagine exedrae uniformly arranged along the sides of the precinct. In fact, there are Flavian examples that show asymmetrical arrangements such as the rectangular exedra on the northeastern side of the *Templum Pacis* (fig. 3), which appear to be significantly deeper than the other ones. In the *Porticus Divorum* in the Campus Martius (fig. 164), a single rectangular exedra projects out of the eastern side, thus defying any expectation of symmetry.

A recent reconstruction published in the *Atlante di Roma* by Maria Cristina Capanna shows a portico with regular exedrae enclosing a massive octastyle temple with


\(^{265}\) Tartaro 2017, 33.
twelve columns on the sides. This reconstruction is untenable since it shows the long sides of the temple stretching beyond the concrete platform, toward the east, in order to fit twelve side columns. However, the plan by Lanciani clearly indicates a finished eastern limit of the platform, as it shows traces of vertical wooden supports used to build the foundation trench (fig. 51). This proves that the eastern limit of the concrete platform was its original edge and therefore we need not imagine a longer podium.

The temple inside the portico has been hypothesized as a centrally planned building on the grounds of some numismatic issues featuring a temple. This evidence, however, has been shown to be misleading due to problems with the coins’ authenticity. Similar hypotheses of a centrally planned temple were based on the use of terms such as *polus* and *caelum* by some Flavian poets, thought to indicate a round shape for the building. Despite doubts regarding the usage of these terms to allude to a certain shape, the idea of a round building has been reinforced by new evidence mentioned by Filippo Coarelli about geophysical investigations in the area of the Aula Ottagona of the Baths of Diocletian conducted by the British School in Rome. According to these unpublished data the concrete platform attributed to the remains of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* is hollow in the center and thus fits the hypothesis of a circular building. Coarelli proposes a reconstruction of the underground level of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* as a round structure with three rectangular niches for the burials (fig. 52), the model for which could have been the *cellae* inside the Mausoleum of

---

266 Capanna 2012, tav. 185.
267 Coarelli 2014, 51; Tartaro 2017, PhD dissertation, 82-83.
268 La Rocca 2009, 230, note no. 66.
269 Three passages in Martial refer to the Templum Gentis Flaviae and make use of the term *polus* IX, 3.11-12; 20.1-2; 34.1-2. Statius, on the other hand, uses the term *caelum* twice, *Silv.*, IV, 3.18-19; V, 1.239-41.
271 The results of these investigations are still unpublished, Coarelli 2014, 51, note no. 468.
Augustus. The structure above ground level can be imagined as a round temple similar to the Hadrianic Pantheon and late Antique mausolea such as the Mausoleum of Romulus in the Villa of Maxentius or that of Constantia on the Via Nomentana. In this hypothesis the archaeological evidence seems to have been accounted for in a more accurate way, while taking into consideration the innovative nature of a structure that combined a dynastic temple, a mausoleum, and the monumentalization of an emperor's birthplace.

Using this reconstruction, we can imagine the Hartwig-Kelsey reliefs as a precinct for an altar located at the entrance of the temple. The space allows for a rectangular structure of about 18 x 6 m which is more than enough to fit all the Hartwig-Kelsey fragments. The façade of this structure would have featured the caryatids topped by the entablature, while the reliefs could have decorated the two short sides, as we see in the Ara Pacis example. The colossal statue of Titus (fig. 43), and certainly one of Vespasian, would have been inside the cella as cult simulacra. This is just one of many hypothetical solutions for a structure that remains more than elusive.

An even more puzzling dilemma is the fate of the Templum Gentis Flaviae after Domitian’s death. There is a large gap in the sources between Suetonius’ reference to the temple and the 4th century AD Regionary Catalogues consisting of the Curiosum and the Notitia. A mention of a “gentem Flabiam” and one of a “gentem Flaviam” can be found in the list of buildings in Regio VI, Alta Semita, respectively in the Curiosum and in the Notitia between the Horti Sallustiani and the Baths of Diocletian. In addition,
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272 Coarelli 2014, 51-54.
273 Ibid.
274 Tartaro clearly summarizes the problematic aspects of the later phases of the Templum Gentis Flaviae and the unresolved reading of the literary evidence combined with the archaeological traces, Tartaro 2017.
275 Valentini Zucchetti 1940, 108, 5; 171, 10.
“gentes Flavii/Flaviae” appear twice in the Historia Augusta. These represent the only information on the Templum Gentis Flaviae in literary sources later than Suetonius. They suggest that some building was present in the area of the sacred compound. However, the monument is no longer defined as a “temple.” The rectangular area occupied by the complex of the Templum Gentis Flaviae was included into the western corner of the Baths of Diocletian between AD 298 and 306. In figure 13 we see visualized for the first time all the archaeological traces of the main building and the precinct identified as the Templum Gentis Flaviae within the context of the Baths of Diocletian, on which the hypothetical reconstruction by Coarelli is superimposed. We know from the dedicatory inscription that Maximian, Maxentius’ father, realized the project in honor of Diocletian. The project entailed an extensive appropriation of several estates in the area while also intervening quite aggressively in the neighborhood by drastically changing the street system. The archaeological investigations carried out in the western sector of the Baths of Diocletian show that the above ground portions of the Templum Gentis Flaviae’s portico and two exedrae were demolished, while the foundations were preserved and reused in the new project for the western side, which corresponds perfectly with that side of the Baths.

The only archaeological trace of the central building is the concrete platform which is at a higher level than the walking level of the Baths. This element has led Coarelli to hypothesize that the central temple was preserved in the western corner of the

276 SHA, Tyr. Trig., XXXIII, 6; SHA, Claud., 3.6.
277 As already mentioned at the beginning of this section this plan represents an addition to the image no. 14 in Tartaro 2017, pag. 35, where the author visualized for the first time the reconstruction by Coarelli within the Baths of Diocletian. In figure no. 13 I added the archaeological evidence and the precinct which indicates clearly the intention of reusing the foundations of the Templum Gentis Flaviae while sparing the central building in the Diocletianic project.
278 Crimi 2014.
279 Tartaro 2017, PhD dissertation on the baths of Diocletian.
Baths of Diocletian as a sort of homage to the memory of the Flavians, whose dynastic mausoleum served as a model for the Mausoleum of Romulus in the Villa of Maxentius. To reinforce this hypothesis Coarelli also advocates for Jean-Claude Grenier’s suggestion that the obelisk currently decorating the baroque Fontana dei Quattro Fiumi in piazza Navona, commonly thought to have once stood in the Iseum Campense, was instead part of the decorative program of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*. Grenier’s argument is solid and based on a careful reading of the text on the four sides, whose message is centered on the glorification of Domitian as *dominus et deus*, rather than a hymn to Isis as we might expect for the Iseum. Coarelli’s use of this argument, however, is not highly convincing. Even if we accept that Maxentius decided to move the obelisk from the Flavian temple to his compound on the Via Appia close to the Mausoleum of Romulus, that does not mean that the religious connotation and complete significance of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* was necessarily preserved.

Moreover, the idea of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*’s survival after Domitian’s *damnatio memoriae* is also problematic for the strongly atypical association between a temple and a bath complex. In order to assess more accurately the significance of the absence of the term “temple” in the Regionary Catalogues, I examined the text of both the *Curiosum* and the *Notitia* to verify the use of the term “templum” in the sections that list the monuments of Rome. The following table summarizes its use in the two texts:

---

280 Coarelli 2014, 204-207.
281 Grenier 2009.
282 Grenier 2009, 238.
283 Tartaro 2017, 36. One exception would be the mythraeum in the Baths of Caracalla. However the nature of a temple to Mythras, an underground structure for a mystery religion, and a sacred precinct for the dynastic cult and the imperial mausoleum differ substantially.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regio</th>
<th>Curiosum</th>
<th>Notitia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II Caeleomontium</td>
<td>Claudium</td>
<td>Templum Claudii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI Altasemita</td>
<td>Floram</td>
<td>Templum Florae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gentem Flabiam</td>
<td>Gentem Flaviam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII Via Lata</td>
<td></td>
<td>Templa Duo Nova Spei et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fortunae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX Circus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hadriaeum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iseum et Serapeum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI Circus Maximus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cererem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Herculem Olivarium</td>
<td>Herculem Olivarium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is clear from the table, this examination was inconclusive. In both texts we have instances of discrepancy, such as in the first example in which the temple of Divus Claudius is listed as a temple in the Notitia, but just as “Claudium” in the Curiosum. On the other hand, the round temple of the forum Boarium – Regio XI Circus Maximus – dedicated to Hercules Olivarius is listed in both texts without the noun “templum” or “aedes.” Therefore, the mention of “gentem Flabiam/Flaviam” could equally refer to a sacred building or to a structure that somehow retained part of its original significance in a different non-sacred context. It is also important to remember that a late Antique source mentions the tomb of Trajan in the base of his own column as the only intrapomerial burial of the city.\textsuperscript{284}

The unprecedented nature of the Templum Gentis Flaviae must have presented the senators who declared the damnatio memoriae of Domitian with several issues. In fact, its nature as a mausoleum and its location inside the pomerium was a difficult

\textsuperscript{284} Eutr. 8.5.2-3. La Rocca 2009, 230.
obstacle to overcome. However, this monumental complex was also the place for the cult of the deified Vespasian and Titus, whose memory was not damned but revered. This impasse stemmed from the clever combination of tradition and innovation that Domitian was able to realize in this revolutionary building. The Augustan tradition of monumentalizing the birthplace of an emperor was continued, but it was done while the emperor was still alive. For Torelli, the Templum Gentis Flaviae was an effective way to celebrate Domitian’s personal cult without actually building a shrine to himself. The impact of the Templum Gentis Flaviae as an intra moenia tomb is clear from Trajan’s decision, less than a decade later, to have his ashes stored at the base of his column in the forum of Trajan.

In addition to this, we must take into consideration the role that the Hartwig-Kelsey Reliefs had within the decorative program of the Templum Gentis Flaviae. When we consider the reconstruction of an altar precinct with a scene of sacrifice and an adventus (or reditus) of Vespasian, the Augustan inspiration from the Ara Pacis seems obvious. However the dedicatee of the structure was not a deity such as Peace, but the entire Flavian family, whose members, imperial and non-imperial, were welcome in the mausoleum as deities while also being celebrated in the temple. Moreover, the building depicted in the relief with the flamen priest has been identified as the temple of Quirinus on the Quirinal (fig. 41), decorated with a pediment illustrating episodes of the foundation of Rome. The topographical reference to the temple of Quirinus, one of the oldest temples of Rome, within the Templum Gentis Flaviae serves to define and widen the limits of Flavian topography, here also reinforced by the construction of the Ara

---

286 Torelli 1987, 569.
In other words, the figurative program creates a strong connection between the temple of Quirinus and the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, whose meaning extends beyond its geographical limits. The scene on the Hartwig-Kelsey relief most likely represents the foundation of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* located close to the temple of Quirinus, the divinized Romulus. The foundation of Rome is here mirrored by the foundation of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* in a visual meta-dialogue between the temple on the relief and the temple decorated by the relief.

Despite the crucial place that this sacred complex occupied in Domitian’s entire building project, our knowledge of its shape and survival after AD 96 is destined to remain partial. Further archaeological investigations could add more elements to its layout, but it is clear that a large part of it was intentionally demolished during the construction of the Baths of Diocletian, while the central area was deliberately saved, at least at foundation level. The western sector of the Baths of Diocletian corresponds to an open area arranged as a garden between the precinct and the baths proper. It is possible that for practical reasons the central concrete platform was not demolished, but was used instead as a base for the garden areas with various arrangements. It is also possible that the central building was preserved but somehow stripped of its cultic connotation.

What is certain is the character of innovation that marked the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* as one of the most effective architectural projects of Domitian (fig. 53). As Coarelli suggested, it was like the Mausoleum of Augustus and the Pantheon superimposed. As a vehicle for Domitian’s autarchic aspirations, it represented a problematic monument whose fate after AD 96 is perhaps forever lost in translation.

---

287 See the following section for more details.
288 Torelli 1987, 569.
289 Tartaro 2017, PhD dissertation on the Baths of Diocletian.
290 Coarelli 2014, 204.
II.f The *Ara(e) Incendii Neroniani*\textsuperscript{291}

The modern name of this altar precinct refers, in a misleading way,\textsuperscript{292} to a series of altars dedicated by Domitian to Vulcan, which had a twofold purpose: on one hand, they symbolically represented the fulfillment of a vow to a god, long overdue, to ensure the protection against new fires; on the other, they served a didactic purpose in showing how a clear space could have prevented an actual fire.\textsuperscript{293} An epigram by Martial alluding to the renewed order in the streets is thought to refer to the construction of this monument, which should then be placed in the year AD 92.\textsuperscript{294} The epigraphic evidence exists for three\textsuperscript{295} of these altars, while some archaeological evidence has been uncovered for two of them, but the total number is unknown.\textsuperscript{296} The inscriptions commemorate the construction by Domitian of an altar in a precinct with *cippi* to fulfill a vow neglected during the times of Nero.\textsuperscript{297} This vow had the purpose of protecting the city from fires as it instructed that the space marked by the *cippi* must be kept clear from buildings and activities, and that a sacrifice during the Volcanalia must be made. The text of the inscription does not clarify whether Domitian completed a project started by Nero or built the area as a new project.\textsuperscript{298}

Some remains were unearthed in 1618\textsuperscript{299} between the Aventine and the Circus Maximus, almost in correspondence to the obelisk on the spina of the circus.\textsuperscript{300} The

\textsuperscript{291} A recent and thorough examination of the evidence, in particular the epigraphic data, was published by Virginia Closs in 2016.
\textsuperscript{292} Closs 2016, 102, footnote no. 2.
\textsuperscript{293} Closs 2016, 114-117.
\textsuperscript{294} Mart., *Epigr.*, 7.62; Rodriguez Almeida 1993a (LTUR I), 76.
\textsuperscript{295} *CIL* VI 826=30837= ILS 4914, 1266.
\textsuperscript{296} It is assumed that Domitian built one altar in each of the Augustan fourteen regions, Platner & Ashby 1929, 30, but this is just a speculation.
\textsuperscript{297} *CIL* VI 826=30837b, line 11, “*Neroniani temporibus*”.
\textsuperscript{298} For Rodriguez Almeida the foundations of the project were started under Nero, 1993a (LTUR I), 76.
\textsuperscript{299} *CIL* VI 30837c, 1266.
remains of this structure are no longer visible but they were published in a plan by Lanciani.\textsuperscript{301} The second \textit{ara} identified archaeologically was excavated in 1889 and is located on the Quirinal Hill, between the temple of Quirinus and the \textit{Templum Gentis Flaviae} (fig. 41). The surviving remains consist of a rectangular travertine platform of 35 m on the side overlooking the ancient road, Alta Semita, enclosed by travertine \textit{cippi}. This area contained the altar which was situated at a lower level and was accessed by three steps. The altar was also in travertine, with a marble cornice, and of considerable size: 18 meters long, 3.25 meters deep, and 1.26 meters high, and access to the altar was provided by two steps. With regard to the location of the \textit{ara} within the precinct, it is important to note that it is off center, toward the north, and aligned with the short side of the platform. In this arrangement, it seems likely that that religious rituals would have taken place while looking toward the \textit{Templum Gentis Flaviae}.

Whether this series of \textit{arae} were begun by Nero and completed by Domitian or a new Domitianic project, they indicate a clear intention on the part of the younger Flavian to recode the emperor’s image in the face of a disaster. As Virginia Closs has noted, the name of Domitian appears as the builder in the text of the inscription, while the name of Nero, who originally vowed the area, is indirectly referred to by an adjective, “Neroniani.”\textsuperscript{302} And yet, the mere presence of Nero’s name, in any form, is astonishing after the \textit{damantio memoriae}, and might have been intentionally used to sharpen the divide between the two emperors.\textsuperscript{303} The Flavian political agenda that aimed at correcting Nero’s political trajectory found full expression in the Valley of the Colosseum, where some projects were completed or built entirely by Domitian. In this case, it seems

\textsuperscript{300} Rodríguez Almeida 1993a (LTUR I), 76.
\textsuperscript{301} Lanciani 1893-1901, pl. 35.
\textsuperscript{302} Closs 2016, 110.
\textsuperscript{303} Ibid.
that the location and arrangement of the *ara* was intentionally chosen to create a meaningful topographical connection with the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*. The Aventine *ara* seems to have been in visual dialogue with the central sector of the Circus Maximus, heavily restored by Domitian, and, perhaps, the southwestern side of the imperial palace on the Palatine. It would be critically important to verify the consistency of this connection in the other cases.

### II.g Conclusions

Domitian’s interventions in the area of the Imperial Fora allow us to ponder the connections between the expression of imperial power and the large-scale modifications of a public space. On the other hand, the construction of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, one of Domitian’s latest projects, and the *Ara Incendii Neroniani* on the Quirinal, show a daring combination of different creative architectural designs associated with the recoding of the imperial response to a disastrous event. In these concluding remarks, I will focus primarily on the Imperial fora section, with the goal of examining how Domitian’s building program in this area was tied to and yet differed from previous interventions, especially regarding the patterns and scope of movement. The aim of this analysis will be to single out Domitian's contribution to the Flavian building program.\(^{304}\)

A look at the plan of the fora under Domitian (fig. 3) reveals his involvement in every single sector. No emperor before or after him built as massively as his did, although Nero’s building plans for the area should be taken into account, and it is conceivable that more Domitianic projects might have originated from Neronian buildings.

\(^{304}\) In general, studies on Domitian’s building program, whether comprehensive or monographic, relate to the Flavians as a tight entity. In particular, see Darwall-Smith 1996 and also Newsome 2011.
From a topographical perspective the changes supervised by Domitian were unprecedented. The emperor took charge of the whole area by restoring, destroying, and building new spaces. Before Domitian the "piazze" of the Imperial Fora were multifunctional spaces designed as destinations, as opposed to the Roman Forum, which was mainly perceived as a thoroughfare. And again, before Domitian, each imperial forum existed as a defined and distinct space surrounded by a reasonable amount of space for pedestrian and wheeled traffic; therefore, the preexisting Imperial Fora, that of Caesar, Augustus, and the Templum Pacis, would have been perceived individually as three public spaces inserted into a framework of public thoroughfares.

The *Forum Domitiani* did not just fill in the remaining space between the Forum of Augustus, the *Templum Pacis*, and the Forum of Caesar. The new forum tied all of those compounds together into a new entity whose points of access and exit were regulated and controlled. The flow and mode of movement changed drastically as the once open spaces between the pre-existing fora were filled with monumentally tall walls, which yielded a completely different vista. In addition to that, the presence of steps in the *Porticus Absidata* at the entrance of the *Forum Domitiani* from the *Subura* proves that the traffic was limited and contained. While this was not unprecedented – steep steps were at the entrance to the Forum of Augustus from the *Subura* – it signaled a strong intention to monitor the flow to and from the *Subura* and the Roman Forum. The construction of the *Forum Domitiani*, in fact, sentenced the destruction of the neighborhood of the *Argiletum* and the main road that ran within the neighborhood, providing an important connection between the *Subura* and the the Roman Forum. While the use of Domitian's forum as a thoroughfare was maintained, as it is shown in

305 Newsome 2011, *passim*. His thorough analysis of the changes in movements in the fora region from Republican times to the first century AD confirm the difference in perception for the two areas. Several mentions of ancient sources corroborate Newsome's argument.
the later toponym of the *Forum Transitorium*,\(^{306}\) the perception of this connection was radically transformed. The open and smooth connection between the *Subura* and the *Forum Romanum* was turned into a regulated access with the construction of the *Porticus Absidata*, a monumental entrance to the *Forum Domitiani*. As already discussed in the relevant section, a recent analysis and reconstruction of the *Porticus Absidata* by the author\(^ {307}\) has shown that the shape and off axis of the building can be interpreted as an attempt to regulate the access\(^ {308}\) into the forum by providing the visitor with oblique paths and no visual axis inside the piazza. During the limited excavations carried out by Bauer starting in 1979, he found traces of *opus signinum* in the central area of the porticus which would indicate its transformation into a water feature. Though we do not have secure dating evidence, it is plausible that this transformation occurred during the second construction phase of the forum when the temple of Minerva was built.\(^ {309}\) This water feature would strengthen the idea of this access being heavily regulated by architectural elements.

The construction of the *Forum Domitiani* had a sensible impact on the other side as well. The access to the Forum of Caesar, once open and visible from a distance of about 50 m from the *Templum Pacis*, was almost completely obliterated by the new forum. The northwest wall of the *Templum Pacis* was dismantled and rebuilt to incorporate the Forum of Domitian into the limited available space, and, at the same time, the southeast exedra of the Forum of Augustus was razed to the ground. These

---


\(^{307}\) Nocera 2015.

\(^{308}\) Gros had suggested earlier that the architecture of the *Porticus Absidata* was meant to prevent the access into the forum as much as possible, Gros 2001. I believe the aim of the structure is better interpreted as a tool for traffic control rather than an impediment, however it is evident that a careful control was to be operated in this sector of the forum, see Nocera 2015 for more details on this point.

\(^{309}\) Nocera 2015.
projects clearly show an aggressive intervention in sacred public spaces that contributed to shaping the city's landscape in ancient times. Domitian's conflict with the Senate may even have heated up on the occasion of the dismantling of the exedra in the Forum of Augustus, which was one of the designated spaces for justice administration. Along the line of radical change, the construction of the *Forum Domitiani* transformed the Imperial Fora region into a single entity made of different parts with regulated and controlled entry points.

The impact of the construction of the *Forum Domitiani* on the topography of the area reflects the planning concepts also employed by Rabirius in the Palace architecture on the Palatine. Rabirius is the court architect known from an epigram of Martial in reference to the imperial palace. Because of his role and the signature elements present in the forum, it is now accepted that he was also the planner of the forum. The whole palace architecture has been analyzed in light of the architect's creative and innovative solutions that playfully alternate straight and curved lines.

The same playfulness is evident in the architecture of the *Porticus Absidata*. Looking at the architecture of the palace (figs. 55 and 56) it is evident how square and rectangular buildings, and consequently axial access points, characterize the more official areas. The basilica, the Aula Regia, and the imperial triclinium were furnished with large axial entrances that accommodated the flow of a large crowd. Statius' description of the walk through these grand halls fits this picture well.

A different situation can be observed in other areas of the palace where oblique entrances and winding routes are associated with smaller rooms, alternating straight and

---

310 Carnabuci 2010.
311 Mart. Epigr. VII, 56.
312 See section VI.i for more details and discussion about the architectural design of the palace.
curved lines. These shapes must have had a twofold purpose. On the one hand, a winding path gives the impression of a longer walk and allows the visitor to prolong the enjoyment of the landscape. On the other hand, it appears that these areas were intended to accommodate a smaller amount of traffic, which could be more easily regulated through narrower and winding routes.

This is especially evident in the SW area of the palace which leads into the most private sector of the emperor’s residence. While the type of crowd that would be subjected to control in the palace was certainly different from the mob coming from the Subura, just as different were the reasons for control. The point of this analysis is to highlight the use of architecture as a tool for traffic management. In addition to that, the plan of the Forum Domitiani is almost identical in size and dimensions to the Stadium in the palace (fig. 19). The intention of regulating the access is expected and necessary in the imperial palace, but it is also reflected in a tendency to increase traffic restrictions observed for the Imperial Fora.

The image of a regulated and orderly city fits well within Domitian's general building program, whose ordering effects are remarked on with admiration by the Flavian writers. Martial mentions that, thanks to the emperor's intervention in the city, Rome had transitioned from a large taberna into a city again, a regulated and clean space where everyone stays within his own limina. Statius applauds the construction of the via Domitiana in a poem from the Silvae, where the river Volturnus thanks the emperor for teaching him how to stay clean and tidy within the newly built banks. The river is unusually depicted as young and exuberant and the term "limes" implies blessing.

---

314 For a discussion of the similarity between the two plans see Nocera 2015.
315 Newsome 2011, 292-93.
316 Mart., Epigr. VI, 61.8: "Tonsor, copo, cocus, lanius sua limina servant. Nunc Roma est, nuper magna taberna fuit".
and immaculate order.\textsuperscript{318} In Statius' poem the lack of order implies danger, tarnish, and confusion.\textsuperscript{319} These aspects are highlighted by the Volturnus River's comparison with the river between Carthage and Utica that runs chaotically due to the lack of any limits.

According to this perspective, Martial's and Statius' comments clearly reveal a civilizing effect of Domitian's intervention where the concept of a clean and regulated space is perceived as an essential component of the emperor's program. In addition to the contemporary references in Martial and Statius, a slightly later satire by Juvenal provides a vivid description of the menace represented by the mob in Rome, who would crowd the streets in unregulated ways creating chaos and danger.\textsuperscript{320} Regulation and cleanliness are, in fact, crucial within Domitian's principate from a moral and social point of view in light of his assumption of the title of \textit{censor perpetuus} in 85.\textsuperscript{321} After he became censor, Domitian started a moralizing campaign which involved some Augustan laws, such as the \textit{lex Iulia de adulteriis coercendis}, and proceeded with the persecution

\textsuperscript{318} Stat., Sil., 4.3, 85, \textquotedblleft et nunc limite me colis beato	extquotedblright. See the interesting comment by K. M. Coleman about the depiction of the river as a youth as opposed to the usual representations such as those in Virgil (Aen., VIII, 31-2) or the representation of the Danube on the column of Trajan where the river is depicted as a mature male figure, Coleman 1998, 120-21.

\textsuperscript{319} Here is highlighted the civilizing and purifying action of the Domitianic intervention: Stat., Sil., 4.3, 72, \textquotedblleft camporum bone conditor meorum	extquotedblright; 74, \textquotedblleft ripas habitare nescientem	extquotedblright; 76-80, \textquotedblleft et nunc ille ego turbidus minaxque, vix passus dubias carinas, iam pontem fero perviusque calcor; qui terras rapere et rotare silvas assueram (puet!), annis esse coepi	extquotedblright; 85-91, \textquotedblleft et nunc limite me colis beato nec sordere sinis malumque late deterges steriliis oli pudorem; ne me pulvereum gravemque caelo Tyrreni sinus obluat profundi (qualis Cinyphius tacente ripa Poenos Bagrada serpit inter agros)	extquotedblright.

\textsuperscript{320} Juv., III. 239-49, "si vocat officium, turba cedente vehetur dives et ingenti curret super ora Liburna atque obiter leget aut scribet vel dormiet intus; namque facit somnum clausa lectica fenestra. ante tamen veniet: nobis properantibus obstat unda prior, magnopopulus premit agmine lumbos qui sequitur; ferit hic cubito, ferit assere duro alter, at hic signum capiti incutit, ille metretam. pinguia crura luto, planta max undique magna calcor, et in digito clavus mihi militis haeret."

\textsuperscript{321} Cassius Dio mentions the exceptionality of the title in \textit{Roman History}, LXVII, 4. The dating for this event is grounded on numismatic evidence, see Jones 1992, 106.
of prostitution, adultery, and castration mentioned abundantly in the sources. His political agenda is then reflected in the topographical changes operated in this region.

Newsome has analyzed the changes in patterns of movement through the fora from the Late Republic through the first century AD. He identifies a major change in the construction of the Forum of Caesar and that of Augustus as the difference between movement “through” – for instance, the old residential neighborhood and the Argiletum – and movement "to" the new fora. He then points out another major change during Flavian times when the “movement-through” function of the area occupied by the Templum Pacis and the Forum Domitiani was transformed by buildings that exerted a heavy control on traffic flow such as the Porticus Absidata.

However, a couple of points need clarification and a different interpretation. The inclusion of Domitian’s intervention in the Imperial Fora under the label of ”Flavian" misses several facets of the meaning behind his program. The Vespasianic Templum Pacis was built over land appropriated from Nero’s estate, providing a piazza that celebrated peace and art. The pattern of movement around this area had already profoundly changed under Nero, and Vespasian’s intervention conformed to the existing fora by providing a space meant as a destination. The Forum Domitiani, on the other hand, while it fits under the Imperial Forum rubric as a space with increased traffic restrictions, it also maintained the connecting role once held by the Argiletum, which is reflected in the name later assigned to the area as Forum Transitorium.

---

322 See Jones, 1992, 106-7 for a brief summary of the usage of the censorship by Domitian. Suetonius describes in details Domitian’s action intended toward the "correctio morum", Dom. 7-9. Cassius Dio tells an anecdote where Domitian was forced to prohibit castration in Roman History, LXVII, 2.
323 Newsome 2011, 292.
324 Newsome 2011, 308-09.
325 Newsome 2011, 292-93.
The regulated access to the Forum of Domitian from the Subura was particularly strict, especially when compared to the access from the Roman Forum and the access to the Forum of Augustus from the Subura, but the perception of the space as a thoroughfare was partially preserved. It is therefore inaccurate to place both Domitian's and Vespasian's fora under the label of "Flavian," as the two projects had different scopes and impact. In a way not unlike the changes that occurred during the construction of the Forum of Caesar, when the Clivus Argentarius was modified but preserved, the Forum of Domitian kept the memory and the perception of the main road in the Argiletum as a passage between the Subura and the Roman Forum. A comparison with the Forum of Augustus shows more differences than similarities in patterns of movement. While the construction of a massive back wall in Peperino tuff provided a safe barrier against the frequent fires in the Subura, the two side entry points provided a straight and fairly wide access into the forum. The presence of steep stairs accounts for traffic restrictions to pedestrian access only, but the degree of control is less severe and sophisticated than that provided by the Porticus Absidata.

The construction of the Forum Domitiani entailed the partial destruction of the existing fora and the physical obliteration of a major thoroughfare between the Subura and the Roman Forum. Nonetheless, the new forum acted as a binding element among the previous fora, fusing the three earlier complexes into a regional entity made of four different sections, while the Subura front became a single barrier that was monumentalized, beautified, and regulated by the Porticus Absidata.

On the other side of the Forum of Augustus, Domitian started, and never completed, a grandiose building project whose limits and shape are difficult to define. The Domitianic Terrace discussed above was probably the only building that was

326 Nocera 2015.
completed before his assassination. Recent archaeological investigations in the area later occupied by the Forum of Trajan have showed that the cut into the saddle between the Capitoline and the Quirinal was completed by Domitian. In the markets of Trajan, toward the northwest of the Domitianic Terrace, a small stretch of foundation was seen and documented by Boni in 1907 (fig. 3). He attributed the construction to Domitian and indicated the orientation of 41° toward the north with respect to the axis of the Basilica Ulpia.327

The recent analysis by Bianchini and Vitti has shown that the Domitianic terrace was not an isolated building but was instead connected to other structures whose foundations have been identified on the grounds of brick stamps.328 The implications of this analysis are notable. While we already possessed enough evidence to hypothesize another, and larger, forum project by Domitian in the sector later occupied by the forum of Trajan,329 this new data allow us to actually visualize a small section and shape of this forum. The convincing reconstruction by Bianchini and Vitti shows the Domitianic Terrace connected to the east to a stretch of wall that opened into an exedra and continued into another stretch of wall (fig. 40).330 In addition to this, there were some foundations behind the monumental fountain that indicate the degree of advancement for the construction of this project.331 Another piece of archaeological evidence for Domitian's unfinished forum project appears on the foundations of the supporting wall of the Capitoline, to the southwest of the Forum of Caesar.332 When looking at those

327 Boni 1907, 426.
328 Bianchini, Vitti 2017, 653-64.
329 See Tortorici 1993 for instance.
330 Bianchini, Vitti 2017, 657, fig. no. 593.
331 Bianchini, Vitti 2017, 659-60.
332 See more details above, pg. ???
remains together, one gets only a partial idea of this new public space, but a few observations can be made.

One of the most interesting aspects is the different orientation of the new project. The façade of the Domitianic Terrace has almost the same orientation as the supporting wall for the Capitoline hill, and this orientation, N-S, is the same along which the Republican neighborhood was arranged. One of the major topographical changes in the area caused by the construction of the Imperial Fora was the shift in orientation, and while Domitian planned his own forum according to the orientation of the pre-existing ones—it would have been unthinkable not to do so—it appears that this new project was arranged along a different axis. This element represents a significant innovation from the previous topographical approach. Moreover, should this new project have been completed, we would have to imagine a continuous barrier separating the Subura and the foot of the Quirinal hill from the Imperial Fora and the Roman Forum. The unique design of the Domitianic Terrace, the only feature built for this new project, fits well within the originality of this public space. Nothing else can be inferred about the architecture of this area, but it is evident that we might have lost one of the most interesting and innovative building projects carried out by Domitian.

\[333\] The difference amounts to 12°.

The Roman Forum and the Capitoline hill are areas where the buildings of Republican date should be viewed as illustrative of Rome’s emphasis on traditional political and moral values. From Caesar on, autocratic builders added or restored structures meant to symbolize that they indeed maintained the res publica, even when those interventions also embodied autocratic stewardship. The legacy of Republican statuary in these zones to which the emperors added, as we will consider in this chapter, similarly asked the viewer to consider both political ideal and political reality.

On the other hand, the Valley of the Colosseum, also including the Velia hill, represented the edge of this intensely public zone and was mainly occupied by private residences of the upper and middle class. The fire of 64 AD impacted this area, most likely between the third and fourth day of the blaze, and gave Nero a sort of blank canvas for his outrageous project of the Domus Aurea, an unprecedented imperial residence half way between a suburban villa and a grand palace.

Vespasian saw the perfect opportunity in turning the immense area occupied by the Domus Aurea into a series of public venues which were meant to be perceived by the citizens as a restitution of stolen property. The Templum Pacis, the Meta Sudans, the Flavian Amphitheater, the Thermae Titi, and the several gladiatorial ludi, all Vespasianic or Flavian projects, were built over areas previously encumbered by Nero’s Domus Aurea. The buildings in the Valley of the Colosseum are fully Flavian projects since all three members of the family were involved, and for this reason they are included in this

---

334 Panella 2011, 77-82.
335 Panella 2011, 82, figs. 10a-10c.
chapter. However, as I will show, Domitian’s involvement seems to have been limited to only a few components of the complexes, and therefore their treatment will be aimed solely at understanding the role of Domitian. One single project, though, can be interpreted as initiated by Domitian, and that is the transfer into the Valley of the Colosseum of Moneta, the state mint.

From a topographical and geographical perspective the area analyzed in this chapter includes the Capitoline hill, comprising the northern Arx Capitolina, the southern Capitoline hill, and the Asylum, a saddle in between (fig. 1). The parts of the forum considered here include the large rectangular piazza delimited by the slopes of the Capitoline on the western edge to the horrea just east of the aedes Vestae, limited at the south by the Basilica Iulia and the temple of the Castors, and at the north by the Porticus Luci et Gaii and the Curia Iulia. In addition to these areas, the two arches dedicated to Titus, one on the Circus Maximus and the other on the Via Sacra, will be considered together with the Domitianic interventions on the Meta Sudans, the Flavian Amphitheater, and the construction of the gladiatorial ludi.

The Domitianic projects on the Capitoline hill and those in the Roman Forum are analyzed together for several reasons. The dialogue between the Capitoline and the forum goes beyond geographical proximity. Both areas carried the weight of Republican Rome from a political, historical, and religious point of view. The memory of the Republican men who contributed to the greatness of Republican Rome was still omnipresent in the Forum through political spaces their statues still punctuated. For instance, the basilica Aemilia/Paulli, which carried the name of the Aemilia family, or the Rostra, which served as platform for many Republican adlocutiones, had an important Republican past discernible to all educated viewers. However, the religious heart of Rome was undeniably on the Capitoline, with a focus on the temple of Jupiter
Optimus Maximus. The *Tabularium*, which rose multiple stories and was faced with massive arcades, served as a liminal connector between the two, providing a columnar backdrop to the western side of the forum while supplying structural support for the buildings above the hill. Several structures on the Capitoline hill were visible from the Forum, but to ascend from Forum to Capitolium one took a winding road until the construction of the Flavian monuments against the western side of the *Tabularium*, which altered the route and closed off a passage into the *Tabularium*, making the connection between the forum and the Capitoline more direct.\(^{336}\)

### III.a The Roman Forum and the Capitoline hill before Domitian

During the Republic a great deal of the public life of Rome took place in the forum together with the Campus Martius, where spaces such as the *Saepta* were experienced by the citizens as multifunctional areas.\(^{337}\) The buildings for commercial, judicial, political, religious, and social activities occupying the long rectangular forum reflected the history and values of Republican Rome.\(^{338}\) In early imperial times the forum started to lose its role as a primary stage for public life in favor of the new, larger, and more tailored spaces created in the imperial fora even while buildings with important Republican pedigrees were restored, such as the Curia and the temple of Saturn. For instance, the forum of Caesar, a temple-portico for Venus Genetrix with a podium also used as *rostra* and surrounded by tabernae, was built under the pretense of needing larger, specially designed spaces for the new intense political, commercial, and legal
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\(^{336}\) The construction of the temple to the deified Vespasian and the so-called *Porticus Deorum Consentium* determined an old passage to be closed. Traces of the passage can be seen behind the collapsed remains of the *cella* of the temple to the deified Vespasian, see subchapter I.

\(^{337}\) The *Saepta* were planned by Caesar as voting precinct but were also used later by Augustus for games and shows, see the relevant section in the chapter ### on the Campus Martius.

activity. Augustus continued the development of imperial public spaces while upgrading the Roman Forum with the rebuilding of Caesar’s *Curia Iulia* as well as the two *basilicae: Julia* and *Aemilia*, nominally undertaken by the living Paullus in 54 B.C. and thereafter referred to as *basilica Paulli*. He also restored the *Rostra*, while Tiberius carried out restorations of the *Aedes Concordiae* and the temple of the Dioscuri. In addition to these remakings he oversaw the construction of the temple of Divus Iulius with its second *rostra*. The Augustan interventions served the purpose of reinforcing the perception of the Roman Forum as an embodiment of Republican values, even though many of the political, legal, and commercial activities had been partially replaced by the Imperial fora. He developed a program for the forum that involved the restoration of Republican buildings and a new dynastic ensemble at the east that included the temple of the Divus Iulius, the Parthian Arch and the Arch of Gaius and Lucius. Tiberius subsequently added his own triumphal arch to the western edge to celebrate the military victory over the Germans. In fact, Augustan modifications to the forum transformed the space into a Julio-Claudian showcase to which later Julio-Claudian rulers had much less to add.

Caligula’s modifications to the forum can be reduced to the outrageous bridge that he built to connect the imperial palace on the Palatine to the temple of the Dioscuri, which served as a sort of vestibule to the palace.339 The immediate destruction of the bridge after his death meant that the short reign of Caligula did not have an enduring impact on the forum’s topography. Claudius’ sporadic building interventions in the city did not include the Roman Forum, while Nero focused his new construction elsewhere. It is after the downfall of the Julio-Claudian house and the accession of the new dynasty that a few new buildings started to appear in the forum, especially under Titus. The

339 *Suet., Calig.,* 22, 1-4.
platform on the northwestern edge of the forum, right along the *clivus Capitolinus*, served as the base for the temple dedicated to the deified Vespasian with an adjoining aedicula that was probably used to house a statue of uncertain identity. The same platform extended along the Clivus Capitolinus and was used as a foundation for an oddly shaped *porticus*, probably housing administrative offices and erroneously known to scholars as the *Porticus Deorum Consentium*. These two projects, which served ritual and utilitarian functions, respectively, aimed to have an aesthetic impact on the Forum. They were likely initiated by Titus but certainly completed by Domitian, who carried on the construction plans with little or no sign of innovation when it came to architectural design. The archaeological evidence for the *porticus* and the temple to *Divus Vespasianus* is almost the only archaeological evidence we possess for Domitianic interventions in the forum.

At the other end of the forum scanty traces of early and late Flavian utilitarian constructions can be seen in two symmetrical buildings in the eastern part of the forum that have been interpreted as *horrea* or “warehouses”: the *horrea Piperataria* and the *horrea Vespasiani*, both of which are attested in the ancient sources. Other Domitianic interventions in the Forum include the likely construction of a monumental fountain in the northern sector, corresponding to the area of the republican *Comitium*, which contained the famous statue of the so-called “Marforio”, now located in the courtyard of the Capitoline Museums. The most conspicuous Domitianic monument in the Forum was his monumental equestrian statue, the bronze *Equus Domitiani*. Its full form is known only from literary and numismatic evidence, and the location of its
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340 *Chronogr.* a. 354, 146 M; Dio, 72.24.
341 Musei Capitolini, Inv. S 1, see Papini 2010.
foundations is still under debate. Its impact on the Forum would have been unprecedented, and it deserves a detailed analysis.

These zones – Forum and Capitoline hill – as sites of memory now also encoded problematic recent histories that had a more direct impact on the fortunes of the victorious Flavians. During the civil war that took place in the year A.D. 69 in the aftermath of Nero’s suicide, the Capitoline and the Roman Forum were among the principal stages of the conflict, and the entire area was consequently deeply impacted by these events. Tacitus provides a detailed account of the events that led to Vespasian’s victory, noting that Vespasian’s brother, Sabinus, had sought refuge on the Capitoline hill, which was then attacked by Vitellius’ soldiers. In the meantime, Domitian too found refuge on the hill and escaped the Vitellians by hiding as an Isis priest. The main cause of the devastation suffered by the monuments on the hill is usually ascribed to the fire that erupted during the clash; however, Tacitus clearly describes how pieces of architectural decoration were used by Sabinus and his men to create a barrier, while stones and roof tiles were thrown directly against Vitellius’ soldiers. We therefore have to imagine that the entire area was turned upside down already during the conflict. At the acme of the clash lighted brands were thrown, either by Sabinus or the Vitellians – Tacitus is not specific – and all of the buildings on the hill burned down. Several other

\[342\] Tac., Hist. 3.69-70.
\[343\] Tac. Hist., 3.74.
That the Capitolium should remain in ruins was religiously inconceivable. Immediately after his rise to power in A.D. 70 Vespasian, now chief priest of Jupiter Capitolinus (pontifex maximus), started a building program aimed at restoring the ancient hill and was personally involved in clearing the debris from the fire. One of the buildings that required immediate attention was the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, which more than any other monument embodied the eminence of Republican religious institutions. At the same time, the temple was the starting point for and the destination of some of the most meaningful religious rituals which impacted all aspects of Rome's political, social, and military life. The temple unfortunately burned down again in the fire of A.D. 80, and this time it fell to Domitian to take care of the restoration.

Domitian’s personal experience in the events of A.D. 69 are apparent in the other interventions on the Capitoline hill, including the construction of two more temples to Jupiter on the Arx Capitolina. A small temple to Jupiter Conservator (the preserver) was built in the place of the house of the custodian of the temple of Isis, who let Domitian hide there during the conflict (see chapter IV on the Campus Martius, section IV.e.1 for an analysis of the Iseum Campense). According to Tacitus this temple was built already at the beginning of Vespasian’s reign. Once Domitian became emperor he built a second, larger temple to Jupiter Custos (the guardian) as a gesture of personal thanks to
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345 See De Angeli 1996, 150-51 for a list of sources for the fire.
348 Suet. Vesp., 8.5.
his savior, whose statue held his own likeness in its arms. The archaeological evidence for either temple is meager at best; however, recent research allows us to reconstruct a fairly accurate plan of the remains in accordance with the data from the literary sources.

In the following subchapters I start by examining the archaeological evidence for Domitian’s construction of the temple of the deified Vespasian and the Porticus Deorum Consentium. I then consider every other known monument in the Forum and on the Capitoline relevant to the Domitianic program, the evidence for which comes mainly from literary and numismatic sources or from images in architectural decoration.

The analysis of these Domitianic interventions in the area of the Roman Forum and the Capitoline hill will show a conflicting relationship with the Flavian (Vespasian’s) and Augustan legacy, highlighting the disruption that some of Domitian’s monuments brought to the area. The monuments that survived his damnatio memoriae were, as expected, those started by Vespasian or Titus, as well as the restoration of the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus. In addition to these, the fountain that was plausibly built on the northwestern edge of the Forum and the repairs made to the Curia Iulia were also maintained. The interventions on the Curia were ideologically significant since they show the continuous reverence of the emperor toward a senatorial building and institution in contrast with the known combattive relationship between Domitian and the Senate. Domitian added magnificent bronze doors to the building, which have been dated to the year A.D. 94 based on literary evidence.
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349 Tac., Hist., 3. 74.
350 See section III.g in this chapter.
351 Hieron. 161; Lanciani 1897, 265.
III.b The Templum Divi Vespasiani

The three standing Corinthian columns of the temple of the deified Vespasian have characterized the western end of the Roman Forum's landscape since Late Antiquity (fig. 57). In the oldest known representation of the temple, the Codex Escurialensis dated before 1506 (fig. 54), the three columns appear standing while the rest of the temple remains indicate that most of the spoliation process had already occurred during Late Antiquity and Medieval times.

Built to honor the deified emperor Vespasian, who died in A.D. 79 after ten years of rule, the Templum Divi Vespasiani occupies an elevated spot on the westernmost end of the Roman Forum at the beginning of the climb toward the Capitoline hill along the clivus Capitolinus. The temple is stuck in a crowded area between the Aedes Concordiae to its left and the porticus Deorum Consentium to its right, probably built in the same period. These three monuments are built against one side of the Tabularium. With the construction of the two structures this side of the Forum would have offered the viewer a sort of façade screen as their fronts are exactly aligned. The façade of the temple of the Divine Vespasian would have overlooked the lower level of the Forum paving with a significant towering impact despite being marginally masked by the staircase of the temple of Saturn. The porticus Deorum Consentium, with its angled orientation, took clever advantage of the limitation offered by the space, forming an open inviting court. The chronological range for the construction of the temple can be framed by the death of Vespasian on June 23, A.D. 79 and the mention in an inscription of A.D. 87 related to
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352 The only monographic treatment of the temple of the Divine Vespasian was published in 1992 by S. De Angeli and provides a thorough history of the monument, the ancient and modern sources, a catalogue of the in situ and the scattered archaeological and architectural remains and a reconstruction of its plan and elevation.

the *fratres Arvales*, the first topographical reference to the temple that survives.\[^{354}\] Considering that the procedure of divinization would have probably taken place no earlier than late A.D. 79 or early 80,\[^{355}\] it is safe to assume that most of the construction work was carried out by Domitian, although we can imagine that Titus started the project by choosing the spot, consecrating it, and, perhaps, laying the foundations. The choice of location for this temple is especially apt once we consider its visual dialogue with the temple of the deified Caesar. Although not perfectly aligned, the two temples share a connection that must have been perceivable by the citizens. The elevated spot where the temple of the divine Vespasian was built gave it a strong visual emphasis mirrored on the other side of the Forum by the central position of the temple to Divus Iulius. This was clearly intended to mark Vespasian as the founder of another fortunate dynasty of emperors. This effort to link the Flavian dynasty with the imperial cult was complemented by the arch dedicated to Titus on the Via Sacra, the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* on the Quirinal, and the *Porticus Divorum* in the Campus Martius.

The temple is mentioned in the list of Domitianic buildings in the Chronographer of A.D. 354,\[^{356}\] the Chronicle by Jerome (A.D. 382),\[^{357}\] the *Curiosum urbis Romae regionum XIII* (mid-4th century),\[^{358}\] the *Notitia urbis Romae regionum XIII* (mid-4th century),\[^{359}\] the Chronicle by Prosper (A.D. 516),\[^{360}\] the Chronicle by Cassiodorus (late 6th century),\[^{361}\] and the *Codex Einsiedlensis* (9th century).\[^{362}\] Only in the Chronographer of 354 and in the *Curiosum* is the temple listed as "templum
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[^354]: See De Angeli 1992, 137-38 for an analysis of the dating elements for the temple.
[^355]: For more details on the steps required for the divinization see De Angeli 1992, 134-36.
[^356]: *Chronogr. a. 354* 146 M.
[^357]: Hier. *Chron. a. AD* 89, 191 Helm.
[^358]: *Cur. Reg. VIII*: 115, no. 7 VZ l.
[^359]: Not. 174 VZ l.
[^361]: Cassiod. *chron.* 140.727 M.
[^362]: *Cod. Eins*. 326 fol. 72b.
Vespasiani et Titi," which contradicts any mention in other sources and has generated the erroneous idea that the temple was dedicated to both Domitian's father and brother.\textsuperscript{363} The fortunate recovery of the complete text of the lost inscription clarifies this point. The 9\textsuperscript{th} c. Einsiedeln manuscript, in fact, copied the dedicatory inscriptions from the temple of Saturn, the Aedes Concordiae, and the temple of the deified Vespasian, and the latter reads:

\begin{verbatim}
DIVO VESPASIANO AVGVSTO S.P.Q.R.
IMPP. CAESS. SEVERVS ET ANTONINVS PII FELIC. AVG. RESTITVER.
\end{verbatim}\textsuperscript{364}

The first line refers to the dedication to the deified emperor Vespasian, while the second line was added under Septimius Severus (A.D. 193-211) who, with his sons, was responsible for a restoration of the temple. A portion of the trabeation of the temple was carved down to the first decorated fascia to make room for the Severan inscription (fig. 64). The traces of the carving are clearly visible in the preserved section of the inscription.

Despite the fact that the remains of the temple of the Divine Vespasian are outstanding for their history, preservation, and quality of architectural decoration, there are not many studies on this monument. The only comprehensive monographic treatment of the temple was published in 1992 by S. De Angeli. In this publication the author provides a great level of detail regarding the history of the building, proposes a reconstruction of the plan and the front elevation, and analyzes the architectural decoration of the \textit{in situ} remains as well as those found in the area and stored in the Capitoline Museums. I will therefore refer to this publication for most of the history and

\textsuperscript{363} De Angeli 1992, 159-163. The erroneous identity can still be found in Darwall-Smith 1996, 154-56; Coarelli 2002, 81.
\textsuperscript{364} CIL VI, 938.
description while providing a new level of analysis of the temple within the Domitianic building program in the Roman Forum.

III.b.1 Archaeological evidence and history of the excavations

The archaeological remains of the temple were unearthed in 1830 during the excavations carried out by Nibby. By this point the temple had experienced a long history of progressive interment followed by an intense spoliation during Late Antiquity and the Medieval period.\textsuperscript{365}

At the time of its construction the western side of the Roman Forum was already occupied by the \textit{Aedes Concordiae} in its Tiberian restoration; the temple of the Divine Vespasian and the \textit{porticus Deorum Consentium} were built against the Tabularium on one side of the Capitoline hill. The \textit{clivus Capitolinus}, an important road leading from the core of the forum up to the Capitoline hill, crossed in front of the temple, marking its southeast edge. Today the loss of a large part of the front of these buildings prevents the viewer from getting a comprehensive look at what must have been a condensed space where tall columns would have towered over the visitor walking along narrow \textit{clivi}.

The spot where the temple of the Divine Vespasian was built corresponds to an area of depression in the geological tuff bedrock. Therefore, the construction of a concrete platform was required in order to level and reinforce the foundation. The foundations of the temple's \textit{cella} and pronaos were built separately. The \textit{cella} is founded on a podium in \textit{opus caementicium} which employs fragments of different types of tuff and travertine.\textsuperscript{366} The foundation of the pronaos is still partially covered by layers of debris, but it appears to have been made of a \textit{caementicium} core enveloped in travertine.

\textsuperscript{365} De Angeli 1992, 10-13.
\textsuperscript{366} De Angeli 1992, 63.
blocks.\textsuperscript{367} Both the podium and the pronaos of the temple were revetted with a molded marble base of which several stretches can be seen \textit{in situ} on both sides.\textsuperscript{368}

The front of the temple overlooks the entire Roman Forum, and still standing are three well preserved columns in Carrara marble topped by Corinthian capitals (fig. 57) and surmounted by a trabeation featuring a frieze decorated with sacrificial implements.(fig. 60). The three surviving columns form a right angle, and at the time of excavation, they were covered with debris layers of about 10 m. The analysis by Rockwell of some geometric traces on the columns sheds new light on the working stages on a Roman construction site.\textsuperscript{369} The traces were, in fact, carving instructions for the fluting of the columns. The limited amount of space available, with the \textit{clivus Capitolinus} passing in front of the temple, must have presented the architect with several problems in terms of access. The issue was resolved by inserting the temple steps in the stylobate between the columns, thus reducing the space needed for a staircase extending toward the \textit{clivus Capitolinus}.

The original marble steps are perfectly preserved between the first and second column from the right, while in the next intercolumniation only the traces for five steps are visible, carved on the travertine foundation block beneath the column (fig. 63).\textsuperscript{370} These steps were built with a tread of 33 cm and a rise of 25 cm. It is problematic to imagine the rest of the staircase extending out of the pronaos toward the \textit{clivus Capitolinus} since no traces remain except for a small stretch of the concrete core which supported the marble steps.\textsuperscript{371} The main issue comes from the fact that the \textit{clivus Capitolinus} begins to rise in front of the temple, thereby making it difficult to imagine

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\setcounter{enumi}{365}
\item ibid.
\item De Angeli 1992, 72, fig. 50.
\item Rockwell 1988.
\item A similar stratagem can be seen in the earlier temple of the Castors nearby in the forum.
\item De Angeli 1992, 76. See further on for an hypothetical reconstruction of the author for the staircase.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
the transition from the inclined level of the street to the five steps in front of the temple’s pronaos.

Inside the temple a massive podium, 6.46 x 5.46 m, was intended for the statue of the deified emperor, and it is still preserved against the wall of the Tabularium. Traces of the holes for the metal clamps reveal the existence of marble revetment. Currently, the top level of the podium is paved with irregularly laid white marble slabs that are most likely the result of the Severan restoration.372 To the left side of the podium, a tall travertine base bears the traces of the lead channels for a column which indicates that the statue was framed by an aedicula. The remains of the back wall of this aedicula, a concrete core faced with bricks, are quite well preserved to a height of 4.60 m. An interesting datum about the traffic path in this area of the Roman Forum prior to the construction of the temple emerges by looking at the Tabularium's wall to the left of the temple. In fact, the collapse of the cella's wall here reveals an earlier arched access to the Tabularium from the Roman Forum that was closed off with the construction of the temple.

Finally, at the right of the temple are the remains of a small building constructed against the left side of the Aedes Concordiae, the so-called aedicula of Faustina, in opus caementicium faced with bricks in a very similar way as the aedicula's wall. The contemporaneity of this building with the temple of Vespasian can be deduced not only by the building technique but also by the traces visible on the molded marble base on the right side of the temple, which show that this base was built to accommodate the small building. These remains were described by both Nibby, who excavated this area, and Canina.373 Nibby described this building as a small brick chamber that was once covered
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373 Nibby 1841, 545; Canina 1845, 195.
by painted plaster, and he then mentioned an inscribed base with a dedication to the deified Faustina by a *viator*, a messenger from the *aerarium* in the temple of Saturn, which is close by.\(^{374}\) It is not clear whether the inscribed base was *in situ* or just within the remains of the brick chamber. Considering the Domitianic date of the *aedicula* we have to imagine that the base was added at a later time or that it was not found *in situ* by Nibby.\(^{375}\)

As already mentioned, this temple underwent a massive spoliation that resulted in the current state of its remains.\(^{376}\) There are no data that point to a specific date for the beginning of the abandonment and spoliation, but we can assume that the temple suffered the same fate as the entire Roman Forum, which served as a quarry for construction material from late antiquity to the Early Modern period. The recovery of a dense burnt layer on the floor of the *cella* by Nibby led him to hypothesize a fire as one of the causes of the destruction of the temple.\(^{377}\) However, no mention in the sources points to a known fire that involved this area of the Roman Forum. Until the early 16th century, the date of the oldest representation of the temple,\(^{378}\) the present remains of the temple were standing in a fairly good condition.

During the course of the 7th century the church of the Saints Sergius and Bacchus was built between the *templum Divi Vespasiani* and the arch of Septimius Severus as one of the many *diaconiae* that were installed in the area, and this resulted in the exploitation of the ancient buildings as quarries for construction materials.\(^{379}\) While the church itself did not occupy the area of the temple, we know of a series of *horti* belonging
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\(^{374}\) Nibby 1841, 545.  
\(^{375}\) Canina instead believed that the temple must have been built after the deification of Faustina, Canina 1845, 195.  
\(^{377}\) Nibby 1841, 544.  
\(^{378}\) This is a print in the *Codex Escurialensis*, see *supra* III.a.  
\(^{379}\) De Angeli 1992, 12.
to the church that certainly were located on top of the remains of the Aedes Concordiae and could possibly have been located above the remains of the templum Divi Vespasiani. The church is visible in a print by Martin Van Heemskerck dated to 1535, where the bases of the columns appear to be covered by layers of debris.

According to the sources, the greatest damage to the temple occurred between the 9th and the late 12th century when the entire Forum was sacked. Throughout the 16th century the systematic spoliation of marble and other construction materials was recorded in contemporary documents that attest to the massive transformation of the area. An explanation as to why the three surviving columns were spared may be found in the fact that their collapse could have damaged the nearby church. Once the church was demolished during the 16th century, the Forum became not only a quarry but also a dumpster, a fact which succeeded in elevating the level of the forum by several meters. A series of visible traces on one of the front columns of the temple indicate that a door was at some point inserted between the columns at a height of 1.20 m above the column bases. We have to imagine that the level of the area was raised and the temple remains were used for an abutting construction.

By the time most of the columns were buried, these remains began to be misinterpreted as those of the temple of Iuppiter Tonans. Pirro Ligorio was the first to put forward this interpretation in order to respond to others that regarded these three standing columns as the remains of either a porticus or those of the bridge built by
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380 Ibid.
382 De Angeli 1992, 13. We know from the sources that the sack by Guiscardo in 1084 reached the forum and the Capitoline hill, therefore it is likely that the temple of the Divine Vespasian was also damaged during this time.
385 A drawing by Dosio dated before 1569 shows the demolition of the church, De Angeli 1992, 16.
386 Nardi 1988, 72; De Angeli 1992, 16.
Caligula between the Palatine and the forum.\(^{387}\) This identification lingered until the 1830 excavations, although some doubts were raised. Palladio, in fact, recognized that the style of the architectural decoration of the three standing columns pointed to a later date than the supposed temple of \textit{Iuppiter Tonans}, which is Augustan.\(^{388}\)

During the 17th and 18th century the level of the entire area continued to rise, forming a walking level that nearly reached the column capitals. It was only during the first half of the 19th century that a series of excavations were carried out in this area of the Forum following the renewed interest in the monuments of ancient Rome that were excavated under Pius VI and the French regime starting in 1807.\(^{389}\) A grand plan for a systematic excavation of the entire area of the Roman Forum was presented by architect and archaeologist Giuseppe Valadier in 1821 which led to the 1829 excavation of the temple of the Divine Vespasian overseen by Nibby.\(^{390}\) In the course of two years the remains were completely unearthed, together with part of the nearby \textit{Porticus Deorum Consentium}. It was not until 1844 that the identity of the temple was finally determined, courtesy of Luigi Canina, who connected the data gathered by the archaeological excavations with those from the ancient sources. Canina was able to link the three Corinthian columns and the surviving inscribed entablature with the remains described by the Einsiedeln manuscript, which included a transcription of the complete text of the inscription, and those mentioned in the Cataloghi Regionari.\(^{391}\) He also established a reconstruction of the plan as a hexastyle temple, confirming Valadier's previous hypothesis and disproving Palladio's first attempt at a reconstruction of the building as an octastyle temple.

\(^{387}\) De Angeli 1992, 14, footnote no. 35.  
\(^{388}\) Palladio 1570, cap, XIX, 68-70.  
\(^{391}\) Canina 1844, 160-61.
In 1882 a street was built in the via del Foro Romano, between the temple of the Divine Vespasian and that of Saturn, which obliterated the ancient clivus Capitolinus and the remains of the staircase in front of the temple of the Divine Vespasian (fig. 59). The street was finally demolished in 1980 to expose the current situation where the entire area is included within the Roman Forum archaeological park and is only accessible to a certain extent by foot. The street between the temple of Saturn and that of the Divine Vespasian has been rebuilt with ancient blocks, and though it mirrors the ancient route of the clivus Capitolinus, its level has been deeply impacted by constructions carried out in the area.

III.b.2 Honor the father: architecture and topographical context of the temple of the Divine Vespasian

As already mentioned the temple stands on a concrete platform that serves as the basis for the nearby porticus Deorum Consentium as well, and they are, therefore, to be considered part of a single project that may have been initiated by Titus but was certainly completed by Domitian.392

The temple remains allow for a reliable reconstruction393 that also benefits from the fragments of architectural decoration that were excavated during the 1800s and are stored today in the Capitoline Museums. A Corinthian hexastyle (figs. 57, 64), the temple of the Divine Vespasian features a pseudoperipteros sine postico plan whose back leans against the wall of the Tabularium. The temple is roughly 28 m long, not including the front staircase, which is not preserved, with a width of 21 m, and the columns reach a height of 14 m from base to capital. The total height of the temple would reach ca 26 m,

393 De Angeli has proposed a reconstruction of the plan and elevation in his monograph in 1992. The author has published a reconstruction of the temple in the Atlante di Roma Antica with some new elements for the interiors and the front staircase, Nocera 2012, tav. 50.
making this a quite imposing monument in a very tight space, while not the highest. In fact, to its right, the temple of Concord in its Tiberian reconstruction was even more imposing in that it had an unusually wide front and a total height of 34 m, while to the left, the smaller Porticus Deorum Consentium provided a less striking visual impact, with columns reaching only 11 m. This area of the Roman Forum was also characterized by the presence of one of the oldest temples in Rome, dating back to the 5th century B.C.: the temple of Saturn, which towered over the clivus Capitolinus by over 60 m, including a massive basement of ca. 9 meters of height. Carrara marble was employed throughout the temple of the Divine Vespasian, including the revetment around the basement and the decoration of the elevation. Remains of the marble revetment in situ allow for an accurate reconstruction of the exterior of the temple. The columns rested on Ionic bases and were topped by Corinthian capitals, none of which is completely preserved (figs. 57, 64, 65). However, the remains are sufficient to reconstruct Corinthian capitals featuring a refined decoration with detailed acanthus leaves in the typical Flavian style, which, in turn, support an elegant frieze exhibiting the Domitianic “eye-glass” motif between the dentils (fig. 60).394

The frieze contains series of sacrificial instruments and elements of priestly costume and rituals arranged in a different sequence on the two sides, although the bucrania were always vertically aligned over the center of the column capitals.395 They are quite well preserved in the surviving corner, still in situ, and in the fragments and reconstruction of another section exhibited in the gallery of the Tabularium in the Capitoline Museums (figs. 60, 66). The objects depicted are: bucranium, galerus with apex, aspergillum, urceus, patera, culter, securis, and malleus. The details on the fictive

394 See De Angeli 1992, 83-103 for a detailed description of the architectural decoration of the temple and Blackenhagen 1940.
metal implements, as those on the architectural decoration, are especially rich for elements that would have been far too high for any viewer to appreciate. The handle of the fictive metal *urceus* jug, for instance, is a satyr leaning on the vase’s rim, while the *urceus*’ body is also decorated with figural motives arranged in two registers. The upper one depicts a scene with satyrs and maenads while a pair of winged horses occupy the lower register. A head of Zeus Ammon alternating with that of Medusa is featured in the center of the *patera* as an emblema, and the priestly *galerus* cap is richly ornamented with olive leaves and a thunderbolt flanked by a pair of wings. These elements look as if variously floating against the bare background, some as if hanging pinned to the wall but others simply hanging, while yet others are placed if set on the ledge of the frieze. The arrangement in the horizontal space of the frieze creates a sort of movement obtained by the varying inclination of some of the elements. We can therefore imagine that this arrangement would have given the impression of a punctuated wavy pattern from the viewer looking at the sides of the temple, especially once painted, as it is likely to have been.\(^{396}\)

This use of figural motifs in an abstract way can also be observed in the small continuous frieze in the Arch of Titus with the single elements arranged in a regularly spaced manner and in high relief. In addition to that, the objects depicted in the upper sections of the panels inside the fornix of the arch of Titus — such as the standards with labels and the *fasces*\(^{397}\) — display a similar arrangement. As some objects in the frieze of the temple of the Divine Vespasian, these elements are represented slanted in order to

\(^{396}\) Darwall-Smith also notes that the arrangement of the tool recalls that of a pattern, Darwall-Smith 1996, 154.

\(^{397}\) See section III.h.3 for more details about this.
give the impression of the movement.\textsuperscript{398} This could be the only true Domitianic element in a rather traditional and conventional sacred building.\textsuperscript{399}

The symbolical value of this frieze has been thoroughly analyzed by De Angeli within the political context of the temple’s dedication and against a wide range of examples dating from the Late Republic and the early imperial age.\textsuperscript{400} The presence on coins of sacrificial objects such as the \textit{urceus} and the \textit{lituus}\textsuperscript{401} was common in the late Republic, followed by Caesar, whose issues started to show the \textit{galerus} as well.\textsuperscript{402} The emphasis on the princeps’ \textit{pietas} under Augustus can be seen in coin series where sacrificial instruments such as the \textit{lituus}, tripod, and \textit{patera} appear consistently.\textsuperscript{403} Similar imagery was found in the frieze on the entablature of the temple of Apollo Sosianus in the southern Campus Martius. In this example \textit{bucrania} appear above the columns, just like the sequence in the temple of the Divine Vespasian, with hanging garlands that join in the middle where an Apolline tripod is depicted. A similar arrangement can be seen in the inner side of the Ara Pacis precinct, where rich garlands hang from \textit{bucrania} over which \textit{paterae} are floating.\textsuperscript{404} Fragmentary reliefs discovered in the area of the \textit{porticus Octaviae}, and attributed to an Augustan building, show another sequence of sacrificial implements including the \textit{lituus}, not present in the Flavian building.\textsuperscript{405}

\textsuperscript{398} See section III.j.3 on the Arch of Titus.
\textsuperscript{399} See also Darwall-Smith for the conventionality of the temple, Darwall-Smith 1996, 155-56.
\textsuperscript{400} De Angeli 1992, 139-48; see also La Follette 2012, 20-24.
\textsuperscript{401} See La Follette 2012 for a discussion of the general symbology behind the use of the image of the \textit{lituus} in varied contexts.
\textsuperscript{402} De Angeli 1992, 139.
\textsuperscript{403} Hölscber 1980, 299, footnote no. 109.
\textsuperscript{404} See Elsner 1991, 58-60.
\textsuperscript{405} La Follette 2012, 27.
There are other several examples of reliefs depicting a sacrificial instruments, among which a few important ones have been dated to Domitian’s times. In the relief from the Flavian tomb of the Haterii, the first building to the right can be identified with the temple of Jupiter Custos built by Domitian, and the frieze on its entablature shows sacrificial instruments alternating with bucrania and eagles. A fragment of architrave that is attributed to the Domitianic restoration of the temple in Via delle Botteghe Oscure in the Campus Martius represents this sequence of sacrificial objects: acerra, urceus, aspergillum, lituus.

Finally, and most importantly, von Blanckenhagen hypothesized the presence of a sacrificial implements in the decoration of the temple of Minerva in the forum Domitiani on the grounds of two Renaissance drawings that seem to document missing parts of the trabeation (fig. 61). In the second of these drawings a continuous frieze depicts two galeri with their apices, a patera with Medusa, an urceus, a culter’s case, a bucranium, a culter, a securis, an acerra, and a lituus.

The degree of ornamentation on this frieze, as it appears on the renaissance drawing, is extreme. The style recalls very closely that of the temple of the Divine Vespasian. The frieze shows two different types of galeri, at the beginning and the end of the sequence. One is decorated with stars and two overlapping S shaped elements while the other has branches of olives. Then the sequence continues with a patera with a beaded rim and a radial geometric pattern with the head of Medusa, while the urceus’s body is decorated with garlands of leaves.

---

406 De Angeli gives an detailed list in De Angeli 1992, 141-42.
407 See section III.g about Domitian’s interventions on the Capitoline hill.
408 De Angeli 1992, 141 footnote no. 384 with bibliography.
409 De Angeli 1992, 141, footnote no. 386 with bibliography.
410 Blackenhagen 1940, 23, 41, tav. 8, fig. 28; De Angeli 1992, 141, footnote no. 385.
The *culter*’s sheath is richly ornated with two heads protruding and a lion leaping on a horse on the body of the case. A small section of an *aspergillum* seems also to peak beneath the bottom part of the culter’s sheath followed by a small goblet, which is represented as broken. Then a *bucranium* is depicted with almost the identical treatment of the *infulae* as in the temple of the Divine Vespasian. The *culter*’s blades are decorated with a winged sea-animal while the *securis* was left blank. The *acerra*, the ritual box for incense, has lion’s legs and two griffins facing a large vase.

It is important to point out that, while the presence of the *bucrania* in a frieze depicting this subject was very common, their representation might differ in a few elements, especially in the way the *infulae* are depicted. The two examples from the temple of the Divine Vespasian and the Renaissance drawing are almost identical, with the exception of the knot of the *infulae* around the horns of the bull. In the temple of the Divine Vespasian the beaded *infulae* make a loop around the horns, while in the drawing there seem to be a knot. While this element in itself is not decisive for the dating of the frieze to Domitian’s times, the combination with the *bucrania* and the degree of ornamentation together with the slanted representation of some objects seem to strengthen the idea that this Renaissance drawing could accurately depict the frieze of the temple of Minerva in the *forum Domitiani*.411 In light of these similarities one might ponder the possibility that two types of *galeri* alternated also for the temple of the Divine Vespasian, while two types of *paterae*, one with Zeus Ammon and another with Minerva, might have been present in the temple of Minerva.

The temple dedicated to the Divine Vespasian was the fourth to be erected to commemorate a deified emperor. Visual evidence from some numismatic emissions by

---

411 In regards to the reliability of the drawing, Blanckenhagen expresses no doubts about the fact that this sheet of drawings represented the *forum Transitorium* and he also notices the close similarities with the frieze of the temple of the Divine Vespasian, Blanckenhagen 1940, 41.
Octavian show that the temple of the deified Caesar in the forum was decorated with a star/comet on the pediment\textsuperscript{412} to celebrate the miraculous ascension of Caesar as described by Suetonius and Dio.\textsuperscript{413} The temple of the deified Augustus appears on some coins of Caligula showing a hexastyle temple, richly adorned with garlands on the front, surmounted by a triumphal \emph{quadriga}, and Victories as \emph{acroteria}.\textsuperscript{414} Statues of Romulus and Aeneas are set along the roof while a sacrificial scene is depicted in the pediment. There is no information about the decoration of the temple dedicated to the Divus Claudius. The presence of the sacrificial theme on the frieze in the temple of the Divine Vespasian recalls important previous examples. We know from a coin series minted by Octavian in 36 B.C.\textsuperscript{415} that a cult statue of the Divine Caesar with \emph{capite velato} and holding a \emph{lituus} was in the temple of the \emph{Divus Iulius}, right in front of the temple of the Divine Vespasian. In addition to this, the iconography of Vespasian’s frieze picks up on the sacrifice scene on the temple to the deified Augustus. It is not surprising that such a subject would be chosen in this context.

A clear reference to the Augustan legacy can be seen in the creation by Titus of the \emph{sodales Flaviales}, a priestly college to honor his father Vespasian in imitation of the \emph{sodales Augustales} established by Tiberius.\textsuperscript{416} The presence of the \emph{galerus} with \emph{apex}, the priestly cap for the \emph{flamines}, is crucial for interpreting the decorative program of the temple. A thorough analysis of this element by Stefano De Angeli and also Escámez De Vera reveals a strong connection to the \emph{flamen dialis}, the priest in charge of the imperial

\textsuperscript{412} See for instance a \emph{denarius} from 36 B.C., \textit{RRC} 540/2.
\textsuperscript{413} Suet., \textit{iul.}, 88.1; Dio 45.67.1; the comet is also mentioned by Pliny, \textit{NH} II.93-94 and Ovid, \textit{Met.} XV. 841-42.
\textsuperscript{414} This temple is shown on a \emph{sestertius} struck in AD 37-38, \textit{RIC I} 36; \textit{BMCRE} 41.
\textsuperscript{415} \textit{RRC} 540 2
\textsuperscript{416} De Vera 2016, 3-4.
There is evidence that a specific flamineate for Vespasian and Titus was not created under Domitian.\textsuperscript{417} It appears that the imperial cult was conflated with that of Jupiter, which became essential in the power legitimization for the Flavians.\textsuperscript{418} It is noteworthy that the elements in the frieze from the temple of the Divine Vespasian are not simply symbolic of a sacrifice; the galerus is the specific attribute of the flamen dialis.\textsuperscript{419} The presence of the thunderbolt in the decoration strengthens the connection with Jupiter, and the entire sequence is an allusion to the imperial cult supervised by the flamen dialis in association with the sodales Flaviales.

The access to the temple was provided by a staircase that was built to fill the gap between the temple and the clivus Capitoline. This clivus suffered an unfortunate fate, starting in 1882, when the Via del Foro Romano was built.\textsuperscript{420} This street was constructed on top of the clivus Capitoline and remained in use until 1940, when some excavations were carried out in the area.\textsuperscript{421} Via del Foro Romano was rebuilt and in use until 1980, when it was finally dismantled for good. It is hard to imagine the clivus Capitoline not being impacted by these works in terms of its original set up and elevation and, therefore, it is even harder to reconstruct the approach to the temple.\textsuperscript{422} The limitations posed by the tight topographical arrangement were further complicated by the fact that the clivus turned and climbed toward the Capitoline hill in front of the temple, creating a progressive increase in the gap between the temple and the clivus. The clear traces of the

\textsuperscript{417} De Angeli 1992, 145-46; de Vera 2016, 41-87.
\textsuperscript{418} After every deification of an emperor a dedicated flamen to supervise his cult was created. While there is plenty of evidence, mainly epigraphic, for a flamineate for Vespasian and Titus in the provinces, no elements indicate the existence of such flamen in Rome. According to De Angeli this can be explained with the subordination of the sodales Flaviales to the cult of Jupiter presided by the flamen dialis, De Angeli 1992, 146.
\textsuperscript{419} See infra the section about the interventions of the Flavians on the Capitoline hill.
\textsuperscript{420} De Angeli 1992, 144-45; La Follette 2012, 22-23.
\textsuperscript{421} See Filippi 2000 for an overview of the clivus Capitoline.
\textsuperscript{422} De Angeli 1992, 24.
\textsuperscript{423} Maetzke 1991, 44-5, 52.
steps carved into the blocks underneath the columns suggest the construction of a staircase that took advantage of the limited space. In fact, the staircase was inserted between the columns, thereby allowing for a shorter flight of steps. Once we take into consideration the gap in elevation between the clivus and the temple it is possible to reconstruct a staircase projecting 2.68 m beyond the temple basement, formed by eight steps with a tread of 33 cm and a rise of 25 cm (fig. 64). This reconstruction fits accurately the topographical arrangement emerging from the archaeological data. However, a moderate margin of error should be taken into consideration with regard to the above mentioned original elevation of the clivus Capitolinus, which might have been compromised by several interventions for the construction of the Via del Foro Romano.\textsuperscript{424}

The interiors of the temple are sufficiently preserved to allow for a reconstruction of the plan and decoration, which have been attempted by De Angeli in 1992 and the author in 2012. The back of the cella was built against the Tabularium in opus testaceum. The remains in situ show clearly the traces of two columns which framed an aedicula housing a seated statue of the Divine Vespasian, the head of which can likely be identified with a fragment of colossal dimensions. The statue of Divus Augustus, as we know it from a sestertius by Antoninus Pius,\textsuperscript{425} was seated, while that of Caesar was standing. The statue of Vespasian, therefore, followed the Augustan format. The fragment of head in white marble used to belong to the Farnese collection and it is now housed in the Museo Archeologico di Napoli.\textsuperscript{426} It is 90 cm high, which would be approximately twice lifesize. The head is missing the upper half of the head, the tip of the chin, and the left ear. The missing top section of the head prevents us from hypothesizing

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{424} Maetzke 1991, 44-45.
\item \textsuperscript{425} \textit{RIC} 1004.
\item \textsuperscript{426} Museo Archeologico di Napoli, inv. 6068.
\end{itemize}
the presence of a wreath. The carving technique of the curls on the sides is similar to other portraits of Titus, especially the one from Ostia housed in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek in Copenhagen.\footnote{Rosso 2009, 495.} Therefore the hypothesis that this fragment could once have belonged to the cult statue inside the temple of the Divine Vespasian is highly plausible (fig. 62).\footnote{The hypothesis was put forward by Coarelli in 2009, 77. The analysis of the piece by Rosso also points toward a dating of the piece under Titus or the beginning of the reign by Domitian, Rosso 2009, 495.} The Vespasian statue featured a bare upper torso and was seated, therefore it can be identified as a Jupiter type, like that of Augustus, but with a few differences. In fact, the cult statue of Augustus had a tunic over his chest. The iconography of the cult statue in the temple of the Divine Vespasian, with a bare chest like Jupiter, shows a more direct assimilation.

A fragment of a capital with the head of a winged Victory also comes from the temple. Its size fits the columns of the aedicula, which have been hypothetically reconstructed as figural capitals with heads of winged Victories in the place of the volutes (fig. 62). The presence of winged victories in the context of apotheosis appears in other meaningful examples such as the temple of Divus Iulius in the Roman Forum to the east, for which a fragment of the frieze with Victories survives, and in the arch of Titus on the Sacra Via at the faerend of the Forum, another Domitianic monument to celebrate the Flavian imperial cult. The temple of the Divine Vespasian contributed significantly to the construction of the Flavian legacy. It represents one piece of a larger, complex project that included the arch of Titus, the Porticus Divorum, and the Templum Gentis Flaviae.
III.c The Porticus Deorum Consentium

Walking up the clivus Capitolinus past the Templum Divi Vespasiani, the ancient Roman would have noticed an oddly shaped porticus likely started by Titus and finished by Domitian on the western edge of the Roman Forum (fig. 67). Like the temple of the Divine Vespasian, the porticus Deorum Consentium is built against the massive wall of the Tabularium and it shares with the temple the concrete platform that was built with the aim of leveling the entire area.\(^{429}\) This structure is unique in its design, which was likely chosen to accommodate this new building within an already crowded area. The porticus occupies an irregular trapezoidal sector along the road that leads toward the Capitoline and it combines elements of fine architecture with complexes of rooms for commercial or administrative use. Its current name probably derives from a Republican sacred building no longer visible, with the exception of a stretch of foundation, and it is referred to in the 4\(^{th}\) century restoration commemorated by the fragmentary surviving inscription of a praefectus urbi, Vettius Praetextatus.\(^{430}\) As we will see, the restoration by Vettius Preatextatus represented an attempt to restore an old pagan cult which was eliminated by Domitian for its strong ties with the senatorial class responsible for its creation in the first place.\(^{431}\)

For the purpose of this chapter, this building will be described and analyzed in light of its inclusion in Titus and Domitian’s building program in this area of the Roman Forum. The architectural design displays a unique form that blends ornamentation and functionality. The unusual obtuse angle of the portico faces the visitor and creates a little piazza along the climb. The porticus Deorum Consentium contributes to the cityscape as

\footnotesize

\(^{429}\) See above, page 10, Nieddu 1986, 45-6.
\(^{430}\) CIL 6.102 = ILS 4003; Nieddu 1986, 48.
\(^{431}\) Nieddu 1986, 49-50.
a sort of scenography where the columnar screen serves the purpose of articulating the space with an open area coming off the heavily crowded sector of the Forum.

**III.c.1 Archaeological evidence and history of the excavations**

The *porticus Deorum Consentium* has not been studied extensively; the one short but detailed treatment was written by Nieddu in 1986. No additional archaeological investigations have since been carried out, making Nieddu’s work basically the only scholarly reference for the study of this building. A recent archaeometric study was conducted on the column shafts, demonstrating that they were carved from green veined cipollino marble from Euboea.\(^{432}\)

The visible remains (fig. 67) are the results of several interventions both ancient and modern, the latter aimed at restoring the original shape of the *porticus*. In the current display re-erected in 1858 we observe twelve columns, among which the first seven, starting from south are original, while the other five are restored. The columns are topped with Corinthian capitals, four of which have been restored. This sector of the Roman Forum had been covered by thick layers of debris since Late Antiquity, thus concealing most of the remains for centuries. Du Peràc’s prints from the late 16\(^{th}\) century (fig. 58) clearly show how the walking level was several meters higher than the paving of the *porticus*, allowing for the substantial preservation of the architecture and some decorative elements.

As already mentioned, the foundations of the *porticus* are built over a concrete platform shared with the temple of the Divine Vespasian, and feature a series of seven rooms aligned with and facing the southwestern side of the temple, and a narrow walkway between them (fig. 68, in dotted lines at lower right). These rooms are

---

consistent in dimensions, with a depth of 3.70 m, a width of 2.60, and a height of 2.60. Above these rooms the porticus proper occupies a trapezoidal area of roughly 680 square meters, consisting of an open court paved with marble slabs and bordered by columns on only the two sides, toward south and west, which meet at an oblique angle of 134°. In one corner of the open court traces of an ancient restoration of paving slabs can be identified, indicating the presence of at least two ancient phases. Considering the Trajanic date of a brick stamp and the possible Hadrianic date for the surviving capitals, we can place the restoration of the paving in the first half of the 2nd century A.D. The columns demarcate a corridor, beyond which a series of eight tabernae in opus latericium are built against the wall of the Tabularium and the southern slope of the Capitoline hill. The epistyle of the colonnade bears on the outside a fragmentary dedicatory inscription dated to A.D. 367 and naming Vettius Pratextatus as the praefectus urbi responsible for the restoration of the cult of the Twelve Gods (fig. 69); I will later return to the implications of this intervention for the interpretation of the building.

This was not the sole inscription found in this area and attributed to the Porticus Deorum Consentium. During the several excavations carried out in the middle of the 16th century near the temple of Saturn, fragments of entablature inscribed on both sides were discovered. The inscriptions, four in total, were read and recorded right before the fragments were destroyed and reused. The texts document restorations made by members of the schola scribarum librariorum et praeconum aedilium curulium who

---

434 Nieddu attributes the restoration of the paving to the Hadrianic period based on the evidence for the capitals. However, considering the Trajanic brick stamp in the back wall of the eighth taberna we cannot exclude that Trajan was the one repaving the court, therefore a general Trajanic-Hadrianic date seems more accurate, Nieddu 1986, 42, 46-48
435 Hulsen 1888, 208.
added bronze seats and silver statues to the decoration of the schola. The reports from the 16th century are not always easy to interpret when it comes to the exact location and the reading of the texts; however, the study of the onomastic types by Hulsen indicates that three inscriptions date to the reign of Trajan, and a fourth to the reign of Caracalla. A careful examination of the documentary evidence from the 16th century points to the Porticus Deorum Consentium for the provenance of all these inscriptions.

The columns are topped by damaged Corinthian capitals decorated with trophies in relief (fig. 70). Some scholars would compare these to the capitals from Hadrian’s Villa and argue that they belong to a later phase, while others would place the capitals in the Flavian period. The decoration of the capitals defines a clear triumphal aura that is not easy to reconcile with a solely utilitarian place. If we consider the capitals as part of the original Flavian design we might think of the topographical proximity with the temple of the divine Vespasian as an explanation for the decoration. A triumphal decorative motif would have immediately connoted the building as “imperial.” In the case of a Hadrianic date, as Nieddu believes, we might posit a connection with Hadrian’s interest in the army and the role it played in the construction of the principate.

Contrary to the rooms at the ground level, the tabernae vary in dimensions from the four smaller ones on the longer side against the southern slope of the Capitoline hill – 3.88 m deep per 2.97 m wide – to the three larger ones on the Tabularium side, which measure 4.42 m deep per 3.61 wide. The central taberna against the Tabularium is less

---

436 Hulsen 1888, 208-09.
437 Hulsen 1888, 216-21; the dating is accepted also by Coarelli 2009, 79.
440 Coarelli 2009, 79.
441 This interpretation put forward by Nieddu 1986, 51, takes into consideration the central role that the army had in Hadrian’s succession.
deep with a depth of 1.98 m. Traces of the floor decoration of the first taberna indicate the presence of a simple *opus sectile* whose pattern can be reconstructed as rows of rectangles bordered by thin listels.

The first archaeological interventions took place in 1833, when L. Canina started a systematic excavation in the area. The first reports appeared in the *Bullettino dell'Istituto di Corrispondenza Archeologica* from 1835; however, it is Antonio Nibby who included an exhaustive treatment of the remains in his *Roma nell'anno 1838, parte prima antica* (Roma, 1838). Immediately after the discovery of the remains, whose identification remained unknown, a restoration project began under the supervision of Valadier, who started a project in 1834 and completed it in 1858. The restoration project was carried out based on innovative concepts of the time, such as the differentiation between ancient and modern elements. Ten column bases were found *in situ* together with fragmentary shafts in cipollino marble scattered all around the area. In order to restore the colonnade L. Grifi, a secretary of the Ministry of Fine Arts, suggested the use of travertine to save money and make the restoration distinguishable from the ancient elements.

A more recent restoration was carried out in 1942 by Antonio Muñoz, who added a brick pillar and a reconstruction of part of the epistyle. He also demolished the big Arcone del Belvedere built under Gregory XVI in the late 1800s. Muñoz’s intervention marked the end of the archaeological interest in this monument that, though a minor addition to the complex topographical fabric of this sector of the Roman Forum, is still meaningful within the projects in this area sponsored by Titus and Domitian.

---

442 Nieddu 1986, 38.
443 See D’Orsi 1994 for a description of restoration projects carried out in the Pantheon, *Porticus Deorum Consentium* and Colosseum during the 1800s.
444 D’Orsi 1994, 74.
III.c.2 The function and correct identification of the porticus

The odd shape of this building was certainly dictated by the topographical restraints of the area. Not only was this edge of the Roman Forum already filled by landmarks such as the temple of Saturn, the Rostra, and the temple of Concord, but it also marked the passage between the forum and the road toward the Capitoline, creating obstacles in terms of differences in elevation. Such difficulties were overcome by the construction of the concrete platform that served as the basis for both the porticus and the temple of the divine Vespasian. The entire area was filled by an irregular trapezoidal platform which was a clever solution designed to use the available space. Moreover, the obtuse angle of the colonnade meant that it was easily viewed by anyone climbing the clivus Capitolinus. In fact, the two branches of the colonnade open toward the viewer. This is a clear scenographic arrangement that offers an unexpected little piazza, almost an embrace for the visitor leaving an area of the Forum crowded by tall, grand structures.

The identification with the porticus Deorum Consentium is based on three sources, two of which are brief mentions by Varro in two different works, while the third is the inscription by Vettius Praetextatus. At the beginning of the Rerum Rusticarum libri tres\textsuperscript{446} he specifically lists the Twelve Gods as those he will not invoke for help as he embarks on this new endeavor. Varro mentions that twelve gold statues, six male and six female, are visible in the forum, and that is the only topographical information he provides. In De Lingua Latina Varro wonders about the current use of “deum consentium” rather than the more accurate “deorum consentium” with regard to an

\textsuperscript{446} Varro, rust., 1, 1, 4, “et quoniam, ut aiunt, dei facientes adiuvant, prius invocabo eos, nec, ut Homerus et Ennius, Musas, sed duodecim deos consentis; neque tamen eos urbanos, quorum imagines ad forum auratae stant, sex mares et feminae totidem, sed illos xii deos, qui maxime agricolarum duces sunt”.
“aedes” whose location is not specified in this text.\footnote{Varro, ling., 8, 70: “cur appellant omnes aedem Deum Consentium et non Deorum Consentium?”} Finally, the dedicatory inscription was found on the site in two pieces in 1834 and described by Kellerman in the \textit{Annali dell’Instituto di Corrispondenza Archeologica}. The text of the inscription mentions Vettius Praetextatus as the \textit{praefectus urbi} who restored in their places the statues of the \textit{Deorum Consentium}.\footnote{CIL, 6, 102, [Deorum Consentium sacrosancta simulacra cum omni loc[...]] CIL 6, 102, \textit{Deorum Consentium} sacrosancta simulacra cum omni loc[...].} The inscription has been restored in the \textit{CIL} with the expression “cultu in formam antiquam restituto” which seems to indicate that Vettius’ intervention was not new but was instead aimed at restoring an older arrangement. However, almost the entire phrase “restored to its ancient form” is an emendation. The date of the inscription is solidly grounded on Vettius’ office as \textit{praefectus urbi} to A.D. 367. Therefore, the three sources together attest to a sacred building to the \textit{Deorum Consentium} during the late Republic and in the late 4\textsuperscript{th} century A.D. In order to better interpret this building and its significance within Domitian’s building program tone needs to understand the context of the earlier sacred structure.

The cult of the Twelve Gods was established in Rome in a time of crisis after the battle of the Lake Trasimene, in 217 B.C during the second Punic War.\footnote{Livy, XXII, X, 9. In this passage Livy describes the anxiety caused by the invasion by the Carthaginians and the necessity to appease the gods with sacrifices. Then he mentions the \textit{lectisternium} that was set for three days and in which six pairs of gods were celebrated, “\textit{Tum lectisternium per triduum habitum decemuiris sacrorum curantibus: sex puluinaria in conspectu fuerunt, Iovi ac Iunoni unum, alterum Neptuno ac Mineruae, tertium Marti ac Veneri, quartum Apollini ac Dianae, quintum Volcano ac Vestae, sextum Mercurio et Ceneri. Tum aedes uotae”}. Scholars have analyzed the etymology of the term “consentium” and indicated in the verbs “consentio” (to agree, to deliberate in common) or the archaic “conso” (to decide) the possible roots of the term.\footnote{Nieddu 1986, 49 with bibliography.} In either case, once the emergency was overcome, the cult of the Twelve...
Gods remained as a testimony of the cohesion among the senatorial class which led Rome to the victory.

In this perspective Domitian’s drastic restyling of the structure makes sense within the larger urban plan that included the dismantling of Moneta, the state mint in the Tabularium, and the aerarium, located by the sources in the temple of Saturn. The state mint was moved to a completely different region and can be identified with the structure underneath the church of San Clemente and adjacent to the mithraeum. The aerarium, where the gold supply of the Roman state was kept, was connected to the Tabularium through a door that opened directly on the Roman Forum but was closed off during the construction of the temple of the divine Vespasian and the Porticus Deorum Consentium. It is likely that the huge Vigna Barberini complex on the Palatine, built by Domitian, became the new seat of the aerarium while the new state mint Moneta was transferred to Regio III by Domitian. In this context, Domitian’s transformation of the Republican aedes of the cult of the Twelve Gods, a symbol of the compact, unanimous senatorial élite, into a beautiful and functional building for the new Flavian imperial administration fits perfectly.

In fact, no extant Flavian source refers to this structure. The architectural typology is unique and oddly shaped, but nothing about this porticus speaks of a religious building, though traces of the earlier building have been identified in the use of
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451 Coarelli 2009, 77-79.  
452 Varro, LL, V. 42; Solin., I, 12; Macr., Sat., I.8.2.3: Origo, 3.6; Servius, ad Aen., VIII, 319, 322; CIL, I, 587; CIL I, 636; CIL VI, 1265; Asc., pro Mil., 40-41.  
454 Coarelli 2009, 78; Villedieu 2009, 247.  
455 Coarelli 1994.  
457 Coarelli 2009, 77-78.
the Grotta Oscura tufa in the foundations of one of the rooms.\textsuperscript{458} The various restorations have stripped this structure of a substantial amount of its original Flavian elements, preventing us from comprehending it fully. The only original parts are the structural elements in tuff and \textit{opus testaceaum}; these bear the same characteristics of the brick work in the \textit{cella} of the temple of the divine Vespasian and are thus securely attributed to Domitian.\textsuperscript{459} In addition to those elements, some column shafts and their capitals might belong to the original Flavian phase, as mentioned above.\textsuperscript{460} The \textit{tabernae} built in the foundations that face the southwest side of the temple might be a little earlier and could have been built by Titus instead.\textsuperscript{461}

Therefore, the identification of the \textit{porticus Deorum Consentium} with the \textit{schola scribarum librariorum et praecoonum aedilum curulium} seems to correspond most fittingly to the epigraphic, archaeological, and historical evidence that we possess for this building. This identification is also in harmony with the \textit{Atria VII} mentioned the buildings attributed to Domitian in the list provided by the Chronographer of A.D 354.\textsuperscript{462} According to Coarelli’s analysis, therefore, the \textit{porticus Deorum Consentium} is a Domitianic building, perhaps started by Titus, aimed at housing administrative space for the imperial staff such as the \textit{schola} of the \textit{scribae librarii} and the \textit{praecones} of the \textit{aediles curules}. The series of rooms open to a colonnaded court would fit this function well. The so-called \textit{Schola Xantha}, sought after by scholars in the wake of the 16\textsuperscript{th} century reports about the inscriptions, did not exist, and the \textit{scribae librarii} were instead housed in the \textit{tabernae} of the \textit{porticus Deorum Consentium}, which were known as \textit{Atria}

\textsuperscript{458} Nieddu 1986, 48-49.  
\textsuperscript{459} Nieddu 1986, 45.  
\textsuperscript{460} Nieddu 1986, 46-48.  
\textsuperscript{461} Nieddu 1986, 45-46.  
\textsuperscript{462} Anderson 1983.
Both the rooms on the ground floor facing the temple of the Divine Vespasian and the *tabernae* on the courtyard with their modular dimensions (fig. 67) could have been used for administrative purposes. In this light, the extent of the intervention by Vettius Praetextatus referenced by the 4th century inscription needs to be reconsidered.

As Alan Cameron points out, the heavily emended text of the inscription could refer to a restoration of a building’s decoration rather than a complete repurposing of the building. Praetextatus was one of the leading aristocratic figures of the 4th century who, together with Q. Aurelius Symmachus and Nicomachus Flavianus, led the revival of pagan cults and traditions. The three leaders are depicted by Macrobius in his *Saturnalia* as they discuss various subjects, among them the pagan cults. Within this context it is easy to see Praetextatus carry out this project, and perhaps even the restoration of the nearby temple of Saturn, with the aim of preserving a symbol of Republican religion. The seventh *taberna* open to the colonnaded courtyard, which is less deep, and has been interpreted by Coarelli as a *sacellum*. It is possible that this room housed statuettes of the Twelve Gods mentioned in the 4th century inscription.

In terms of Titus' and especially Domitian’s building activity in this sector of the forum, the *porticus Deorum Consentium* is fittingly interpreted as a space for the imperial administration which had started to increase in size and complexity. The construction of the massive Vigna Barberini complex on the Palatine, intended for a similar purpose, strengthens this picture of a rising imperial bureaucracy whose administrative needs required new and tailored spaces and offices.
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III.d Memories of Domitian between the forum Romanum and the Capitoline hill: the Equus Domitianus and the horrea Piperataria and horrea Vespasiani in the forum, the restoration of the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, and the temples of Jupiter Conservator and Custos on the Capitoline

As already mentioned in the introduction, the only Domitianic buildings in this area for which we have substantial archaeological evidence are the temple of the Divine Vespasian, the porticus Deorum Consentium or Atria VII, and some work on the temples on the Capitoline hill. However, literary references and scant surviving brickwork attest to a larger intervention in the Roman Forum and the Capitoline hill through restoration of existing buildings and the construction of new ones. In this section I will analyze the known evidence for these structures, aiming at reconstructing the complex puzzle of Domitian’s activity in this core region of the ancient city.

III.e The Equus Domitianus

Statius, Silvae, I, 1-2:

“Quae superimposito moles geminata colosso Stat Latium complexa forum?”\(^{468}\)

Which mass stands embracing the Roman Forum, Doubled by a gigantic statue on it?

Among the projects of Domitian known only through the ancient literary and numismatic sources, the equestrian statue of the emperor erected in A.D. 91 to celebrate his military campaigns against Germans, Dacians, and Chatti\(^{469}\) might have been the most eccentric feature in the Roman Forum. Unfortunately, the statue was immediately

---


\(^{469}\) See Jones 1982, 126-159 for Domitian’s military campaigns.
destroyed once the *damnatio memoriae* was decreed by the senate in A.D. 96, and today even its exact location within the forum remains a mystery. Statius’ description of this imposing monument, an extended panegyric unusual in the extant literary record,\(^{470}\) and the reverse of a *sestertius*\(^{471}\) are the primary sources for its appearance. One incredibly well preserved bronze equestrian statue of Domitian was discovered in the sacellum of the *Augustales* from Misenum, but the pose of this statue is quite different and his head was re-worked as that of Nerva.\(^{472}\)

In terms of iconography, the *Equus Domitiani* must have been a bronze statue of colossal size, with Domitian riding a horse in military gear, with a cloak and a sword at his side. The pose of Domitian is that of a triumphator, gesturing with his right hand, while holding a small statue of Minerva in his left hand. Minerva, in turn, held the severed head of Medusa. The horse’s pose is contained, with the head slightly turned down, and the severed head of a German positioned under the right hoof. The scarce archaeological evidence combined with the numismatic sources (fig. 77) and the description by Statius have been analyzed by several scholars with varied results in terms of the interpretation and reconstruction of this monument.\(^{473}\) However, there are aspects of this equestrian statue that have been overlooked. The relationship between the topographical location, the orientation, and the size has never been treated in connection
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\(^{470}\) Stat., *Sil.*, I.1 ff.

\(^{471}\) BMC 1021.5, *RIC* II.1 D 797, p. 324.

\(^{472}\) See Pozzi *et al.* for a thorough presentation of the statue, the restoration, and interpretation; see Tuck 2005 for a different reading of the statue as representing a hunting rather than a military one.

\(^{473}\) For the archaeological research in the forum see Boni 1904-1907, Giuliani and Verduchi 1987. Torelli has provided a holistic analysis of the urban planning by the Flavians in 1987 including a reading of the location of the *Equus*. Thomas in 2004 has reanalyzed the evidence to suggest an entirely different location for the *Equus*. Coarelli in 2009 suggested a new reconstruction of the equestrian statue with the addition of a quite atypical dedicatory inscription. In Muth 2010 the scholar provides a reading of Domitian’s intervention in the Roman Forum, with special focus on the *Equus*, as a remaking of the Augustan city. For the commentaries on the text by Statius see *supra* footnote no. 127. Among these, Cordes 2017 provides an useful reading of Statius’ treatment of the statue in relation to the contemporary reception.
with the description by Statius in a holistic way. In the following paragraphs I redefine this monument as extravagant and non-Augustan. The Equus Domitiani will be analyzed in the context of the other equestrian statues in the forum and elsewhere to show that its colossal size was unprecedented there, and that it was the result of a choice among other and equally, if not more appropriate, locations. The orientation of the statue, which no scholar has ever noticed as perplexing, will also be discussed in light of Domitian’s attitude toward his father’s legacy and that of Augustus. Finally, the monument’s extravagance will also be highlighted by a reading of the text by Statius which betrays an anxiety about the reception of the statue.

III.e.1 Equestrian and other statues in the Roman Forum

Since the Republic the Roman Forum was punctuated by several types of honorary statues known from literary and numismatic sources. The typologies include simple statues on bases, equestrian statues, and columnae rostratae, columns decorated with rostra and topped by a honorary statue. During the late Republic and early empire, to have a portrait statue in the Roman Forum was an high honor and several were built to the point that in 158 B.C. there were so many statues in the Forum that the senate ordered the removal of those that they hadn’t authorized. Among these dedicatory monuments there were four equestrian statues in or around the rostra dedicated to Sulla, Pompey, Caesar, and Octavian. Sulla’s monument was a gilded bronze equestrian
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474 Contra Muth 2010 followed by Moormann forthcoming. Coarelli had already expressed a similar view about Domitian disrupting the “Augustan balance” in the Roman Forum with the construction of the equestrian statue, however he did not take the orientation nor the description by Statius in careful consideration. Coarelli 2002, 63, 2009, 81-83.
475 Pliny, NH, 34.30.
statue erected in 80 or 79 B.C. on the rostra vetera\textsuperscript{476} — the original platform for public speeches situated in front of the Comitium — and destroyed by the plebs together with that of Pompey.\textsuperscript{477} The statue was set up again by Caesar and placed in the new rostra planned by Caesar and built by Augustus at the northwestern edge of the forum in 42 B.C.\textsuperscript{478} Velleius Paterculus noted that the honor of having one’s equestrian statue in the area of the rostra was accorded only to these four men over the course of about three hundred years.\textsuperscript{479}

Another equestrian statue dedicated to Julius Caesar might have been placed in front of the temple of the Divus Iulius. The evidence for this statue comes from a reference in Pliny that suggests the presence of a statue in armor in front of the temple whose base was used to affix official documents.\textsuperscript{480} Traces of the anchor system for an equestrian statue were found in front of the temple of Divus Iulius and attributed at first to the statue in honor of Quintus Marcus Tremulus mentioned by Livy\textsuperscript{481} but absent at the time of Pliny.\textsuperscript{482} The Equus Tremuli was erected in front of the temple of Castor and Pollux to celebrate the victory over the Hernici in 306 B.C. However, the base discovered in the forum has been dated to Augustan times and it most likely pertains to a statue dedicated to Caesar.\textsuperscript{483} If we take into consideration the equestrian statue of Caesar in his own forum described by Statius as a comparison for the Equus Domitiani\textsuperscript{484} and

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item This is the definition used by Suetonius to contrast these rostra to those on the temple of the Divus Iulius, Suet., Aug., 100. For the location and description App., BC, V. 130; Cic., Phil. IX.13; Vell., II.61; Suet., Iul., 75; Dio 42.18.2.
\item Suet., Iul., 75; Dio 42.18.
\item Platner & Ashby 1929; Papi 1995 (LTUR II), 227.
\item Vell., 2.61.
\item Pliny, Ep., 8.6.13
\item Livy, IX.43.22-24; Papi 1995 (LTUR II), 229.
\item Pliny, NH, XXXIV.23; Platner & Ashby 1929, 202.
\item Platner & Ashby 1929, 202.
\item Stat., Silv., I. 84-90.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
recently identified archaeologically by Delfino,\textsuperscript{485} Caesar had three equestrian statues dedicated in a contained topographical area.

Octavian received the honor of a gilded equestrian statue in or around the \textit{rostra} in 43 B.C. upon request by Lucius Marcius Philippus (fig. 80).\textsuperscript{486} The iconography of this statue appears in four numismatic issues with different poses of the horse.\textsuperscript{487} The honors attributed to Octavian in the forum included also \textit{columnae rostratae} to celebrate the naval battles of Naulochus and Actium. A direct reference to the statue for the victory over Sextus Pompey at Naulochus in 36 B.C. is in Appian,\textsuperscript{488} while Servius mentions four golden “rostratae” columns celebrating Augustus’ and Agrippa’s naval victories for the conquest of Aegypt.\textsuperscript{489} Most significantly, Servius clarifies that these columns were on the Capitoline hill in his time, where Domitian had moved them from the forum. The motivations for this move are not specified, nor it is said where exactly they were located in the Roman Forum.

Therefore, the Roman Forum during the Flavians displayed a varied panorama of honorary statues, among which there were perhaps two equestrian statues of Caesar, other equestrian statues dedicated to Sulla, Pompey, and Octavian in the area of the \textit{rostra} in addition to the “rostratae” columns dedicated to Octavian and Agrippa. It is important to note that no “emperor” was, so far, accorded the honor of an equestrian statue in the Roman Forum.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{485} Delfino et al. 2010. \\
\textsuperscript{486} \textit{RE XIV} Marcius 76; Cic. \textit{ad Brut.} 16.7, see Papi 1995 (\textit{LTUR II}), 230-31. \\
\textsuperscript{487} Papi 1995 (\textit{LTUR II}), 231. \\
\textsuperscript{488} App., \textit{BC}, 5, 130. \\
\textsuperscript{489} Ser., \textit{ad Georg.}, 3.29: “\textit{Columnas dicit, quae in honore Augusti et Agrippae rostratae constitutae sunt. Augustus victor totius Aegypti, quam Caesar pro parte superaverat, multa de navali certamine sustulit rostra, quibus confiatìs quattuor effecit columnas, quae postea a Domitiano in Capitolio sunt locatae, quas hodieque conspicimus...}”.
\end{flushright}
III.e.2 Where was the Equus Domitiani?

Archaeological evidence for this statue have been sought by archaeologists since the early 20th century, when Giacomo Boni uncovered a rectangular foundation with traces of metal supports which he identified as the remains of Domitian’s equestrian statue. Stratigraphic analysis carried out during later excavations by Giuliani and Verduchi showed that Boni’s foundation was in fact pre-Augustan, thus disproving its identification as Domitian’s monument. Giuliani and Verduchi uncovered a foundation to the north of the one found by Boni, indicated by traces of re-paving of the area (fig. 71). The foundation is 96 square meters and consists of a concrete core with fragments of tuff and travertine, which is also the construction technique for the cella in the temple of the Divine Vespasian. Thomas re-analyzed the evidence for the equestrian statue and suggested a third possible location in the spot that was later occupied by the column of Diocletian, and then subsequently converted into the surviving column of Phocas in A.D. 608 (fig. 72). Thomas’s hypothesis warrants consideration, for it analyzes the sightlines that were indeed peculiar to Domitian’s buildings, an important but often overlooked element of Domitianic architecture. His choice for the site is based on an allegedly direct line of sight between the Equus and the forum Domitiani, but this is not an entirely convincing hypothesis.

First, the topographical arrangement between the Roman Forum entrance to the forum Domitiani, the basilica Aemilia, and the forum of Caesar has yet to be
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490 Boni 1904-1907, 574-77.
492 Giuliani 1995, (LTUR II), 228.
493 See above, pag. 4.
494 Thomas 2004.
495 As Thomas correctly points out Torelli highlighted the element of sightlines in Domitian’s building program in his 1987 article.
established, and we cannot be sure of a visible dialogue between the entrance to the forum Domitiani and the equestrian statue. As a matter of fact, even if the statue was visible from the forum Domitiani, the visual axis would have been very narrow, thus allowing for just a glimpse of the mighty statue (fig. 73). The sightline suggested by Thomas in his plan (fig. 72) is misleading since the map does not show the forum Transitorium at all. The arrow seems to come from an open space beyond the Curia and the Basilica Aemilia, while the problematic entrance to the forum Domitiani is inexplicably omitted. As illustrated in figure no. 19, in fact, this proposed visual connection is too tenuous to link these two monuments.

Furthermore, I believe the concept of sightlines is misused in Thomas’ analysis. Sightlines are definitely a crucial aspect of Domitianic/Rabirian monuments, as the imperial palace on the Palatine demonstrates; however, they only mattered if they were actually part of the viewer’s experience. In this case, the dim visual connection would have created a one-way link, allowing for a glance of the equestrian statue from the forum, but no corresponding view in the opposite direction. In fact, the viewer would need to bypass the Equus to look into the forum, so the immense bronze mass was in fact more an optical obstacle than it was a connecting element. It seems more likely that the visual connection might have been a symbolic one, with Minerva in the temple of the forum Domitiani smiling at her protégé Domitian in his triumphant manifestation.

The analysis of sightlines often takes into consideration alignments that are plausible on a map but would not actually have been perceived in actuality, and therefore would not have mattered for the purpose of topographical planning and design. Torelli’s
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496 Bauer hypothesized a tetrapylon which would have blocked the view entirely, Bauer 1976-77. Viscogliosi instead suggested a simple solution with two flanking arches already featured in a drawing by Palladio, Viscogliosi 2000, 85-6.
497 Thomas 2004, 38, fig. 14.
498 See the relevant chapter and section on the Flavian palace, IV.i.
placement of the *Equus Domitianus* follows Giuliani and Verduchi’s identification of the foundation in the center of the forum (fig. 74) and justifies this choice with the resulting alignments between the equestrian statue, the temple of Minerva, and the *Ianus Quadrifrons* in the *forum Domitiani*.\(^\text{499}\) This alignment, while evident on the map, would not have been perceived by any viewer due to the presence of the basilica *Aemilia*, and is therefore not significant for the choice of the equestrian statue’s location.\(^\text{500}\) The foundation identified by Giuliani and Verduchi occupies the center of the Roman Forum, the heart of the city (fig. 73, in blue); this would have been reason enough for the choice of this location. Giuliani and Verduchi need not offer such an argument for visual sightlines when the statue would have been immediately visible to visitors approaching the forum from any direction. The monument would in fact have dwarfed every other feature in the surroundings (fig. 75).\(^\text{501}\)

No hypothesis on the location of Domitian’s equestrian statue is fully convincing; until other archaeological investigations are undertaken, however, Giuliani and Verduchi’s hypothesis remains the most plausible. Despite the vagueness around its exact location, the surviving data regarding the monument allow for some observations to be made about it, in light of Domitian’s activity in the Roman Forum.

*III.e.3: A break with Augustus and Vespasian: the Roman Forum as the forum of Domitian*

With so many different types of honorary and equestrian statues in the forum, the addition by Domitian might seem just the appropriate development for his imperial

\(^\text{499}\) Torelli 1987, 575, fig. 4.

\(^\text{500}\) Thomas already noted that this sightline would have been blocked by the Basilica Aemilia, Thomas 2004, 34.

\(^\text{501}\) The size of the *Equus Domitianus* is one of the most emphasized aspects in Statius’s poem, Statius, *Silvae*, I. 1.
self-representation. However, there are elements such as scale, orientation, location, and iconography peculiar to this monument that contradict this interpretation. The detailed description by Statius in the first poem of the Silvae provides several clues for the reception of the statue and its place within Domitian’s political program. The first two lines of the poem, already presented at the beginning of this section, form a question representative of the bewilderment of the viewer at the sight of the monstrous statue. Lisa Cordes has recently analyzed colossality and exaggeration in Statius’ description of the Equus Domitiani as a way of providing a “positive coding” of a monument that the author anticipated would cause fear and astonishment. In relation to this, let us look at lines 56-60:

“Vix sola sufficient insessaque pondere tanto 
Subter anhelat humus; nec ferro aut aere, laborant 
Sub genio, teneat quamvis aeterna crepido 
Quae superingesti portaret culmina montis 
Caeliferique attrita genu durasset Atlantis.”

Hardly will the earth resist and the ground burdened
By such massive weight gasps for breath;
Nor is their struggle the result of iron or bronze,
but of Domitian’s genius,
Although it is held up by an eternal base which
Would support the peaks of a mountain piled on top of it
And would have stood fast when pressed
by the knee of Atlas the Skybearer

In this description the enormous weight of the statue which causes the earth beneath to struggle is ascribed not to the physical attributes of the monument but to the “genius” of Domitian, whose colossal size corresponds to the godliness of the emperor

502 Thomas interprets the construction of the Equus Domitiani in the forum as perfectly appropriate, 2004, 24-25; Muth also finds both the location and the colossal size justified, 2010, 491-93.
503 See supra footnote no. 127 for bibliography on the Silvae.
504 Cordes interprets this cryptic description of the equestrian statue as a way to reinforce the impression made on the beholder and his inability to fully comprehend it, Cordes 2017, 76-77.
and is therefore appropriate.\textsuperscript{506} In light of this explanation, the viewer should embrace the gigantic bronze mass as visual evidence of the scale of the emperor's genius rather than being afraid of it. Fear is also the immediate reaction that Curtius, suddenly awakened by the construction noise in the nearby \textit{Lacus Curtius}, has at the first sight of the colossus, only to rejoice when he recognizes Domitian.\textsuperscript{507} Although panegyric poems were expected to provide hyperbolic descriptions and comparisons by contrast, in \textit{Silvae} I.1 Statius is consistently re-coding the size of the statue in a positive light. According to Cordes all these attempts were aimed at anticipating a negative reaction of the viewer.\textsuperscript{508}

In addition to this, in lines 8-21 the \textit{Equus Domitianus} is compared to the Trojan horse which presents the reader with the problematic interpretation of the negative connotation associated with the Homeric horse.\textsuperscript{509} Statius, however, overcomes this ambivalence by annulling the negative aspects of the Trojan horse, and successfully restores the image of the emperor as victorious but lenient.\textsuperscript{510} Carole E. Newlands points out the ambiguity of the comparison with the Trojan horse and explains that Statius uses the comparison in a “protreptic” function to remind the viewer (and the emperor?) of the extraordinary powers he holds and the danger that may come from them.\textsuperscript{511} However, I find it perplexing that Statius would bring up such a controversial analogy that requires justification in a lengthy section, and there might be another explanation. The analyses of this controversial association have focused mainly on the text, thereby overlooking the topographical context of the statue. I would argue that Statius was most likely trying to

\textsuperscript{506} Cordes 2017, 79.
\textsuperscript{507} Stat., Silv., I, 71-84.
\textsuperscript{508} Cordes 2017, passim.
\textsuperscript{509} See Newlands 2002, 55-60 for a presentation of opposite interpretations by Geyssen, who sees the comparison as a positive characterization by contrast, and Ahl, who sees in the Trojan horse a true expression of threat.
\textsuperscript{510} Cordes 2017, 82-84.
\textsuperscript{511} Newlands 2002, 58-59.
contain a strong criticism that had already been vividly expressed by the crowd during and after the construction of the statue due to its unprecedented size, the location, and the iconography. It is easy to imagine the comparison with the Trojan horse being one of the most common, bewildered comments circulating in the wake of the *equus*’ construction, which might have compelled Statius to reassure his audience by accentuating the differences between the two horses.

With regards to the size, it is possible to get a more accurate idea from a comparative reconstruction published by Filippo Coarelli, where the drawings effectively illustrate the scale of this colossus with respect to other known monuments (figs. 75, 76). As Newlands points out, the statue served the twofold purpose of presenting Domitian as both god and triumphant general,\textsuperscript{512} while its size reminded of the audacity of Nero’s colossus. In his reconstruction of the equestrian statue, Coarelli tentatively linked to the statue a large inscription reported by Petrarch as elegiac couplets. The inscription is mentioned by several authors between 1470 and 1578 as re-used in a wall beyond S. Giovanni in Laterano.\textsuperscript{513} The content of the inscription is a clear celebration of military victories, most likely those fought by Domitian against the German tribes for which the *Equus* was built.\textsuperscript{514} The inscription could conceivably fit in the large base of the statue, but the use of the first person in the text which would make this a highly unusual dedicatory inscription for a public monument. Coarelli’s explanation of the extraordinary character of the inscription relies on the equally extraordinary character of the *Equus Domitiani* itself.\textsuperscript{515} Whether we accept this hypothesis or not\textsuperscript{516} it is undeniable that the

\textsuperscript{512} Newlands 2002, 71.
\textsuperscript{513} Coarelli 2009, 82-83.
\textsuperscript{514} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{515} Coarelli 2009, 82.
\textsuperscript{516} Despite the lack of evidence the pertinence of this inscription to the *Equus Domitiani* seems to me quite plausible.
construction of the *Equus Domitiani* in the middle of the forum created a shocking effect. Such an explosive presence in a space primarily inhabited by monuments that celebrated the Republican past of Rome must have been perceived as a dramatic fracture with the Augustan and Flavian legacy.

As mentioned above, the description in the *Silvae* matches the image on a *sestertius* from A.D. 95-96\(^\text{517}\) that shows the emperor riding a horse with his right arm gesturing ahead, the horse’s right hoof on a severed head of a German as the personification of the Rhine (fig. 24). The dynamic of the pose creates a tension between mobility and immobility that, according to both Ahl and Newlands, is inborn in the ambiguous nature of the poem.\(^\text{518}\) Most significant is the clear idea of control over the enemies that is a *Leitmotiv* of Statius’ praise of Domitian’s politics. The portrait of Domitian as a restorer of order, whether through civic works or military action, is fully embodied in the bronze monument.\(^\text{519}\)

The severed German head representing the personification of the Rhine calls to mind the river Volturnus thanking Domitian for having built safe and sound banks within which the river can flow in an orderly fashion. More importantly, as Brian Rose pointed out, the presence of a German as a representation of the enemy was an anomaly in the Roman Forum, where only a few images of enemies are recorded, all of which were Parthians.\(^\text{520}\) In terms of triumphal imagery, this was a new addition to the forum, with perhaps the exception of the severed head of Cicero displayed on the rostra together with the severed heads of other alleged enemies. It would have formed quite a contrast with the peaceful looking Parthians on the arch and the Basilica Aemilia.

---

517 *BMC* 1021.5, *RIC* II.1 D 797, p. 324.
519 Ahl 1984, 92.
520 The images of the Parthians could be seen in the Basilica Aemilia, the arches of Augustus, Gaius, and later that of Septimius Severus, Rose 2005, 66
Statius’ text also hints at other aspects of the viewer’s experience that are worth analyzing. The construction of such an imposing equestrian statue required a massive task force that must have disrupted both the visual and acoustic experience of the forum.\footnote{521 See Reitz 2012, 332-341, for an interesting analysis of the sound experience and the speed of construction of the statue alluded to by Statius, in relation with the poetic mode of the panegyric.} Statius indicates that this disruption did not go on too long, as building the colossal statue was not a lengthy process, but he is vague.\footnote{522 Stat. Sil. I, I, 60-65: “Nec longae traxere morae. iuvat ipsa labores forma dei praesens, operique intenta juventus miratur plus posse manus. strepit ardua pulsu machina; continuus septem per culmina ventis it fragor et magnae figit vaga murmura Romae”. See also Reitz 2012, 335-339.} It is interesting to find in Statius’ poem the mention of the clashing sound that accompanied the construction of the statue and caused Curtius to rise from the mud in the nearby Lacus Curtius and, as already mentioned, marvel at the Equus.\footnote{523 Stat., Sil., I. I, 66-83.} Considering the latitude of Domitian’s building program in the city, the sound of construction might have been a constant aspect of the visitor’s perception of the city in almost every region of Rome for the entire 15 years of Domitian’s rule. This distinctive element of any construction activity, both in the ancient and contemporary cities, is not often hinted at in the poets’ work, but is a powerful indicator of how the city felt, looked, and sounded for the Roman resident under Domitian.

Finally, I would like to analyze the orientation of the Equus Domitiani according to Statius’ description in light of Domitian’s position within the Augustan and Flavian legacies. Statius makes it very clear that the Equus Domitiani was placed somewhere in the central sector of the forum looking toward the temple of the Divus Iulius (fig. 78). This peculiar aspect of the statue’s location has not caused any scholarly comment, especially by those\footnote{524 See Muth 2010 and Moormann forthcoming for instance.} who see in Domitian’s intervention in the Roman Forum a
continuation of the programs of Augustus and Vespasian. In fact, while this orientation seems to reflect a clear homage to Caesar, it also meant that the statue had its back toward the temple of the Divine Vespasian. I believe the reasons for this choice warrant closer scrutiny. In Statius’ line 30 the father simply sees the back of the statue, while Concordia, the adjacent temple, sees it and responds with a sweet expression. In other words, no “reaction” is noted for the temple of the divine Vespasian as opposed to the “smile” from Concordia.

There are no other comments in the poem about the location of the statue with respect to the temple of his father Vespasian. Statius’ silence might betray a certain uncertainty about the choice. In the chosen location, Domitian as triumphant general looks toward Caesar and Augustus as the founding fathers of Rome, and not his own. A direct comparison with Caesar is brought up by Statius with regard to the equestrian statue in the forum Iulium.

This comparison too, like the one with the Trojan horse, bears some ambivalent tones. In fact, the poet stresses how impossible it is not to appreciate how the two horses are as different as the two riders. In the current scholarship this choice is explained as a decision by Domitian to orient the Equus toward the Palatine where the rider would have gazed at one of his accomplishments: the Flavian imperial palace. But this explanation is not supported by the topography. The Flavian palace is not directly in front of the suggested location for the statue, but on its right side. To look toward the palace

---

525 Stat. Sil., I, 1, 31: “terga pater blandoque videt Concordia vultu”.
526 For the purpose of this analysis it suffices to place the statue somewhere in the center of the Roman Forum.
527 Stat. Silv., I, 84-90: “Cedat equus Latiae qui contra templo Diones Caesarei stat sede fori, quem traderis ausus Pellaeo, Lysippe, duci, max Caesaris ora mutata cervice tuit; vix lumine fesso explores quam longus in hunc despectus ab illo. Qui rudis usque adeo qui non, ut viderit ambos, tantum dicat equos quantum distare regents?”.
528 Thomas 2004, 31;
Domitian the rider would have needed to turn his head toward the right at an angle of about 45°, which is possible, but the most obvious visual connection was certainly with the temple of the *Divus Iulius*.

In fact, it is easy to forget, considering the poor state of preservation of the temple of the divine Caesar, that the elevation of this temple and other monuments in the forum would have partially hindered this view and, thus, made the connection with the imperial palace less explicit. Furthermore, the Arch of Titus would not have been on a direct visual axis or topographical alignment, while the Flavian amphitheatre and the *Meta Sudans* were too far away to constitute a perceptible connection. Therefore, the choice for the orientation of the *Equus Domitianus* does not seem to hint at any meaningful connection with the Flavians.

In order to fully comprehend the choice for this orientation, I would like to try to imagine the *Equus Domitianus* turned to the opposite side, toward the temple of his *divine* father Vespasian (fig. 79). In this way the dynastic connection would have been especially striking both because of the proximity of the two monuments and also because of the topographical arrangement. The temple stands on an elevated sector of the forum along the route toward the Capitoline hill, and in this setting would have appeared as if the deified father was looking after the son celebrating his triumph. Moreover, this orientation would have allowed the bronze rider to look toward one of his most lavish

---

529 See once again Stat., Silv., I.I.31 where he specifically describes the temple of the Divine Vespasian and the temple of Concordia as overlooking at his back, “terga pater blandoque videt Concordia vultu”.

530 Despite the gigantic size of the statue, the position of the temple on an elevated platform would have partly annulled the dwarfing effect of the equestrian monument, “ipse autem puro celsum caput aere saeptus tempula superfulgere et propsectare videris”, Stat. Sil., I. I, 32-33. According to Coarelli’s reconstruction the statue plus the basement would have reached a height of 18 m, whereas in the reconstruction in the Digital Roman Forum website the estimate eheight of the statue is between 12 and 16 m, http://www.digitales-forum-romanum.de/gebaeude/equus-domitianus/?lang=en. In the suggested non-historical reconstruction, fig. 25, the temple of the Divine Vespasian would tower over the statue for 15 m ca.
interventions, the restoration of the temple of *Jupiter Optimus Maximus* on the Capitoline hill, which represented the religious cradle of the Roman pantheon and served as the final destination of the emperor’s triumphal parade.531

In addition, the orientation toward the Capitoline hill would have also highlighted the connection with the other two temples dedicated to *Jupiter Conservator* and *Jupiter Custos* that we know Domitian built during his reign and that of his father, and which were especially significant for the emperor.532 Both choices of location would have offered Domitian the chance to create meaningful associations and to be perceived by the people of Rome as the legitimate bringer of order, triumph, and religious protection. Therefore, it is especially consequential that the last of the Flavians chose to associate his equestrian statue with the first of the Julio-Claudians. As already mentioned, Statius picks up on this cross-dynastic connection by highlighting the fact that the younger Flavian harkens back to the Julio-Claudians by comparing the *Equus Domitiani* with Caesar’s equestrian statue in his own forum.

He goes as far as saying that Caesar might learn from the gentle rider that is Domitian;533 though Domitian chooses to draw an association with Caesar, he also surpasses him. I believe the intention to tie Domitian to Caesar, whether in the building program or in Statius’ text, is to distance the *Equus* from the Augustan installations in the forum which were aimed at restoring Republican traditions, and which Vespasian did not dare to alter.534 Coarelli has correctly interpreted the placement of the *Equus* in the forum with its orientation as a disrupting element of the delicate balance between

---

532 Tac., *Hist.*, 3.74, see below section III.d.
533 Sta., Sil., I. 1., 25-28: “discit et e vultu quantum tu mitior armis, qui nec in externos facilis saevire furores das Cattis Dacisque fidem: te signa ferente et minor in leges iret gener et Cato castris”.
534 For instance, the completion of the *Curia Iulia*, the restoration of the temple of Castor, temple of Saturn, temple of Concord, temple of Vesta, the *Rostra*, *Basilica Aemilia-Paulli*, the construction of the *Basilica Iulia*, the temple of the Divine Caesar.
imperial and Republican powers that the Augustan and Vespasianic topography was able to maintain.\footnote{Coarelli 2009, 82-83.}

As we have seen, the forum was inhabited by several equestrian and honorary statues, so another equestrian statue should have been perceived as a legitimate addition. When Statius himself deemed the \textit{Equus} appropriately located,\footnote{Stat., \textit{Sil.}, 22-24: \textit{``par operi sedes hinc obvia limina pandit, qui fessus bellis adscitae munere prolis primus iter nostris ostendit in aethera divis''}.} perhaps he meant to gesture to the proliferation of equestrian statues in the forum. However, the characteristics of the \textit{Equus Domitiani} point to the exceptionality of this monument, particularly in this setting. The size, orientation, and iconography make this an extravagant equestrian monument, for no other statue in the forum can be compared to it. Suzanne Muth argued that in following the previous tradition of honorary statues Domitian did not break with his predecessors, while the scale of the monument is to be understood in light of the size of the open piazza in the center of the forum.\footnote{Muth 2010, 491-93.}

The first part of this argument has already been discussed and Statius’ rhetorical stratagems in the description of the size of the statue clearly betray the fear of criticism. As a further indication of the scale of the \textit{equus} as an intentional break with tradition it is important to remember that Vespasian had very openly rejected the idea of a costly colossal statue in his honor.\footnote{Suet., \textit{Vesp.}, 23.3, \textit{``Nuntiantis legatos decretam ei publice non mediocris summae statuam colosseam, iussit vel continuo ponere, cavam manum ostentans et paratam basim dicens''.}} When we think of the scale of the \textit{Equus Domitiani} as appropriate and proportioned for the open Roman Forum, we assume that Domitian did not have any other choice and that is not the case. Since the construction of the \textit{forum Iulium} the location of the equestrian statue in front of the temple was the most appropriate choice. Augustus chose not to have a similar statue in his own forum and

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Coarelli 2009, 82-83.
\item Stat., \textit{Sil.}, 22-24: \textit{``par operi sedes hinc obvia limina pandit, qui fessus bellis adscitae munere prolis primus iter nostris ostendit in aethera divis''}.
\item Muth 2010, 491-93.
\item Suet., \textit{Vesp.}, 23.3, \textit{``Nuntiantis legatos decretam ei publice non mediocris summae statuam colosseam, iussit vel continuo ponere, cavam manum ostentans et paratam basim dicens''}.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
remained content with the equestrian statue that honored him as Octavian (not Augustus) at the rostra, while an Equus Traiani would be built later in Trajan’s forum.

The most logical, appropriate location for the colossal Equus Domitiani would have been in the forum Transitorium or even in the larger forum that remained unfinished in the area later occupied by the forum of Trajan. Instead, Domitian chose the forum Romanum with the intention of disrupting the Republican tradition by having the equestrian statue of an emperor of a colossal size representing a German and with his back to his divine father in the center of the Roman Forum. The scale would have dwarfed every other statue.

In addition, we still have to explain Servius’ mention of the removal of the honorary statues of Augustus and Agrippa to the Capitoline from the forum. Palombi has argued that the archaeological traces earlier misinterpreted as those of the Equus Domitiani are instead the traces of the honorary columns of Augustus and Agrippa, and their removal might have been occurred on the occasion of the construction of Domitian’s statue. If this argument is correct, then there cannot be any doubt about Domitian’s intentional break with Augustus. The choice of this highly symbolic location, the monumentality of the image, and the removal of Republican honorary statues that might be seen as visual competition would have made the Equus one of the most striking additions to the Roman Forum during the Flavian period.

---

539 Serv. G., 3. 29: “ac navali surgentes aere columnas dicit, quae in honore Augusti et Agrippae rostratae constitutae sunt. Augustus victor totius Aegypti, quam Caesar pro parte superaverat, multa de navali certamine sustulit rostra, quibus conflatis quattuor effecit columnas, quae postea a Domitiano in Capitolio sunt locatae, quas hodieque conspicimus”.


541 Contra Thomas 2004 who takes Statius’ presentation of this setting as appropriate quite literally, Thomas 2004, 24-25.
As we have seen, the location and orientation of the *Equus Domitiani* were far from what was considered appropriate for an equestrian statue. The fact that this was one of the first Domitianic monuments to be dismantled, and the vivid, emotionally charged description of its destruction that we read in Pliny the Younger\(^{542}\) indicate that the immediate reaction to the construction of the *Equus* must have been one of discontent. A trivial, satirical tone is found in a possible reference to the destruction of the statue in one of Martial’s epigrams. Rodriguez Almeida has interpreted a less than positive comment toward Lydia in epigram XI, 21\(^{543}\) (*Lydia tam laxa est, equitis quam culus aheni*) as an allusion to one of the stages of the *equus*’ destruction, in which the large bronze aperture in the horse’s buttocks would be revealed.\(^{544}\) In other words, one could interpret this as a satire on the appearance of such a monumental image.

Domitian’s interventions in the Roman Forum included the transfer of *Moneta* to the building identified underneath the church of San Clemente and the *aerarium*, whose functions were probably replaced by the administrative building known as *Vigna Barberini* on the Palatine. These actions, as we have seen,\(^{545}\) are to be interpreted as revolutionary commentaries on traditional Republican institutions. The construction of the *Equus Domitiani* fits perfectly within this scenario.

---

542 Plin., *Pan.*, 52: *Iuvabat illidere solo superbissimos vultus, instare ferro, saevire securibus, ut si singulos ictus sanguis dolorque sequeretur. Nemo tam temperans gaudii seraque laetitiae, quin instar ultionis videretur, cernere laceros artus, truncata membra, postremo truces horrendasque imaginis abiectas, excocatasque flamnis; ut ex illo terrore et minis in usum hominum ac voluptates ignibus mutarentur.*

543 Mart., *Epigr.*, XI, 21: *Lydia tam laxa est, equitis quam culus aheni*/ *Quam celer arguto qui sonat aere trochus,*/ *Quam rota transmisso totiens inpacta petauro,*/ *Quam vetus a crassa calceus udus aqua,*/ *Quam quae rara vagos expectant retia turdos,*/ *Quam Pompeiano vela negata noto*/ *Quam quae de pthisco lapsa est armil la cinaedo/ Cului Leuconico quam viduata suo*/ *Quam veteres bracae Britonis pauperis, et quam*/ *Turpe Ravennatis guttur onocrotali,*/ *Hanc piscinam dicor futuisse marina,*/ *Nescio; piscinam me futuisse.*


545 See section III.j.6 in this chapter.
III.f Another Domitianic fountain? The so-called “Marforio”

Both archaeological and literary evidence points to the area around the Republican Comitium (fig. 78) as the original site of the massive statue that can be seen today in the courtyard of the Palazzo Nuovo in the Capitoline Museums, which is widely known as “Marforio” (fig. 81). The sculpture in Carrara marble depicts a semi-recumbent bearded male figure leaning on his left elbow above a rocky surface. The careful finish of the statue has been compared to that of the personifications of the Nile and Tiber from the temple of Isis in the Campus Martius, both of which have been attributed to the Domitianic restoration after the fire of A.D. 80.546 In the center of the statue, the mouth of a mask served as the faucet for the water. The original site of discovery is the area of the republican Comitium, near the church of St. Martina, and listed in the sources since medieval times.547 The first mention of the statue is in the Einsiedeln manuscript, where the colossal statue is listed in one of the pilgrim itineraries.548 The toponym locus Marforii is present in documents from the 15th and 16th centuries with identical topographical references.549 The Marforio was then moved to the Capitoline hill in 1588 for a fountain that was built in 1594 by Giacomo della Porta.550

The statue was associated in the sources and old prints with a large granite labrum, 6 m in diameter, which matches the length of the recumbent figure and was found in the same area in 1588.551 The labrum was later moved to the so-called Campo Vaccino (area around the Temple of the Dioscuri in the Forum Romanum) under the orders of Sixtus V (1585-1590). The labrum is today part of a monumental fountain built

546 Coarelli 2009, 510.
548 Ibid.
549 Ibid.
in 1817 in piazza del Quirinale, also featuring statues of the Dioscuri that were positioned next to the Augustan obelisk that had already been moved to this piazza in 1786 (fig. 82).552

The statue falls in the category of personifications of rivers of which numerous examples are known. The identification of the statue and the origins of the name have sparked a debate since the Middle Ages.553 For instance, according to Poggio Bracciolini, the name originated from “Martis forum”, while Andrea Fulvio in 1527 suggested “Mar Fluvius.”554 In 1544 Bartolomeo Marliani proposed an interesting identification with the Rhine, in relation to the construction of the Equus Domitianus in the forum. However, the statue is currently regarded as a personification of the Tiber, which would be fitting in the area of the Comitium, a repository of memories evoking the Republic.555 Finally, a late Flavian date for the statue has been suggested by several scholars on the grounds of style. Du Jardin has extensively analyzed several examples of river gods and found decisive elements in favor of a Flavian date.556 In addition, Du Jardin also saw a similarity in the tiny representation of the Jordan River from the frieze on the arch of Titus.557

If the stylistic arguments are correct, a fountain in this sector of the Roman Forum would fit perfectly with Domitian’s building program in other areas, such as the Imperial fora and the Palatine. In fact, water features could be considered a sort of signature of the last of the Flavians.558 Examples include a water feature in an exedra on

555 Ibid.
556 Du Jardin 1932-33.
558 Vespasian’s interest in water installations was limited to the restorations on the Meta Sudans and the shallow euripi in the Templum Pacis.
the southeast side of the Templum Pacis, the so-called Domitianic Terrace in the area later occupied by the forum of Trajan, which was meant as a monumental termination of the Aqua Marcia aqueduct, and transformation into a nympaeum of the Porticus Absidata at the northern entrance of the forum Domitian. In fact, the water features that Domitian introduced in the imperial palace directed the guests along preconceived routes while providing the visitor with an ever-changing landscape. The role of river personifications within Domitian’s cultural and political program is also highlighted by the fact that, for the first time, these appear frequently on coins struck by the mint of Rome. The evidence for the provenance of the “Marforio” statue and the associated labrum is based on the numerous references in medieval and later documents, while a date within Domitian’s reign has been widely accepted. It is then plausible to imagine another Domitianic fountain in what had been the heart of Republican Rome.

III.g Horrea

In the area of the Roman Forum, prior to the Flavians, only one horreum is known from the literary and archaeological evidence: the Augustan-era horrea Agrippiana. This complex was built by Agrippa just outside the core of the forum, to the south of the temple of the Dioscuri. With the construction of the Templum Pacis by Vespasian and the forum Domitiani, the area once occupied by the Republican Macellum was almost completely filled by the new imperial spaces. Along two sides of the Sacra Via the archaeological remains of two symmetrical buildings have been
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559 See Nocera 2015 and the chapter on the Imperial fora in this work for a detailed analysis of these two monuments.
560 See the chapter on the Palatine for this interpretation of the palace’s space.
561 Papini 2010, 13, 17 footnote no. 27.
563 Nocera 2015. See also the relevant sections in the chapter dedicated to the Imperial Fora, II.c, II.g.
identified as horrea. To the east of the Atrium Vestae a series of modular rooms were built over thick deposits that in turn lay over the ashes of the A.D. 64 fire; these have been identified as the horrea Vespasiani mentioned in the Chronographer of A.D. 354 as examples of Domitian’s public works. Concrete foundations were poured during the principate of Vespasian, but it was only during the reign of Domitian that the building was completed and it became a commercial center.

On the other side of the road a similar complex is found to the southeast of the Templum Pacis. These horrea too are mentioned in the Chronographer, as “horrea Piperataria ubi modo est basilica Constantiniana” (fig. 83). Both buildings exploited the remains of some Neronian foundations as well as the urban planning that Nero had already envisioned for the area. We know from the sources that the horrea Piperataria were intended to house the spice market, used as ingredients in medicines as well as food, and to provide storage space that was used by the imperial liberti or rented out. It is therefore plausible to imagine, as Houston does, that Galen, in the 2nd century A.D., would have kept here ingredients for medicines and a copy of his De compositione medicamentorum per genera, as Galen’s accounts of losing this material to the fire of 192 A.D. indicate. The horrea Piperataria burned down again in the fire of 283 A.D. and were completely obliterated by the later construction of the Basilica Constantiniana. They were first unearthed in the 1899 excavations by Lanciani and
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564 Chronogr. a. 354, 146 M.
566 Atlante I, 295.
567 Chronogr. a. 354, 146 M.
568 Piranomonte 1996 (LTUR III), 45.
570 Houston 2004, 48; Tucci 2013, 293.
Hülsen, and in the late 1940s by Barosso. The most recent investigations in an adjacent area are by Capodimonte and Piranomonte, and were published in 1988. The horrea Vespasiani were substantially modified and transformed under Hadrian following his interventions on the slope of the Palatine that overlooks the forum.

III.h The temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus

Damaged by fire and lightning numerous times, the Capitoline Hill was the sacred heart of the ancient city. The archaeological remains here encompass a period from the construction of the Servian walls in the 6th century B.C. to Late Antiquity, and they are difficult to read for several reasons. On the one hand, the presence of the Medieval and Renaissance buildings such as the Palazzo Senatorio and the Palazzo dei Conservatori that frame Michelangelo’s piazza prevent archaeologists from accessing the lower levels; on the other, the few excavations undertaken in the 19th century do not provide adequate documentation and interpretation of the limited data that was gathered.

The temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus was originally built on the southern section of the Capitoline hill (fig. 84) in the 6th century B.C. Remains of the temple foundations in Cappellaccio tuff are still visible today, especially in the new arrangement of the Museo Nuovo of the Capitoline Museums. The massive Tuscan temple stood on a foundation roughly 62 x 53 m, and it originally housed a seated statue of Jupiter,

572 Piranomonte 1996 (LTUR III), 45-46.
573 Ibid.
576 Tagliamonte 1993, LTUR I, 228.
577 Arata 2010, 117.
578 Tagliamonte 1993, LTUR I, 145.
reportedly executed by the famous Etruscan artist Vulca, which showed him holding a thunderbolt in his right hand.

Note that the cult statue of Divus Vespasian was modeled on this one, as was that of Divus Augustus (but not Divus Julius Caesar).\textsuperscript{579} Since the very beginning, the temple was dedicated to the Capitoline triad, including Juno and Minerva, whose images were also included in the tripartite \textit{cella}. The temple suffered many fires followed by restorations undertaken by prominent public figures, such as Sulla after the fire of 83 B.C., but the weight of religious tradition caused the temple always to be restored on the original foundations and according to its original style, even though the walls and columns had become stone by the late Republic.\textsuperscript{580} The temple of \textit{Jupiter Optimus Maximus} was, in fact, the perfect example of Roman religious conservatism. Rebuilt and restored many times, it was always reconstructed with strict limitations on the changes allowed.\textsuperscript{581}

After the civil war that preceded the rise to power of Vespasian, and the firing of the Capitol in the siege by the Vitellians, the temple of \textit{Jupiter Optimus Maximus} needed to be reconstructed. The first Flavian reconstruction appeared on several Vespasianic coins (fig. 85).\textsuperscript{582} This restoration of the temple maintained the original design as a hexastyle temple with three rows of columns on the front and one on the sides. Scant archaeological traces of this first Flavian reconstruction can be identified on some sections of the surviving substructures of the temple.\textsuperscript{583}

The fire of A.D. 80 spread to the Capitoline hill and destroyed once again the temple of \textit{Jupiter Optimus Maximus} just a few years after Vespasian's reconstruction.

---

\textsuperscript{579} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{580} De Angeli 1993, \textit{LTUR} III, 149.
\textsuperscript{581} Perry 2013, 176-187.
\textsuperscript{582} De Angeli 1993, \textit{LTUR} III, 148-153.
\textsuperscript{583} De Angeli 1993, \textit{LTUR} III, 151.
We know from Plutarch that the temple, the fourth version, was completed and consecrated by Domitian,\textsuperscript{584} while Dio, on the other hand, mentions that Titus supervised the restoration of the parts of the Capitoline that were destroyed.\textsuperscript{585} It is plausible that Titus was the emperor who inaugurated the temple’s restoration,\textsuperscript{586} which was certainly completed by Domitian.\textsuperscript{587} Unfortunately, the temple suffered several subsequent misfortunes. It was allegedly struck by lightning in 96 and later under Septimius Severus in 217 and 222, which prompted further restorations. By 400 the building had weathered badly, after which its magnificent revetment became a quarry for construction material or was spoliated during barbarian attacks.\textsuperscript{588}

Due to the intense building activity on the Capitoline, traces of Domitian’s temple are almost completely obliterated. The references to it in the sources, numismatic evidence, and historical reliefs are the only way toward a picture of this memorable restoration. While the general scheme of the temple as hexastyle\textsuperscript{589} and Corinthian was maintained, it was the glittering, expensive quality of the Domitianic version that was mostly addressed by the ancient authors. We know from Zosimus and Procopius that the doors and the bronze roof tiles were gilded.\textsuperscript{590} Plutarch is very critical of Domitian’s expenditure for the restoration, which amounted to 12,000 talents.\textsuperscript{591} He is almost sarcastic about the use of Pentelic marble columns from Athens that Domitian utilized, probably following Sulla’s spoliation of marble columns from the Olympeion in Athens to

\textsuperscript{584} Plut. Publ., 15. 3-4.
\textsuperscript{585} Dio, 66.24.1-2.
\textsuperscript{586} This event is mentioned in the inscription of the Fratres Arvales, CIL VI 20159. 12-13, while the temple is depicted in a coin from AD 80, RIC II, 128 N.102.
\textsuperscript{587} See De Angeli 1993, LTUR III, 151 for a comprehensive list of sources attributing the completion of the temple to Domitian.
\textsuperscript{588} De Angeli 1993, LTUR III, 152-53.
\textsuperscript{589} DH, AR, IV, 61.
\textsuperscript{590} Zos., V, 38; Procop. BV, III, 5.4.
\textsuperscript{591} Plut., Publ, 15.3-4
decorate his own version of the Capitoline temple.\footnote{592} In Plutarch’s eyes their proportions did not fit the temple, and caused them to lose their elegance and beauty.\footnote{593} Apparently Plutarch considered the gilding so outrageous that he compared Domitian to the famous Phrygian king Midas.\footnote{594} However, this judgment may well be derived from bias since the use of lavish materials had already been attested for earlier temple restorations.

We know from Pliny that in 296/5 B.C. the thresholds were replaced with bronze and a quadriga, probably of bronze as well, was placed on the roof,\footnote{595} replacing the terracotta Jupiter in a quadriga famously described by Livy.\footnote{596} Among the other Republican improvements involving lavish materials were gilded shields that were affixed to the pediment in 193 B.C.,\footnote{597} while a few years later white stucco was put on the columns\footnote{598} and a mosaic floor was added to the cella of the temple.\footnote{599} Most remarkable are the descriptions of one of the most significant restorations of the temple carried out by Sulla after the destruction of 83 B.C. Dionysios mentions the use of extravagant materials\footnote{600} intended as an upgrade.\footnote{601} More details about costly materials can be read in Pliny, who indicates the presence of gilded roof tiles and Sulla’s replacement of the burned columns with marble ones imported from the Olympicion in Athens.\footnote{602} Therefore, it seems like Domitian’s renovation was not characterized by an
unprecedented lavishness. To compose a more accurate idea of the appearance of Domitian’s temple we must turn to numismatic evidence and historical reliefs.

Two coin types most likely depict the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus in the Domitianic version. A cistophorus of A.D. 82 shows the temple as tetrastyle with three figures, one male seated in the center and two standing females to the sides, while the pediment bears an articulated decoration. The Capitoline temple is also shown on an undated denarius where the temple is depicted as hexastyle with three figures inside. The difference in the number of columns might be due to the fact that columns would often be omitted in depictions of a temple on a coin to show the statues inside. The numismatic evidence also confirms Domitian’s habit of putting only his own name on the buildings he completed or restored, deliberately erasing the memory of any previous intervention.

The architectural decoration of the pediment and the fastigium of the temple is better understood through evidence found on the so-called relief of the Extispicium in the Louvre (fig. 86) and on one of the Marcus Aurelius panels in the Capitoline Museums (fig. 88). Both reliefs depict the Capitoline temple and show several details of the decoration. The missing parts of the Extispicium can be reliably restored from Renaissance drawings. The fragments of the relief were discovered in the area of the eastern hemicycle of the forum of Trajan in 1540. In 1576 P. Jacques drafted a copy of both the main fragments, including the parts with the winged Victory and the currently missing section with the façade of the temple. In addition, the Renaissance drawings

603 Darwall-Smith 1996, 106.
605 Suet., Dom., 5: omnia sub titulo tantum suo ac sine ulla pristini auctoris memoria.
606 See Tortorella 1988 for a detailed history of the discovery and analysis of the relief.
607 Tortorella 1988, 475.
shown in the *Codex Vaticanus Latinus* 3439 (fig. 87), the *Codex Coburgensis*, and the *Codex Berolinensis* provide other significant details.\(^{608}\)

The visual evidence for the Domitianic version of the temple, which did last with minor repairs until the Severan restoration, allows us to reconstruct a hexastyle temple with a pediment decorated with an elaborate composition. Jupiter occupied the center as a young, beardless god seated above an eagle and between Juno and Minerva, both of whom were represented *capite velato*. As Tortorella points out, the author of the relief might have mistaken Minerva’s helmet for the veil,\(^{609}\) which is perfectly appropriate for Juno. To the left and right, respectively, the *bigae* with *Luna* and *Sol* are represented moving towards the divine triad. Then, in the drawing by P. Jacques, a Cyclops forging Jupiter’s thunderbolt is depicted on the right followed by a recumbent figure, while on the left there is a male figure probably holding a *pedum* in his right hand.\(^{610}\)

However, a comparison with the details appearing in the Marcus Aurelius relief (‘pietas Augusti’) shows that the author of the *Extispicium* might have simplified the decoration of the temple by omitting several figures while misunderstanding others. From the Antonine relief we can reconstruct smaller figures underneath the triad who might be identified with Hercules or Ganymede on the left, and Salus or Aesculapius on the right.\(^{611}\) Moreover, to the left of *Luna* there is a seated female figure, perhaps *Tellus*, while on the right, after the *biga* of *Sol*, there is a male figure who could be identified with Vulcan.\(^{612}\) The acroterial decoration is consistently represented as showing a central
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\(^{608}\) Tortorella 1988, 475-76.

\(^{609}\) Tortorella 1988, 477.

\(^{610}\) Ibid.

\(^{611}\) Tortorella 1988, 477.

\(^{612}\) Tortorella 1988, 479-80.
quadriga occupied by Jupiter, with either Venus or Minerva to the right followed by Mars and a *biga*, whereas to the left there is a fragmentary female figure.\textsuperscript{613}

In sum, the archaeological evidence for this Domitianic contribution to Roman religious architecture does not allow for an accurate assessment. The literary and numismatic evidence, along with the marble reliefs, attests to a costly intervention that was neither unexpected nor unprecedented for what was perhaps the single most important temple in Rome. The lack of remains prevents the evaluation of certain stylistic choices that were criticized by some sources. Nonetheless, the survival of Domitian’s temple of *Jupiter Optimus Maximus* until the Severan restoration testifies to a relatively well received intervention, despite the occasional criticism.

### III.i The temple of Jupiter *Conservator/Custos*

> “Domitianus prima inruptione apud aedituum occultatus, sollertia liberti lineo amicitu turbæ sacrícolarum immixtus ignoratusque, apud Cornelium Primum paternum clientem iúxta Velabrum delítuit. Ac potiente rerum patre, disiecto aeditui contubernio, modicum sacellum Iovi Conservatori aramque posuit casus suos in marmore expressam; mox imperium adeptus Iovi Custodi templum ingens seque in sinu dei sacravit.”\textsuperscript{614}

Tacitus is the only ancient author who mentions the construction of two temples to Jupiter by Domitian. The first one, a *modicum* temple, was dedicated to *Jupiter Conservator* as a personal thank offering to the god who allowed Domitian to survive the bloody clash in December A.D. 69. It was built in the vicinity of the house of the

\textsuperscript{613} Tortorella 1988, 480.
\textsuperscript{614} Tac., *Hist.*, 3.74.
custodian of a temple, perhaps of Isis,\textsuperscript{615} that let Domitian hide from the Vitellian forces. Scenes from that December decorated a marble altar that was placed near the temple.

The second, \textit{ingens} temple was built later, when Domitian became emperor, and it represented a more substantial honor toward the god who saved his life. This temple was dedicated to \textit{Jupiter Custos}, and according to Tacitus, it contained a seated image of Jupiter holding Domitian on his lap. This is in itself an extraordinary feature of this sacred building.

Despite the obvious importance of both building projects within Domitian’s program of religious architecture, the archaeological evidence for the temples is at best scanty. Several scholars have analyzed some problematic remains on the \textit{Arx} and attempted to identify the remains, but their conclusions are not certain.\textsuperscript{616}

Arata has hypothetically linked the temple of \textit{Jupiter Conservator} to several remains on the \textit{Arx} at the ground level of the Capitoline Museums. These remains can be described as a small, elongated building with an apse on its northwest end and semicircular and rectangular niches on at least one side (fig. 89).\textsuperscript{617} The building was brought to light in 1833 as part of a restoration project launched by Gregory XVI aimed at building a room to house the Capitoline Venus.\textsuperscript{618} As Arata points out, it is hard to

\textsuperscript{615} See Wiseman 1978 for a discussion on the topographical location of the events of AD 69 on the northern \textit{Arx Capitolina} and for the possible location of a \textit{sacellum}/temple to Isis nearby.

\textsuperscript{616} Giannelli was the first to systematically study and date these remains (Giannelli 1978); Arata has identified the small \textit{sacellum of Jupiter Conservator} in some remains in the basement of the Capitoline Museum (Arata 1997), he also identified the temple of \textit{Jupiter Custos} in the remains of two foundations in \textit{opus caementicum} in the garden of the Ara Caeli (Arata 2010): Tucci instead does not believe that those foundations could belong to a temple (Tucci 2006); von Hesberg interprets the same concrete foundations as belonging to the temple of Honos and Virtus (von Hesberg 1995).

\textsuperscript{617} Arata 1997.

\textsuperscript{618} Arata 1997, 130.
explain why these remains were ignored by previous descriptions of the area, such as those of Lanciani, Colini, and Lugli.\footnote{Arata 1997 129-30.}

The building shows at least two different phases. The first one can be dated to the early Flavian period based on the building technique, while the second phase features a drastic modification of the elevation and the addition of a black and white mosaic with wall frescoes that suggest a Hadrianic date.\footnote{Arata 1997, 140.} The architectural format seems to indicate a small \textit{(modicum)} temple with niches to house cultic statues. The substantial modifications in the second phase justify the identification with a public cultic space rather than a private \textit{sacellum}.\footnote{Arata 1997, 152-53.} Arata’s cautious hypothesis is tempting and seems, at the moment, like the most plausible identification.\footnote{See also Filippi 2012 in Atlante 1, who accepts Arata’s identification.}

It is even harder to identify any remains belonging to the second, \textit{inges} temple that Domitian built to honor \textit{Jupiter Custos} on the Capitoline hill. Suetonius reports the construction of a new \textit{aedes} there, while Tacitus mentions the cult statue of Jupiter with Domitian on his lap.\footnote{Tac., \textit{Hist.}, 3.74.} Despite various attempts, no secure identifications can be made. There have been attempts to identify the temple of Jupiter Custos in coins or reliefs. Castagnoli suggested identifying the temple as the first building on the right in one of the panels from the tomb of the Haterii.\footnote{Castagnoli 1941, 67-69.} Other scholars proposed an identification with the building represented on one panel in the attic of Trajan’s arch in Benevento. Alternatively, another hypothesis associates the temple of Jupiter Custos with the building next to the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the \textit{Pietas} relief of Marcus

\footnote{Castagnoli 1941, 67-69.}
Aurelius in the Capitoline Museums. None of these hypotheses is grounded on solid evidence. However, the presence of a frieze decorated with a series of sacrificial implements on the temple depicted in the Haterii relief might strengthen slightly Castagnoli’s hypothesis. Building details in this relief, which shows multiple Flavian buildings, some Domitianic, are clearly artists’ license sometimes, but if this detail is accurate it fits period practice. In fact, other Domitianic buildings such as the temple of the Divine Vespasian in the forum, possibly the frieze of the temple of Minerva in the forum Domitiani, and a fragment of architrave from the possible Domitianic restoration of the temple in Via delle Botteghe Oscure represents a sequence of ritual objects.

A controversial hypothesis was developed by Arata, who identified two almost parallel concrete foundations in the Ara Coeli Garden on the Arx (fig. 90) as the possible substructures of a temple foundation. The building technique in opus caementicium with fragments of travertine and marble is similar, though not identical, to the construction technique of the podium of the temple of the Divine Vespasian. The late Flavian date of the concrete foundations abutting a sector of the Republican tufa wall led Arata to identify in the foundations the remains of the Domitianic temple to Jupiter Custos. According to this hypothesis, the temple would have been oriented toward the Roman Forum with a façade roughly 20 m wide and a pronaoos built over chambers supported by the concrete foundations. The size of this reconstruction would justify Tacitus’ description of the temple as ingens, while the location, just to the south of the
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625 See Reusser 1996, LTUR III, 231-32, for a summary of the various suggestions of identification.
626 See section III.a.2 in this chapter.
627 See chapter II, section c.2.
628 De Angeli 1992, 141, footnote no. 386 with bibliography.
629 Arata 2010, 140.
630 Arata 2010, 144-45.
631 Arata 2010, 145.
sanctuary of Isis, fits the historical context of the dedication, wherein Domitian hid in the house of the Iseum’s custodian.\textsuperscript{632}

As mentioned earlier, however, this hypothesis has not received wide approval. Tucci does not believe that these foundations can belong to a temple podium.\textsuperscript{633} He points out that they are not perfectly parallel and not even perfectly perpendicular to the Republican tufa wall, and might therefore belong to an unidentified public building.\textsuperscript{634} For Filippi the identification with the temple of \textit{Jupiter Custos} is problematic because the foundations seem to belong to a restoration rather than a new construction, as stated by Tacitus.\textsuperscript{635} Therefore, Filippi hypothetically placed the temple on a spot north of the sanctuary of Isis, but no evidence was given for this hypothesis.\textsuperscript{636} Though more problematic than the identification of the temple of \textit{Jupiter Conservator}, Arata’s hypothesis for this second temple is still, in my opinion, the most plausible.

\textbf{III.j Flavian projects in the Velia, Circus Maximus, and the Valley of the Colosseum}

In the following subchapters I will describe projects that fall under different categories. Two arches were dedicated to Titus, one to celebrate his Jewish Wars triumph while he was alive and a second one to commemorate his apotheosis. The first one was built on the hemicycle of the Circus Maximus at the initiative of the Senate, but was certainly finished by Domitian; what have been considered its remains have been the

\textsuperscript{632} Tac., \textit{Hist.}, 3.74.
\textsuperscript{633} Tucci 2006, 21.
\textsuperscript{634} Tucci 2006, 13; according to Arata the imperfect parallelism and perpendicularity is due to the fact that the foundations were meant to reinforce the existing wall and that the excavation around the foundations accentuated these irregularities, Arata 2010, 144-45.
\textsuperscript{635} Filippi 2012 in Atlante 1, 175.
\textsuperscript{636} Filippi 2012 in Atlante 1, 175 and 203, note no. 789.
subject of recent excavations.\textsuperscript{637} The second and now better known arch on the Velia Hill, along the Via Sacra, largely intact, was instead built by Domitian after Titus’ death in 81, as can be inferred by the dedicatory inscription to Divus Titus.\textsuperscript{638}

To the northeast of this Sacra Via arch a series of projects were developed by the Flavians, which Domitian completed with diligence after his father’s and brother’s deaths. As mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, the entire Valley of the Colosseum, or \textit{Regio III} according to the Augustan division, was devoted to the construction of public buildings aimed at defining the Flavians’ political agenda in contrast to that of Nero, who appropriated areas occupied by private residences.\textsuperscript{639} In fact, every single part of the Domus Aurea and the Domus Transitoria on the Palatine were demolished and built over by Flavian public buildings with the objective of giving back to the citizens of Rome this core section of the city both de facto and symbolically.

In addition, on the western slopes of the Palatine, Vespasian took care of restoring the temple of the Divine Claudius, partially concealed by Nero’s monumental nymphaeum,\textsuperscript{640} and a second small sanctuary of Flavian date has been recently identified to the east.\textsuperscript{641} This temple has been associated with the Republican sacred area of the \textit{Curiae Veteres} whose reconstruction by the Flavians fit perfectly within Vespasian’s policy of creating a connection with the traditional past of Rome. These Flavian projects in the valley, which include the Colosseum, a monumental fountain known as the \textit{Meta Sudans}, and a series of gladiatorial schools and functional buildings known as \textit{ludi}, can

\textsuperscript{637} See Pergola, Coletta 2014; John Humphrey 1986, 97-100; Darwall-Smith 1996, 95-96.
\textsuperscript{638} \textit{CIL VI} 945=\textit{ILS} 265. It may be represented on the Tomb of the Haterii relief, late Flavian or Trajanic, as the arch labeled ‘arcus in sacra via summa’; for the monument, see Kleiner 1992. 196-99.
\textsuperscript{639} Mart., \textit{Epigr.}, 2.8.
\textsuperscript{640} Suet., \textit{Vesp.}, 9.1; Darwall-Smith 1996, 48-55; Panella 2013, 115.
\textsuperscript{641} Panella 2013, 118-123.
be categorized as truly Flavian, as each of the three members of the imperial dynasty were involved.

The one exception to this view is the *Moneta*, the new state mint that Domitian transferred to this area from the traditional location in the temple of Saturn in the Forum Romanum. Archaeologically, the building related to Moneta has been identified just to the southeast of the *Ludus Magnus*, the main gladiatorial training school. In fact, this seems to have been a Domitianic initiative which has been interpreted as an act of opposition to tradition according to which the state mint was meant to be in the Roman Forum. As we will see, the archaeological evidence allows only for a partial reconstruction of this structure. Each building in the Valley of the Colosseum will be briefly described in relation to the involvement of Domitian and in contrast to his more personal building program for the entire city.

III.h.1 *The Arches of Titus on The Via Sacra and the Circus Maximus*

Two monuments were dedicated to Titus: the commemorative arch on the Via Sacra (fig. 91), and the honorary arch on the curved side of the Circus Maximus figs. 95, 96). The two monuments differ substantially for several reasons. The first arch is a fully Domitianic project which was carried out after Titus’s death, perhaps between AD 82 and 90, and which celebrated not only his earthly achievements — the conquest of Jerusalem — but also his apotheosis. The arch on the Circus Maximus, on the other
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642 Coarelli 2009, 77-80.
644 See Pergola, Coletta 2014, 344, note no. 2 for details on the archaeological and epigraphic bibliography on this arch; also Marcattili 2009, 221-233.
645 Arce 1993 (*LTUR*), 110.
hand, was a typical honorary arch intended to glorify Titus’s triumph, and was dedicated immediately before his death in AD 81, but finished under Domitian. Though primarily a project of Titus, the arch in the Circus Maximus will be here included in light of the latest archaeological discoveries, which indicate a clear Domitianic signature in the style of its decoration.

III.h.2 The arch of Titus on the Via Sacra: a monumental gateway at the service of Flavian topography

A landmark in the ancient and modern city, the arch of Titus stands on the saddle between the Velia and the Palatine hill and was in visual dialogue with other crucial elements of the Flavian building program: the Flavian Amphitheatre and the Meta Sudans in the Valley of the Colosseum to the east, and the larger arch built by Domitian on the Clivus Palatinus to the south, on the way toward the imperial palace. As a passageway, the arch of Titus directed the traffic to and from the Via Sacra and also toward the Palatine hill. As a commemoration of Titus’ apotheosis, it occupied a special place between his father’s and brother’s most grandiose accomplishments: the Colosseum, whose own main portal was configured like a triumphal arch with the quadriga of Vespasian and Titus upon it, and the imperial palace.

647 The excavations carried out on the curved side of the Circus Maximus in 2009-15 directed by M. Buonfiglio for the Soprintendenza Capitolina, yielded significant fragments of the architectural decoration of the arch of Titus. Some preliminary results were published by S. Pergola and A. Coletta in 2014, however a new, more detailed analysis of other fragments, among which there are Domitianic Corinthian capitals, is forthcoming by A. Coletta and S. Pergola in a new volume of the Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma with the title “Nuovi dati per una proposta di ricostruzione dell’arco di Tito al Circo Massimo”.
648 Ibid.
649 According to Coarelli this arch does not occupy the Summa Sacra Via indicated in the relief from the tomb of the Haterii, therefore the arch depicted in the relief is not the arch of Titus, Coarelli 1983, 19-21, 27-29, contra Pfanner 1983, Kleiner 1990.
After some scholarly debate generated by stylistic similarities between this arch and the arch of Trajan in Benevento, it has now been definitively established that this monument was built by Domitian, based on solid stylistic evidence and on the grounds that historical circumstances would have required Domitian to complete this arch at the beginning of his reign. In fact, we know from Suetonius, the anti-Domitianic historian, that Domitian reluctantly did proclaim Titus’ apotheosis after his death; therefore, the arch must have been completed in the early years of Domitian’s rule.

Part of the debate over the dating of this arch stemmed from the odd lack of mention of this building in ancient sources, apart from two vague mentions in Martial and Cassiodorus, neither of which allow precise identifications. The arch is mentioned in the Codex Einsiedlensis from the 9th century AD, in which the inscription is transcribed and erroneously assigned to both Vespasian and Titus. The dedicatory inscription clearly indicates the consecration of Titus as the subject of the monument. Some scholars hypothesized that, considering the funerary character of the inscription, the arch could have been the temporary burial site of Titus before the completion of the Templum Gentis Flaviae on the Quirinal, where all members of the Flavian family were eventually buried. However, it has been convincingly argued that the remains of the imperial family were most likely buried in the Mausoleum of Augustus while Domitian
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650 See Kleiner 1992, 183-85 and Arce 1993 (LTUR), 110 for the hypotheses about a Trajanic date with bibliography.
651 Kleiner 1992, 185; also Darwall-Smith 1996, 166-71, supports a Domitianic date for the arch of Titus.
652 Suet., Dom., 2.3: “defunctumque nullo praeterquam consecrationis honore dignatus”.
653 Mart., de Spect., 2.2.
655 Cod. Eins. VIII. 14, no.37.
656 CIL VI 945=ILS 265, “Senatus populusque Romanus divo Tito divi Vespasiani f(ilio) Vespasiano Augusto”.
was building the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, which was completed by AD 95. The scale of the inscription (fig. 91) has been justly noted by Holloway as especially remarkable, leading the scholar to interpret the dedication, rather than the decoration, as the most important component of the arch.

The arch’s felicitious preservation to the present day is due to its inclusion in the medieval fortress of the Frangipane family. Heavy restorations were then undertaken under Pope Sixtus IV (1472-1484) and in the 19th century by G. Valadier and R. Stern, who dismantled and reassembled it, adding several elements, including the supporting pillars for the columns and the attic.

The arch of Titus is a single fornix arch with four embedded columns on both façades with composite Ionic-Corinthian capitals in Pentelic marble, which are topped by an architrave in Luna marble. The architrave is decorated with a continuous figural frieze surmounted by a cornice with richly decorated brackets. Between the dentils, the typical Domitianic eye-glass motif is clearly visible. Above the architrave, the attic has been heavily restored with the exception of the inscription on the Colosseum side, which bears the original dedication. On the Forum side, the inscription is modern and celebrates the restoration under Sixtus IV.
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658 This date is based on a few mentions by Martial, *Epigr.*, IX 1; 3; 20. See the relevant section of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* for more details.

659 Holloway 1987, 187-91. Holloway interpreted the decoration of the arch, especially the inner panels, as a way to replace the extension of the inscription which would be expected as per other triumphal arches. However, as it has been said, this arch is not a triumphal arch but a consecration monument, Kleiner 1992, 189.

660 Arce 1993 (*LTUR*), 111.

661 These are the earliest surviving examples of Roman composite capitals though not the first created, see Darwall-Smith 1996, 166 with bibliography.
III.h.3 The figural decoration of the arch: Domitianic modes

The spandrels of the arch are decorated with winged Victories in flight poised upon globes and carrying trophies or battle pennants; each one is different. The keystone on each façade is decorated with a figural bracket employed here for the first time in an atypical architectural context, serving a purely decorative function. These brackets are carved with a rich “baccellatura” motif and adorned with personifications of Rome on one side and the Genius of the Roman People on the other. It has been noticed that the façade of the arch of Titus is fairly simple and smooth, especially when compared to the decoration of the inner sides and the vault. For Lehmann-Hartleben, this contrast would have directed the viewer’s attention toward the fornix to admire its elaborate decoration.

Indeed, the most significant decorative parts of the arch (besides the triumphal statuary including Titus that once crowned the arch) are the reliefs on the inner sides of the fornix and the central panel on the vault, which depicts Titus’ apotheosis. The southern side displays the spoils relief, where the viewer can see the triumphal procession commemorating Titus’ conquest of Jerusalem (fig. 92). A series of attendants are carrying on two *fercula* objects looted from the Temple in Jerusalem, among which are most prominently the enormous seven-branched Menorah candelabrum on one litter and, on the other, the offering table, and the silver horns, together with three placards with labels, tituli (once painted on) borne in triumph parade to identify displays. In this scene, the figures are densely grouped in the lower section of the space, moving in a left-right direction, mirroring the progression of the actual triumphal parade towards its
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662 Lehmann-Hartleben 1934, 94-5.
664 Lehmann-Hartleben 1934, 97.
665 See Yarden 1991 for a thorough analysis of the spoils from Jerusalem.
final destination, the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus. To the right of this panel the parade is heading through an arch which displays elaborate decoration and is topped by two *quadrigae* led, most likely, by Vespasian and Titus, while the younger Domitian is seated on a horse between his father and brother, with his head turned toward his right (fig. 94). A larger draped female figure, probably Minerva, is standing to Domitian’s left.

The upper half of the spoils relief is less crowded, thus giving visual emphasis to the objects depicted, in particular to the Menorah, which is richly decorated and quite imposing on the left half of the panel. The *titulus* placards on their tall shafts and the silver horns are represented as slightly tilted or on oblique angles, creating an interesting sense of movement which recalls, to a certain extent, the decoration with sacrificial instruments on the frieze of the temple of the Divine Vespasian in the Roman Forum. In the arch, as on the frieze of the temple, the objects almost float on a smooth background. While the pattern on the temple is more apparent, in the arch of Titus one can still appreciate the suggestion of objects standing out of a bare background. All of this booty would have been exhibited in the Templum Pacis, thereby tying together the two monuments.

The fornix of the arch of Titus on the northern side is decorated with a relief panel that depicts another section of the triumph parade heading toward the Capitoline hill, where Titus, on the right, is standing over a quadriga while being crowned by Victory (fig. 93). A series of personifications, variously interpreted, accompany the
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667 The riders of the *quadrigae* are not meant to be recognized since this part of the arch is not carved, only the horses are visible. The central figure which has been interpreted as Domitian, instead, is finished and clear.
669 See the relevant section on the temple of the Divine Vespasian in this chapter, III.b.
chariot. To the right we see the personification of the *Genius Populi Romani* or *Honos* and the *Genius Senatus*, while to the left, leading the parade, *Roma* or *Virtus* stands directly in front of the quadriga. In this panel too it is possible to notice a sort of horizontal division of the space: the lower section is very crowded, while the upper part is almost empty, with the exceptions of the thin *fasces* that surround Titus’ chariot. The upper right-hand corner, however, is completely taken up by the figures of Titus and Victory, who occupy an elevated position on the chariot. Diane Kleiner has interpreted the inclined *fasces* as meant to represent the effect of the breeze created by the chariot.670 However, I would instead say that the diagonal positions of the *fasces* is a convincing, and realistic, way to depict the effect of bouncing caused by the *lictors* marching. Both scenes on the panels suggest a linear movement in one direction, expressed through the position of the legs of the men, who are leaning forward, and the position of the horses, which are clearly marching, perhaps trotting.

Finally, in the upper sections of both reliefs, the objects are on the diagonal, to suggest bouncing and, also, their lightness, in striking opposition to the seven-branched candelabrum and the offering table, which are both perfectly straight and seem to weigh671 on those who carry them.

A repetition of the triumphal parade theme is depicted on the outside, on the frieze in the architrave. Here widely spaced figures form a sort of pattern with an intense chiaroscuro effect caused by the high relief. The vaulted passage of the fornix is decorated with richly ornamented coffers with central rosettes. The rosettes differ slightly from each other in the treatment of the petals and the central bud. But one of the most significant elements of the arch is the bust of Titus, being carried by an imperial
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670 Kleiner 1992, 188.
671 As Kleiner points out, Kleiner 1992, 187.
eagle to his apotheosis in the center of the vault. The frame that surrounds the apotheosis is formed by a heavy laurel garland in four sections.

The arch of Titus has been the subject of much art historical analysis and debate centered on the general assessment of Roman art and the way the figural panels deal with realism and illusionistic techniques.\textsuperscript{672} For the purpose of this study, however, it is important to understand its topographical placement and how that would have guided the interpretation of the arch by citizens. From the many examples of extant Domitianic buildings, passageways, and structures, it is clear that sightlines were of great importance in all cases.\textsuperscript{673} The arch of Titus would have been visible from a large part of the valley of the Colosseum, the Roman Forum, and the Clivus Palatinus. It defined a traffic node resulting from the east-west axis that linked the Flavian Amphitheatre, and the Meta Sudans, with the Via Sacra and the Via Nova, and the north-south axis that led to the Palatine hill through the Clivus Palatinus. Thus, further exploration and a better understanding of the remains of the Clivus Palatinus around the arch would be enlightening: today, for instance, it is possible to go toward the Palatine without passing through the arch, but I wonder whether in antiquity it might have been obligatory for those going to the top of the hill to pass through the arch. In any case, it is easy to see how Domitian was able, once again,\textsuperscript{674} to link free-standing Flavian monuments by


\textsuperscript{673} See Torelli 1987 and Thomas 2004 for examples about it. See also the analysis of the imperial palace on the Palatine in section IV.i, the interpretation of the Porticus Absidata in sections II.c and II.g, and the observations about the position and orientation of the Equus Domitiani in the Roman Forum in this chapter, section III.e.

\textsuperscript{674} Similar topographic constructions can be observed in the complex \textit{Iseum Campense-Minerva Chalcidica-Porticus Divorum} in the Campus Martius, section V.c, and in the \textit{Templum Gentis Flaviae} on the Quirinal, II.e, where the presence to the temple of Quirinus on the Hartwig-Kelsey reliefs contributed to the effect of expanding the Flavian references in the topography.
topographical and visual means in order to emphasize his family’s presence, legitimacy, and power in the urban fabric of the city.

III.h.4 The arch of Titus in the Circus Maximus

Extensive excavations in the 1930s uncovered parts of the arch of Titus and important fragments of its figural decoration. Recent archaeological investigations carried out on the hemicycle of the Circus Maximus and aimed at opening the area to the public resulted in a series of more important discoveries related to the arch of Titus and its reconstruction. This arch appears on the Forma Urbis Romae (fig. 95) and in several representations from the 4th century AD, such as mosaics from Piazza Armerina, from Luni, and the so-called Relief of Foligno. A simplified version of the arch also appears on a sestertius by Trajan of AD 103-111, which celebrated the restoration of the Circus Maximus. We know that the arch was dedicated by the senate to Titus for his triumph commemorating the conquest of Jerusalem in AD 81, because the text of the inscription was transcribed in the Codex Einsiedlensis, and reported the complete titles of the emperor and included an elogium for the defeat of the Jewish people and the destruction of the city. During the recent excavations, fragments of the original inscription were also brought to light. We know that the arch of Titus perhaps replaced a single fornix of Stertinius built with the spoils of the conquest of Spain in 196

675 Buonfiglio 2014, 326.
676 See Buonfoglio 2014 for a presentation of the preliminary results of the excavations.
677 Fragments 7a-e, 8a-h, 9.
679 RIC II, 274, no. 571.
680 Cod. Eins. IX.
681 CIL VI 944.
682 Pergola, Coletta 2014, 339.
and later destroyed by Nero in AD 68 to widen the passage for his triumphal parade.\textsuperscript{684}

This new archaeological data has confirmed the layout of this arch as being a three-bay monument of considerable size, 17 m in width and ca. 21 m in height,\textsuperscript{685} which made it the largest arch built in Rome before the construction of that of Septimius Severus in AD 203.\textsuperscript{686} The central fornix was 4.8 m wide, while the side ones were ca 2.2 m wide; the fornices were connected through an opening.\textsuperscript{687} The entire monument was revetted in Luni marble and the façades were decorated with columns topped by Corinthian capitals corresponding to pilasters (fig. 96). In this respect, this arch differs from that on the Via Sacra, where the columns are instead engaged. The moldings of the columns’ dados and of the architrave are smooth, with the exception of an especially deep scotia, which is somewhat surprising since more ornamentation would be expected in the context of a Flavian monument.

Two different explanations, neither of which precludes the other, have been offered. It is possible that the contrast between the smooth molding and the deep scotia was intended to create a chiaroscuro effect.\textsuperscript{688} As an alternative, or in addition, Pergola and Coletta also noticed inconsistencies in building techniques visible in the use of large solid pieces of marble in certain parts and a sort of collage of scrap slabs for others with no particular order or reason. They concluded that these inconsistencies may be explained by a possible rush to finish the arch, which is more than likely considering that Titus died in the very year in which it was dedicated, and thus Domitian might have

\textsuperscript{683} Liv., XXXIII, 27, 3-4. See Pergola, Coletta 2014 for bibliography and other hypotheses on the position of the arch of Stertinius.
\textsuperscript{684} Suet., Nero, 6.25.
\textsuperscript{685} Buonfiglio 2014, 332.
\textsuperscript{686} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{687} Pergola, Coletta 2014, 339.
\textsuperscript{688} Pergola, Coletta 2014, 339-41.
found himself in a hurry to complete the decoration, thus leaving the moldings smooth.\textsuperscript{689}

Among the architectural fragments recovered in both excavations, there are panels with figural reliefs of two different sizes, thus indicating the presence of a larger and smaller frieze. It is difficult to reconstruct the exact position of these incomplete panels on the arch. It is possible that they were placed on the high plinths of the columns on the façade or in the central fornix,\textsuperscript{690} although the connecting doors to the side fornice would have left little space for them (fig. 96). The surviving remains consist of a panel with a fragment of a soldier’s head with a helmet whose cheekpiece is decorated with a lightning bolt; this element has been interpreted as a reference to the \textit{Legio XII Fulminata}, present in Judaea with Titus.\textsuperscript{691}

Another fragment of the relief shows half of a temple pediment with a recumbent personification of a river god as acroterion and other more fragmentary pieces depicting the lower section of three figures. The smaller pieces belong, most likely, to a frieze on the architrave, similar to that of the arch of Titus on the Via Sacra. In fact, the extant fragments belonging to this smaller frieze seem to depict a triumphal parade, just as in the case of the other arch of Titus. Another similarity is the presence of the River god in a recumbent position, which also appears in the architrave of the arch on the Via Sacra. The attribution of the completion of this arch to Domitian is based on the historical context and, especially, on the several undoubtedly Domitianic stylistic elements of the decoration. In addition, it is noteworthy that the Circus Maximus was the site of the outbreak of the great fire of AD 64. It has consequently been hypothesized that Domitian would have undertaken extensive restorations in the area, and recent excavations carried

\textsuperscript{689} Pergola, Coletta 2014, 341.  
\textsuperscript{690} Pergola, Coletta 2014, 340.  
\textsuperscript{691} La Rocca 1974.
out between 2009 and 2015 have indeed revealed a definitively Domitianic building phase. This identification has been strengthened by the study of brick stamps not only in the Circus Maximus but also in the substructures connecting the circus and the imperial palace.\textsuperscript{692}

In conclusion, although the arch of Titus in the Circus Maximus was begun under Titus and dedicated by the Senate, it was likely finished by Domitian, who left his signature in the style of decoration and the arrangement of the figural motifs. It has been appropriately noticed\textsuperscript{693} that this arch was a reversal of an intervention undertaken by Nero, who destroyed the Republican arch to enlarge the passage. Therefore, it fits well within the Flavian agenda of emending all of Nero’s outrageous acts.

\textit{III.j.5 The Flavian Amphitheater, the Ludi, and the Meta Sudans}

The archaeological evidence for the Colosseum, the \textit{ludi} and the monumental fountain called \textit{Meta Sudans} (fig. 97) prove that they were part of a comprehensive project dated between the reign of Vespasian through that of Domitian. The area was investigated by a long and thorough archaeological project carried out under the direction of C. Panella between 1986 and 2003. The results, published on several occasions,\textsuperscript{694} have yielded exceptional data in relation to the occupation of the area from archaic times to Late Antiquity. The rigorous methodology employed by Panella and her team left no doubts with regard to the dating of the different phases of the structures, which can be placed in the reigns of all the three Flavians, although Domitian’s participation has been identified in a limited intervention which was aimed at

\textsuperscript{692} This study by L. Casadei will appear in a forthcoming volume of the Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma.
\textsuperscript{693} Pergola, Coletta 2014, 344, note no. 6.
completing his father’s vision. The younger Flavian finished this huge project with the construction of the gladiatorial school and the other gladiatorial facilities called ludi.

The Colosseum was known as amphitheatrum or amphiteatrum until the end of the 10th century AD,\footnote{For mentions in imperial times see Suet., Vesp., 9.1; Tit., 7.3; Dom. 4.1; Acta Fratrum Arvalium, CIL VI 2059 = 32363; Mart., Epigr. 2.5; FUR 13 a-b; see Rea 1993 (LTUR), 30 for a complete list of the sources.} after which the proximity of the Colossus, the gigantic statue built by Nero to decorate a section of his Domus Aurea, caused the building to be called the Colosseum. The Flavian intervention did not completely erase the Neronian constructions, which were at times reused at foundation level or filled in order to obtain a higher walking level.\footnote{Rea 1993 (LTUR), 30-31; Rea, Beste, Lancaster 2000, 344-48.} In addition, the Flavian project took advantage of the Neronian orientation, street system, and hydraulic fixtures.\footnote{Rea, Beste, Lancaster 2000, 353.}

The Flavian amphitheatrum was started by Vespasian and inaugurated by him when it was still incomplete. A second, and more grandiose inauguration, attested by a second dedicatory inscription, took place under Titus in AD 80.\footnote{For the reconstruction of the two inscriptions see Alföldy 2002.} This event is famously celebrated in a few numismatic issues which show the amphitheater, the fountain known as the Meta Sudans, and a portico.\footnote{RIC II, 129 N. 110 = BMCEmp II, 262 Nn. 190 s. cfr. RIC II, 208 n.} The importance of this edifice within Flavian politics has been discussed at length by numerous scholars;\footnote{See Rea 1993 (LTUR) for bibliography; Darwall-Smith 1996, 75-90, La Regina 2001 and Rea 2002 for more recent bibliography.} for the purpose of this section I would only like to note that, despite the testimony of the Chronographer of AD 354 indicating Domitian as the builder of the upper section of the Colosseum,\footnote{Chronogr. a. 354, 274 VZ I, “Vespasianus…tribus gradibus amphitheatrum dedicavit…Divus Titus…amphitheatrum a tribus gradibus patris sui duos adiecit…Domitianus…amphitheatrum usque ad clipea (fabricavit)”;}\footnote{Jones 1992, 93; Darwall-Smith 1996, 78.} archaeological analysis proves that he was responsible only for the construction of the hypogeal sector (fig. 98). This complex system of galleries was designed to contain lifts
capable of carrying animals and machines directly into the arena to provide elements of surprise and new challenges to the gladiators fighting.

The presence of animals must be related mostly to the performances of *venationes*, elaborate hunts which we know were also offered in Domitian’s private villa at the Alban Lake, where a long stadium was built for that purpose.\(^{702}\) In the Alban Villa these shows would take place on the occasions of the *Quinquatria*, a special festival in honor of Minerva that Domitian established in his private residence and in which the poet Statius competed.\(^{703}\) Before the intervention by Domitian in the hypogean section, the arena in the Colosseum was supported by wooden beams and covered by sand that could be easily removed for the *naumachiae* that some sources report were staged at the Colosseum.\(^{704}\) However, there is no archaeological evidence for such shows,\(^{705}\) that would anyway have stopped with the construction of the Domitianic underground system.

Recent analysis of the building technique of the hypogea shows that these first foundations walls were built in tufa to support the arena.\(^{706}\) Interventions to reinforce the walls are documented for the reign of Trajan and in the 4th century AD.\(^{707}\) The system of lifts was very complex and was constantly maintained throughout the entire history of the monument. A ring of lifts for the animals has been identified at roughly 3 m from the edge of the arena, which might have been provided with a safety net to protect the upper class audience seated in the first row. In addition, twenty moving platforms, built in the

---

702 Lugli 1918, 64-67, Lugli was able to identify the stables for the animals in a series of rooms to the north of the building.
704 Suet., *Tit.*, 7.3; Mart., *de Spect.*, 26-28.
705 Rea 1993, 34.
707 Beste 2001; Rea 2002.
same phase as the Domitianic tufa walls, were scattered through the arena for the transportation of mobile stages for reenactments and actors.\textsuperscript{708}

Marble balustrades were placed at the edges of the access ramps to the \textit{vomitoria} in order to prevent people from falling, and their decoration shows similarities with that of the theatre of Domitian’s Alban Villa.\textsuperscript{709} Barbara Pettinau has examined over 40 examples of these architectural elements and divided them into several categories. Many of these are dated to Antonine and Severan times; however, several fragments representing animals bear striking similarities with the same architectural elements of the theatre in Domitian’s villa.\textsuperscript{710} The presence of the animals, both mythical and real, might be connected with the performance of the \textit{venationes}.\textsuperscript{711}

A necessary complement to the grand Flavian Amphitheater was the system of gladiatorial facilities known as \textit{ludi}, which were built by Domitian, four in number and all in the surroundings of the Colosseum: the \textit{Ludus Magnus}, the main gladiatorial school (fig. 99), the \textit{Ludus Matutinus}, perhaps the training area for the \textit{venationes} usually offered at dawn,\textsuperscript{712} and finally, the \textit{Ludus Gallicus} and the \textit{Ludus Dacicus}. In addition to these buildings, this elaborate urban system of infrastructure dedicated to the gladiatorial entertainment included the \textit{Castra Misenatium}, barracks for the sailors from Misenum specifically assigned to the operation of the \textit{velaria}, the \textit{Spoliarium}, a sort of mortuary where the dead bodies were stripped and disposed of, the \textit{Saniarium}, where the wounded were treated, the \textit{Armamentarium}, the storehouse for gear and arms, and the \textit{Sumnum Choragium}, where the machines and stages for the performances were set up and kept.

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{beste99} Beste 1999.
\bibitem{pettinau89-90} See Pettinau 1989-1990 for this analysis.
\bibitem{pettinau89-90a} Pettinau 1989-1990, 380-83.
\bibitem{pettinau89-90b} Pettinau 1989-1990, 383.
\bibitem{pavolini96} Pavolini 1996 (\textit{LTUR} III), 197.
\end{thebibliography}
It is very unfortunate that the archaeological evidence for this system of Domitianic buildings is, to say the least, poor. The *Ludus Matutinus* is attributed to the late years of Domitian's reign by two late sources that indicate AD 94 and 95 for the construction of this structure. Excavations carried out between the *templum Divi Claudi* and the *vicus Capitis Africae* by Antonio Maria Colini in 1938 uncovered the remains of elliptical foundations tied to a sewage system dated to the Flavian period by brick stamps.\(^{713}\) Today these remains are no longer visible. The *Ludus Dacicus* has been identified by Emilio Rodríguez Almeida in two fragments of the FUR, 142 and 161, which place the *ludus* between the baths of Titus and the *Ludus Magnus*.\(^{714}\) However, no archaeological traces of this *ludus* have been uncovered, just as nothing remains of the *Ludus Gallicus* which was most likely built in the same area.\(^{715}\)

On the other hand, the *Ludus Magnus*, which was the main training school for the gladiators, has partially survived to the east of the Colosseum (fig. 99). The first remains were uncovered in 1937 and further explored in the last archaeological campaign in the area in 1957-61.\(^{716}\) The *Ludus Magnus* consists of an elliptical arena equipped with seating for 300 people and surrounded by a *quadriportico*, likely on two levels. Unfortunately, the Domitianic parts of the preserved remains pertain only to the foundations, whereas the visible remains were built under Trajan, who was responsible for a major restoration in the area to address structural issues.\(^{717}\)

Though not a building for entertainment, the *Meta Sudans*, a monumental fountain built at the intersection of four or five roads,\(^ {718} \) was a crucial element of the

\(^{713}\) Colini 1944; Pavolini 1996 (*LTUR* III), 197.

\(^{714}\) Rodríguez Almeida 1977.

\(^{715}\) Pavolini 1996 (*LTUR* III), 195-96.

\(^{716}\) Pavolini 1996 (*LTUR* III), 196.

\(^{717}\) Pavolini 1996 (*LTUR* III), 196-97.

\(^{718}\) Panella 1996 (*LTUR* III), 248.
Flavian project in the Valley of the Colosseum (fig. 102). The fountain replaced an earlier, smaller Augustan version built slightly to the southeast,\textsuperscript{719} and was built in exact alignment with the Arch of Titus on the Via Sacra (fig. 100). The \textit{Meta Sudans} derives its name from the conical shape of its upper element which is reminiscent of a circus meta. It consists of two concentric concrete foundations with a central well, 9 m deep. Pipes for draining have been identified, while a channel for the water feed has yet to be discovered.\textsuperscript{720} Nothing of the elevation of the fountain remains although it was still fairly well preserved before 1936 when it was demolished together with the remains of the foundation of the Colossus of Nero during construction work on the Via dell’Impero (fig. 97).\textsuperscript{721} However, the data from the excavations allow us to reconstruct a square base enclosing a round basin with a diameter of 15.90 m.\textsuperscript{722} In the center a vertical element, with a diameter of 7 m, would rise for 17 m ca.\textsuperscript{723} The vertical element was divided into three registers: the bottom cylinder was faced with bricks and revetted in marble, the middle cylinder was faced directly with marble, while the upper conical element was faced with bricks and topped by a sphere or a flower with three petals. The Meta appears on a few coins where the middle element seems to have been pierced by niches with statues (fig. 101).\textsuperscript{724}

The construction of the \textit{Meta Sudans} is attributed by late antique sources to Domitian, although the presence of the monumental fountain on two \textit{sestertii} of AD 80 and AD 81 would indicate that the \textit{Meta} was already finished by Titus’s death. As Panella

\textsuperscript{719} The Augustan version was only known through literary and numismatic sources until Panella discovered it during the excavations, Panella 2013, 2014, Zeggio, Pardini 2007.
\textsuperscript{720} Panella 1990, 78-80.
\textsuperscript{721} Panella 1996 (\textit{LTUR III}), 247.
\textsuperscript{722} Panella 1996 (\textit{LTUR III}), 249; Panella 1990, 78; Panella 2013, 118.
\textsuperscript{723} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{724} Panella 1996 (\textit{LTUR III}), 249.
explains,\textsuperscript{725} the two sets of data can be reconciled by recognizing the \textit{Meta Sudans} as an essential element of the larger Flavian project in the Valley of the Colosseum. It has been demonstrated that these coins showing the Colosseum and the \textit{Meta Sudans} were, in fact, minted after Titus’ death\textsuperscript{726} indicating that Domitian, although he finished the \textit{Meta Sudans},\textsuperscript{727} was willing to honor his brother’s achievements by celebrating these two buildings on his coins.\textsuperscript{728}

The issues with the legitimacy of their power that the Flavians faced during their rule were dealt with in different ways; building the largest entertainment network in Rome was one of those. The addition of the \textit{Meta Sudans}—an earlier Augustan monument\textsuperscript{729}—to this project, reinforced the idea of public use of a space, previously appropriated by Nero, in a grand and functional way. The certain involvement of Domitian in all these projects, with a particular emphasis on the gladiatorial facilities, paints an interesting picture of dynastic cohesion at the level of political vision for this sector of the city. While Domitian’s true interest in entertainment building projects would be fully expressed in his stadium-\textit{Odeum} complex in the Campus Martius and the theatre and stadium in his Alban Villa, he continued the constructions started by Vespasian with no change in what seems to have been the original concept.

\textsuperscript{725} Panella 1996 (LTUR), 248.
\textsuperscript{726} Von Gerkan 1925, 28.
\textsuperscript{727} Panella places the construction of the fountain more precisely in the span of ten years between AD 80 and 90, Panella 2013, 118.
\textsuperscript{728} Longfellow 2011, 41-42.
\textsuperscript{729} See Longfellow 2011, 38-39 for an analysis of the alterations the Flavians carried out to the Augustan version.
\textit{III.j.6 Moneta}

One of the most important interventions by Domitian in the \textit{Regio} III is the construction of the \textit{Moneta}, the new state mint which was supposed to replace the traditional mint in the Roman Forum and the Capitoline Hill (fig. 103).\footnote{See Coarelli 1994 and Tucci 2005 for different hypotheses for the temple of Juno Moneta.} The identification of this building with remains underneath the church of San Clemens is today certain based on a series of epigraphic and archaeological data. Before these discoveries the attribution of this building to Domitian was based essentially on the Chronographer of AD 354, which mentions \textit{Moneta} in the \textit{regio tercia} following the \textit{amphitheatrum} and the \textit{Ludus Magnus}.\footnote{\textit{Chronogr. a} 354, 146M.} In addition, the conflict between the army under Aurelian and the \textit{opifices Monetae} took place \textit{per Coelium montem}, suggesting a nearby location.\footnote{Aur. Vict., \textit{Caes.}, 35.6.}

But the most conspicuous evidence came from the discovery of three inscribed \textit{cippi} in front of the church in 1556. These \textit{cippi} bore dedications\footnote{\textit{CIL VI}, 42, 43, 44.} by several specialized workers of the mint such as an “exacto auri, argenti, aeris”, “offcinatores”, “signatores”, “suppostores”, and “malliatores.”\footnote{Coarelli 1994, 47.} Lanciani records the discovery of another group of inscriptions in the grassy area in front of the church with dedications by “conductors fluturae argentariae.”\footnote{\textit{CIL VI}, 239, 791; Lanciani 1990.} In 1715 restoration work in the church led to the discovery of another inscription to Constantine by a “procurator s(acrae) m(onetae) u(rbis) una cum p(rae)p(ositis) et officinatoribus.”\footnote{\textit{CIL VI} 1145.}

The combination of this epigraphic evidence with the that of the Chronographer was further strengthened by the archaeological data gathered by Federico Guidobaldi.
between 1981 and 1989, when the underground sector of the church was investigated. As is well-known, the complex of San Clemens represents one of the best examples of surviving archaeological stratification spanning several centuries, from the late 1st AD mithraeum to the 12th century church above it. This circumstance prevents any thorough excavation of the earliest remains, since it would result in the destruction of the upper levels. Guidobaldi was able to perform surveys, limited digging, and corings in scattered spots, which allowed him to produce an accurate, though partial, plan of the remains.

The results confirmed the presence of a large, elongated rectangular edifice whose reconstructed dimensions should be 65-70 m x 30 m ca (fig. 103). This building was dated to Flavian times on stratigraphic grounds, showing that it was built directly above strata formed during the fire of AD 64. The outer walls are built in a massive opus quadratum technique with tufa blocks—perhaps similar to the foundation walls of the Colosseum hypogeum—while the inner walls are in opus mixtum. The building is arranged around a large central empty space onto which a series of modular rooms open. Remains of stairs suggest the presence of at least an upper level, which could very easily be supported by the opus quadratum walls.

Next to this structure a well preserved mithraeum was also uncovered. Considering that the brick stamps of the mithraeum indicate the late Domitianic period for its construction, and that stratigraphically this temple was built against the rectangular building, we may safely assume that the latter was built in the early years of
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739 Colini, Cozza 1982, 91; Coarelli 1994, 49.
740 For Coarelli the presence of this not very common building technique in imperial times should be explained by the need for safety. A building enclosed by such walls would not have been easily broken into, Coarelli 1994, 50.
Domitian’s reign, and, most likely, in connection with the finishing stages of the Colosseum- Meta Sudans project. Furthermore, a Renaissance drawing of fragment 680 of the FUR shows one side of a rectangular building arranged around a central area, demarcated by a continuous line, and a series of modular rooms very similar to the remains underneath San Clemens (fig. 103). The partial engraving visible on the drawing, “MON”, has been convincingly associated with “MONETA”, giving even more weight to the identification.

The transfer of Moneta by Domitian from the area of the Roman Forum to the regio tertia was probably motivated primarily by practical and functional reasons. The old state mint located near the temple of Juno Moneta on the Capitoline hill and in connection with the state aerarium, traditionally located inside the temple of Saturn, was no longer sufficient in terms of space. The new building in the Valley of the Colosseum provided all the necessary facilities for the minting procedures. The space arrangement has been analyzed by Coarelli, who suggested one of several hypotheses of activity distribution within the space. In addition to practical reasons, it is also possible to see in this drastic change an intentional break with tradition that is also manifest in the outrageous construction of the colossal Equus Domitian in the middle of the Roman Forum.
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742 Guidobaldi 1978, 33; Coarelli 1994, 50.
743 For Coarelli this central feature might have been a water basin used during the different procedures, Coarelli 1994, 57.
744 Doubts were raised by Rodríguez Almeida, 1981, 63-65.
746 Coarelli 2009, 77-83; Packer 2015, 40-41.
747 See the section dedicated to the Equus Domitian in III.e for a more detailed analysis of the equestrian statue.
III.k Conclusions

The assessment of Domitianic construction in the Roman Forum and the Capitoline is constrained by the lack of archaeological evidence for the most meaningful monuments, while the preservation of the buildings in the Valley of the Colosseum indicates the extent of the “Flavian” project, much of which did not suffer from Domitian’s damnatio memoriae. As we have seen, out of the entire Domitianic building program in the forum and Capitoline Hill, only the temple of Divus Vespasianus and the Atria VII (known as Porticus Deorum Consentium) stand conspicuously on the northwestern edge of the Roman Forum in a fairly good degree of preservation. However, we have to take into consideration that the remains of the Atria VII belong mainly to the later phases. For all the other Domitianic buildings there is only limited archaeological evidence.

As per other areas of the city,748 I believe that the relationship with the inherited legacy is one of the most significant for a productive discussion. Domitian’s monuments in the forum and on the Capitoline hill reveal an ambivalent relationship to the building program of Augustus, whose interventions were meant to upgrade the traditional Republican structures with an emphasis on religious piety and order. By contrast, the diligent continuation of the large Flavian project, including the hypogean sector of the Colosseum, the Meta Sudans, and the gladiatorial facilities in the Valley of the Colosseum show a smooth continuation of the Flavian agenda.

In the Roman Forum, following in Augustus’ footsteps, Titus most likely began the construction of a concrete platform on the western edge of the forum to house the temple dedicated to his deified father. This project was then inherited by Domitian once

---

748 See the analysis of lines of continuation and innovation considered for the area of the Imperial fora, chapter III.
he assumed power. The younger Flavian carried to completion the projects started by Vespasian and Titus within a larger urban plan that included the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* on the Quirinal, and the *Iseum-Minerva Chalcidica-Porticus Divorum* complex on the eastern Campus Martius, aimed at building a Flavian topography focused on the imperial cult. The architectural design of the temple of *Divus Vespasianus* is rather traditional with the exception of some details in the decoration, such as the arrangement of the sacrificial implements in the frieze. In the construction of the *Atria VII*, one might identify elements of Domitian’s architectural vision in the clever use of the limited space, which resulted in an oddly shaped but functional building that was visible from all significant sides.\(^{749}\). The construction of the *Atria VII* as administrative offices and the two *horrea* to the east of the forum indicate the need for new customized spaces for the growing imperial bureaucracy. Yet, there is little archaeological evidence for these monuments.

It is with the construction of the *Equus Domitiani*, somewhere in the middle of the forum, that Domitian was able to fully express his idiosyncratic vision. The exceptional character of this monument was in the scale, the iconography, the location, and the orientation, facing the temple of *Divus Iulius* with its back to that of *Divus Vespasianus*. The choice of the orientation was deliberate and meaningful, since the opposite arrangement would have allowed Domitian to build equally significant connections. Therefore, it has been here suggested that the setting was meant to signal a break with the Flavian and, consequently, Augustan legacy in order to create an unexpected affiliation with Julius Caesar.

\(^{749}\) See for instance the use of space for the construction of the *forum Domitiani* which took advantage of the available space in the most effective way, section II.c.
In addition, a series of orders and changes took effect as soon as Domitian rose to power. He moved the state mint, Moneta, from the Capitoline hill to the Valley of the Colosseum,\footnote{See section III.j.6 and Coarelli 1994, 2009, 81-83 for a discussion of these measures.} while transferring part of the aerarium archives to the new Palatine spaces of the so-called Vigna Barberini.\footnote{See section IV.h for a description and analysis of the Vigna Barberini complex.} These measures have been interpreted as an autocratic expression intended to undermine senatorial privileges.\footnote{Ibid.} Moreover, the dedicatory inscription on the restored temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus took the declaration of autocracy a step further by the omission of the dedicatee in favor of the emperor’s name. This habit of Domitian’s was strongly criticized in the ancient sources.\footnote{Suet., Dom. 5.} As a consequence of these measures and manifestations of absolutism, most of the interventions by Domitian in the forum and the Capitoline hill were immediately dismantled once the damnatio memoriae was declared. The Equus Domitiani was torn to pieces while the two temples to Jupiter, Conservator and Custos, which symbolized his self-asserted identification with Jupiter,\footnote{Darwall-Smith 1996, 113-115.} did not survive the later natural disasters and armed conflicts, and were never restored.

A different fate might have been in store for the fountain, likely of Domitianic date, that was located in the area of the Comitium and decorated with the personification of the Tiber known today as “Marforio.” The consistent mention in medieval and later sources of the statue’s topographical location indicate that the fountain probably stood in its original location long after the emperor’s assassination and damnatio memoriae. A functional, monumental fountain that beautified a historically charged area of the Forum needed no dismantling.
Domitian’s break with Vespasian and Augustus is manifest in his political actions and in several of the monuments he built on his own initiative in the Roman Forum and the Capitoline. The disquiet caused by the erection of the gilded *Equus* led to its dramatic public destruction, an act that was narrated in emotional tones by Pliny the Younger. Many of the most conspicuous monuments of Domitian in the center of Rome would therefore have disappeared within a few decades of their erection, but the traces they left in the literary, numismatic, and archaeological record allow to reconstruct the pieces of an urban plan that was aimed at creating a new Flavian Rome which was revolutionary in many ways and traditional in others.

While limited to a continuation of the vision of his father and brother, Domitian’s intervention in the Valley of the Colosseum demonstrates a certain attention to the architecture of entertainment, fully developed in a more personal way through the construction of the *stadium-Odeum* complex in the Campus Martius. The lack of archaeological evidence for other Domitianic buildings, such as the gladiatorial facilities, prevents a more detailed assessment of the architectural design or the topographical arrangement of this elaborate system of edifices. Considering the established attention on Domitian’s part to urban connections and patterns of traffic it is unfortunate that we are not able to visualize the network of the gladiatorial facilities in their entirety.

---

755 Plin., Pan., 52.
756 See the discussion about Domitian’s changes in the area of the imperial fora, section II.c.2, II.f.1, the paths of traffic in the imperial palace, Sections IV.), IV.j, the general impact of the construction of two complex on the western and eastern edge of the Campus Martius, chapter V, passim.
CHAPTER IV: PALATIUM. NERO, DOMITIAN, AND THE EVOLUTION OF IMPERIAL RESIDENTIAL ARCHITECTURE

The Palatine hill in Rome must be one of the most historically charged areas of the ancient and modern city. The thousands of years of construction that accumulated on the hill account for the plethora of archaeological remains and literary sources that tell the story of how Rome was founded and ruled. Despite the copious works undertaken by several scholars on the subject,\textsuperscript{757} the Palatine hill has not ceased to yield new data that keep our understanding of its role in the history of Rome constantly evolving. Ancient sources used the term \textit{palatium} since the Augustan period, when the residence of the emperor and the name of the place became interchangeable and charged with the symbolic meaning of power.\textsuperscript{758} Therefore, the idea of an imperial residence was well rooted in language and culture before the Palatine residences came to occupy the entire hill.

\textsuperscript{757} A list of references for the specific parts of the hill analyzed separately will be provided within the subchapters. It is important here to mention some studies that analyze the hill as a single entity such as \textit{Auditorium and Palatium} by B. Tamm (1963), which thoroughly analyzes the remains on the hill in light of their use as assembly rooms. M. Royo provides an extensive analysis of the evolution of the hill in his \textit{Domus Imperatoriae}, published in 1999, where he utilizes the literary sources combined with archaeological evidence to trace a history of the transformations that led to the Flavian intervention and emphasizing the weight of Republican conceptions in the Augustan approach. Both Tamm and Royo focused on the origins of imperial use of these residences while C. Cecamore, in her 2002 publication, considers the entire topography of the hill, providing an exhaustive treatment of archaeological and literary sources (both ancient and modern, especially from the Renaissance). Her contribution is invaluable for the clarification and suggested identifications of some of the most ambiguous and debated sites on the hill, such as the \textit{Roma Quadrata}, the \textit{Mundus}, or the \textit{Porta Romanula}. A. Carandini has published extensively dealing with both general treatment of the hill and specific areas. His very well known books on the birth of the city, Romulus and Remus have been very successful and, at the same time, highly controversial. Recently his book on the House of Augustus (written with D. Bruno) and on the Republican houses have received, once again, praise and criticism. In 2012 F. Coarelli published another comprehensive work on the Palatine from the origins to the first century AD. This work is particularly successful in addressing the issues with the mythical topography of the hill. In the first three chapters Coarelli deals with the boundaries, the street system, the cults in a thorough and thought-provoking way. In the chapters on the Republican houses and the House of Augustus where the focus seems to be the heated debate with Carandini that takes a significant amount of the text.

\textsuperscript{758} Tamm, 1963, 57-75.
The analysis of the Palatine hill under Domitian (figs. 104 and 105) presents a few challenges. On the one hand, the lavish remains of his principal contribution to the topography, the imperial palace, seem to speak a clear language, demonstrating the need for a functional imperial residence for the emperors and diversified demands for the imperial administration. On the other hand, the topographical transformation of the hill that culminated in the imperial palace is long, intricate, and not fully archaeologically explored.

Moreover, the history of the excavations on the Palatine, which began with the ruinous sondages undertaken at the beginning of the 16th century, is the history of political friction between the Pope and the Italian State, which ultimately led to a race for the acquisition of the most extraordinary finds. The lack of methodology and the fragmentation of the earlier fieldwork produced a set of data that is inconsistent and quite hard to match with the more recent results and the literary sources. Finally, the excellent recent fieldwork carried out on several sectors of the hill has produced data so compelling that it forces us to reconsider some of the traditional interpretations and to reassess the scope of Domitian's intervention on the Palatine.


760 The north-western sector of the hill, occupied by the so-called domus Tiberiana, has been extensively studied by C. Krause (see Krause 1994, 2009), and more recently by M. A. Tomei (see Tomei, Filetici, 2011). The eastern sector of the hill, also known as Vigna Barberini has been studied by an equipe of scholars from the École Français in Rome. Several publications have been produced under the supervision of F. Villedieu (see Villedieu 1995a and 1995b, 2001, 2007, 2009). An unprecedented analysis of the building techniques of the Flavian palace have been carried out by a team of Germans scholars whose results have had a deep impact on the traditional dating of the building complex (see Wulf-Rheidt 2002-03, 2007, 2011, 2012a and 2012b, Sojc, Wulf-Rheidt 2009, Sojc 2005-06, 2012, Pflug 2012, 2014). Other excavation projects have been carried out on several different areas, such as the temple of Magna Mater supervised by P. Pensabene, and the remains on the side overlooking the Colosseum led by C. Panella, however these projects do not directly concern Domitianic remains.
In this chapter I will start by briefly describing the Palatine hill during Republican times and the early empire with its houses and temples, and will then present two crucial pre-Domitianic construction phases: those of Nero and Vespasian. As we will see, it would be impossible to comprehend and accurately assess the interventions by Domitian without having fully delimited the extent of these earlier phases. Finally, I will analyze all the projects carried out by Domitian on the hill with the goal of understanding their meaning in a holistic way. The analysis of the remains on the Palatine hill will be centered on four topographical units, all drastically impacted by Domitian, which are listed in a counterclockwise manner from north-east to south-west as follows: the Domus Tiberiana, the so-called Forum Buildings, the Vigna Barberini complex, and the Imperial Palace. These remains, covering the entire hill, are arranged roughly on the same north-east/south-west axis. This arrangement, as we will see, might have been influenced by Neronian construction.

IV.a Building up on the Palatine

Domitian's contributions on the Palatine have been reassessed in light of the recent data gathered from excavations that attest to significant additions and modifications to the area starting with the Julio-Claudians (Tiberius and Claudius) and then with Nero and Vespasian.\(^\text{761}\) It appears that a new architectural “Palatine language” had already been conceived by Tiberius and Claudius, who envisioned the Domus Tiberiana as an imperial residence with extended landscaped areas. Nero’s phase of the imperial palace and his outrageous Domus Aurea extended his vision for a grand scale.

\(^{761}\) A note from Tacitus tells us that Domitian was assigned the seat of power on the Palatine at the beginning of his father’s reign, “nomen sedemque Caesaris Domitianus accoperat”, Tac. Hist., 4.2. This might indicate that Domitian was left in charge of the work carried out in his father’s name on the Palatine see Krause 2009, 264, and Villedieu 2011-12, see also further on the relevant section dedicated to Vespasian and his interventions on the Palatine.
imperial residence beyond the Palatine hill into the core of the city. Nero’s residence was immediately dismantled after his death in AD 68 and subsequent damnatio memoriae. However, Nero’s input seemed to have been carefully assimilated by Domitian, who perfected the vocabulary of imperial architecture through the innovative ideas of his court architect Rabirius. In fact, the transformation of the topography of the hill was so fitting that the new buildings survived the damnatio memoriae of the emperor and can be viewed as precursors of the villa and palatial architecture that will flourish later on in Rome and the rest of the empire. It is, however, undeniable that Domitian’s vision for this area of the city, while certainly molded as a continuation of his predecessors, was also destined to exceed the previous design and space concepts. A flexible architecture is the tool used to achieve this plan, where size, decoration, accessibility, and security varied as a consequence of the buildings’ function. Domitian's intervention transformed the existing topographic fabric of the Palatine hill by adding new buildings and modifying the existing ones to produce an organic system fit for any imperial need. The Palatine became under him a dedicated imperial micro-city, a direction in which it had already been developing for decades.

IV.a.1 The Palatine of the Republic and Augustus: myth and perception

The hill had been known and perceived by the Romans in association with some of the most momentous events of Roman history related to the founding of the city as well as legendary places such as the Scalae Caci or Roma Quadrata. Several sacred areas are known from the epigraphic and literary sources and partially confirmed by archaeological excavations. The oldest of these was the temple of Victoria, on the southwestern end of the hill. This aedes was dedicated in 294 B.C. and restored by
Augustus after the fire of 3 AD\textsuperscript{762} together with the adjacent temple of the Magna Mater, that had been built between 204 and 191 B.C.\textsuperscript{763} In addition to these two temples and other sacred areas marked by altars, the ancient sources describe the Palatine hill as a crucial sector of the ancient city for sacred spaces. Augustus built the sanctuary of Apollo, a magnificent sanctuary with porticoes and a rich decorative program, on the southwestern edge of the Palatine overlooking the Circus Maximus, and likely near his own house.\textsuperscript{764}

Augustus chose to live on the Palatine\textsuperscript{765} and the Claudii may have had property here too. The hill had been the residence of choice for prominent members of the Roman Republican élite for some time,\textsuperscript{766} turning the hill into something like modern Rome's Parioli, or the Upper East Side in New York city. We know that Cicero had owned a house there since 62 B.C. and it occupied an especially scenic sector with a beautiful vista over the entire city.\textsuperscript{767} Cicero’s brother, Quintus, also lived nearby but on terrace at a slightly lower level.\textsuperscript{768}

In the northeastern corner of the hill, later occupied by the so-called Vigna Barberini complex, the remains of at least one aristocratic house have been found.\textsuperscript{769} This sector of the hill was a residential area coveted by Republican aristocrats in Rome.

\textsuperscript{762} See map entry no. 210 of Digital Augustan Rome with bibliography.
\textsuperscript{763} See map entry no. 212 of Digital Augustan Rome with bibliography. Thorough excavations have been carried out in the area by P. Pensabene, see Pensabene 1998 for a summary of the results.
\textsuperscript{764} Stephan Zink has written his doctoral thesis for the University of Pennsylvania on the sanctuary and published two articles on the architectural design of the temple and its polychromy, Zink 2008, Zink, Piening 2009, 2011.
\textsuperscript{765} Suet. Aug. 72, 1; Ov., trist., 3.1.29-68.
\textsuperscript{766} For details on sources on the Republican houses on the Palatine see Tamm 1963. An extensive treatment of the Republican houses on the Palatine hill can be found in Carandini et al. 2010. This study provides a thorough review of the literary sources that mentions Republican houses from 210 B.C. to AD 69. Less convincing are the topographic and architectural reconstructions, for which the evidence is not always grounded.
\textsuperscript{767} Cic. Fam., 5.6; Dom., 100, 103, 132; Att., 2.24.3.
\textsuperscript{768} Cic. Att., 2.4.7; 2.7.5; 4.3.2.
\textsuperscript{769} Morel 2001, 41
The northeastern corner of the Palatine was centrally located, close to all the major public buildings of the city and commanding a spectacular view over the Sacra via and the Velia. The remains of the house have been identified beneath the foundations of the semicircular exedra of the Domitianic portico.\footnote{See the relevant section on the Vigna Berberini for more details on the project by Domitian.} The presence of a Severan pathway over the remains has prevented archaeologists from assessing whether the remains pertain to one or more houses; however, excavators have been able to date the house to the beginning of the reign of Augustus, when it was first constructed, while the earlier structures beneath it date to the mid/third quarter of the first century B.C.\footnote{ibid.} A peristyle paved in \textit{opus sectile} with a garden in the center has been partially uncovered, while rooms with mosaic floors and painted stuccoes were unearthed together with \textit{in situ} lead hydraulic fixtures.\footnote{Morel 2001, 35-41.}

The earliest remains identified on the site of the future imperial palace belong to Republican and Augustan phases. G. Boni, who directed the excavations on the Palatine in the first half of the nineteenth century, unearthed the remains of the Augustan Aula Isiaca underneath the so-called Basilica, already excavated in the eighteenth century, as well as the late Republican Casa dei Grifi under the Aula Regia.\footnote{Carettoni 1960, 197.} In the lower level of the terrace, underneath the Sunken Peristyle, traces of at least three Republican domus have been uncovered.\footnote{Sojc 2012, 20.} Among the features belonging to these houses are stucco wall decoration and mosaic floors.\footnote{Sojc 2012, 21.}
Augustus' choice for self-representation is described by the sources as modest,\textsuperscript{776} and his presence on the Palatine as a \textit{primus inter pares} seems to be fairly consistent with the archaeological remains. However, what seemed “modest” in Augustan times compared with later palaces might still have been imposing, especially when we think of the House of Augustus as part of the sanctuary of Apollo and the so-called porticus of the Danaids.\textsuperscript{777} The analysis by Iacopi and Tedone on the Augustan complex identified as porticus of the Danaids also suggests that an early expansion toward the east could have taken place during Augustan times and formed part of the façade facing toward the Circus Maximus.\textsuperscript{778} In this complex, Domitian’s intervention would focus on the expansion of the Palatine library, which he turned into a larger building with twin halls for, perhaps, a Greek and Latin library.\textsuperscript{779} It already had Greek and Latin libraries—since the Augustan period. The recent work carried out on the House of Augustus,\textsuperscript{780} the Domus Tiberiana,\textsuperscript{781} and the Sunken Peristyle of the Flavian palace\textsuperscript{782} seems to suggest, then, that the Augustan residence was in fact larger than we thought.

\textsuperscript{776} Suet. \textit{Aug.} 72, 1, “\textit{Habitavit primo iuxta Romanum Forum supra Scalas anularias, in domo quae Calvi oratoris fuerat; postea in Palatio, sed nihilo minus aedibus modicis Hortensianis, et neque laxitate neque cultu conspicuis, ut in quibus porticus breves essent Albanarum columnarum et sine marmore ullo aut insigni pavimento conclavia. Ac per annos amplius quadranginta eodem cubiculo hieme et aestate mansit, quamvis porum salubrem valitudini suae urbem hieme experiretur assidueque in urbe hiemaret}.”

\textsuperscript{777} A controversial reconstruction appears in Carandini, Bruno 2008. Despite the doubts about the evidence for the reconstruction proposed in the book, it is clear that this space was grand and richly adorned.

\textsuperscript{778} Iacopi, Tedone 2005-2006.

\textsuperscript{779} See the relevant section further on for details about this Domitianic project.

\textsuperscript{780} See the work by Stephan Zink, 2008, 2011, which also involves a new analysis of the so-called House of Augustus.

\textsuperscript{781} See Tomei, Filetici 2011.

\textsuperscript{782} See Sojc 2012.
IV.a.2 A new imperial residence for the Julio-Claudians: was the Domus Tiberiana the house of Tiberius?

The constantly increasing demands on the administration of the empire soon called for new spaces both for the residential needs of the imperial family and for public business. These needs were first met on a large scale with the construction of an impressive building complex known as Domus Tiberiana, which was to receive attention also from both Vespasian and Domitian. The exact chronological sequence of the building phases is currently debated, but it can be said that the northwestern sector of the hill was occupied by several Republican domus, among which was the family house of Tiberius. In fact, we know from Tacitus that Tiberius resided on the Palatine since the very beginning of his reign.

The ancient and modern sources refer to the “Domus Tiberiana” as a palatial complex that occupies the northwestern corner of the Palatine (figs. 104 and 105). Despite the fragmentary archaeological data it is possible to identify an upper level, corresponding to the Renaissance Orti Farnesiani, consisting of a large landscaped area with an elaborate fountain basin and thermal bath complexes. The lower levels included

---

783 Tamm credits Caligula with an extensive building project in the area (Tamm 1963, 64-71). Krause, the main excavator of the remains, dates to Nero's times the construction of a unitary large basement partly before and partly after the 64 AD fire (Krause 1994). Royo too agrees that the main transformation of Republican residences, one of which could have been Tiberius' house, into a large imperial complex did not start until Nero and the Flavians (Royo 1999, 209-14). Cecamore opts for a completely different interpretation of this concrete basement as the remains of the Templum Novum Divi Augusti (Cecamore 2002, 185-211), however this interpretation has not been widely accepted. Tomei's excavations brought to light significant remains of a rich building attributed in its early construction to pre-Claudian and Claudian times (Tomei, Filetici, 2011). Coarelli, on the basis of certain literary sources, is willing to credit Tiberius with the initial project of a unitary palace, later expanded by Caligula, which would explain the debate about the name domus Tiberiana (Coarelli 2012, 450-67).

784 Tac. Ann., 1.13. In this episode Haterius has to go to the "palace" to be pardoned by Tiberius, "...constat Haterium, cum deprecandi causa Palatium introisset ambulantisque Tiberii genua advolveretur...".
an underground quadriporticus, staircases, and several functional rooms for a range of diversified needs, some of which have yet to be identified.\textsuperscript{785}

The modern studies on the Domus Tiberiana have struggled with several issues regarding its overall plan and functionality, but the two questions that have caused the most debate concern the identity of the first builder, hence the reasons behind the name, and the chronological sequence of the construction phases. The first question derives from the fact that, until recent times, there was scarce archaeological and textual evidence to connect the name of Tiberius to any construction phase of the building; therefore, other explanations were put forward to explain the use of the label "Domus Tiberiana."

Rosa was the first one to identify some Julio-Claudian phases of construction in the northern façade covered by the Domitianic front,\textsuperscript{786} while Lugli narrowed down the dating of this façade to Tiberius' reign based on building technique.\textsuperscript{787} However, the identification of these Julio-Claudian, or Tiberian, phases did not seem sufficient to justify the name "Domus Tiberiana," despite the fact that, as mentioned earlier, Tacitus reports that Tiberius lived on the Palatine.\textsuperscript{788} In addition to Tacitus’ account, Flavius Josephus describes the imperial palace where Caligula is killed by calling it “the palace....built in different parts whose names belong to those who built it”.\textsuperscript{789}

Despite the literary references, there was still not enough archaeological evidence for a Tiberian phase, which led Tamm to think that the association between \textit{domus} and

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{785} See further on details about the excavations and the interpretations of the archaeological evidence. \\
\textsuperscript{786} Tomei, Filetici, 2011, 18. \\
\textsuperscript{787} Lugli 1957, 589. \\
\textsuperscript{788} Tac. \textit{Ann.}, 1.13. \\
\textsuperscript{789} Ios. \textit{AJ}, 19.1.15, “διὰ τὸ ἕν τὸ βασίλειον ὃν ἐπ᾽ ὀικοδομίαις ἐκάστοτῶν ἐν τῇ ἡγεμονίᾳ γεγονότων ἀσκηθὲν ἀπὸ μέρους ὀνόματι τῶν οἰκοδομησόμενων ἢ καὶ τί τῶν ἡμερῶν ὀικήσεις ἀρξάντων τῇ ἐπώνυμῳ παρασχέσθαι”, “for while the edifice was one, it was built in its several parts by those particular persons who had been emperors, and those parts bare the names of those that built them or the name of him who had begun to build its parts”, translation by W. Whiston, 1895.
\end{flushleft}
Tiberiana appeared first in relation to the events of 68 AD. Tacitus describes Galba’s path after a sacrifice at the temple of Apollo, from which he headed back to the Domus Tiberiana toward the Velabrum, while Suetonius mentions Vitellius watching his enemies burning on the Capitoline from the Domus Tiberiana. Finally, to account for the lack of mention in the contemporary sources and the archaeological evidence, Tamm suggested that the name "Domus Tiberiana" was in fact given to the building by Domitian as a sort of homage to Tiberius, whom he was known to respect. This explanation has persisted until the most recent archaeological investigations, which identified a larger Tiberian phase in the building. Following this investigation Tomei pointed out an earlier use of the label Domus Tiberiana that might help in matching the name with the archaeological evidence. In fact, in CIL VI 8654 we find the mention of a Iulia Gemella, most likely a liberta of Iulia, Augustus’ daughter, among the liberti in the Domus Tiberiana. The inscription is dated to AD 39, indicating that already under Caligula this label was used for this sector of the imperial palace.

In the following paragraphs I will summarize the complicated history of the excavations in this area of the hill and provide details about the Julio-Claudian phases of the palace. It is important to note in advance that, as mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, the recent excavations underneath the Farnese Gardens revealed the existence of a large, luxurious palatial complex which can be dated to pre-Claudian and Claudian times. This indicates that at least the birth of a “palatine architecture” needs

---

790 Tamm 1963, 64-65.
791 Tac., Hist. 1, 27.
792 Suet., Vit., 15, 3.,
793 Tamm 1963, 78-79.
795 The name of Iulia Gemella is listed as part of the “a suppellectile de domu Tiberiana”, CIL VI 8654.
796 Tomei 2011, 13.
797 Tomei, Filetici, 2011a, 2011b, 118-120.
to be placed chronologically earlier than the palace Domitian built on the southern sector of the hill.

IV.a.3 Archaeological evidence and history of the excavations in the Domus Tiberiana

This sector of the hill is certainly the least known archaeologically for several reasons. After the medieval spoliation that occurred on this building, the Farnese family took ownership of the entire area and built over the remains, burying the vestiges of this important section of the imperial residence. The combination of the spoliation and the later Renaissance construction caused serious structural issues, which have been recently addressed in several excavation and restoration campaigns. The presence of the Orti Farnesiani on the top of the terrace (fig. 111) and structural issues on the northern and western sides have prevented an open area investigation on the site for years, and most likely some parts of the Domus Tiberiana will never be explored. Even the most recent excavations were scattered and very limited in their extension. A further analysis of the building techniques employed in the entire Domus Tiberiana is currently being undertaken and should shed light on the many questions that are still unanswered, particularly when it comes to securely dating the early imperial interventions.

---

798 See Tomei, Filetici, 2011, 12-34, for a detailed history of the modern interventions in this area.
799 The results of this investigations and repairs was published by Tomei and Filetici in 2011. While the archaeological reports are lacking in methodology and clarity, the scale of the restorations and structural analysis merits recognition.
800 The so-called Giardini Farnesiani, for instance, have become a landmark of the Palatine. Though we know that they cover some crucial areas of the palace it will probably not ever be possible to completely excavate them.
801 Tomei, Filetici 2011.
802 M. Serlorenzi, the new soprintendente for the Palatine, is the supervisor of this project which is carried out by S. Camporeale for the structures and F. Coletti for the study of the pottery finds.
The known remains of the Domus Tiberiana occupy a quadrangular area of roughly 135 x 120 m which is delimited by the via Nova to the north, the clivus Palatinus to the east, the House of Livia and the Magna Mater sanctuary to the south, and the horrea Agrippiana and the church of Santa Maria Antiqua to the west, toward the Velabrum (figs. 104 and 108). As already mentioned, the remains occupy varying levels as does the so-called Clivus Victoriae on the Velabrum side. The most recent archaeological discoveries are located on the upper terrace of the hill, today occupied by the Orti Fornesiani (fig. 111), and consist of the remains of a large and richly decorated open area with a water basin in the center and green areas to the sides, all of which date to pre-Claudian and Claudian times. This landscaped section of the imperial palace occupies almost the center of the Domus Tiberiana and its remains are currently visible through a platform which is accessible from the upper level of the hill, adjacent to the Flavian palace on the southeastern side and the Magna Mater sanctuary on the southwestern side. This open area is built on a hypogean quadriporticus, whose three segments have recently been cleared of debris. The quadriporticus is connected to other cryptoporticoes that had been identified in past excavations (fig. 109); they prove the existence of an intricate system of underground passages that connected the entire hill, from the House of Livia to the northernmost corner of the Domus Tiberiana. The rest of the remains pertaining to the Domus Tiberiana are not accessible to the public and extend toward the northwest.

The side overlooking the Velabrum and the horrea Agrippiana was obliterated by a massive wall built by the Farnese family. Recent excavations have identified a

---

803 See further on for the archaeological evidence for the dating.
804 The author participated to these excavations which yielded, among others, remains of a marble statue of a draped male figure with traces of painting and two magnificent large wings in Greek marble, all currently exhibited in the Antiquarium on the Palatine.
805 The so-called Neronian cryptoporticus was excavated by P.Rosa in 1862, Tomei, Filetici, 2011, 14-15.
residential complex built over a foundation terrace, a sort of *basis villae*, which dates back as the Augustan period and was later included in the residence by Augustus together with a monumental water basin.\(^{806}\) The most impressive archaeological investigation of the Domus Tiberiana was undertaken by P. Rosa starting in 1861 when Napoleon III bought the Farnese Gardens.\(^{807}\) Rosa excavated the palace on all accessible fronts, liberating the remains from massive, thick layers of debris. On the upper level of the terrace, where the Farnese Gardens had become a landmark of the Palatine, he was only able to explore the eastern sector where he identified the so-called Neronian cryptoporticus (fig. 110) and the vestiges of the Domitianic thermal complex. On the southern corner, close to the so-called House of Livia, he uncovered an elliptical basin that he identified as a fish pond, while other scholars interpreted it as a *natatio*.\(^{808}\) It could, of course, have been both.

The northern front overlooking the via Nova yielded impressive remains. The debris layers were 15 m high, and their removal completely changed the vista of the Palatine from the Forum, particularly from the House of the Vestals. In fact, Rosa’s excavations exposed the Hadrianic arcades, still visible today, which towered above the forum and testified to the scale of the construction of this sector of the palace. Rosa was able to distinguish the different construction phases with impressive accuracy and recognized a Julio-Claudian early phase followed by a Domitianic and finally a Hadrianic intervention.\(^{809}\)

---

\(^{806}\) Tomei, Filetici, 2011, 159.
\(^{807}\) As already mentioned, Tomei provides a detailed and engaging history of the excavations in the domus Tiberiana in the 20th century, Tomei, Filetici, 2011, 12-34. Here I present a concise summary of that.
\(^{808}\) Tomei, Filetici, 2011, 17.
\(^{809}\) Tomei, Filetici, 2011, 18. The data collected by Tomei and her team in the recent excavations seem to coincide with Rosa’s early analysis. Following the rich material finds from these excavations, Rosa was the first one to set up a Palatine museum on the hill, in a Farnese building later demolished by Lanciani. We know from a description by Rosa that the museum held a striking variety of objects including statues,
Rodolfo Lanciani resumed the work on the Domus Tiberiana in 1870 when Napoleon III sold the Farnese properties to the Italian State after his defeat in the Battle of Sedan in 1870. He worked on the northern side, which overlooked the via Nova. Lanciani was followed by Giacomo Boni in 1900 and Alfonso Bartoli, who excavated the Velabrum side between 1927 and 1940. He uncovered the "basoli" of what was correctly identified as the Clivus Victoriae (fig. 112). Gianfilippo Carettoni directed the investigations in the 1960s on the northern corner, focusing mainly on maintenance and repairs, while in the same period Fabbrini conducted excavations on the eastern side adjacent to the Neronian cryptoporticus.

Van Deman had identified substantial construction phases by Caligula, Domitian, and Hadrian based on building technique and the results of a sondage that she excavated on the northwestern corner of the building and in the area of Santa Maria Antiqua. Between 1981 and 1987 Clemens Krause directed a Swiss team in a thorough investigation of the remains of the Domus Tiberiana, which resulted in new plans of the different construction periods of the palace. This work established phases from the early Julio-Claudian times to Hadrian, including Nero, Vespasian and Domitian. The remains of Republican aristocratic houses were identified as sparse vestiges inside the core of the building and attributed to Period I. These were first restored and then incorporated in the complex, and all of them can be dated to Republican and Augustan times.

---

810 The term refers to the basalt blocks commonly used to pave ancient Roman streets.
811 Tomei, Filetici, 2011, 27.
812 Van Deman 1924.
Two phases were identified in Period II, the second of which was dated to Nero’s reign, post AD 64. In the first one, the houses were buried in the construction of a large foundation measuring 400 x 450 m, with a height varying between 5.5 m (SE corner) to 17 m (NW corner); this served as the platform for the future imperial residence.\(^{815}\) In light of the latest archaeological investigations and the epigraphic evidence, Tomei, instead, believes that this massive platform is to be attributed to Tiberius.\(^{816}\) The extensive interventions by Vespasian and especially Domitian will be analyzed in the following section. For now, it will suffice to notice a clear interest by the Flavians in this Palatine residence.

The Hadrianic phase included the extension of the palace toward the via Nova through the construction of massive arcades and a row of *tabernae* along the via Nova; this, in turn, changed the vista of the Palatine from the Forum (fig. 107). The latest occupation and consequent abandonment of the Domus Tiberiana is attested by the presence of burials in amphorae dated to the sixth-seventh century AD.\(^{817}\) Cecamore, instead, argued that the upper level of the Domus Tiberiana could have housed the temple of Augustus, which underwent several restorations, although this has since been proven wrong.\(^{818}\)

Additional excavations by the British School at Rome were carried out in the area now occupied by the church of Santa Maria Antiqua.\(^{819}\) Since the late 1980s the Soprintendenza has undertaken several studies, excavations, and structural analysis of the known remains pertaining to the Domus Tiberiana, leading to the 2011 publication

---

\(^{815}\) Krause 1994.

\(^{816}\) Tomei, Filetici 2011, 227-29.

\(^{817}\) The author excavated one of these burials in amphorae in one of the *tabernae* overlooking the Roman Forum. The burial was dated on the grounds of pottery finds to the late 6th AD.

\(^{818}\) Cecamore 2002, 202-06. This hypothesis has been proved wrong by the recent excavations, Tomei, Filetici 2011.

\(^{819}\) Hurst 1986.
edited by M. A. Tomei and M. G. Filetici, which includes the excavation reports, analysis, and history of the monument together with a study of the structural and restoration issues that are central to the preservation of this palatial complex.

IV.a.4 The Julio-Claudian Domus Tiberiana

Starting from the upper level, which corresponds to the area occupied by the Orti Farnesiani, the Domus Tiberiana was conceived as a luxurious section of the imperial residence consisting of a large open area punctuated by water features and gardens. Under Tiberius most of the Republican aristocratic houses known from the sources were preserved. As we have seen, according to Tomei it was Tiberius, and not Nero, who built the original foundations and most likely included in the imperial residence the domus belonging to his father, whose remains would be obliterated by the Flavians but spared by Tiberius, Claudius, and Caligula. To this Tiberian phase belongs the central cryptoporticus consisting of four sides, of which only three have been investigated. The hypogean quadriporticus had "bocche di lupo" openings and supported a peristyle garden where we can imagine columns arranged according to the pattern of the "bocche di lupo", as some traces show. The articulated system for sewage and draining made of suspensurae and lead fistulae discovered all over the upper level supports the idea of a large area where water features were prominent.

Several authors, and archaeological evidence, attest to the major construction that Caligula carried out in this sector of the Palatine. Suetonius reports on his well-known extension from the Domus Tiberiana to the Forum as an attempt to turn the

820 See Tamm 1963 for a detailed analysis of the sources with regards to the Republican houses on the Palatine. Also Carandini et al. 2010.
821 Bruno 2012, 235.
822 Tomei, Filetici 2011, 206-239.
823 Tomei, Filetici 2011, 224; Bruno 2012, 235.
temple of the Dioscuri into the palace's vestibule, as it were, and of a bridge connecting the *palatium* with the temple of the *divus* Augustus on the Capitoline. The forum extension is confirmed by Flavius Josephus, who mentioned as well the expansion of the house of Germanicus, Caligula's father, which was also on the Palatine. Caligula's intervention in the Domus Tiberiana must have had such an impact that Pliny the Elder calls the building *domus Caii* and he compares it in terms of its grandiosity to the *Domus Aurea* of Nero, which Pliny had known and which he lived to see largely erased.

Some of the data from the new archaeological investigations might also confirm other fragments of Caligula’s story that were reported in the literary sources in relation to the Palatine. We know from the account of the assassination of Caligula in Flavius Josephus that Germanicus’s house was also adjacent to the imperial palace, and that the emperor was murdered in a “quite, private passage,” most likely a cryptoporticus. This has been tentatively identified by Tomei as the above mentioned quadriporticus in the central area of the Domus Tiberiana (fig. 109).

A second phase was identified in the reinforcement added on the inside of the cryptoporticus and related to a lead *fistula* bearing the name of Claudius. Claudius' important modifications on the Domus Tiberiana are not mentioned by the sources, although Statius tells us that Claudius lived there and he refers to it as the “Tibereia”

---

824 Suet. *Calig.*, 22, 2. The domus Tiberiana is here mentioned as "*palatium*", "...*partem Palatii ad Forum usque promovit, atque aede Castoris et Pollucis in vestibulum transfigurata...".
827 *Pl. NH.*, 36, 15, 111.
830 Tomei, *Filetici* 2011, 206-239.
831 Tomei, *Filetici* 2011, 225.
Structural instability might have been the reason for his intervention, which laid the basis for the later and more massive addition to the top level. In fact, a corresponding change was made on the terrace above with the construction of a water basin, 30 x 12 m, revetted in white marble and surrounded by green areas. For this phase the archaeological evidence is certain, and it testifies to the importance of this sector of the imperial residence during Julio-Claudian times as well as the central role of the landscaped areas and water features that would later inspire Domitian when he made his own addition to the hill.

**IV.b Nero and the Palatine**

Nero’s vision of a grand Palatine residence needs not to be connected solely to the fire of AD 64 and the subsequent construction of the Domus Aurea. In fact, Nero built imperial residences throughout his reign: first the Domus Transitoria, and then the Domus Aurea after the fire. The remains of Nero’s construction on the Palatine hill show that his vision was aimed not just at the beautification of the area but was also concerned with the paths of traffic.

---

832 Stat., Silv., III.3.66-70: “Tiberea prima aula tibi vixdum ora nova mutante iuventa panditur (hic annis multa super indole victis libertas oblata venit) nec proximus heres, immitis quamquam et Furiis agitatus, abegit”.

833 The dating of this water feature to Caudian times lacks archaeological support. As Bruno points out (Bruno 2010, 236) the presence of the fistula in the cryptoportico does not necessarily mean that the basin on the top terrace was built in the same phase. The two features, however, occupy the same phase stratigraphically as they are both after the first phase and before Domitianic times. However, other absolute dates could be hypothesized, for instance Caligula could have been built the water basin.

834 Tomei emphasizes Augustan interventions on the Velabrum front and all over the Domus Tiberiana, Tomei, Filetici 2011, 59-85, 155-175, 222-239. While some of these observations seem to be grounded on archaeological data Tomei might have overstated the extent of Augustus’ program on this sector of the Palatine. In fact, while there is evidence for Augustan restorations in several sectors, the data are too scattered to hypothesize a unitary idea for an imperial residence which Tomei seems to embrace. Instead, the archaeological, literary, and epigraphic evidence point to a substantial interest form the Julio-Claudians toward this sector of the imperial residence.
Nero’s alterations to the Domus Tiberiana can be identified in the second phase of Period II of Krause’s study. In this phase the northwestern corner was rebuilt while the entire terrace was arranged as an open area with gardens surrounding a central structure and built over a hypogeal portico. In this phase the façade of the monument was furnished with a large staircase perhaps providing access to and from the Apollo sanctuary and the so-called House of Augustus. The fire of 64 AD is the watershed that separates the two construction phases of Period II. Therefore, according to Krause, Period II represents the moment when the Domus Tiberiana first became a building complex manifesting a unitary design concept aimed at creating a monumental expansion to the imperial residence (fig. 105, Neronian phase). The results produced by Krause emphasized the impact of Nero’s building activity on this sector of the Palatine, attributing to this emperor the conception of a grand palatial residence separated from the House of Augustus. However, as we have seen, the latest archaeological excavations seem to show a substantial Tiberian phase that justifies the name Domus Tiberiana.

Nero’s intervention on the top level was drastic and caused a significant change in the way the whole area was perceived. In fact, the original foundations built by Tiberius were extended toward the north, east, and south, causing a rearrangement of the access points and the traffic circulation impacted by the construction of underground passages. The so-called Neronian cryptoporticus (fig. 110) was in fact built to connect the Domus Tiberiana to the House of Augustus without necessarily crossing the Area Palatina,

---

836 According to Krause, Nero distinguished between his personal residence, the Domus Aurea on the Esquiline, and the imperial residence on the Palatine which represented the center of power reminiscent of the mythical Roma Quadrata, Krause 2009, 264, 1998, 213 and ff.
837 see supra, Tomei, Filetici 2011, 68, 161-62, 213.
between the Domus Tiberiana and the future Flavian palace.\textsuperscript{838} The Domus Tiberiana was furnished with a monumental staircase in the center of the northeastern side overlooking the via Sacra, while the top level was arranged symmetrically with an alternation of water features and green areas. The northeastern corner was finished with a suspended L-shaped portico which offered an exceptional view over the Forum (fig. 105, Neronian phase).

After the fire of 64 AD the street level in front of the staircase was elevated and the street extended to the \textit{clivus Palatinus} toward the east. Bruno makes an interesting observation about the Neronian construction phase, which seems to show an interest in the regulation of the entire area. This seems evident in the symmetrical arrangement of the remains on the top terrace and the regular grid pattern imposed there to facilitate the patterns of traffic.\textsuperscript{839} In fact, these changes to the traffic patterns both at ground and underground level were maintained even later, especially with the changes implemented by Domitian. No evidence of a Neronian intervention was found on the eastern, northern, and western corners of the Domus Tiberiana.

To the east of the Domus Tiberiana, in the so-called Vigna Barberini complex, a collapse level dated later than the fire of 64 was identified. The above-mentioned house, whose remains were identified among the Flavian construction on the Vigna Barberini, suffered from structural issues caused by some technical negligence.\textsuperscript{840} The collapse of the structure was most likely due to an earthquake which can be dated either between 64 and 65 AD or 68 and 70 AD based on the ancient sources and the data from the

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{838} Tomei 1977. \\
\textsuperscript{839} Bruno 2012, 239. \\
\textsuperscript{840} Morel 2001, 41.
\end{flushleft}
A coin hoard dated to late Neronian times was found in the abandonment levels, confirming the chronological sequence (fig. 119).\textsuperscript{841} A resounding discovery was made between 2009 and 2010 following a *sondage* in the northern sector of the Vigna Barberini, which was intended to assess the state of preservation of the substructures supporting the artificial terrace.\textsuperscript{842} The concrete core of a well preserved but odd round foundation was brought to light (figs. 120, 121). The structure has been dated to Neronian times based on building technique and a marble capital decorated with a painted owl, a motif common on Neronian coins and in the painted decoration of the Domus Aurea on the Oppian hill.\textsuperscript{843} It consists of a cylinder 16 m in diameter enclosed by a circular wall, 2.10 m thick, and pierced by a pillar right in the middle. The entire height of the building is 12 m, which places the ground level just above the valley of the Colosseum, thereby creating a straight connection in elevation between this sector of the forum and the Palatine. The presence of traces of hemispheric holes on the top surface of the cylinder, combined with the dimension, shape, and data from the sources, allowed the excavators to cautiously interpret the structure as the famous *coenatio rotunda* described by Suetonius,\textsuperscript{844} the ever-revolving dinner hall regarded as one of the most prodigious features of the Domus Aurea. In fact, the hemispheric holes could have housed stone spheres which would have facilitated the revolving movement of a superimposed structure.\textsuperscript{845} Some of these holes contained traces of clay which could have served as lubricant for the revolving movement. According to this interpretation, the feature uncovered in this corner of Vigna Barberini

\textsuperscript{841} Villedieu 2011-12.
\textsuperscript{842} Desnier 2001, 57-58.
\textsuperscript{843} Villedieu 2011-12, 5.
\textsuperscript{844} Villedieu 2011-12, 6.
\textsuperscript{845} Suet. *Nero*, 31.2.
\textsuperscript{846} Villedieu 2013, 11-12.
was just the structure meant to support a hall or room above, of which no evidence remains. The traces of the mechanism seem to find a more than plausible explanation in the interpretation put forward by Villedieu (fig. 121):\textsuperscript{847} However, more details and an extension of the excavation area are needed to confirm this, so far, quite astounding discovery.

On the southern sector of the hill, later occupied by the Flavian palace, several relevant remains can be attributed to Nero's reign based on the stratigraphy. Most significantly, it appears that the extensive leveling of the upper part of the hill and, at least, partial work on the so-called Sunken Peristyle were carried out by Nero. In fact, construction belonging to two Neronian phases was uncovered by Carettoni just underneath the imperial *triclinium*. The first phase belongs to the so-called *Domus Transitoria*, the imperial residence that Nero started to build and then replaced with the Domus Aurea.\textsuperscript{848} The remains belonging to the *Domus Transitoria* were identified by Carettoni as a two-storey nymphaeum, which can be reconstructed on the grounds of drawings made during the excavations in the 1700s (fig. 129). It was decorated with Verde Antico and Rosso Antico marble columns with bronze capitals. A sunken garden and other smaller rooms were uncovered, featuring walls decorated with refined paintings, one of which depicts scenes from the Trojan War.\textsuperscript{849} Finally, water staircases completed the decoration of this area, which seems to have been arranged in two levels judging by the traces of the second floor identified just underneath the Domitianic *triclinium*. Stratigraphic data allowed the excavators to attribute to the second Neronian

---

\textsuperscript{847} Villedieu 2011-2012. The interpretation has been challenged by Carandini who places the *coenatio rotunda* in a sector of the Neronian Domus Aurea roughly corresponding to the valley of the Colosseum of which no archaeological evidence exists, Carandini 2011, 143-47.

\textsuperscript{848} Suet., *Nero*, 31.1-2.

\textsuperscript{849} Carettoni 1960, 197.
phase a latrine and a large circular feature initially identified as the *coenatio rotunda*\(^{850}\) mentioned by Suetonius with regards to the Domus Aurea.\(^{851}\)

On the top level of the terrace Nero built new structures on top of the House of the Grifi and the Aula Isiaca;\(^{852}\) however, the remains are too scattered to make inferences on their specific function and shape. Remains of a square hall were also identified underneath the Domitianic Aula Regia, whose orientation followed the previous one. The foundations have been dated to Nero's reign based on the building technique and their orientation, which is consistent with the remains of the nymphaeum.\(^{853}\) Moreover, the analysis of the building technique carried out by Iacopi and Tedone yielded interesting results and interpretations. They identified traces of a foundation forming a three-sided portico corresponding to the limits of the future so-called Sunken Peristyle; they interpret this as a *porticus triplices miliariae* which was typical in villas.\(^{854}\) Therefore, we have to acknowledge a series of scattered traces of structures dated to Nero's reign that are aligned with the later Domitianic palace and seem also to follow its general spatial definition.

The thorough analysis of the so-called Sunken Peristyle by a varied team of scholars, which resulted in a publication edited by Natasha Sojc in 2012, revealed more interesting data about pre-Domitianic interventions. While the absolute chronological dating was not ascertained, they admit the possibility that a major intervention was carried out here by Nero consistent with what was happening on the top level.\(^{855}\) The presence of two octagonal rooms and the hypothesis that these rooms were originally

\(^{850}\) Cassatella 1986, 535-37.
\(^{851}\) Suet. *Nero*, 31.2.
\(^{852}\) Bruno 2012, 236.
\(^{853}\) Tomei 2011b, 131.
\(^{854}\) Iacopi, Tedone 2009, 241.
\(^{855}\) Sojc 2012, 22.
equipped with *oculi* and open to a garden area evince a strong resemblance with the Neronian Domus Aurea.\(^{856}\)

This brief survey of Nero’s alterations to the Palatine hill reveals a few aspects essential for the comprehension of the later Domitian’s projects. Nero planned a series of structures that involved the presence of landscape and water features, grand staircases, cryptoportici, and extravagant features such as the revolving cylinder. Some of these features were already present in the Julio-Claudian phase, but with Nero we detect a deeper level of experimentation with spatial design and patterns of traffic. While it is impossible to know whether these features were connected, and if so, how, it is noteworthy that Nero was the first emperor to consider the entire hill as a canvas to be molded for the different needs of his personal and public activities. Vespasian would continue along these lines but would leave it to his son Domitian to bring these projects to completion.

**IV.c Vespasian and the Palatine**

We know from Dio that Vespasian showed no particular interest in the imperial residence on the Palatine, as he preferred to reside elsewhere in Rome in the *Horti Sallustiani*.\(^{857}\) Tacitus tells us that during his father’s reign Domitian was assigned the seat of power on the Palatine, and, according to some, this might indicate that Domitian oversaw the beginning of an intense building project that continued until his death.\(^{858}\)

---

\(^{856}\) Wulf-Rheidt, 2012b. According to the author, the second storey in the Sunken Peristyle is dated to Hadrianic times when the octagonal rooms were equipped with a vault, but the *oculi* hypothesis makes sense in a single-storey building which was probably topped by a terrace or a garden.

\(^{857}\) Dio, 65. 10. 4.

\(^{858}\) Tac. *Hist.*, 4.2., “*nomen sedemque Caesaris Domitianus acceperat*”. For the idea of Domitian supervising part of the construction work carried out by his father on the Palatine see Krause 2009, 264, and Villedieu 2011-12.
While the reign of Vespasian marked the beginning of an important construction phase all over the hill, we need to assess the Vespasianic phases on the Palatine against his other projects in the city, such as the valley of the Colosseum, the restoration of the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, and the Templum Pacis. As we will see, when considering the larger context, Vespasian’s involvement on the Palatine needs to be reconsidered.

Early Vespasianic phases have been identified in the Domus Tiberiana where, during the Vespasianic phase, the Neronian monumental staircase on the north-eastern side was demolished and replaced with a thermal complex dedicated to the service personnel, while the rooms at the southeast of these imperial baths were identified by Krause as a frigidarium and a caldarium arranged axially and symmetrically.859 A new latrine occupied the side of the Domus Tiberiana that overlooked the Via Sacra. It was built partially underground and decorated with frescoes depicting trees and fruits on the vault and gladiators on the walls.860

On the northeastern corner of the hill, in the area later occupied by the so-called Vigna Barberini complex,861 an elaborate compound including porticoes and offices was built by Domitian. However, the excavators were able to determine that the large accumulation of debris that formed the base of the artificial terrace might have started under Vespasian and been completed by AD 92.862 Several water fixtures were tied to the Flavian construction of this complex. A lead fistula bearing the name of C. Licinius Mucianus, a general and governor of Syria, was discovered in a channel between the

860 Tomei 1991, 57-64; Bruno 2012,
861 More details on this part of the hill in the relevant section of the chapter that deals with the interventions by Domitian in the Vigna Barberini area, which were the most substantial.
862 Villedieu 2009, 246-47. For Villedieu it is more than plausible that the young Domitian supervised these works since the very beginning.
Foundations of the curved side of the portico (fig. 124). The involvement of Mucianus in Vespasian’s rise to power is well known from Tacitus, who describes him as an arrogant, self-indulgent character with an undeniable charisma.\textsuperscript{863} The presence of this fistula has been variously interpreted. For the excavators it is possible that the pipe belonged to a private house owned by Mucianus and was reused in the Vespasianic-Domitianic construction.\textsuperscript{864} However, considering the role that Mucianus seemed to have had under Vespasian,\textsuperscript{865} it is also possible that he was in some way involved\textsuperscript{866} in the first stages of the Vigna Barberini project, perhaps the initial construction of the artificial terrace.

The long excavations on the north-eastern slope on the Palatine directed by C. Panella from 1986 to 2003 yielded exceptional results for all documented periods of occupation on the hill. On this sector of the Palatine we know from the sources that Vespasian resuscitated the temple of \textit{Divus Claudius},\textsuperscript{867} which was concealed, and most likely partially demolished, by the immense nymphaeum built by Nero. The new archaeological data indicate the presence of another small Flavian temple and its precinct just to the north of the temple of Claudius, overlooking the valley of the Colosseum and the Meta Sudans.\textsuperscript{868}

Finally, recent analyses of the building technique of several foundations in the imperial palace have led the scholars to hypothesize the existence of unfinished features that pre-date the construction of Domitian.\textsuperscript{869} A peculiar characteristic of these foundations is the presence of travertine fragments in the concrete core, which is

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{863} Tac. \textit{Hist.}, 1.10; Suet. \textit{Vesp.}, 6.4.
\item \textsuperscript{864} Villedieu 2007, 141-43.
\item \textsuperscript{865} For a detailed indications for the ancient sources that mention Mucianus see Carandini et al. 2010, 342, note no. 26.
\item \textsuperscript{866} This hypothesis was put forward by Carandini et al. 2010, 149-50.
\item \textsuperscript{867} Suet., \textit{Vesp.}, 9.1.
\item \textsuperscript{868} Panella 2009, 290-92.
\item \textsuperscript{869} Iacopi, Tedone 2009; Sojc 2012.
\end{itemize}
completely absent from the foundations that can be securely dated to Domitian's reign. Moreover, brick stamps and a lead *fistula* bearing the name of Vespasian relate to the latrine underneath the imperial *triclinium*,\(^{870}\) which seems to stay in use under this emperor.\(^{871}\)

The plan of the Vespasianic remains prepared by Iacopi and Tedone shows the foundations of a hall directly underneath the Aula Regia which pre-dates the Domitianic version and is later than the Neronian remains (fig. 105, Vespasianic phase). They also identified other walls that delimit, perhaps, two similar peristyles in the northeastern sector of the palace. The consistent presence of the peculiar Vespasianic foundations in travertine throughout the palace led the two scholars to hypothesize a pre-Domitianic palace which showed some of the same features, such as peristyles, as the later Domitianic version.\(^{872}\) They go as far as suggesting that some building techniques, typically associated with Domitian, are in fact earlier in date. One such example would be the *bipedales* brick courses, the introduction of which Lugli had attributed to Nero. Lugli himself, however, noted that Nero only attempted that technique and it never became a regular and consistent feature of his buildings.\(^{873}\) While the archaeological evidence uncovered by Iacopi and Tedone definitely shows some interventions by Vespasian, the traces of these are too scarce to infer the presence of a well thought out and carefully designed imperial palace that pre-dates Domitian's intervention. The groups of rooms surrounding the *atria* in the Sunken peristyle of the Flavian palace have also been linked

---

\(^{870}\) Iacopi, Tedone, 244, footnote no. 12.
\(^{871}\) Carettoni 1960, 197.
\(^{872}\) Iacopi, Tedone 2009, *passim*.
\(^{873}\) Lugli 1957, 571.
to Vespasian based on differences in construction technique from those of secure Domitianic date. \(^{874}\)

In sum, the latest archaeological evidence suggests that Vespasian was involved in several sectors of the Palatine, but only the modifications to the *Domus Tiberiana* seemed to have reached a completion stage. The projects that Vespasian carried out as a builder in Rome during his reign clearly indicate what his priorities were. The *Templum Pacis*, a sumptuous garden with water features and war booty in a precinct dedicated to Peace, must have been among the most important projects since it was completed by AD \(^{75}\) \(^{875}\) and it represented the emperor’s signature achievement at the beginning of his reign. Among the completed projects carried out by Vespasian, there is the restoration of the temple to Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline hill, which burned down during the fight against Vitellius in the year AD 69. \(^{876}\) The importance of the Capitoline temple did not leave Vespasian any choice; it had to be restored. In addition, he rebuilt, as already mentioned, the temple of the divine Claudius and he may have built or started the construction of another small temple precinct nearby. The only non-religious building that certainly embodied his political vision is, of course, the Flavian amphitheater, which he did not live to see inaugurated or completed. \(^{877}\)

Therefore, if we look at the sum of the interventions by Vespasian on the Palatine hill, they pale in comparison with what he focused on in other areas of the city. It is especially clear to me that the future palatial residence and the Vigna Barberini complex did not preoccupy Vespasian’s mind. While he preferred to stay in the *Horti Sallustiani*,

---

\(^{874}\) Sojc 2012. 23.  
\(^{875}\) Suet., *Vesp.*, 9; Ios., *BJ*, VII, 158, 161, Dio 65.15.1; Aur. Vict., *Caes.* IX.7. See also Fogagnolo, Moccheggiani Carpano 2009, 184.  
\(^{877}\) Suet., *Vesp.*, 9.1; Suet., *Titus*, 7.3.
he also certainly had to spend time on the Palatine, and he chose the *Domus Tiberiana* for those, probably short, visits.\textsuperscript{878} The interventions on the *Domus Tiberiana* are tightly connected to the construction of the new imperial palace on the southeastern sector of the hill, and the two buildings were meant to work in symbiosis in terms of flow and functionality. In light of these observations, it seems even more likely that Domitian might have overseen the building projects on the Palatine in his father’s name.\textsuperscript{879}

**IV.d Domitian’s Palatine: an imperial micro-city**

Despite the necessary adjustment to the scope of Domitian’s interventions on the Palatine made necessary by the new archaeological discoveries, the impression of grandiosity and a great deal of innovation still characterize his building projects. In this section I will describe and analyze all areas of the Palatine hill involved in projects carried out by Domitian. At the beginning a description will be given of the alterations made by Domitian to the Palatine library within the Augustan complex; then a treatment of the interventions made to the *Domus Tiberiana* will follow. Next I will describe the Forum Building and the impressive ramp that were tied to traffic control. The Vigna Barberini will be analyzed in light of the long and thorough excavation work that uncovered many aspects of this compound while leaving some issues unresolved. Finally, the palace proper will be analyzed with the aim of establishing the function of the space in relation to the court activities. Within the analysis of the palace I will reassess the significance of the traditional labels “Domus Flavia” and “Domus Augustana” as obsolete and misleading. In the conclusion to this section, I will show that Domitian transformed

\textsuperscript{878} Krause 1995.

\textsuperscript{879} This idea is supported by Krause 2009, 264, and Villedieu 2011-12 on the grounds of the mention by Tacitus, *Hist.*, 4.2, and the evident continuity between certain early Flavian and Domitianic phases of construction on the hill.
the entire hill into a functioning mechanism perfectly fit for all the needs of the imperial entourage.

**IV.e The Domitianic restoration/addition to the Palatine library**

Perhaps the least prominent of Domitian’s interventions on the Palatine hill, the restoration/addition to the Palatine library bears some significance within the larger context of this emperor's building program in the city (fig. 105). The archaeological remains of the Augustan complex, which include what we think is his own residence, the sanctuary of Apollo, the *porticus* of the Danaids, and the library, occupy the southwestern sector of the hill and are still visible today, though only partially accessible. After the development of the Domus Tiberiana and the construction of the imperial palace, the House of Augustus complex itself lost its prominence in favor of more grandiose buildings and it was soon covered by later construction. The role of imperial residence was assumed by the grand palace that Domitian developed to the southeast, even though he restored and added a new wing to the Palatine library.

**IV.e.1 Archaeological evidence and history of the excavations**

The remains of the library were first unearthed by P. Rosa, who began his work in 1865 and continued to work on the Palatine for about ten years, bringing to light several remarkable finds, among which the discovery of the *Scalae Caci* is worth mentioning. A. Bartoli further excavated the area of the library by lowering the level about two meters. Unfortunately, this intervention by Bartoli was not published systematically, and the only surviving documentation is a list of material recovered in an article from 1967.

---

880 Iacopi 1997, 18.
881 Iacopi, Tedone 2005-06, 351, footnote no. 1.
In 1956 G. Carettoni embarked on a decades-long excavation project in the area between the *Scalae Caci* and the libraries.\textsuperscript{882} This project contributed enormously to our understanding of the Augustan complex, providing us with concrete data to match the literary sources. Iacopi and Tedone published in 2005-06 a brief though substantial report on the fieldwork they conducted in the area in front of the libraries and the temple of Apollo, which they identified as the remains of the so-called porticus of the Danaids.\textsuperscript{883} The work by Iacopi and Tedone was particularly important in as much as they were able to clear away some assumptions about the traditional interpretation of this site. These assumptions included the idea that the Augustan libraries were located directly underneath the structures built by Domitian, who simply restored an existing situation.\textsuperscript{884} It was also believed that Domitian had then filled the entire lower terrace of the House of Augustus\textsuperscript{885} while the location of the porticus of the Danaids, and the *locus* where Augustus reportedly held senate meetings, were unknown.\textsuperscript{886}

The porticus of the Danaids, known from the sources as *porticus Phoebi*\textsuperscript{887} and *porticus ad Apollinis*,\textsuperscript{888} was identified in the surviving sector of a massive foundation that formed a long rectangle in front of the temple of Apollo, whereas its longitudinal axis corresponded to the axis of the Augustan library.\textsuperscript{889} The Augustan library was identified in the remains of a single apsed hall on the short southwestern side of the porticus. The same apsed hall was also used for senate meetings when the notoriously

\textsuperscript{882} Iacopi 1997, 49.
\textsuperscript{883} Iacopi, Tedone 2005-06.
\textsuperscript{884} Iacopi, Tedone 2005-06, 351.
\textsuperscript{885} ibid.
\textsuperscript{886} Suet. *Aug.*, 29, 3.
\textsuperscript{887} Prop. 2.31. 1-2.
\textsuperscript{888} *Tabula Hebana* 1-4, Raveggi 1974, 49-54.
\textsuperscript{889} Iacopi, Tedone 2005-06, 358-75. For a different reconstruction see also Carandini 2008, fig. 25.
weak health of Augustus prevented him from reaching the forum. The idea that the libraries mentioned by the sources could have been the same place where Augustus held senate meetings had already been put forward by Carettoni, but the location of this library had remained in the shadow until Iacopi and Tedone's research produced new and convincing results.

**IV.e.2 History of the building and Domitianic intervention**

The interpretation of the apsidal hall as a library is justified by several data. The building is arranged as a tripartite space with a lavishly decorated floor in the middle and a series of marble faced benches/steps along the sides. The comparison between this hall and the Curia that Iacopi and Tedone advanced is convincing and helpful in supporting the idea that this building was the location of the senate meetings mentioned by Suetonius. The dimensions of the Curia are very close, as is the internal arrangement. According to P. L. Tucci, who has analyzed the Flavian libraries in Rome, the presence of seven niches per side (3.80 m high x 1.80 m wide x 60 cm deep) confirms the use of this Augustan apsed hall as a library. Under Domitian the library retained the valence Augustus established for it: a place emblematizing learning and culture under the stewardship of Apollo. From Augustus onward, in fact, all emperors liked to present
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890 Suet., Aug., 29.3; 72.1; 80-82.
891 Iacopi, Tedone 2005-06, 351-52.
892 Iacopi, Tedone 2005-06, 353. The *opus sectile* that decorates the floor in the central nave is made of fragments of Giallo Antico, Pavonazzetto, Proconnesian, and Luni marbles arranged in triangles and rectangles. Marble slabs were also employed to cover the benches on the sides (ibid.).
893 Iacopi, Tedone 2005-06, 354-55. The authors also reports the traces of a statue base in the apse that could have housed a statue of Augustus.
894 Tucci 2013, 286-87. See also section II.b.3.
themselves as supporters of scholarship, and Domitian followed in Augustus’ footsteps, especially in his well-documented connection with Minerva.\footnote{See Darwall-Smith 1996, 115-28, with ample bibliography, for a treatment of temples dedicated to Minerva under Domitian and the emperor’s relationship with the goddess.}

The surviving Augustan phase of the library is limited to the foundations and some extant sectors of the marble decoration; nothing of the elevation is preserved.\footnote{Iacopi, Tedone 2005-06, 352-54; Tucci 2013, 287.} All these remains are covered by a significant restoration that has been securely dated to Domitian’s reign based on brick stamps and construction techniques. Remains of a twin adjacent hall located toward the south are also visible and belong to the Domitianic intervention. The analysis by Iacopi and Tedone shows that the remains that survive underneath the Domitianic southern hall cannot be used as evidence that this building was originally built in Augustan times.\footnote{Iacopi, Tedone 2005-06, 355.} As Tucci points out, a twin hall could not have existed on the opposite side of the porticus of the Danaids because of the presence of the \textit{Scalae Caci}.\footnote{Tucci 2013, 286.} Therefore, we should envision an asymmetrical area in front of the temple of Apollo flanked only on the southwest by a single hall used as a library and a meeting venue; this was joined by a twin building during Domitian’s reign. The Domitianic phase is reflected in a lost fragment of the Forma Urbis which is preserved in a Renaissance drawing.\footnote{\textit{FUR}, 20b.}

The addition by Domitian were prompted by various factors. For instance, at the beginning of the reign of Domitian, there was massive construction work launched in the area behind the forum of Caesar and between the Capitoline and the Quirinal. At that time, the \textit{Atrium Libertatis}, also known as the library of Pollio, was destroyed, and we
can imagine some of the volumes being shifted to the Palatine library.\textsuperscript{900} In addition, the Palatine library might also have provided access from the Circus Maximus side to the so-called \textit{Paedagogium}, an ambiguous building that was constructed with the Domitianic imperial palace but whose function is still unknown.\textsuperscript{901} One of the most interesting aspects of these two Palatine buildings is their striking similarity to the southern hall in the enclosure of the \textit{Templum Pacis} (fig. 12), which has been analyzed by Tucci, who first noticed the similarity. He has dated the hall, based on construction techniques, to Domitian's reign.\textsuperscript{902}

The interpretation of the southern hall in the \textit{Templum Pacis} as a library is based on less reliable data,\textsuperscript{903} but the shape and dimensions of all these buildings do seem to confirm Tucci's intuition. Based on the Renaissance drawing of the fragment 20b of the \textit{Forma Urbis}, showing three columns in front of the Domitianic addition to the Palatine library, Tucci also suggests that a more substantial Domitianic intervention might have taken place to enlarge the porticus of the Danaids in order to include the second library.\textsuperscript{904} This would have produced a more symmetrical and less awkward arrangement of the entire area in front of the temple. However, as tempting as this hypothesis is, there is no archaeological evidence to support it.

Therefore, Domitian's intervention included a restoration of the Augustan library, whose foundations were included in the new building, and the addition of a twin

\textsuperscript{900} Tucci 2013, 288. The \textit{Atrium Libertatis} is mentioned by several literary sources: Cic., \textit{Att.} 4.16.18; Suet., \textit{Aug.} 29.5; Dio Cass. 48.41.7; Livy 34.44.5, 43.16.13, 45.15.5; Festus 277; Pliny, \textit{NH} 35.10, 36.23-25, 36.33-34; Ov., \textit{Trist.} 3.1.69-72. According to Carandini the \textit{Atrium Libertatis} was located close to the Curia in the Roman Forum, Carandini 2012, 174.

\textsuperscript{901} See section IV.i for more details about this building.

\textsuperscript{902} Tucci 2013, 277-91. See also chapter II on the Imperial Fora in this work.

\textsuperscript{903} Tucci 2013, 280-85.

\textsuperscript{904} Tucci 2013, 286, footnote no. 21.
hall adjacent to the southwestern side.\textsuperscript{905} The use of these halls as a library is confirmed by the presence of niches with the expected dimensions for ancient libraries.\textsuperscript{906} The construction of an adjoining hall is particularly interesting when seen as a precursor of the later use of twin buildings to house separate Greek and Latin libraries\textsuperscript{907} in the Basilica Ulpia and the Baths of Caracalla.

Before Domitian, in fact, the use of a single apsed hall seems to have been a common design for libraries. Domitian’s intervention in the Augustan complex fits perfectly in the context of his general program for the entire hill. With the massive construction undertaken everywhere else on the hill, the Augustan apsed hall may have lost its function for administrative and political meetings. The addition of the twin building altered the function of the original one and established the use of these halls as libraries.

\textbf{IV.f The Domitianic Domus Tiberiana}

With the interventions by Domitian the Domus Tiberiana was significantly altered, although the modifications continued along the line of a grand residence with large landscaped areas and water features. According to the chronology of Krause, Period IV was dated to Domitianic times based on the appearance of the \textit{bipedales} courses in the masonry, a building technique which employs regular courses of square bricks measuring two Roman feet per side (60 cm) to regularize the horizontal levels of the masonry. The northeastern corner of the top terrace was drastically modified. The thermal complex was equipped with an oval basin (fig. 105) located diagonally with

\textsuperscript{905} Iacopi, Tedone 2005-06, 352-54.  
\textsuperscript{906} See the discussion about these features in libraries in Tucci 2013; see also Dixon & Houston 2006. For a more detailed discussion about the significance of the Domitianic intervention and construction of libraries see the chapter on the Imperial Fora in this work.  
\textsuperscript{907} Tucci 2013, 289-91.
respect to the central axis of the complex, and the arrangement of the landscape elements was also modified. These imperial baths were built with a significant change in orientation: they appear diagonal with respect to the rest of the building, although they comply with the north-south orientation common in thermal complexes.\textsuperscript{908} The change in the arrangement was probably aimed at correcting the previous alignment, which did not take advantage of the correct exposure to light typically employed in bath complexes. The Domitianic baths comprised eight rooms which occupied a triangular area and opened on a garden featuring an oval basin and closed by a wall with two semicircular exedrae.

Domitian replaced the service baths built previously by Vespasian with a small scale living space arranged in small rooms and an open area enclosed by a Π shaped portico (fig. 105). The rooms were equipped with a heating system and traces of marble decoration remain on the windows jambs. Krause interpreted this area as a \textit{diaeta} with a small \textit{coenatio}.\textsuperscript{909} The Neronian L-shaped portico was demolished and Domitian constructed another small thermal complex with a round feature on the northeastern corner. It was clearly separated from the "oblique" complex by the wall with two exedrae, which is why Krause interprets this as baths for the service personnel.\textsuperscript{910}

In the center of the top terrace more changes took place under Domitian. The central Julio-Claudian water basin was made smaller and its inner walls were re-shaped with semicircular and rectangular niches (fig. 108). This design mirrors, in reverse, that of the water feature in the second peristyle of the Flavian palace, making the connection between the two Domitianic buildings visually immediate and meaningful. The intercolumniation around the basin also changed, while some "bocche di lupo" in the

\textsuperscript{908} ibid.
\textsuperscript{909} Krause 2009, 266.
\textsuperscript{910} Krause 2009, 267.
cryptoporticus were closed. The dating of the phase is based on the construction technique that shows the use of the bipedales in regular courses in the masonry. No traces of decoration remain for this phase, but it was probably similar to the contemporary and almost identical feature in the second peristyle of the Flavian Palace, which featured marble revetment in its Flavian phase and elaborate opus sectile decoration for the Severan phase.

On the side overlooking the clivus Victoriae, corresponding to the northern corner of the building, interventions were undertaken in both Domitianic and Trajanic-Hadrianic times. In this area, not accessible to the public, there are impressive remains of various rooms arranged on two levels and supported by arcades. The decoration on the vaults consists of beautiful painted stucco, while the floors are in mosaic. A long corridor is still visible from the clivus Victoriae equipped with an elegant marble balustrade opening onto the clivus and in an excellent state of preservation. A series of arcades were also added to the side overlooking the Velabrum, which connected this side of the Domus Tiberiana with the Forum Building and the ramp discussed below. The massive arcades that are still visible today were built by Hadrian (fig. 107) and obliterated the Domitianic façade of the Domus Tiberiana. Nevertheless, it is possible to identify elements of continuity between the Domitianic and the Hadrianic project.

In sum, the Domus Tiberiana remains a difficult building to understand in detail. The scattered excavations shed light on only parts of it, and most of its dating criteria rely solely on construction technique. Stratigraphic excavations have only very recently begun to be undertaken, and some of the dating could change in the course of the current
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911 Tomei, Filetici 2011, 225.
912 ibid.
913 Bruno 2012, 246.
914 See Tomei, Filetici 2011, 54-56 for an analysis of the construction technique employed in this sector.
project. The implications of the most recent data with regard to Domitian's interventions will be discussed in the conclusions, since they are inextricably linked to all the other building projects on the hill. However, it seems clear that the idea of a unified imperial palace on the hill was formed some time before Domitian rose to power. The loss of most of Nero's buildings prevents us from accurately assessing his contribution, though it seems like the transition from the "modest" House of Augustus to the grand Domitianic palace might have been smoother than we thought. The changes that Domitian implemented in the Domus Tiberiana were significant for they previewed the design concepts that would reach its peak with the Flavian palace proper, but the truly innovative addition by Domitian in this sector of the hill is to be found in the Forum Building and the ramp, which were unique and showed an essential aspect of Domitian's concern with the Palatine area: access and security.

IV.g The Forum Buildings and the Ramp

The most drastic intervention by Domitian can be seen in the northern corner of the Domus Tiberiana, where he replaced the structures built by Caligula with his Forum Building, consisting of an impressive ramp which connected the imperial residence to the forum through several loops, of which seven are well preserved, and many halls (figs. 105 and 114). The ramp reached down to the forum level and ended in a tall building which resembles the principia of a castrum.915

This Forum Building consists of a large courtyard whose inner walls feature alternating rectangular and semicircular niches (fig. 114). Traces of marble slabs left by the spoliation are visible and attest to the richness of the decoration. To the east of this

---

915 This aspect is effectively emphasized by Tamm 1963, 79-81.
courtyard there are two other halls and a massive ramp\textsuperscript{916} which would have served as a connection between the forum and the Domus Tiberiana through seven flights all the way up to the palace (fig. 117). The remains of these structures were first brought to light in the early twenty-first century under the direction of G. Boni, who also started the restoration of the vaulted ceiling of the ramp (fig. 115). The restorations were resumed only in 2010 and completed in 2014,\textsuperscript{917} with the occasional opening of the ramp to the public and for exhibitions (figs. 116 and 117). To the south, an odd arrangement of small rooms fill the area between this group and the \textit{Horrea Agrippiana}. This complex of buildings is extremely interesting; it has been analyzed by several scholars,\textsuperscript{918} and recently a more detailed examination has appeared following the restoration of a large sector of the Roman forum and the Palatine.\textsuperscript{919} However, although the latest publication deals accurately with the archaeological remains and structural issues, it does not analyze the design or its uniqueness. Perhaps the reason is to be found in the difficulty posed by the lack of comparanda for such an arrangement of halls and courtyard, and the almost perfect east-west orientation, which is at odd with the alignment of the Domus Tiberiana.

This group of buildings clearly served as a monumental entrance from the forum while providing an effective control for the traffic flow. There are not many passageways between the halls, and they could therefore easily be managed by guards. The comparison with military architecture seems to be fitting,\textsuperscript{920} and this was a time when security needs had to be addressed both architecturally and topographically. The difference in orientation with regard to the rest of the Domus Tiberiana is awkward in

\textsuperscript{916} See Fortini 2015 for a recent analysis of the ramp and other monuments on this area of the forum.
\textsuperscript{917} Fortini 2015.
\textsuperscript{918} Delbrueck 1921; Lugli 1957; Tamm 1963; Krause 1994; Hurst 2006.
\textsuperscript{919} Fortini 2015.
\textsuperscript{920} Tamm 1963, 79-83.
plan but it might not have been perceived as such by the visitor coming from the forum. In fact, the northeastern side of this complex is perfectly parallel to the via Nova, while the northwestern side turns by 90° and overlooks the Velabrum. Therefore, the perception from the forum and the Velabrum would have been of an integrated double façade with an exceedingly tall wall, perhaps with two towers,921 aimed at announcing the meaningful change of space from the forum to the imperial residence.

The ramp that was built to the east of this group of buildings is preserved for seven flights. However, we have to imagine more loops to reach the height of the palatial residence on the top level of the terrace, making this a towering feature that would have allowed access to the imperial residence for horses and carriages as well. This complex signaled a significant change in security facilities between the forum and Palatine, and may have influenced the later imperial palace built by Diocletian in Split at the beginning of the 4th century AD. Despite the originality of its design and the unprecedented use of such architecture in an imperial residence, no mention of this structure appears in the literary sources.

IV.h Vigna Barberini

As we have seen, Nero and perhaps Vespasian showed interest in this sector for different reasons, however it was Domitian who completed a huge building project that provided an ideal space for administration combined with a beautiful landscaped garden with water features. In this section I will describe the area in more detail, providing a history of the occupation and then focusing on the complex built by Domitian.

The northeastern corner of the Palatine has been an archaeological mystery for a long time. The area was owned by the Barberini family from the early seventeenth to the

921 Tamm 1963, 82.
early nineteenth century and had been intended for agricultural use as vineyards, orchards, and gardens. The continuous plowing caused irreparable damage to the ancient remains, which had already suffered from spoliation and plundering. Finally, the presence of the church and monastery of San Sebastiano, and the convent of San Bonaventura, have prevented extended archaeological investigation. Earlier excavations unearthed only a few sections of what seems to have been a magnificent dépendance to the imperial palace (fig. 123). The excavations that have been undertaken since the mid 1980s, however, have yielded crucial data for understanding the development of imperial architecture in Flavian times and later.

IV.h.1 Archaeological evidence and history of the excavations

The archaeological remains on the artificial terrace that occupy the northeastern corner of the Palatine are scattered and not well preserved in elevation (fig. 118). As mentioned before, the presence of the two churches has prevented a large scale excavation, and the visible remains amount to stretches of foundations of the Domitianic semicircular portico, some fragments of marble revetment and decoration, the cylindrical Neronian feature, and the massive foundations of the temple erected between the end of the second and the beginning of the third century AD. The terrace was artificially built in Flavian times and it is enclosed by massive retaining walls which are visible along the northeastern, northwestern, and southeastern sides in their later restorations and modifications. These remains are strikingly less impressive than their southern counterpart, where the Flavian palace still rises to a height of over 10 m. However, the recent work carried out on Vigna Barberini\textsuperscript{922} produced a new picture of

\textsuperscript{922} Vigna Barberini 2007.
this sector of the imperial palace which appears to have featured splendid gardens and water features finished with lavish decoration perfectly suited for a regal estate.

The traces of two massive pillars can be seen today just to the right of what used to be the entrance to the Vigna Barberini complex. Nothing remains of the superstructure, but they are perfectly compatible with the foundation for an arch. We know from the sources that Domitian supposedly built a large number of triumphal arches and vaulted passageways all over the city, richly adorned with chariots and triumphal elements, because Suetonius tells us that this habit upset the population to the point that someone wrote "it's enough" in Greek on one of these arches. In addition, this arch would have provided an ideal grand access to the Vigna Barberini complex, and would also have marked the beginning of the ascent toward the Domitianic palace on top of the hill. It also stands in visual dialogue, though not aligned but at a right angle, with the arch of Titus only 115 m to the north, down the Clivus Capitolinus. The importance of sightlines in Domitianic projects has been highlighted on several occasions. Here the two arches are elements of a Flavian topography that included the Colosseum and the Meta Sudans.

The Vigna Barberini site was still in use during the fourth century AD but was then transformed into a quarry for construction materials in the fifth century. The abandonment occurred in the sixth century when the area was used as a burial ground, and it continued to be used as a cemetery throughout the seventh century. We have no information on the site until the tenth century, when a Benedictine monastery named S. Maria in Pallara was founded. This monastery would be converted later into the church
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924 See Torelli 1987 for several observations about visual connections within the Flavian buildings, also Gros 2009. For the sightlines in the Roman Forum with relation to the Equus Domitiani and also for the Palatine palace see Thomas 2004.
925 Hubert 2001, 108. For the remains of the arch see Cassatella 1993 (LTUR I).
of San Sebastiano to honor the saint who was forced to vow his allegiance to the emperors Diocletian (285-305 AD) and Maximian (286-305 AD) on the steps of the temple in the center of Vigna Barberini.\textsuperscript{926} As in other areas of the Palatine, the noble Roman families acquired sectors of the hill between the thirteenth and the fourteenth century until cardinal Domenico Capranica became the owner of Vigna Barberini at the beginning of the fifteenth century, when the area had been dedicated to agricultural use for a long time.\textsuperscript{927} The restoration of the church of San Sebastiano was undertaken by the Barberini family, while the southern sector of the area was occupied by the convent of San Bonventura. In 1909 the Italian State implemented the 1887 and 1889 laws regarding the creation of an archaeological park in the core of the city, which included the Palatine, and appropriated the Barberini estate known as Vigna Barberini. After an intervention by A. Bartoli between 1931 and 1938, and G. Carettoni in 1954, the Soprintendenza began a long excavation project in collaboration with the École française de Rome in 1985, which is still ongoing and yielding results.\textsuperscript{928}

\textit{IV.h.2 History of the building and Domitianic interventions}

As already mentioned in the section dedicated to the Palatine under Nero, a substantial collapse occurred after AD 64 due, perhaps, to an earthquake. The intervention after the collapse was the filling of the cryptoporticus of the earlier house and the leveling of the collapsed layers to build a level foundation for the artificial terrace that was meant to support the later grand complex. In this phase the Neronian

\textsuperscript{926} Hubert 2001, 109.
\textsuperscript{927} Hubert 2001, 112.
The cylindrical room mentioned above was also covered with debris. The excavators have established that the construction most likely started during the reign of Vespasian and was completed around 92 AD.

The artificial terrace was built by leveling the area with debris in order to obtain a rectangular area measuring 135 x 165 m framed by massive supporting walls. Vaulted substructures were built to support the terrace, creating up to four stories in the northeastern corner and two in the northern corner. The excavators were able to see only a few of these vaulted chambers, which featured a heating system and marble revetted walls. While we do not know the exact number of these rooms, since a large part of the substructures is still buried, they definitely amount to hundreds. The regular modular arrangement seems to fit the hypothesis of an administrative compound containing the imperial archives managed by the Chartularius. The toponym known for the nearby medieval tower, the "Chartularia", fits into this narrative, as does the mention by Dio about the fire of 191 AD nearly destroying the imperial archives on the Palatine.

Despite the partial excavation on the top level of the terrace it has been possible to reconstruct a lavish garden surrounded by a portico with a curved side toward the southwest (figs. 122, 123). Just inside the curved side of the portico the garden was adorned with a water basin featuring the well-known Roman design of alternating semicircular and rectangular niches revetted in marble. Under Hadrian the water basin was demolished and the entire garden rearranged with paths of beaten earth flanked by
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The remains of a large marble channel surrounding the exterior of the portico were found scattered in front of the curved façade and to the east and west of the portico. Within the channel were large rectangular marble slabs laid side by side and converging toward the middle where scattered drains were placed (fig. 125). Villedieu hypothesizes that the unusual width of this channel might have been functional, intended to cool down the summer heat by closing the drains and allowing a shallow body of water to surround the portico.\(^{936}\)

Remains of massive columns, whose diameters range from 1.2 to 1.6 m, might have belonged to a building which stood in this area and was later obliterated by the construction of the Severan temple. The analysis of the foundations of the Severan temple has led the excavators to hypothesize the presence of a similar earlier structure which they cautiously identified with the temple of \textit{Iuppiter Victor} known from a Trajanic and perhaps a Domitianic coin.\(^{937}\) If the temple hypothesis is correct, then we have to imagine a large sacred area arranged as a garden with a temple in the background (figs. 105 and 122); this would not be dissimilar to the layout of the \textit{Templum Pacis}. This splendid sanctuary/garden did certainly have a spatial, symbolic, and ideological connection with the imperial Flavian palace to the southwest, though it is not aligned with the palace. The misalignment was probably caused by the presence of pre-existing buildings both in the Vigna Barberini complex and in the palace. Besides, the northwestern side of the Vigna Barberini aligns with the \textit{clivus Palatinus} and emphasizes the ascent toward the palace with its massive wall which culminates in the Domitianic arch just past the northwestern entrance. It appears that Domitian’s concern with the design was focused on the perception of these grand façades from the forum.

\(^{935}\) Villedieu 2001, 65.
\(^{936}\) Villedieu 2001, 67.
\(^{937}\) Villedieu 2009, 247.
rather than their relation with other buildings on the hill. A sense of lavishness paired with symmetry and order was the effect that these buildings created for the viewer accessing the Palatine from the Valley of the Colosseum and the Via Nova in the Forum.

In fact, the northeastern side is parallel to the Sacra via, where we can also imagine how impressively the walls must have presented themselves with their four stories of vaulted chambers on the eastern corner. The curved side of the porticus presents a shape and dimensions very similar to the semicircular exedra overlooking the Circus Maximus that marks the southwestern façade of the imperial palace. These similarities led Villedieu to hypothesize an intentional dialogue between the two features, where the Vigna Barberini imitates the palace proper.\textsuperscript{938} However, it has been established that the semicircular exedra in the palace is in fact a Trajanic-Hadrianic addition,\textsuperscript{939} which nullifies the imitation hypothesis (fig. 105, Hadrianic phase). We should then imagine either Trajan or Hadrian intentionally mirroring the Vigna Barberini curved portico in their intervention in the palace. This bears significant implications for the effect of Domitian's \emph{damnatio memoriae}, which did nothing but strengthen the legacy of his architectural achievements on the Palatine.

After the death of Domitian, Hadrian faced several collapses due to the instability of the supporting platform. The entire area was rearranged as mentioned above, and it stayed in its Hadrianic form until the fire of 191, which caused severe damage. Some of the most conspicuous remains on the terrace belong to the Severan phase of Vigna Barberini, when Elagabalus (AD 218-222) built a temple in the middle of the terrace facing northwest and dedicated it to \emph{Sol Heliogabalus}. Alexander Severus, his successor

\textsuperscript{938} Villedieu 2009, 247.  
\textsuperscript{939} Wulf-Rheidt, Sojc, 2009,
(AD 222-253), re-dedicated the temple to *Iuppiter Ultor* with the intention of erasing the actions of his predecessor.

The wealth of data related to the Domitianic intervention on the Vigna Barberini area reshapes our understanding of the development of imperial architecture. The creation of such a sumptuous sanctuary/garden as an annex to the imperial residence seems to follow the line of the previous imperial residence. The Domus Tiberiana, in fact, featured a large garden area combined with a residential function throughout its Julio-Claudian phases. Domitian took the concept and developed it in order to create more diverse spatial setting to meet the increasing demands of the imperial court. Moreover, the presence of over a hundred spaces likely used for the imperial administration hints at the later construction in the Markets of Trajan. The most recent analysis of the archaeological data combined with archival study has allowed scholars to reconstruct a more complete project by Domitian in the area later occupied by the forum of Trajan.\(^{940}\) It appears that in more than one respect Trajan’s projects constituted a continuation of those of Domitian.\(^{941}\)

**IV.i The imperial palace**

In Plutarch’s life of Publicola, the incessant building activity that characterized Domitian’s rule is attributed to a diseased, insane desire to build.\(^{942}\) One of the most striking products of this allegedly diseased activity is his imperial residence on the Palatine hill (figs. 105, 126). The imperial palace has traditionally been viewed as a
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\(^{940}\) Bianchini, Vitti 2017. See the relevant section on the Imperial Fora for more details on these important discovery.

\(^{941}\) See Waters 1969 for an analysis of aspects, mainly the military campaigns, in which Trajan followed Domitian and Wheeler 2010. See also Tomei 1991 for a connection between the Trajanic Villa of Arcinazzo and the triclinium of the Domus Flavia.

\(^{942}\) Plut. *Publ.* 15.5.
daring architectural accomplishment which surpassed any previous attempts. While many aspects of Domitian's palace, combined with the Vigna Barberini complex, are truly unprecedented, the recent explorations in the Domus Tiberiana suggest that the last of the Flavians followed the architectural paths laid by his predecessors, with a special debt toward Nero, while pushing the limits in terms of scale and luxury. However, the treatment of the entire hill as a “palace” and the addition of the truly innovative Forum Building and the ramp do speak of a new spatial concept for the imperial residence, which was destined to remain Domitian’s most successful and welcome achievement.

The imperial palace is a complex structure made of different parts whose names are often modern and sometimes misleading. In short, the palace consists of an almost square block articulated in two levels (fig. 126). The upper level includes, from the northern corner, a basilica, an Aula Regia, and the so-called No Man’s Land, the palace vestibule, which opened onto two almost identical peristyle gardens with water basins. One of these is called Sicilia in late sources, and they were surrounded by smaller rooms with various shapes. An imperial triclinium, called Coenatio Iovis, occupies the southwestern corner of the upper level. The so-called Sunken Peristyle, an elaborate peristyle garden with smaller fountains and cubicula, was built at a lower level to the west, while a garden in the shape of a stadium dominated by a grand sort of pulvinar was built to the east in the lower level. To the southeast of the garden-stadium a series of porticoes with a large water feature were built at the level of the pulvinar. Traditionally, the imperial palace has been considered to have had a public sector, the

---

943 This name was given to this area in modern times for the lack of archaeological excavations undertaken there, see more about this in the section about the history of the excavations.
944 SHA, Pertinax, 11.6, see further on for more details.
945 Ibid.
Domus Flavia on the northwestern side, and a private one, the Domus Augustana on the southeastern side. In the following section I will describe how the two labels were devised to demonstrate their misleading significance, and I will show how the palace stemmed from a coherent design where the limits of public and private were permeable.

**IV.i.1 Archaeological evidence and history of the excavations**

The remains of the imperial Flavian palace are, to say the least, impressive. They occupy the southwestern corner of the hill, for an area of about 48,000 square meters. The elevation of the so-called Aula Regia reaches just above 10 m, and almost the entire palace is preserved to some degree of elevation together with sparse traces of the magnificent decoration. It is still possible today to walk along the *clivus Palatinus* and be overwhelmed by the appearance of the northeastern façade of the palace (fig. 128). The imperial residence must have generated an even more impressive perception of grandiosity due to the ascent toward the palace along the *clivus*. As mentioned above, this walk would have also been complemented by the lost arch and the splendid Vigna Barberini complex at the left, almost in anticipation of the imperial palace proper, whose original height was more than three times*946* that of the preserved remains.

Almost the entire palace has been excavated, and it is discernible at foundation level. One of the least archaeologically known areas is the eastern corner, called “No Man's Land” for that reason, which connects the imperial palace to the Vigna Barberini complex. The edges of the palace are still in need of more exploration. Despite the many archaeological investigations in the palace and the excellent work carried out recently,*947* we are far from a coherent and unified view of the exact function of the rooms, structural

---

*946* See Gibson, De Laine, Claridge, 1994 for a reconstruction of the *imperial triclinium* of over 30 m high which shows similar proportions with the Aula Regia.

*947* See Sojc 2012.
solutions, and construction phases. The very fragmentary way in which the residence was unearthed and the numerous scholars who have worked on it with different methodologies, approaches, and objectives have produced a great deal of data which are not always easy to combine into a cohesive picture.

From the eighth to the fifteenth century, the remains of the imperial palace became part of the papal estates and were continuously occupied by monks, who adapted the remains into a monastery.\textsuperscript{948} Between the fifteenth and the nineteenth century this area was privately owned by several families until the Scottish Charles Mills acquired the property in 1818 and named it Villa Mills.\textsuperscript{949}

In the mid sixteenth century Pirro Ligorio explored the Villa Mills ruins and erroneously identified some of the remains in the southwestern area as the house of Augustus, and a fragment of curved trabeation with sculptural elements as part of a round temple of Apollo.\textsuperscript{950} More systematic excavations were carried out during the eighteenth century throughout the imperial palace, and Ligorio's misidentification of the House of Augustus continued to linger.

In the second half of the nineteenth century Napoleon III entrusted the Roman architect Pietro Rosa with excavations on the Palatine.\textsuperscript{951} Rosa focused mainly on the area corresponding to the Domus Tiberiana, but in 1862 he was also able to excavate the northern peristyle, the Aula Regia, and the southern nymphaeum adjacent to the

\textsuperscript{948} Bartoli saw traces of medieval paintings in the remains of the monastery (Bartoli 1929, 7).
\textsuperscript{949} See Iacopi 1997 for a summary of the excavations on the Palatine. Bartoli also summarizes the faith of this area of the Palatine in \textit{Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità}, Vol. 5, 1929, pp. 7-8. Around the mid sixteenth century, the Colonna and Stati were the owners of the southern area of the hill while in 1552 the Mattei family acquired the southern area from the Colonna and the Stati. They kept it until 1689 when the Spada became the owners. The next owner was Pietro Magnani in 1746 from which Rancoureil acquired it. In 1856 a convent for nuns was established in the area which remained occupied until 1906 when the Suore della Visitazione left the Palatine.
\textsuperscript{950} Bartoli 1929, 8-9.
\textsuperscript{951} For a thorough and engaging account on the activity of Pietro Rosa on the Palatine see Tomei 1999.
triclinium of the Flavian palace.\textsuperscript{952} In 1870, Napoleon III was defeated in the battle of Sedan, and Rome was annexed to the Italian State. Napoleon III sold his remaining properties on the Palatine to the Italian government, and despite the political turmoil, Pietro Rosa continued to supervise the excavations for a couple of years.\textsuperscript{953}

Rodolfo Lanciani had been working with Pietro Rosa for some time when he became the director in charge of the Palatine excavations for twenty years at the end of the nineteenth century. Guglielmo Gatti and Dante Vaglieri succeeded Lanciani as directors of the exploration of the Palatine in 1906 and 1908, respectively, but it was with Giacomo Boni, who directed the excavations from 1909 to 1925, that major discoveries were made. Through the demolition of the western side of Villa Mills, Boni discovered the Domitianic labyrinthine fountain in the middle of the northwestern peristyle and the remains of a nymphaeum adjacent to the eastern side of the triclinium, symmetrical to the one on the opposite side.\textsuperscript{954} Boni was responsible for the re-discovery of the Augustan Aula Isiaca underneath the Basilica, already excavated in the eighteenth century, as well as the late republican Casa dei Grifi under the Aula Regia.\textsuperscript{955}

The next leading figure in the Palatine excavations was Alfonso Bartoli. He focused his fieldwork on the upper section of the southeastern area of the palace, which had thus far been neglected, publishing some results in a short publication called "Domus Augustana" in 1938. Bartoli correctly interpreted the remains as the Flavian palace, but he maintained that the site was originally occupied by the House of Augustus and had later been replaced by Domitian's building.\textsuperscript{956} Bartoli's identification of the House of Augustus proved to be incorrect, but he did clear the area of the Flavian palace,

\textsuperscript{952} Tomei 1997, 66-67. \\
\textsuperscript{953} Palombi 2006, 51, footnote no. 41. \\
\textsuperscript{954} Bartoli 1929, 5-6. \\
\textsuperscript{955} Carettoni 1960, 197. \\
\textsuperscript{956} Bartoli 1939, 6.
allowing for a more comprehensive view of the remains. During the second half of the twentieth century restoration work and excavations were carried out in the so-called House of Livia, which led to the discovery of a Republican domus in 1956, published by Carettoni and later identified as the House of Augustus.\textsuperscript{957}

A thorough architectural analysis of the imperial palace was published by Helge Finsen in 1967 and 1969.\textsuperscript{958} A detailed study of the construction techniques and phases of the Imperial Palace has been ongoing since 1998 by the Architekturreferat des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts and several other German and French institutions.\textsuperscript{959} The large extent to which this project can contribute to our understanding of the palace can be assessed in the publications that have been produced so far.

Traditionally the Flavian palace has been described according to the labels \textit{Domus Flavia} and \textit{Domus Augustana}, which are applied to the northwestern and southeastern areas of the imperial palace, respectively, and suggest a separation between public and private sectors (fig. 127). However, no mention in the sources indicates that this separation was intended or perceived by its builders or contemporaries.

Our knowledge of Rome’s imperial palace has grown substantially in the last fifteen years thanks to the incredibly fruitful work of several teams of excavators. In the wake of this research many scholars have pointed out the inadequacy of the labels and the strict, simplistic division of the palace into two halves.\textsuperscript{960} Yet, the labels are currently

\textsuperscript{957} Carettoni 1956-57; 1957; 1966-67; 1967.
\textsuperscript{958} This study appeared in two supplements of the Analecta Romana Instituti Danici and it became the most important reference for the architecture of the palace until recent years.
\textsuperscript{960} Among the many voices claiming the inadequacy of the labels, U. Wulf-Rheidt clearly states that there was no separation between the public and the private sector with particular reference to the so-called Sunken Peristyle, while continuing to use the labels, Wulf-Rheidt 2012a, 106-09. N. Sojc in the introduction to the volume dedicated to the impressive recent work carried out in the so-called “Sunken Peristyle” explains that the label \textit{Domus Augustana} originated from a misidentification but she chooses to
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used in every publication, signaling the two alleged halves of the palace as separate or distinct both in architecture and function. A brief look into how these labels were devised will clarify their inadequacy and obsolescence and will explain why these labels will not be used in this study.

The label *August(i)ana* appears in several epigraphic sources, from marble fragments to lead *fistulae* to brick stamps. S. Panciera has recently analyzed the only inscription bearing this adjective, which comes from the nineteenth century excavations on the Palatine. His article reviewed all the epigraphic sources together with the new inscription and convincingly confirmed the early intuition by Christian Huelsen and Ferdinando Castagnoli, according to which *August(i)ana* refers to the entire complex of imperial residences on the Palatine and was probably in use before Domitian’s time. Therefore, the modern labels generate an unnecessary confusion between the *Domus Augustana*, as intended in ancient times and indicating the entire complex of imperial residences, and the *Domus Augustana*, as only the public portion of the Flavian palace.

---

961 Every recent publication still makes use of both labels. In particular, Carandini not only uses the labels but emphasizes the division in public and private, generally dismissed (see footnote above), as an imitation of the *pars publica* and *privata* present in the House of Augustus, Carandini 2011, 2012.
962 See Panciera 2007 for a detailed catalogue of all the epigraphic attestations.
965 Castagnoli 1964, 186, footnote 51.
966 Panciera 2007, 304.
According to Lanciani, the first time that the label *Domus Augustana* was applied to a sector of the imperial palace was on the plan published by Onofrio Panvinio in 1565 in "De Ludis Circensibus" (fig. 131).\(^{967}\) Panvinio's plan is discussed by Bianchini in his "Del Palazzo de Cesari", published in 1738, where he explains that the label indicates the House of Augustus, which can be located in the southwestern area of the Palatine hill.\(^{968}\) This interpretation was further supported by the erroneous identification of the large semicircular exedra that overlooks the Circus Maximus as the amphitheatre of Statilius Taurus (fig. 3), located instead in the Campus Martius\(^{969}\) and mentioned by Suetonius among the building projects carried out by Augustus.\(^{970}\) After this first appearance the legitimacy of the identification and the label *Domus Augustana* were corroborated by the reports published by Guido Guattani in 1785.\(^{971}\) Thanks to the work carried out by the German team on the Palatine in recent years, we now attribute the building of the exedra to the beginning of the second century AD.\(^{972}\)

In the meantime, between the nineteenth and the twentieth century, excavations were carried out in the western sector of the remains, uncovering the parts of the palace that were immediately, and correctly, attributed to Domitian. The first time the label *Domus Flavia* appears in a publication is in 1929 in Bartoli's short excavation report in Notizie degli Scavi in Antichità.\(^{973}\) The label *Domus Flavia*, and its variations, were devised for this area of the palace in order to distinguish it from the *Domus Augustana*.

\(^{967}\) Lanciani-Visconti 1873, 36.  
\(^{968}\) Bianchini, 34, Tav. 1.  
\(^{969}\) Coarelli 2002, 85, 185, 262.  
\(^{970}\) Suet. Aug. 29. A plan by Pirro Ligorio, dated 1561, labels the second century exedra as *Theatrum Palatinum*, Frutaz 1962, Tav.31; in the plan by Panvino in 1565 the building is called *Theat. Tauri*, Frutaz 1962, Tav. 35; This misidentification is showed also on the du Pérac's plan of ancient Rome from 1574, Frutaz 1962, Tav 37; finally, in 1579, the plan by Mario Cartaro shows the label *Theat. Palatinum* as indicating the exedra, Frutaz 1962, Tav. 51.  
\(^{971}\) Guattani 1785. See also Sojc 2012, 14.  
\(^{972}\) Wulf-Rheidt, Sojc, 2009, 268.  
\(^{973}\) Bartoli 1929, *passim*.  
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As we have already seen, while *Domus August(i)ana* is present in the sources with various meanings,\(^{974}\) the Flavian part of the palace was never referred to in the sources as *Domus Flavia*.\(^{975}\) Lanciani\(^{976}\) and Boni\(^{977}\) named the western area of the palace *Domus Flavorum*, which corresponded to the traditional *Domus Flavia*. In 1940 Lugli still refers to this part of the palace as *Domus Flavorum*.\(^{978}\)

In conclusion, it is crucial to understand that the southwestern area of the palace was saddled with a label which was initially used to indicate the remains of the House of Augustus. The misidentification of these remains generated the label *Domus Augustana* that has been maintained long after the incorrect identification was rectified. Finally, it is only by accident that two labels were applied to indicate two different parts of the palace whereas, instead, the plan of the palace does not show any evident division into two halves. The creation and application of the labels followed the way in which the discoveries were made, not the way the compound was designed and planned. As the remains were brought to light, the excavators felt the need to label them in the fashion of the well known *Domus Augustana* and Domus Tiberiana, as they were used in the ancient sources. Therefore, *Domus Flavia* was the label chosen for the remains adjacent to the House of Augustus that were believed to have been built by Domitian. The fact that the so-called *Domus Flavia* was discovered after those of the so-called *Domus Augustana* condemned the northwestern part of the palace to be forever separated in name and interpretation from its southeastern counterpart. In this work these remains will be referred to as the Flavian palace, and its parts will be described according to their orientation rather than the traditional division in two separate sectors.

\(^{974}\) Panciera 2007.
\(^{975}\) Lugli 1962, Vol. VIII, 179-221.
\(^{976}\) Lanciani 1894, 20.
\(^{977}\) Boni 1913, the plan on page 243, fig. 40, shows the labels.
\(^{978}\) Lugli 1940, 121.
IV.i.2 History of the building and Domitianic interventions

When Domitian became emperor in 81 AD he was then well acquainted with the architectural and spatial development of the imperial residence. The completion of the imperial residence was a huge task. The execution of a grand imperial residence was assigned to the architect Rabirius, whose name is known from Martial.979 Even if we take into consideration the contribution to the architecture of the palace by Nero and Vespasian, the final spatial configuration, the scale of the halls, and the decoration are the product of Domitian's and Rabirius' vision.

The Domitianic palace occupies an area whose axes run in a NE-SW and NW-SE direction while occupying two main levels characterized by a wide range of shapes, sizes, and connections (fig. 126). Because the whole building can be enclosed in an almost square block there are no main axes; the palace seems instead to have been conceived as a combination of distinct yet interconnected blocks. The palace could have been accessed from the northeastern and northwestern side through the clivus Palatinus and the paths linking the palace to the Domus Tiberiana. The main entrance has been identified on the northeastern side thanks to the recent analysis of the scattered archaeological remains on the eastern corner, the so-called No Man's Land.980 A Domitianic coin from 95 or 96 AD shows an elaborate building façade that has been identified either as the entrance to the palace, a temple, or the Domitianic building located on the northern corner of the hill connecting the Palatine with the forum. The plausibility that the coin shows the imperial palace is thought to be more likely than the other hypotheses.981

979 Mart. Epigr. 8.36.
980 The nickname refers to the fact that this area has been neglected by archaeological investigations for a long time. Zanker has convincingly identified this space as a large vestibule used for the salutationes (Zanker 2004); Pflug also followed this interpretation and added new details on the way the crowd was managed, (Pflug 2014).
981 MacDonald 1982, 55-56.
The eastern side of the palace housed a large vestibule, the Aula Regia, and a basilical hall. The Aula Regia is an almost square hall which measures 41 x 34 m with an original height of 30 m. The foundations for this hall were almost 5 m thick and 10 m deep. The side walls are articulated by aediculae set in absidal niches that are framed by giallo antico and pavonazzetto marble columns *en ressaut*, a solution similar to that employed in the colonnade of the *forum Domitiani*. A marble ledge inside the colonnade of the Aula Regia and framed by *aediculae* with porphyry columns suggest the presence of statues, two of which might be identified in the two colossal statues of Hercules and Dionysius found nearby.

A shallow apse was located opposite the entrance to the Aula Regia, perhaps to house a seat for the emperor on the occasion of the morning *salutationes*. The basilical hall to the northwest also featured an apse and was decorated with floors in *opus sectile*. It has been suggested that it could have been used for justice administration as the hall to the east of the Aula Regia might have been a *lararium*. However, the identification of the exact function of these halls cannot be determined with certainty and, as we will see, they seem to be part of a sophisticated ensemble where multifunctionality was the essential aspect.

Beyond these buildings were two almost identical peristyles surrounded by landscaping and small rooms with various shapes. The western peristyle displayed columns in portasanta and purple-white pavonazzetto marble. Both peristyles featured a central shallow water basin, but only the northern one was also adorned with an

---

982 The names Aula Regia and Basilica appear for the first time in the plan produced by Bianchini in his "Del Palazzo de Cesari" published in 1738. See also MacDonald 1982, 52, footnote no. 19.
983 The two colossal statues in basalt stone were uncovered in front of the No Man’s Land area and are now exhibited in the Pinacoteca in Parma, Kleiner 1992, 182, 184, figs. 151 and 152.
octagonal labyrinthine feature right in the center. The southwestern side of this latter peristyle gives access to a grand dining hall, the so-called *Coenatio Iovis* or imperial *triclinium* flanked by two richly decorated nymphaea with oval shaped water basins. Traces of the regal decoration of the *Coenatio Iovis* allow us to reconstruct a lower order of columns in grey granite with Corinthian capitals while the second order had pilasters in white marble and Corinthian capitals.

The southeastern peristyle leads to an area characterized by a complex articulation of rooms with different shapes and sizes which provide access to the sunken level built in an early Flavian phase. The southwestern sector is the lower level of the palace, and it consists of yet another peristyle garden, the so-called Sunken Peristyle, characterized by an elegant fountain decorated with *pelta* motifs added in Hadrianic times and surrounded by a series of rooms identified as *triclinia*. The large semicircular exedra that currently defines the southwestern side of the palace has been dated to the late Trajanic or early Hadrianic period; therefore, we should imagine this side toward the Circus Maximus ending in a straight façade at the time of Domitian. This sector of the palace was also complemented by a building which is oriented along the same axis as the palace and built at the same time, as the brick stamps show. This fragmentary structure is known as the *Paedagogium* due to the numerous graffiti, starting from the Severan times, that read “exit de paedagogio” following a name. The

---

984 It appears that this feature was called "Sicilia" at least by the 4th century AD, SHA, Pertinax, 11.6, "Supervenerunt Pertinaci, cum ille aulicum famuliciu m ordinaret, ingressique porticus Palatii usque ad locum qui appellatur Sicilia et Iovis coenatio".
985 See footnote above for the origins of this name.
986 Gibson, De Laine, Claridge 1994, 82-87.
987 Sojc 2012, 23.
988 Sojc 2012, 25.
989 Ibid.
990 Papi 1999 (*LTUR IV*), with bibliography; Keegan 2013, 71.
layout of the preserved structure consists of a quadriporticus with several rooms of various sizes, a central courtyard, and a semicircular exedra on one side (fig. 134).

The presence of the Severan graffiti has been interpreted as indicating in this building either a training school for the Palatine slaves to complement the other known Paedagogium ad Caput Africae on the nearby Caelian hill, which was also a building for the slaves. It has been suggested that the Palatine Paedagogium would have supplied the accommodation for the slaves while the building on the Caelian was the actual school, or vice-versa.\(^991\) It is, however, unclear whether this building had the same function during Domitian’s reign. In any event, its location was related to the connection between the palace and the Circus Maximus, an area that Domitian was forced to restore heavily due to the intense damage caused by the fire of AD 64.\(^992\)

The southeastern corner of the palace is occupied by a spectacular long garden in the shape of a stadium (fig. 130), which is built at a lower level and equipped with a monumental exedra which now towers over the entire palace. This garden-stadium was only accessed through the lower level of the palace, but it was visible from the upper level in a manner similar to the current arrangement where the stadium-garden is offered as a magnificent vista to the tourists strolling through the palace. This refined element of the landscape was definitely built by Domitian, even though heavily restored and modified by Septimius Severus (AD 193-211).\(^993\)

The stadium was surrounded by a covered portico, while in the open area three were two semicircular fountains whose remains are still visible. The ground level of the

\(^{991}\) Papi 1999 (LTUR IV), 7-8.  
\(^{992}\) The archaeological evidence for this area is highly problematic due to the intense modern urban presence. However, a recent study of brick stamps in the area dated to Domitian’s times has been undertaken, and a paper by L. Casadei will appear in a forthcoming volume by the Bullettino della Commissione Arccheologica Comunale di Roma, see also section III.j.4 on the Arch of Titus in the Circus Maximus for more information about the recent archaeological investigations in the area.  
\(^{993}\) Wulf-Rheidt, Sojc 2009, 275.
portico surrounding the garden was decorated with brick pillars and three-quarter columns revetted with a marble decoration in Tuscanic style.\footnote{Ibid.} The oval feature that is visible today belongs to a later intervention by Theodoric who built a small ludus, perhaps for venationes.\footnote{See Augenti 1996; Bruno 2012, 263-64.} The presence of a stadium-shaped garden was not entirely new in Roman villas architecture. Pliny the Younger describes his villa in Tuscany and periodically mentions a garden with roses, ivy, laurels, and cypress trees that are planted in a way to form a hippodrome.\footnote{Pliny, \textit{Ep.}, 5.6.32-34.} The shape of this garden is especially significant in Domitian’s palace. In fact, its shape and orientation bear striking similarities to the shape of Domitian’s forum,\footnote{More details on this in the relevant section of the chapter on the Imperial fora; for the Alban villa see Lugli 1922, von Hesberg 1981, 2006, 2009; Liverani 1989, 2008.} while another, much larger stadium, perhaps an actual venue for venationes, was present in Domitian’s villa in Castel Gandolfo. Other examples of a stadium-garden within villa architecture can be found in Hadrian’s Villa and the Villa of Maxentius on the Via Appia.

The recent analysis in the area southeast of the stadium-garden has allowed us to reconsider the original extent of the Domitianic palace. In fact, the series of halls and rooms identified in this sector, previously attributed to Septimius Severus, have now been dated to Domitianic times on the basis of building technique. Despite the scattered remains, the German scholars were able to reconstruct a rectangular portico with two semicircular exedrae to the sides opening to a courtyard featuring a water basin (fig. 133).\footnote{Wulf-Rheidt, Sojc 2009, 275, figs. 7 and 8.} This “hanging garden”, as it has been interpreted, is similar to the suspended garden area built over the vaulted chambers in the Vigna Barberini complex, and it also seems to point to the seclusion of the area, which might have been accessible only
through the terrace above the portico of the garden stadium. As an extension to this sector a series of buildings were progressively added and are attributed to the emperors Septimius Severus and Maxentius (A.D. 306-12).

The space in the Flavian palace is elegantly articulated in hypaethral and roofed areas, producing a balanced combination of water works and landscape alternating with grand and more intimate settings. All is lavishly complemented by colored marbles, paintings, stuccoes, and daring architectural solutions for the indoor spaces, while landscaping and water works provide other remarkable coloristic and acoustic effects in the outdoor sectors. The variety of dimensions, scale, and decoration on both the top and the sunken levels suggests an incredibly wide range of usage and surpasses the traditional and obsolete division of the palace into public and private areas.

IV.j Conclusions

The Palatine under Domitian underwent several significant changes. The entire hill was finally occupied by an immense compound exclusively dedicated to the residential, administrative, and ceremonial needs of the emperor and his entourage. While the transformation of the hill and the development of this new architectural language was a gradual process initiated by the early Julio-Claudian emperors, Domitian managed to take it to its peak in terms of scale and luxury, but also regulation and function. Despite the extremely negative references in the sources with regard to his character and his conduct as an emperor, his achievements on the Palatine remained untouched by the devastating effects of the damnatio memoriae, and therefore stand as a testament to the excellence and cleverness of his and Rabirius' vision.

999 Wulf-Rheidt, Sojc 2009, 275.
1000 ibid.
Domitian's intervention in the Augustan complex, though limited, is nonetheless meaningful (fig. 106). The two apsed halls flanking the porticus of the Danaids toward the southwest resemble strikingly the southern hall of the Templum Pacis, thereby reinforcing an architectural connection between the area of the Imperial Fora and the Palatine. As far as the use of these halls for meetings is concerned, there is no mention in the sources that this happened during the reign of Domitian. In fact, with the construction of the imperial palace complex and the options of several different settings, it is easy to imagine that any number of meetings would have taken place in the palace since it offered a flexible arrangement suitable for the evolving demands of the empire.

The modifications that Domitian carried out in the Domus Tiberiana can be classified in two categories (figs. 105 and 108). On the one hand, he re-arranged the upper terrace by replacing his father's baths and re-shaping the central water feature to mirror the one in the second peristyle of the Flavian palace. These changes were essentially cosmetic and did not have a significant impact on this section of this palace, which maintained its general residential function. On the other hand, the innovative and new groups of buildings that appeared on the northern corner as a connection to the forum did have a major impact on the perception of the palace. The sources speak of the egregious extension that Caligula built to connect the Domus Tiberiana to the Forum and how he used the temple of the Dioscuri as a vestibule to the palace, but the complex built by Domitian seems instead to respond most appropriately to the increased need for security. The forum extension with the monumental ramp, as correctly interpreted by

---

1001 See the discussion about this connection in the chapter on the Imperial Fora. Another striking similarity can be observed in the shape, dimensions, and orientation of the stadium-garden of the imperial palace and the Forum of Domitian.
1002 Krause 1995. It is also possible that the richly decorated apartments in the Domus Tiberiana were chosen by Domitian to house his concubines, Plut., Publ., 15.5.
1003 Suet. Calig., 22, 2.
Tamm,\textsuperscript{1004} exploits the known forms of the military architecture, a \textit{castellum} tower and the \textit{principia}, providing this strategic entrance to the imperial residence with the necessary tools for traffic control. The enormous dimensions of this group of buildings, which we can only imagine in their original height, were not perceived as extravagant, for they provided the imperial residence with a secure entrance that remained in use for centuries to come.

The most substantial Domitianic interventions are to be found in the eastern sector of the hill and correspond to the Vigna Barberini complex and the Flavian palace. As we have seen, the area occupied by the Flavian palace was not a blank canvas when Domitian began the construction, while the Vigna Barberini complex, most likely, covered parts of the Domus Aurea whose precise extent it is not yet possible to ascertain.

The space created in the palace responded to the increased and diversified needs of the huge imperial court. A spatial analysis of the palace has been carried out by several scholars in recent years\textsuperscript{1005} and, as already mentioned, the traditional division into public and private is inaccurate and misleading. A closer look at the space design in the palace should clarify this issue.

The traditional dividing line between public and private areas runs exactly along the separation between the two twin peristyles cutting in half the sets of rooms that mark the passage between these two peristyles. This seems quite arbitrary since the two peristyles are, in fact, visually connected and mutually interactive through a wide passage (fig. 129).\textsuperscript{1006} The sets of rooms flanking the two peristyles have similar sizes and

\textsuperscript{1004} Tamm 1963, 77-85.
\textsuperscript{1005} Among the many see Zanker 2004, Pflug 2014.
\textsuperscript{1006} This connection between the two peristyles is inescapable, and it is what forces Zanker to stretch the outline of the \textit{Domus Flavia} block towards the \textit{Domus Augustana}, see supra section IV.i. Bruno also points out that this area should not be regarded as separate, (Bruno 2012, 243).
display a playfulness in the alternation of curvilinear and rectangular lines that is typical of Rabirius’ work.\textsuperscript{1007}

The division into public and private is based on the reading of two different axes (fig. 127, AA1 and BB1) along which the two halves are allegedly arranged.\textsuperscript{1008} However, when we view the palace as a nearly square shape, it is possible to identify at least one more axis which is perpendicular to the two NE-SW ones and promotes the idea of cohesiveness. The entrance to the palace from the northwestern side, through the octagonal room, is aligned with the two peristyles and the oval space that overlooks the stadium. This axis, C-C\textsubscript{1} (fig. 134),\textsuperscript{1009} is especially interesting, for it runs through spaces of alternating sizes and shapes: it cuts through a rectangular space arranged into curvilinear and rectilinear rooms, then passes through a large, square peristyle, a passageway flanked by small rooms formed by alternating straight and curved lines; then it joins an identical large peristyle ending in another rectangular space arranged into curvilinear and rectilinear rooms. A visitor could literally see through this axis, and walk through a curving path, from the northwestern entrance to the southeastern side, while being mesmerized by the continually changing vistas. This itinerary would emphasize the sight of landscaped areas and the water works, climaxing in the view of the garden stadium.

The presence of the C-C\textsubscript{1} axis indicates a more fluid conception of the space distribution in the palace as it literally ties together the traditionally separated two

\textsuperscript{1007} See the \textit{Porticus Absidata} in the \textit{Forum Transitorium}, the bath complex in the villa of Domitian in Sabaudia, and the church of Santa Maria della Rotonda in Albano, a former \textit{nymphaeum} which was part of Domitian’s favorite grand residence in Castel Gandolfo (see Lugli 1917-19 for details on the villa, and Dio for Domitian’s preferences for this villa, 65.4 and 65.9.4).

\textsuperscript{1008} Both Bartoli and Zanker speak of two buildings (Bartoli 1938, 5; Zanker 2004, 91); Wataghin Cantino suggests that two different architects worked on the two halves (Wataghin Cantino 1966, \textit{passim}).

\textsuperscript{1009} Finsen is the first, and only one, to identify this axis and to speak of its importance. However, he also uses the two labels consistently throughout his work and accepts the idea of a separated public and private sectors in the palace, (Finsen 1967, 32-33, and \textit{passim}).
halves. Moreover, the archaeological remains bear no traces of any separation between the two halves of the palace. It is crucial to stress the importance of the CC1 axis that corresponded to a direct vista that linked the northwestern to the southeastern end of the palace (fig. 129). This line of sight is not interrupted by walls, although it could perhaps be closed by doors or gates when necessary, and it is the only one that connects the two landscaped areas of the upper level. Despite their large dimensions, the two peristyles would have provided the necessary crowd control due to the two central water features that would have limited the walkable sectors.\textsuperscript{1010} Therefore, they could both be used for ceremonial matters where a sizable crowd was expected.

This idea of a more fluid motion throughout the palace can be translated into different degrees of formality or \textit{negotium} that characterized the function of different areas. The same grand halls could have been used for a diverse range of formal occasions. For instance, the emperor would have hosted official \textit{salutatio}nes in the vestibule and the \textit{Aula Regia}, but he could have taken a stroll around any peristyle garden with a selected group to discuss official matters in a less formal setting. This interpretation is supported by Vitruvius' indications for the houses of the \textit{nobiles} that would have required a wide range of settings, while gardens were also suitable for the entertainment of guests.\textsuperscript{1011} While the imperial \textit{triclinium} could have been used for lavish official banquets as much as for less formal events, it has been suggested that the area around the first peristyle might have been used for smaller groups of diners, arranged in

\textsuperscript{1010} For another instance of a water feature used for crowd control see Nocera 2015. The plausible Domitianic date of the water feature in the central area for the \textit{Porticus Absidata} seems to point to this use of water basins.

\textsuperscript{1011} Vitruvius, VI, 5.2, \textit{nobilibus vero qui honores magistratusque gerundo praestare debent officia civibus, faciunda sunt vestibula regalia alta, atria et peristyla amplissima, silvae ambulationesque laxiores ad decorum maiestatis perfectae, praeterea bybliothecae pinacothecae basilicae non dissimili modo quam publicorum operum magnificentia comparatae, quod in domibus eorum saepius et publica consilia et privata iudicia arbitriaque conficiuntur.}
a more intimate way.\textsuperscript{1012} The size of a gathering, though, does not necessarily correlate to its formality or importance. A small meeting or dinner party could have been just as official as a large one, and could have been held virtually anywhere in the palace. Therefore, the consideration of the spectrum from formal to informal is certainly most fitting for a correct reading of the palace architecture.

Despite the fact that the largest halls occupy the western part of the upper level, the endless variety of shapes and dimensions supports the idea that the Flavian palace was conceived with the flexibility and the capacity to serve as a venue for any kind of event. Even the separation between the upper level and the Sunken Peristyle, traditionally identified as the private/residential sector with its \textit{cubicula}, has been superseded by the most recent interpretation of its various rooms as \textit{triclinia}.\textsuperscript{1013} The close comparison with villa architecture, in particular Villa Oplontis,\textsuperscript{1014} seems to justify the interpretation, as do the similarities between the \textit{klinai} arrangement hypothesized for the Sunken Peristyle and those of the Domus Aurea.\textsuperscript{1015}

Historically the scholarship on the Flavian palace has focused on the identification of kitchens, latrines, and, following the above mentioned interpretation of the Sunken Peristyle, \textit{cubicula}. A more holistic look at the Palatine hill and a comprehensive analysis of the architectural program carried out by Domitian suggests that the Flavian palace was at that time a multifaceted stage used by the emperor for both formal and informal events.

\textsuperscript{1012} Mar 2009, 261-62; ; Pflug 2014. For the variability in banquet settings see also E. Salza Prina Ricotti and the different solutions for \textit{klinai} arrangements in Hadrian’s Villa, which would suit different types of banquet parties, Salza Prina Ricotti 1997, 136-184.  
\textsuperscript{1013} Sojc 2012, 29-38.  
\textsuperscript{1014} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{1015} Sojc 2012, 36.
Ricardo Mar in a recent article has pointed out the limited space available in the Palace for residential and domestic purposes.\textsuperscript{1016} It seems as if the palace was not conceived with long-term habitation in mind. Other areas of the hill need to be taken into consideration for a more comprehensive view of life within the imperial court. Before the recent excavations on the Domus Tiberiana it was assumed that Tiberius was not the initial builder of the palace, but in light of the recent data it is now possible to reconstruct a picture wherein he probably used his family house while the palace was being built.

Caligula certainly used the Domus Tiberiana as his own residence and expanded the building toward the forum up to the temple of the Dioscuri.\textsuperscript{1017} Pliny compares the extent of this house to that of Nero, and observes that they could both encompass the entire city.\textsuperscript{1018} We can imagine this early palace consisting of several buildings, as we can infer from Flavius Josephus’ account of the aftermath of Caligula’s assassination.\textsuperscript{1019}

Claudius maintained his residence in the Domus Tiberiana, as is shown by the recent archaeological evidence. The reinforcement of the cryptoporticus on the terrace can be dated to Claudius' times by the presence of a lead \textit{fistula in situ} (fig. 113), while he also eliminated the connection between the palace and the temple of the Dioscuri built by Caligula.

The two new residences that Nero built, the \textit{Domus Transitoria} and the Domus Aurea, must have met any possible needs for the emperor and his entourage. However, the substantial archaeological evidence for Neronian interventions on the Domus

\textsuperscript{1016} Mar 2009, 252.  
\textsuperscript{1017} Suet., \textit{Calig.}, 22.2.  
\textsuperscript{1018} Pliny, \textit{Nat. Hist.}, 36, 15, 111.  
\textsuperscript{1019} Jos., \textit{AJ}, 19.1.15.
Tiberiana is reason enough to imagine the emperor using this sector of the Palatine as his residence while his new majestic palace was being built.

The Domus Tiberiana had been the imperial residence for decades when the Flavians started to plan the new addition, and it is there that we should look for the residential space even when the Flavian palace was completed.\textsuperscript{1020} It is also plausible to see Rabirius as the chief architect for the entire building program on the hill. The increased demands of the court would have required large and more diverse spaces that Domitian successfully provided in the Flavian palace and the Vigna Barberini complex. In fact, the recent archaeological work carried out by the École Français de Rome on the site of Vigna Barberini has demonstrated that Domitian's intervention involved the construction of a sacred precinct above rooms with administrative functions.\textsuperscript{1021} In light of this analysis, we should consider the Flavian palace as a dedicated space for a variety of ceremonial, courtly, and leisure functions. The Domus Tiberiana was then most likely used as the residence proper while the Vigna Barberini complex offered a combination of sacred, administrative, and leisurely space.

The salient aspects of Domitian's building program on the Palatine are to be found in the creation of an organic system of functional space dedicated to every need of the imperial court. Until Domitian completed his projects, several sectors of the hill were occupied by private residences and administrative spaces, while formal functions were limited to a few buildings and settings. Domitian's vision seems to have been one of spatial regulation across the entire hill. In other words, instead of looking for public and private areas within one building, such as the Flavian palace and its traditional division, we should look at the entire Palatine as a unitary palace compound, just like the ancient

\textsuperscript{1020} See Krause 1995.
\textsuperscript{1021} Villedieu 2009, 246-47.
label *domus Augustana* indicates, and decipher the function in a more methodical and comprehensive way. Filling the hill with imperial buildings also had an impact on the paths of traffic and the perception of the Palatine from the surrounding valleys. In fact, the large numbers of *clivi* were replaced by a few major routes. Nero was the first one to implement a more grid-like system, and Domitian perfected it by filling the spaces in between with more buildings.

We might think of the Palatine hill, in its Domitianic form, as a combination of civic, domestic, and sacred areas where the relationship between space and function, as performed in the city, are translated into a microcosm on the Palatine, while the same relationship, as known from domestic architecture, is displayed on a much grander level. In other words, Domitian's Palatine is at once a micro-city and a macro-house.
CHAPTER V: THE DOMITIANIC CAMPUS MARTIUS: EGYPT, GREECE, AND DYNASTIC CULT

The Campus Martius\textsuperscript{1022} occupies a large, mostly flat area limited by two bends of the Tiber to the south and the west, the Capitoline hill to the south, and the Pincian and Quirinal hills to the east and northeast (fig. 136). The eastern border was marked by the course of the Via Lata, the continuation of the consular road, the Via Flaminia, which approached the city from the northeast. Throughout the Republican and early imperial times, this large area of the city was situated outside the \textit{pomerium}, providing the perfect spot for generals awaiting the triumph.\textsuperscript{1023} The eastern limit of the \textit{pomerium} was significantly extended by Claudius\textsuperscript{1024} first, in AD 49, and then by Vespasian in 70 (fig. 137),\textsuperscript{1025} who, in the \textit{lex de imperio Vespasiani}, claimed Claudius’ extension as a precedent.\textsuperscript{1026} The modifications of the \textit{pomerium} and the increasingly intense building activity in the Campus Martius since the Late Republic contributed to the integration of this area into the urban fabric of the city while providing the citizens of Rome with a rich series of public venues.

The advantages offered by the largely flat topography and the unencumbered areas formed the perfect blank canvas for the ambitious builders and urban planners of

\textsuperscript{1022} The literature on this area of ancient Rome is vast. For a general succinct account of the archaeological evidence see Platner & Ashby 1929, Coarelli 2002, 258-302 and a detailed bibliographic list arranged per sections in 375-76, Castagnoli 1946. In 1997 Coarelli published a monographic treatment of the Campus Martius from the origins to the Republic. More recent contributions to the study of this sector of the city come from Albers 2013, Jacobs and Conlin in 2014 and an analysis on new archaeological data published by Filippi in 2016. See also the article by Panzram 2008 and Moermann forthcoming for a general assessment of Domitian’s building program in the Campus Martius.

\textsuperscript{1023} We know from the sources that Vespasian and Titus, for instance, spent the night in the area of the \textit{Iseum} before reaching the \textit{porticus Octaviae} and then the triumphal gate, Fl. Ios., \textit{bell. Iud.}, 7, 5, 4.

\textsuperscript{1024} Evidence for this extension comes from the account by Tacitus, \textit{Ann.} XII, 24, and from the presence of nine extant \textit{cipli} that testify to the intervention of the emperor, see Boatwright 1984.

\textsuperscript{1025} Buttrey, 1980, 24; Liverani 2005, 62. See Liverani 2007, 292, footnote no. 2 for the bibliography about the pomerial extensions by Claudius and Vespasian.

\textsuperscript{1026} CIL VI 960=ILS 244 14-16.
the ancient city, foremost among whom were Agrippa, working with Augustus, and Domitian. By the time Augustus completed his extensive building program, the Campus Martius had been transformed from a grassy plain good for exercise and military training into an area of such beauty and sanctity that, in Strabo’s words, the rest of the city seemed ancillary.\textsuperscript{1027} Domitian’s permanent mark in this region was also consistent and extensive. In this chapter I will analyze the interventions by Domitian in the \textit{campus} with a special focus on the west and east compounds, the stadium-\textit{Odeum} and the \textit{Iseum-Minerva Chalcidica-Porticus Divorum}, respectively. These complexes formed a sort of pendant, massive barrier delimiting and containing the Campus Martius along an east-west axis. As I will show, the additions and alterations by Domitian in the Campus Martius were driven by a consistent master plan aimed at creating buildings connected by topography, form, and function. At the end of the chapter a short view of the so-called Cancelleria Reliefs, found in the area of the Campus Martius, will also be offered. While it is not known to which Domitianic monuments these reliefs belonged, their findspot in the Campus Martius accounts for their presence in this chapter, and also allows for a few hypotheses on their original location.

\textbf{V.a Building up the Campus Martius}

The Campus Martius held strong symbolical meanings tied to the birth of the city and stemming from the legend of Romulus’s ascension into the heavens from a spot in the middle of the \textit{campus},\textsuperscript{1028} as well as the expulsion of the last Etruscan king, the owner of the area.\textsuperscript{1029} After the banishment of Tarquinius Superbus in 509 B.C. an altar dedicated to Mars was vowed in the area that consequently became known as the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item 1027 Strabo, 5.3.8.
\item 1028 Liv. 1.16.1.
\item 1029 Liv. 2.5.1-2.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Campus Martius. This Ara Martis, which took monumental form by the Middle Republic, remained one of Rome’s most important shrines.\textsuperscript{1030} Throughout the Republican period this sector of the city was used for a wide range of activities, from an exercise ground to gathering places for the soldiers to religious or civic events. During the Republic military and sports training took place in several areas in the mid and western Campus Martius, such as the \textit{Trigarium}.\textsuperscript{1031}

Sacred areas punctuated the southern sector of the Campus Martus, including the temple of Apollo Medicus and that of Bellona at the southern edge of the Campus. To the northeast the \textit{porticus Metelli} enclosed the temples of Iuno Regina and Iuppiter Stator followed by the \textit{aedes Neptuni} and a temple of \textit{Hercules Magnus Custos}, whose location is more elusive. Finally, religious events were held in the sector dedicated to Mars along the western edge, the sacred area of Largo Argentina, and the \textit{aedes} of the \textit{Lares Permarini} in the porticus Minucia. The \textit{Saepta Iulia}, planned by Julius Caesar, was used to cast the votes by the \textit{comitia tributa}, and it was later complemented by the \textit{Diribitorium}, built by Agrippa, which was used to count the votes.

The plain proved perfect for the management of large crowds, and it is perhaps because of its topographical advantages that it was selected at the end of the Republic as the ideal location for entertainment venues. We owe to Pompey the Great the construction of the first permanent stone theatre, followed by the \textit{Crypta Balbi}, the Theatre of Marcellus, and the \textit{Gymnasium} of Nero, which likely housed some contests of

\textsuperscript{1030} The location of the altar which does not survive archaeologically is debated. See the entry no. 49 “\textit{Ara Martis}” in Digital Augustan Rome, by Andrew B. Gallia for the different hypotheses of the location and the mentions of the altar in the sources.

\textsuperscript{1031} The term indicates a racing track for chariots drawn by three horses, \textit{trigae}. See entry no. 6 in Digital Augustan Rome.
his *Neronia*.\textsuperscript{1032} Julius Caesar showed an interest in the area by setting up a temporary wooden theatre for games, as did Augustus, who was also responsible for the construction of a temporary theatrical structure.\textsuperscript{1033}

Under Augustus the Campus Martius was drastically altered by the first, extensive building program aimed at showcasing the ruler’s achievements and propaganda (fig. 136). Several temples to the south, in the area of the Circus Flaminius, were rebuilt, such as the temple of Apollo Sosianus, the temple of Bellona next to it, and the *porticus Metelli*, which subsequently became the *porticus Octaviae*. Through the projects carried out mainly by Agrippa,\textsuperscript{1034} Augustus filled the space with a carefully planned program that emphasized dynastic legitimization and landscape design. In the northern sector, the Mausoleum of Augustus, the *Horologium*, and the *Ara Pacis* formed part of an assemblage that focused on the rebirth of Rome and was, in turn, tied to the renewal of traditional religion – a markedly Augustan facet of a city transitioning between Republic and empire.

Agrippa was responsible for a series of interventions that focused on the water systems. He built a new aqueduct, the *Aqua Virgo*, and was responsible for a major drainage of the area which he accomplished as *curator aquarum*.\textsuperscript{1035} Earthen fill was employed in several spots to raise the level of the area so as to prevent the Tiber’s floods from reaching the Campus Martius. This drainage work and the later interventions by

\textsuperscript{1032} See further on for a more detailed discussion of the *Neronia* in contrast with Domitian’s foundations of the *Capitolia*.


\textsuperscript{1034} See Pentiricci 2009, 28-40 for a succinct but thorough analysis of the buildings by Agrippa in the Campus Martius.

\textsuperscript{1035} Frontin., *Aq.* 98.1.; Suet., *Aug.*, 37.
the Flavians, however, would not spare this sector of the city from the unstoppable force of the Tiber.\footnote{Floods remained a frequent occurrence which involved the Campus Martius especially for its proximity to the river’s banks. See Aldrete 2007 for a thorough discussion of how the floods were viewed, managed, and interpreted in the literary mentions and archaeological evidence; also Jacobs & Conlin 2014, chapter six.}

Besides the above-mentioned Diribitorium built to the south of the Saepta, and the new aqueduct, Agrippa’s monumentalization of the eastern and central Campus Martius is visible in the construction of the Pantheon, a temple/dynastic monument set in alignment with the Mausoleum of Augustus to the north and a series of adjacent structures focused on water and leisure. To the east of the Saepta Agrippa built a stoa of Neptune, the first public baths of Rome, followed by the stagnum Agrippae and the nemus Agrippae, all connected to the euripus.\footnote{Dio 53.27.1.} The stagnum was a large artificial basin that occupied the central depression known as palus caprae; it received its waters from the Aqua Virgo and drained into the euripus, a long, shallow channel that ran along part of the southern Campus Martius and along the western edge, ultimately draining into the Tiber.

Between Augustus and the Flavians the only interventions worth noting are those of Nero, who built his own thermae northwest of Agrippa’s baths. These complexes have been recently enlightened by the discovery of new sections of a large quadriporticus identified as the Gymnasium of Nero, which might have also prompted some restorations/modifications of Agrippa’s euripus.\footnote{See Fillipi 2014 for a recent analysis of the new archaeological data of the Gymnasium of Nero and the euripus.}

Under Vespasian the Campus Martius was involved in a significant alteration resulting from the extension of the pomerarial line, which was pushed north to include the area of the theatres (Pompey, Balbus, Marcellus) and the sacred area of Largo Argentina,
toward the east, just beyond the Via Lata (fig. 137). Archaeological data about interventions in the area during the early Flavian period testify to a general increase in ground level, perhaps to contain the Tiber’s floods. However, it is with Domitian that this area of the ancient city was drastically altered by a complex urban intervention involving almost all sectors (fig. 138).

The fire of A.D. 80 caused extensive damage in the Campus Martius. We know from Suetonius that the fire ravaged Rome for three days and three nights, while Dio Cassius gives us the list of the buildings that were involved in the fire, the same that ravaged the Capitolium: the temple of Serapis, the temple of Isis, the Saepta, the temple of Neptune, the baths of Agrippa, the Pantheon, the Diribitorium, the theatre of Balbus, the stage building of Pompey’s theatre, and the porticus Octaviae. Dio himself points out that the list is not exhaustive; therefore, we can easily assume that Domitian had to intervene almost everywhere. Starting from the southern edges, traces of Flavian repairs and restorations have been found in the theatre of Pompey, the Crypta Balbi, and the Porticus Minucia Frumentaria. The remark by Suetonius that Domitian employed significant financial resources to restore all libraries that were damaged by fire leads to the assumption that he may have restored the library in the Porticus Octaviae. However, no archaeological traces exist of this intervention.

The sacred area of Largo Argentina was given a complete restyling: this included

---

1039 *Cippi* of Vespasian have been found at a higher level than the previous arrangement and they also testify of a non-consistent increase, see La Rocca 2014, 138. For the difference in level between the Flavian and previous levels see Filippi 2016; Pentiricci 2009, 46; Guaglianone forthcoming.

1040 Suet., *Titus*, 8.3.


1042 Dio 66.24.3.

1043 Filippi 2016.

1044 Manacorda 2016, 321-36.


a significant rise in the walking level, which was paved with travertine slabs as opposed to the tufa paving used during Republican times.\textsuperscript{1048} The \textit{vicus} between the sacred area of Largo Argentina and the \textit{porticus Minucia} to the east was equipped with a pedestrian \textit{via tecta} in tufa blocks that is in phase with the Domitianic travertine repaving of the area in front of the temples.\textsuperscript{1049} This intervention did not alter the Republican street system, though it represented an improvement in terms of functionality and comfort for the passersby. A reconstruction of the Pantheon can be assumed from the list that Dio gives us, but the relevant archaeological data are elusive. The northern sector of the Campus Martius was not involved in the fire of 80 A.D. and it is, in fact, difficult to identify specifically Domitianic interventions in this area.\textsuperscript{1050}

Domitian’s most significant and massive projects in the Campus Martius are to be found on the eastern and western edges. The complex stadium-\textit{Odeum} bordered the area to the west and offered the people of Rome a grandiose compound that hosted the Greek style competitions established by Domitian in honor of Jupiter Capitolinus, the \textit{Capitolia}. Under the aegis of Jupiter, these shows and their architectural frame were tied to Domitian’s philhellenic interests, and complemented his restoration of the burnt Capitolium, rededicated in AD 82.\textsuperscript{1051} On the opposite side of the Campus, the the restoration of the \textit{Iseum}, the new construction of the \textit{porticus Divorum}, a “sacred park” dedicated to the deified Vespasian and Titus, and an extravagant round structure dedicated to \textit{Minerva Chalcidica} marked this area with strong symbols of dynastic legitimacy. In the paragraphs that follow, I will examine the western and eastern

\textsuperscript{1048} Coarelli 1981,
\textsuperscript{1049} Guaglianone \textit{forthcoming}.
\textsuperscript{1050} The recent discussion about the \textit{Horologium Augusti} seems to indicate that there is no Flavian phase in the different levels identified at the site of the obelisk, see Albéri Auber’s contribution in Haselberger 2014, and Haselberger 2014, 181-84.
\textsuperscript{1051} See section III.h, III.i.
complexes followed by a description of a series of imperial warehouses that Domitian built in the southern Campus Martius. An analysis of the building program of Domitian vis-à-vis that of Augustus/Agrippa is made necessary by the fact that they were responsible for the two most extensive building projects in the Campus Martius. As will be shown, Domitian’s plan was intended to follow in Augustus’ footsteps, although there were still significant differences, as well as a more personal vision representing a marked departure from the past.1052

V.b Entertaining the people in the Campus Martius: the Stadium-Odeum complex

Undoubtedly one of the most striking examples of urban continuity, the stadium of Domitian, survives today in the layout of piazza Navona (fig. 139). It was built together with the adjacent covered theatre, the Odeum, to equip the city with an appropriate structure for the Capitolia,1053 athletic and musical competitions in the Greek style. To the south of piazza Navona the curved layout of Palazzo Massimo alle Colonne, overlooking Corso Vittorio Emanuele II (fig. 140), suggests the presence of the cavea of the Odeum,1054 which Domitian built next to the stadium.1055 As I will demonstrate, the proximity of the stadium to the Odeum suggests a homogeneous project1056 that combined Hellenistic traditions with architectural innovation. The construction of these two sumptuous buildings was carried out as part of the large urban project that Domitian undertook after the fire of A.D. 80, which caused extensive damage in the Campus

1052 A different interpretation can be found in Panzram 2008 and Moormann forthcoming.
1053 Cens. de die nat., 18.15; Suet., Dom., 4.4; see Alexander Heinemann for an interesting analysis of the foundation of the Capitolia versus the Neronia, Heinemann 2014.
1054 First suggested by Blake 1959, 109, this identification for the location of Domitian’s Odeum is today largely accepted, see later on the analysis of the different hypotheses put forward for the Odeum.
1056 The idea of a consistent project has been convincingly formulated by many, see especially Gros 2014.
Martius. Topographically, the Stadium-\textit{Odeum} complex formed a sort of bastion oriented along a north-south axis that marked the western edge of the region (fig. 138). We will examine in more detail the implications of this analysis later on, but for the time being it is important to signal the presence of a pendant complex at the eastern edge created by the Iseum Campense-\textit{Minerva Chalcidica-Porticus Divorum} sequence that formed another coherent Domitianic boundary (fig. 138).

In the following sections, I will start by discussing the earlier entertainment buildings that punctuated the Campus Martius, which provide a necessary context for understanding Domitian’s additions. I will then analyze the Stadium-\textit{Odeum} complex in light of the most recent research, with the objective of distinguishing elements of innovation and their significance in the building program of the last of the Flavians.
V.b.1 Entertaining the people in the Campus Martius: before Domitian

Long before the arrival of the Flavians, the Campus Martius was characterized by diverse entertainment offerings. The list of structures used for shows from the Late Republic onward includes two wooden stadiums, three permanent theatres, an amphitheater, a wooden theatre, and the use of venues not specifically built for shows such as the Saepta and the Diribitorium.

We know from Suetonius that Julius Caesar hosted an athletic competition that lasted for three days and for which a wooden stadium was built in the Campus Martius. In a similar way, Suetonius describes the countless games held by Augustus in various parts of the city, inviting actors to perform in all languages and gladiators to fight in the circus, the amphitheater (most likely that of Statilius Taurus, see below page ###), and the Saepta, the Republican voting enclosure in the central sector. Like Caesar, Augustus had wooden seats set up in the Campus Martius temporarily for athletic contests.

---

1057 For a recent summary of the building projects for public shows in the Campus Martius see Jacobs & Conlin 2014, 64-94; Coleman 2000, 210-58.
1058 Both Caesar and Augustus set up temporary wooden structures for the games, Suet., Iul., 39.3, Aug., 43.1.
1059 In chronological order: the theatre of Pompey, Balbus, and Marcellus. For a detailed study of the development of the Roman theatre as an architectural type see Sear 2006.
1060 Though the location is not supported by archaeological evidence, most likely the amphitheater of Statilius Taurus was in the southern Campus Martius. See Welch 2009 for an analysis of the development of the Roman amphitheater.
1061 Calp., Ecl., 7. 23-72. Despite some doubts about the interpretation of the passage (see Jacobs & Conlin 2014, 64-65, 200, footnote nos. 1-3) this is likely the description of the amphitheater built by Nero also mentioned by Pliny, NH, XVI.76.200.
1062 Suet., Aug. 43.1.
1063 Suet., Iul., 39.3.
1064 Suet., Aug., 43.1.
1065 Ibid.
The first permanent theatre in Rome was built by Pompey\textsuperscript{1066} and inaugurated in 55 B.C. to celebrate his third triumph in the eastern campaigns.\textsuperscript{1067} Pompey chose the southwestern sector of the Campus Martius (fig. 136), an area fairly close to the Tiber and offering flat terrain, the perfect blank canvas for such an ambitious project. From an architectural point of view, the theatre of Pompey codified the new type of Roman theatre: built as an independent structure supported by vaulted arcades, rather than leaning against a natural slope. The project included also a large park surrounded by a \textit{quadriporticus} and bordered to the east by a small \textit{curia} that housed a dedicatory statue to Pompey (fig. 141). The Pompeian Curia would become the stage for the assassination of Julius Caesar about a decade later. The park was likely marked by trees surrounded by multiple fountain basins, whose remains were found beneath the Teatro Argentina.\textsuperscript{1068} The portico was decorated with statues by famous Greek artists which were carefully selected by Atticus.\textsuperscript{1069} In the nearby Hecatostylum, so-called because of its long colonnade, the personifications of the fourteen states (\textit{nationes}) conquered by Pompey were also exhibited.\textsuperscript{1070} This series would later be expanded by Domitian in his forum.\textsuperscript{1071}

A significant architectural component of the complex was the temple of Venus Victrix built as a crowning element of the \textit{summa cavea} of the theatre. In this arrangement the seating of the theatre acts as a sort of curved version of the \textit{Π}-shaped
porticoes common in Greek and Roman Republican architecture. The temple of Venus Victrix spread an aura of sanctity over the complex, which consequently assumed a religious character. According to Tertullian, this might have been an effective strategem to overcome the concerted censorial opposition to permanent theatrical structures, which were blamed for encouraging all sorts of turpitude. The combination of the temple, the luscious park, the precious statuary, and the personification of subdued peoples made this complex a true predecessor of the imperial forum typology.

Pompey’s theatre project shaped the topography of the Campus Martius by establishing north-south and east-west axes that became fixed topographical references for future urban planning in the area, including the construction of Domitian’s Stadium-Odeum, aligned along the north-south trajectory.

Under Augustus, the Campus Martius was transformed through countless construction projects in almost every sector. In 29 B.C., the first stone amphitheater in Rome was built, most likely in the Campus Martius, in an unknown spot. The project was undertaken by Statilius Taurus, a general who led part of the land forces during the

---

1072 The Π-shaped portico appears in numerous examples in religious and non-religious architectural contexts, see Coulton 1976 for a detailed catalog and analysis of the architecture and development of the Greek stoa. To mention a few examples in the Greek world, the sanctuary of Asklepiion at Cos, the sanctuary of Athen Lindia at Lindos, several stroai combined to form Π-shaped structures in the lower and upper town of Pergamon, and the Propylaia on the acropolis of Athens. The Roman cities of Lazio display several examples of porticus triplex that embraces a temple. For instance, the sanctuary of Juno Gabina in Gabii which includes also a theatrical cavea, see the bibliography for the Gabii Project by the University of Michigan here [https://sites.lsa.umich.edu/gabiiproject/basic-bibliography-of-gabine-studies/](https://sites.lsa.umich.edu/gabiiproject/basic-bibliography-of-gabine-studies/). The town of Minturnae features a three-sided portico in the Republican forum, while the most spectacular example of Π-shaped portico can be found in Palestrina at the sanctuary of the Fortuna Primigenia. Here the portico leads to a theatrical cavea surmounted by a small round temple, see Gros 1987 and Coarelli 1987. A similar arrangement can be seen in the sanctuary of Hercules Victor in Tivoli, see Giuliani 2009.

1073 Tert., De spect., 10, 4-6. Tertullian reports that Pompey called his theater complex “a temple of Venus, under which we built seats to view the shows”, ([...itaque Pompeius Magnus solo theatro suo minor cum illam arcem omnium turpitudinum extruxisset, veritus quandoque memoriae suae censoriam animadversionem Veneris aedem superposuit et ad dedicationem edicto populum vocans non theatrum, sed Veneris templum nuncupavit, cui subiecimus, inquit, gradus spectaculorum... 10.5]).
battle of Actium. This building project falls among many others that were launched by other aristocrats but supported by Augustus, perhaps with the goal of perpetuating the Republican tradition of aristocratic architectural patronage. The location of this amphitheater cannot be discerned from archaeological evidence since it was not rebuilt after it was damaged by fire; therefore, its placement within the Campus Martius remains hypothetical, though plausible and based primarily on a reference by Strabo to an amphitheater in this area.

A second theatre combined with a portico, the so-called Crypta Balbi (figs. 136, 142), was built to the southeast of the theatre of Pompey by L. Cornelius Balbus, probably to celebrate his triumph in 19 B.C. At the time of that theater's inauguration in 13 B.C., Rome suffered a major flood that forced Balbus to travel to his new complex in a boat. The theatre of Balbus, though much smaller and less magnificent, featured an ensemble of structures very similar to that of Pompey, even in its orientation. The theatre opened onto a quadriporticus — the crypta — that ended in a semicircular exedra to the east. Stretches of the crypta were brought to light during a systematic excavation of the area carried out by Daniele Manacorda in the 1980s. The crypta featured a covered passage later used by medieval artisans for their workshops. The

1074 Dio Cass. 51.23.1; Suet., Aug. 29.5; cf. Tac., Ann. 3.72.
1075 Suet., Aug., 29.4-5, in the list of works carried out by eminent members of the aristocracy we find, among others, the temple of Saturn by Munatius Plancus, the theatre by Cornelius Balbus, and the many buildings ascribed to Agrippa.
1076 Strabo, 5.3.8. See Fallague 2014 and entry no. 40 in Digital Augustan Rome for a summary of the different hypotheses about the location of the amphitheater by Statilius Taurus.
1077 Suet., Aug. 29.5. The site has been thoroughly investigated by Daniele Manacorda and it is now the seat of one of the best conceived archaeological museums of Rome, the Crypta Balbi, aimed at presenting the continuity of the life of ancient Rome through the Middle Ages. For the report and analysis of the archaeological finds see Manacorda 2001.
1078 Dio 54.25; Pliny, NH 36.60.
presence of a religious building associated with this complex is debated.\textsuperscript{1080} It is possible that the small rectangular building shown in the Forma Urbis should be identified with the temple of Vulcan mentioned in the sources.\textsuperscript{1081} The compound was decorated with a Gigantomachy frieze that was likely restored under the Flavians.\textsuperscript{1082}

As the theatre of Balbus was being built, Augustus completed a third stone theatre by carrying out a project envisioned by Caesar.\textsuperscript{1083} The theatre of Marcellus, named after Augustus' late nephew and dedicated in 13 or 11 B.C.,\textsuperscript{1084} was built in the southern Campus Martius in a cramped space among the three Republican temples of the \textit{forum Holitorium} to the south-east, the temples of Apollo and Bellona to the north, and the Circus Flaminius to the south-west, (fig. 143). Its proximity to the temple of Apollo provided a convenient religious association with one of Augustus' favorite gods; as in the case of the other permanent theatres, Augustus probably thought that it would ensure a smoother reception of the project by the senatorial elite. A temporary theatre made of wood and decorated with extraordinary lavishness was built by Nero to host the quinquennial contests in the Greek fashion, the \textit{Neronia}.\textsuperscript{1085} Pliny simply mentions an amphitheater by Nero,\textsuperscript{1086} and we have a detailed description of its magnificence in an eclogue by Calpurnius.\textsuperscript{1087} While the sources do not specifically locate Nero's theatre in the Campus Martius, this area remains a plausible candidate for the available space and

\textsuperscript{1080} See Jacons & Conlin 2014, 199, footnote no. 124.
\textsuperscript{1081} Plut., \textit{Quaest. Rom.}, 47; Livy, 24.10.9; Coarelli 2002, 276.
\textsuperscript{1082} Fuchs 1969.
\textsuperscript{1083} Dio 43.49.2; Suet., \textit{Iul.} 44.
\textsuperscript{1084} Dio 54.26.1 dates the dedication of the theatre of Marcellus in 13 B.C while for Pliny, \textit{NH}, VIII.65, it took place in 11 B.C.
\textsuperscript{1085} Suet., \textit{Nero}, 12.3.
\textsuperscript{1086} Pliny, \textit{NH}, XVI.76.200.
\textsuperscript{1087} Calp., \textit{Ecl.}, 7. 23-72. See supra footnote no. 32 for this reading of the eclogue.
the theatrical connotation. It would have been a perfect complement to other projects of Nero in the Campus Martius such as the Gymnasium\textsuperscript{1088} and the baths.\textsuperscript{1089}

By the time Domitian embarked on his Stadium-\textit{Odeum} complex project, buildings for entertainment were largely present, not only in the Campus Martius but in Rome in general. The variety of structures set up for shows allowed for diverse offerings. For instance, when Augustus celebrated the \textit{ludi saeculares} in 17 B.C., he used three theatres for different types of shows (Greek style plays or games), while he also held \textit{venationes} with African beasts in the circus, the forum, or the amphitheater, and \textit{navalia} in the \textit{Stagnum Agrippae} in the Campus Martius or somewhere across the Tiber.\textsuperscript{1090} Gladiatorial games, always a favored event, could be watched in the amphitheater of Statilius Taurus as well as in the open Campus Martius, which, as a training field for military purposes, offered various possibilities.\textsuperscript{1091}

With the inauguration of the Flavian Amphitheater by Titus in A.D. 80, the architecture of entertainment had become a codified political instrument for the display of power and imperial propaganda. In the context of such a wealth of offerings, Domitian’s stadium and \textit{Odeum} may seem nothing more than two other buildings for shows in the Campus Martius. However, as we will see, this complex for games and theatrical performances embodied the emperor’s vision of a systematic urban plan in which grandiose architecture and elaborate figural imagery met functionality through innovative solutions. Furthermore, Domitian’s permanent headquarters for Greek style competitions fulfilled a personal dream of his, and not only survived his \textit{damnatio}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{1088} See Filippi 2014 for new data about the architecture of Nero’s gymnasium.  \\
\textsuperscript{1089} Suet., \textit{Nero}, 12.3.  \\
\textsuperscript{1090} \textit{RGDA} 22-23.  \\
\textsuperscript{1091} Strabo, 5. 236. An analysis of the topography of the Campus Martius with considerations on the possible activities that took place inside and outside the dedicated buildings can be found in Borlenghi 2014.
\end{flushright}
memoriae, but became an indelible landmark in the cityscape that has, more than any other ancient structure in Rome, morphed into the modern urban fabric.

V.b.2 Stadium-Odeum: Archaeological evidence and history of the excavations

The archaeological evidence for both buildings is problematic due to the presence of Medieval, Renaissance, and Baroque structures built over the Roman remains.\textsuperscript{1092} During the Middle Ages, the preserved remains of the stadium were identified as those of a circus and were thought to belong to the Circus Flaminius.\textsuperscript{1093} It is not until the mid-20\textsuperscript{th} century that the remains were correctly identified by Platner and Bunsen,\textsuperscript{1094} leading to the subsequent studies and reconstructions by Lanciani.\textsuperscript{1095} The stadium size was notable, about 275 m in length by 106 m in width, approximately the length of the entire complex of Pompey and about half the size of the Circus Maximus.

The first systematic exploration of the remains of the stadium was conducted on the occasion of a substantial urban rearrangement under Mussolini, who launched a large initiative in this area, the so-called “piano regolatore” of 1931. It was a fortuitous event — the creation of Via Zanardelli and Corso del Rinascimento — that led to the excavation of the hemicycle of the stadium by Antonio Maria Colini, who published a monograph in 1941 with the title “stadium Domitiani”. The data from the excavation allowed Italo Gismondi to complete the plastic model whose accuracy and precision have

\textsuperscript{1092} For the first time a systematic analysis of the archaeological evidence from the ancient times until the modern neighborhood has appeared in the volume edited by Jean-François Bernard, “Piazza Navona, ou Place Navone, la plus belle & la plus grande”, 2014.

\textsuperscript{1093} Bernard, Ciancio Rossetto 2014, 135. The stadium of Domitian appears as Circus Flamineus (Itinerarium Einsiedlense I, 2; II, 2; VIII, 3; Valentini-Zucchetti 1940-53 II, 176, 180) while it is listed as Circus Alexandri in the Ordo by Benedetto Croce from the 12\textsuperscript{th} century (Valentini-Zucchetti 1940-53, III, 219). In other medieval sources it is indicated as Circus Agonalis and it is represented in prints with the typical elements of the circus such as the carceres, the spina, and obelisks which were absent in the stadium of Domitian, Bernard, Ciancio Rossetto 2014, 135.

\textsuperscript{1094} Platner-Bunsen et al. 1842, 70-75.

\textsuperscript{1095} Lanciani 1893-1901, tavv. 15, 21.
stood the test of time (fig. 144). Colini’s work was re-edited in 1998 by Paola Virgili with the addition of unpublished drawings and analysis of fragments of sculptural decoration. In more recent times, a few scattered explorations have taken place in the sector corresponding to the western Campus Martius, yielding new data that has widened our understanding of the stadium and the Odeum. New methodological approaches and the benefit of modern technologies have been employed in the recent investigations, but it is important to remember that during the 1931 excavations, Colini was able to explore areas that have since become inaccessible and might never be available for research again. Excavations were conducted in the area around Piazza Navona between 2006 and 2010 under the aegis of the École française in Rome, which have resulted in a new volume that presents a holistic study of the urban development of Piazza Navona through time.

The Odeum, also attested as Odium (fig. 140), is consistently attributed to Domitian by the sources; however, its location was uncertain for a long time. The building sequence as it appears in the 4th century lists does not always correspond to precise topographical references and the lack of substantial remains have hindered the correct identification of the location. Initially the Odeum was thought to have been located on Monte Giordano, about 600 m to the west of the stadium, based on the semicircular shape of the streets and the discovery of some curved architectural blocks. Another hypothetical location for the Odeum came from the discovery between 1907 and 1910 of some curved fragments of architectural decoration from the

---

1096 Georadar testing, “carotaggi”, chemical analysis on the water residue in the piping system etc. See the volume by Bernard from 2014 for a recent summary of scholarship and analysis of new data.
1097 Bernard 2014.
1098 Reg. Cat., IX, 10. We also know from Dio that Trajan restored it or amplified it, 64.4.
1099 Fallague 2014, 122-23. Fallague discusses how this location was also suggested for the remains of the amphitheater of Statilius Taurus.
area of Monte Citorio during the construction of the palace for the Parliament. Most likely, however, these fragments belonged to an *ustrinum* (an imperial pyre enclosure) inserted in a precinct with a curved side. The presence of *ustrina* in the area was not new, as an *ustrinum* to Marcus Aurelius surrounded by an enclosure, and another to the Antonines have been identified in the area.

The current and widely accepted hypothesis locates the *Odeum* just south of the stadium between Via della Cuccagna to the east, Corso Vittorio Emanuele II to the south, and Corso del Rinascimento to the west. This hypothesis was put forward after the excavations that took place in Corso del Rinascimento and Via dei Sediari in 1936-37. During these investigations several elements were uncovered, among which were a marble gutter, travertine paving, pieces of Cipollino and Africano marble columns belonging to two different orders, and a curved piece of travertine cornice. The survival of the *Odeum* in the current typography can be seen in several medieval foundations in the area of Palazzo Massimo alle Colonne and the church of San Pantaleo, just south of the stadium. The systematic radial arrangement of these medieval walls betrays the presence of an earlier semicircular structure, a *cavea*, to which they adapted a plan that fits with what we would expect of a covered auditorium, as the name suggests (fig. 145).

Fallague 2014, 123. Monte Citorio was also another hypothesis for the location of the remains of the amphitheater of Statilius Taurus.

Fallague 2014, 123.

Mancini 1913, 7-10.

Platner and Ashby 1929, 545.


Gauthiez 2014, 127-29, fig. no. 4 at page 127.
V.b.3 Big, Beautiful, and Welcoming: the location and architecture of the Stadium-Odeum complex

Despite the problematic aspects of conducting archaeological investigations in an area that is currently urbanized, recent projects have contributed to a more nuanced comprehension of this sector of the Campus Martius. As already mentioned, the project of constructing the first Greek-style stadium in stone was prompted by the establishment of the *Capitolia*, which are described in the sources as penteteric competitions – occurring every four years like the Olympic games – which lasted for several days and included the *agon musicus*, *equestris*, and *gymnicus*.\(^{1106}\) While we do not have more direct information about the general logistics of the Domitianic *Capitolia*, the work of Maria Letizia Caldelli has shed light on several details by comparison. She has thoroughly analyzed the evidence for similar competitions, such as the *Italika Romaia Sebasta Isolympia*, established in Naples in 2 B.C to honor Augustus.\(^{1107}\) Epigraphic data from Naples and Olympia illustrate the complex enrollment procedure, which would start about a month before the games, and provide the sequence of events.\(^{1108}\) This information from similar competitions illustrates the gigantic task of building not only the structures to host the contests but also a network of accessory buildings, such as *hospitalia*, which were necessary to house athletes and staff.\(^ {1109}\) The topographical choice of Domitian’s projects reflects these needs in terms of functionality, scale, and grandeur.

---

\(^{1106}\) Caldelli 2014, 39.
\(^{1107}\) See Caldelli 2014, 39, footnotes nos. 7-10.
\(^{1108}\) Lists with the name of the winners of the Neapolitan Sebasta were discovered in 2004 during the works for the subway in Naples, while the inscription from Olympia provides the list of events and the rules for the enrollment, Caldelli 2014, 40, footnote no. 8.
\(^{1109}\) Caldelli 2014, 40. Caldelli rightly emphasizes the idea that Rome, as the capital of the empire, needed to provide five- star hospitality venues since they were supposed to accommodate renowned artists and athletes all over the Mediterranean.
The western Campus Martius was the ideal fit for such an ambitious program (fig. 3). The stadium was built over an elevated plain rising between two marshy zones known as *palus caprae*. The archaeological data from this area have been recently enriched by some corings carried out near the Fontana dei Fiumi, the baroque fountain created by Bernini in 1651 in the center of piazza Navona. There is evidence for urban activity in the area, followed by a massive fire that can be dated to either A.D. 62, when Nero’s gymnasium burned down, or to A.D. 80. In light of this evidence, and the mention in the sources of wooden stadiums set up by Caesar and Augustus, it is an accepted hypothesis that the stadium of Domitian might have occupied the same spot as the previous Julio-Claudian structures.

The stadium was completed before A.D. 86, when the first *Capitolia* were held, and it is the best-known example of a stadium built over vaulted structures outside Greece and the eastern provinces. The shape of the stadium is reminiscent of a circus: rectangular, with a hemicycle on one end and a straight side on the other (figs. 139, 146). The stadium of Domitian covers an area of 275 x 106 meters, for a reconstructed height of 18 meters. In contrast with the typical circus, the stadium does not have a central spina, to allow for diverse types of shows such as running, fighting, and boxing. The stadium is depicted, both in plan and elevation, on an aureus of Septimius

---

1110 See Fontaine 2014 for an analysis of the topographical developments and 3D model of this sector of the Campus Martius from the construction of the theatre of Pompey to the restorations/additions in the 3rd century AD.
1111 Buonfiglio, Ciancio Rossetto, Le Pera, Marcelli, Schingo 2014.
1112 Tac., *Ann.*, 15.22.
1116 For Virgili 1999, 341, this is the *only* stadium built over vaulted substrucutres but an older example is in Cuma while in Pozzuoli there is the stadium built by Antoninus Pius, see Bernard, Ciancio Rossetto 2014, 140, footnote no. 43.
1117 In the case of the stadium of Domitian the straight side toward the south is in fact slightly oblique, see the plan by Colini 1941.
Severus,\textsuperscript{1118} which also shows the location of the imperial pulvinar in the center of one of the long sides. The imperial pulvinar might have been located on the western side, on the grounds of the opulent marble fragments discovered there.\textsuperscript{1119} The skeleton of the stadium was built in \textit{opus caementicum} faced with bricks and covered in molded stucco, while the arena was given an earthen floor. A few slabs of travertine discovered \textit{in situ} provide evidence for the paving of the inner spaces.\textsuperscript{1120} Travertine blocks are documented on top of the pillars as support for the arches. The façade was punctuated by a double order of arches supported by pillars topped by Ionic capitals in the lower level and Corinthian capitals in the upper level with the now traditional order mixing, as on the theatre of Marcellus, the Colosseum, and the Odeum.

In the plan, the stadium of Domitian shows monumental entry points in the center of all sides preceded by a \textit{prothyrum}. The entrance on the long sides was characterized by three wide naves aimed at facilitating the paths of traffic in and out of the stadium. Remains in Luni marble and Portasanta columns likely belonged to the decoration of the entrance from the north, still visible in piazza di Tor Sanguigna\textsuperscript{1121} which testifies to the lavishness of the ornamentation at the access points. The inner arrangement of the stadium betrays careful planning concerning the regulation of traffic flow. The main elements of the stadium architecture are articulated according to this sequence: entry points, \textit{ambulacrum} and gathering halls, \textit{media cavea}, \textit{ambulacrum}, \textit{ima cavea}, \textit{ambulacrum}, podium wall, and arena (fig. 148). An elaborate system of passageways, having already been tested in the Flavian Amphitheatre, ensured easy monitoring of crowd movements.

\textsuperscript{1118} RIC IV.1, 124 N. 260.  
\textsuperscript{1119} Virgili 1999, 342.  
\textsuperscript{1120} Bernard, Ciancio Rossetto 2014, 146.  
\textsuperscript{1121} Bernard, Ciancio Rossetto 2014, 141.
Recent analysis of new architectural elements of the stadium has identified this Domitianic project as an example of innovative architecture for entertainment: Bernard and Ciancio Rossetto discovered travertine pillars whose placement did not align with that of the pillars appearing in the façade. These elements shed new light on the reconstruction of the plan and altered the plastic model that had been made based on Colini’s previous work. The error — so far the only significant one in Colini’s reconstruction — stemmed from the fact that this is an unprecedented solution for a known architectural type. Colini, in making his reconstruction, assumed that the pillars’ spacing in the façade would correspond to that of the pillars in the inner ambulacrum, when in fact, in the stadium of Domitian, the two arrangements differ (fig. 149). Another element of innovation lies in the absence of tabernae, which are usually built in the ground levels of entertainment venues.

In addition, there is visual evidence, provided by the abovementioned Severan aurei and two Renaissance drawings, that seems to indicate the presence of vertical supports for the velarium, canopies to shade the seats, as is attested for the Flavian Amphitheater. If this hypothesis is correct, this could be the only example of a stadium equipped with a velarium. Among the unusual elements identified in the stadium architecture there is the podium, a 3-meter wall surrounding the arena that is not typical for stadiums, but always present in amphitheaters and circuses as a defensive barrier for the audience. For Bernard and Ciancio Rossetto, this element, together with

---

1122 Bernard, Ciancio Rossetto 2014, 142-46.
1124 The depiction of the stadium in the Severan aurei is much clearer than the Renaissance drawings by P. del Masaio (1469) and A. Strozzi (1474), see the discussion in Bernard, Ciancio Rossetto 2014, 149-50, fig. 14. In fact, a comparison with the way the statues are depicted in the Severan coin and those vertical elements on the top of the stadium seems to indicate two completely different elements. The two Renaissance drawings instead are hard to read when it comes to the details of the top section.
the great length of the stadium,\textsuperscript{1126} could indicate that this monument had been intended from the beginning to accommodate a wide range of shows. And in fact, we know from the sources that it was used in place of the Flavian Amphitheater for gladiatorial shows after the fire of A.D. 216, during the reign of the emperor Macrinus, when the amphitheater was damaged.\textsuperscript{1127}

In addition to its innovative architecture, the stadium had a sense of grandeur typical of many other Domitianic buildings,\textsuperscript{1128} which stemmed from the refined ensemble of statuary that is known to have decorated the stadium.\textsuperscript{1129} The works of art certainly played a role in its listing by Ammianus as one of the most magnificent monuments in Rome.\textsuperscript{1130} Among these statues, special mention is owed to the so-called Pasquino, a larger-than-life fragmentary group discovered near the stadium at the end of the 15th century, which has stood in Piazza del Pasquino since 1501 (fig. 150).\textsuperscript{1131} This work is a Roman replica of a Hellenistic statuary group, known from other examples,\textsuperscript{1132} representing a mythological warrior lifting the body of a dying or dead young male comrade, a body sometimes exhibiting a wound on his chest, to rescue him from the battlefield.

The Pasquino from the Stadium of Domitian is not very well preserved. Only the upper body of the warrior survived with his head turned toward his right, while the arms and legs are completely missing. The second figure is only preserved in a small section

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{1126}{52.9 m instead of the typical range from 17.5 m in the stadium in Delos and 43 m in Nysa, Bernard, Ciancio Rossetto 2014, 151.}
\footnotetext{1127}{Dio 78.25, Bernard, Ciancio Rossetto 2014, 150-51.}
\footnotetext{1128}{Among all the Flavian Imperial palace on the Palatine with its original architectural solutions in the plan of the Aula Regia complemented by an extensive use of colored marble, see section IV.i.}
\footnotetext{1129}{Fragments of marble statues have been found in countless spots around the area of the stadium, see Colini in Virgili 1998, 94-95, XX-XXI.}
\footnotetext{1130}{Amm., 16.10.14. Ammianus refers here to the later restoration by Alexander Severus, SHA, Vita Allexandri, 24, which, however must have retained the essence of the Domitianic building.}
\footnotetext{1131}{For ample discussion on the so-called Pasquino see Schweitzer 1936; Wunsche 1991; Maiuro 2007.}
\footnotetext{1132}{See Maiuro 2007 for an analysis on the different versions of the group.}
\end{footnotes}
depicting the belly of the dead man as he is being lifted. The identification of the two figures is debated: it could be either Menelaus recovering the body of Patroclus, or Ajax lifting the body of Achilles.\footnote{Schweitzer 1936, 52 ff for the first and more common interpretation; see Maiuro 2007, 170, footnote no. 10, for support to the second interpretation.}

Other fragments also document mythological depictions. A fragmentary statue depicting the Minotaur preserved only in the bust and the head has been attributed to a group representing the fight between Theseus and the Minotaur (fig. 151). This statuary group is known from other examples, and has been tied to Pausanias’ mention of a 5\textsuperscript{th} century B.C. work by Myron on the acropolis of Athens.\footnote{Paus. I, 24, 1.} The replica set does seem to derive from a Classical work. The fragment has been dated to Domitian’s reign on stylistic grounds, and represents an excellent Roman copy of the original by Myron.\footnote{Germini 2009, 459.} The discovery spot, in Via San Tommaso in Parione, near piazza Navona, suggests that the fragment belonged to a group that once decorated the stadium.\footnote{Ibid.} Furthermore, copies in Pentelic marble of works by Praxiteles, Scopas, or Lysippus were found in the area around piazza Navona and can be imagined as decorating the niches of the façade,\footnote{Gros 2014, 92.} not unlike the arcades of the Colosseum, as known from Flavian coinage and the monument of the Haterii.\footnote{RIC II, 129 N. 110=BMCEmp II, 262 Nn. 190 s., see also RIC II, 208 n. The monument of the Haterii is in the Gregoriano Profano section of the Vatican Museums, Rome.} Finally, several intact and fragmentary columns were found around the stadium, two of which have been incorporated in the café of one of the five star hotels in the area (fig. 153).\footnote{This example can be seen at the Hotel Martis, in Via S. Giuseppe Calasanzio.} The refined sculptural decoration with the representation of fights from legendary conflicts such as the Trojan War and Theseus and the Minotaur would have mirrored the performance of contests in the stadium,
where boxing matches would have been staged. These mythical analogues for current combats enhanced the very Greek nature of the architecture.

The innovative architectural elements employed for the first time in this stadium generate the image of a beautiful, functional, and welcoming public venue (fig. 152). When we try to imagine the experience of space in the stadium of Domitian, unique features would have offered a sense of comfort, with large gathering and walking spaces which were well lit and provided with easy access points.\textsuperscript{1140} Passageways and stairs to the upper levels were also unusually large and illuminated, while an articulated water system together with the presence of \textit{latrinae} provided good drainage. All these elements point toward a coherent project that took into consideration urban planning and crowd management combined with a sophisticated decorative program.

The architectural features of the \textit{Odeum} are more difficult to discern, since the archaeological evidence, as already mentioned, is at best scarce. Based on the most accepted hypothesis,\textsuperscript{1141} the \textit{Odeum} was built just to the south of the stadium and to the north of the theatre of Pompey as part of a unified building plan that included the stadium. A reconstruction of the \textit{Odeum} remains elusive given the poor state of the archaeological evidence.

The data from the sources differ in terms of seating capacity, ranging from 10,600 in the Regionary Catalogs\textsuperscript{1142} to the 11,600 recorded by the Chronographer of A.D. 354.\textsuperscript{1143} However, analysis of the fragments \textit{in situ} led Hulsen to suggest a capacity of 5000, while Lanciani and Lugli estimated 7000.\textsuperscript{1144} In any case, this building must

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[1140]{Bernard, Ciancio Rossetto 2014, 152-53.}
\footnotetext[1141]{See \textit{supra} for a discussion about the different hypotheses for the location of the Odeum, Fallague 2014.}
\footnotetext[1142]{Valentini-Zucchetti 1940, 123.}
\footnotetext[1143]{\textit{Chronogr. a. 354} 146M.}
\footnotetext[1144]{Fallague 2014, 120-22.}
\end{footnotes}
have been monumental and lavishly decorated since it is again listed by Ammianus, together with the stadium, among the must-see spots in Rome.\textsuperscript{1145} It is thus possible to hypothesize a cavea with a diameter between 95 and 140 m,\textsuperscript{1146} appropriate proportions for a theatre that was conceived as a complementary section of the unified stadium-\textit{Odeum} project.\textsuperscript{1147}

The peculiarities of Domitian’s project that included the stadium and \textit{Odeum} can be fully understood only when viewed against the previous attempts to bring the Greek-style agon to Rome, such as the \textit{Neronia}, and when put into context within the known architectural typology of theatres and amphitheatres. Alexander Heinemann has examined the different fates of the games founded by Nero and Domitian, two emperors who suffered \textit{damnatio memoriae}.

\textsuperscript{1148} The \textit{Neronia} were introduced in the year 60 and held only one more time in 65, whereas the \textit{Capitolia} continued to be held until the 4\textsuperscript{th} century A.D.\textsuperscript{1149} The popular success of these Greek-style games stands in contradiction to the open resistance to athletics of the senatorial circles.\textsuperscript{1150}

Nero had made use of both new and old buildings in the Campus Martius for his games: the theatre of Pompey hosted the rhetorical music agons, the \textit{Saepta} were devoted to gymnastics, while the new Gymnasium was used for running events.\textsuperscript{1151} We could also imagine that Nero’s baths, with their convenient location in the middle of the Campus Martius, were used for the \textit{Neronia}. Nero himself performed in the games as a kitharode and in singing contests, but he is also mentioned as a charioteer. Tacitus

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textsuperscript{1145} & Amm., 16.10.14 \\
\textsuperscript{1146} & Fallague 2014, 120. For Fallague this width implies that the \textit{Odeum} could not have been a covered theatre as it is interpreted. \\
\textsuperscript{1147} & See especially Gros 2014 for an analysis of the consistent project for both buildings with comparanda from Hellenistic sites where the proximity of a stadium and \textit{odeum} is widely attested. \\
\textsuperscript{1148} & Heinemann 2014. \\
\textsuperscript{1149} & Amm., 16.10.4. \\
\textsuperscript{1150} & Tac. \textit{Ann.}, 14. 20-21. \\
\textsuperscript{1151} & Heinemann 2014, 228. \\
\end{tabular}
\end{footnotesize}
reported that there was no official winner in the eloquence category, but the emperor got the prize.\textsuperscript{1152} As Alexander Heinemann points out, the \textit{Neronia} were therefore truly Nero’s games,\textsuperscript{1153} aimed at exhibiting his artistic persona to Roman audiences.

Despite the fact that participation in the \textit{Neronia} was extended to a wide sector of the empire, these games were not actually intended to attract a large international body of performers and artists, as they fell in the fourth year of the Olympic cycle and therefore conflicted with many other competitions.\textsuperscript{1154} While the \textit{Neronia} – and the \textit{Juvenalia} – were conceived of by Nero as a means for the emperor to connect with the global empire by introducing a participatory model, in practice, the emperor’s own participation created an even greater barrier.\textsuperscript{1155}

Domitian’s games, on the other hand, were coordinated with other similar events, such as the \textit{Sebasta} in Naples tied to honors for the deified emperors, and occurred at times\textsuperscript{1156} which did not conflict with the Olympic games, thus allowing for wider participation.\textsuperscript{1157} The dedication to Jupiter, rather than to himself, fit neatly into a narrative in which Jupiter figured as a protective deity for the Flavians.\textsuperscript{1158} Moreover, participation in the \textit{Capitolia} followed this regulation: the artistic competitions were open only to participants from the western parts of the empire, while gymnastics were

\textsuperscript{1152} Tac. \textit{ann.}, 14.21.
\textsuperscript{1153} Heinemann 2014, 235.
\textsuperscript{1154} Heinemann 2014, 233.
\textsuperscript{1155} Heinemann 2014, 249-50.
\textsuperscript{1156} See Caldelli 2014, 40 for the analysis of epigraphic evidence that indicates the month of June for the \textit{Capitolia}.
\textsuperscript{1157} Heinemann 2014, 233, 236-37.
\textsuperscript{1158} The restoration of the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus Capitolinus occurred twice during the reign of the Flavians. First, Vespasian restored it after the conflicts of the year AD 69 which destroyed part of the Capitoline hill. The fire of AD 80 caused severe damage to the temple which was again restored by Domitian, see the discussion of the interventions by Domitian on the Capitoline hill in section III.h and III.i.
practiced exclusively by participants from the Greek provinces.\textsuperscript{1159} This is one of many ways that Domitian, while taking inspiration from the last of the Julio-Claudian emperors, clearly set himself apart from Nero, thus allowing a meaningful part of his legacy to survive his \textit{damnatio memoriae}.\textsuperscript{1160}

Domitian’s participation was also carefully crafted to communicate to the audience an imperial persona rather than a performing one. Domitian would attend the competitions as \textit{agonothete} in the company of important priests, the \textit{flamen dialis} of Jupiter, an ancient office, and the new \textit{sodales Flaviales},\textsuperscript{1161} a priestly order honoring Vespasian and Titus, which involved wearing a diadem depicting the Capitoline triad.\textsuperscript{1162} The event therefore acquired a religious aura that ensured the reception of the event as a proper one, despite its Greek nature. The survival of the \textit{Capitolia} and, as a consequence, of the Stadium-\textit{Odeum} ensemble, attests to Domitian’s capacity to legitimize both an event and architectural types that, until then, had necessitated the presence of a temple. The success of Domitian’s \textit{Capitolia} stands in stark contrast to Nero’s \textit{Neronia}, and in a way represents the realization of a revolutionary cultural approach to the experience of entertainment started by Pompey over a century earlier.

\textsuperscript{1159} Heinemann 2014, 237; Caldelli 2014.
\textsuperscript{1160} See the conclusions to the dissertation for more detailed examples. In general, Domitian’s debt to Nero is enormous from a topographical and architectural point of view. Despite the autocratic portrait offered by the sources, the protracted life of nearly all of Domitian’s interventions on Rome’s topography and public architecture speaks volumes of the positive reception of his building program.
\textsuperscript{1161} See Escámez de Vera 2016 for a detailed analysis of the college of priests known as \textit{sodales Flaviales} which played a crucial role in the Flavian imperial propaganda of legitimization through the association with Jupiter.
\textsuperscript{1162} Suet., \textit{Dom.}, 4, 4.
V.c The Iseum Campense, Porticus Divorum, and Minerva Chalcidica

The expression of the cultic topography of Domitian, The Iseum Campense, Porticus Divorum, and Minerva Chalcidica occupy the eastern sector of the Campus Martius (fig. 136, 155). While the archaeological evidence is very poor for all of them, their topographical location can be ascertained based on several fragments of the Forma Urbis Romae (FUR).\(^\text{1163}\) The attribution to Domitian of the restoration of the Iseum Campense after the fire of 80 A.D. and the construction of the Porticus Divorum and the Minerva Chalcidica is certain, and is based on the mention of all buildings in late sources. Though they were built as separate structures, they will be considered here as a group due to the strong topographical and symbolic bonds they share.\(^\text{1164}\)

V.c.1 The Iseum Campense

A mention by Dio of both Isis and Serapis might indicate that the first construction of the Campus Martius sanctuary took place in 43 B.C., ten years after the Senate ordered the demolition of all temples dedicated to Isis.\(^\text{1165}\) The Iseum Campense — Isis in the Campus — was built under the patronage of the Second Triumvirate, Octavian, Antony, and Lepidus, whose members followed Caesar’s building program in this area by choosing the site adjacent to the Saepta and the Villa Publica.\(^\text{1166}\) The cult of Isis had suffered a variable fate in Rome before the Flavians, with Agrippa banning all

---

\(^{1163}\) The Minerva Chalcidica is documented by a drawing by O. Panvinio of the lost fragments of the FUR, Cod. Vat. Lat. 3439, f.25r; the Porticus Divorum is documented by the fragments 35 a-I and the PM (Pianta Marmorea) plates 31 and 46.

\(^{1164}\) Torelli discusses at length the epithet “Chalcidicus” with reference to the forum building and the round structure in the Campus Martius. He also highlights the organic urban design of the complex formed by the Iseum, the Minerva Chalcidica, and the Porticus Divorum. Torelli 2004.

\(^{1165}\) Dio, 47.15.4; Ensoli, 2000, 268.

\(^{1166}\) D’Alessio 2012, 506; Dio, 47. 15. 4.
rituals in 21 B.C., while Tiberius abolished this cult along with others that were foreign and sent the proselytes away to Sardinia or outside Italy. None of these episodes, however, seems to have entailed the destruction of the Iseum Campense, because the repression of the cult mostly targeted the area inside the *pomerium*. After the ban by Tiberius, Caligula was responsible for a revival of the cult, which was manifest in several aspects throughout his reign.

The special importance of this Egyptian cult for the Flavians, which was tied to the circumstances of Vespasian’s coming to power, has been thoroughly analyzed by several scholars. These studies show how the partial appropriation of the cult of Isis and Serapis by Vespasian first and Domitian later culminated in an original combination of Egyptian traditions and Roman imperial ideology that was tied to the legitimization of the Flavian imperial authority. The so-called “Pharaonic Kingship” of the Flavians is attested by several episodes involving all three family members. Tacitus and Suetonius describe the miraculous experience of Vespasian during his visit to the temple of Serapis in Alexandria, and the healing that he was able to perform reluctantly. Dio tells us that upon Vespasian’s arrival in Alexandria, the Nile overflowed in an exceptional way. These auspices cast an aura of oracular predestination over Vespasian’s access to the throne as the news of the defeat and death of Vitellius in Cremona reached him while
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1167 Dio, 54.6.6.  
1168 Tac., Ann., 2.85; Suet., Tib., 36.  
1171 For details on the extensive bibliography on the subject see Capriotti Vitozzi 2014, footnotes nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8.  
1172 See Capriotti Vitozzi 2014 for the coinage of the expression and thorough analysis of the Egyptian aspects of the Flavian rule.  
1173 Tac., hist. 4.81-82; Suet., Vesp., 7,1-2.  
1174 Dio, 65.8.1.
in Egypt. Titus stopped in Memphis on his return from Judaea to make offerings and perform rituals to Apis, and, fortuitously, during the turmoil of A.D. 69, Domitian escaped the Vitellians by hiding as a priest of Isis on the Capitoline hill.

It is not surprising, then, that according to Josephus, in the wake of the triumph for the conquest of Jerusalem in A.D. 71, Vespasian and Titus decided to spend the night in the Iseum Campense before they started the triumphal procession. The event is celebrated in a sestertius by Vespasian depicting a tetrastyle Egyptian-Roman temple crowned by a semicircular pediment featuring Isis-Sothis riding a dog, while the cult statue depicts a standing Isis (fig. 154). No source attests a reconstruction of the Iseum Campense by Vespasian; therefore, the image on the coins must represent the version rebuilt by Caligula, which may have housed a cult statue similar to the Capitoline Isis dated to Claudius' reign.

The Iseum Campense was certainly involved in the fire of A.D. 80 which gave Domitian the opportunity to restore the entire area according to a cohesive plan that included the Minerva Chalcidica and the Porticus Divorum (fig. 138). As we will see, the entire complex became the architectural and topographical actualization of the Flavian dynastic cult. The Iseum Campense was turned into the most important and monumental public sanctuary for the cult of Isis, while the topographic proximity to the Porticus Divorum established a connection with the deification of the two older Flavians under the protection of Minerva, acting as a hub from the Minerva Chalcidica. The
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1175 Suet., Vesp., 7.1.
1176 Suet., Tit., 5.4.
1177 Suet., Dom., 1; Tac., hist., 3.74.
1178 Flav. Jos. bell. lud., 7, 123.
1179 BMCEmp II, 189 N: 780 tav.35.3; RIC II, 70 N. 453, 78 N. 537.
1181 See Bülow Clausen 2013 and 2015 (PhD dissertation) for an analysis of the special meaning of the connection of Domitian with both Isis and Minerva.
Iseum featured a new form that combined a grand portico enclosing garden features as well as temples. Several sources list the Iseum among the buildings restored or built by Domitian. Mention of the Domitianic Iseum Campense can be found in Martial, who indicates the location of the “Memphitica templa” of Isis close to the Hecatostylum, while Juvenal mentions the proximity to the old Saepta called “ouili”. Finally, in Metamorphoses XI, Apuleius describes Lucius’ visit to the temple of Isis in Rome, known as the Isis Campensis. Hadrian (A.D. 117-138) was responsible for a massive intervention in the area that focused mainly on the southern section, while Septimius Severus (A.D. 193-211) restored parts of it.

No archaeological remains are currently visible, nor was this area systematically investigated. The only information that we have comes from some scattered excavations carried out by Canina and Lanciani at the end of the 20th century, and more recent, but partial, investigations in the 1980s and in 1991. Information about the topographical arrangement can be found in some fragments of the FUR included in Carettoni Plate 31 (fig. 20). In addition, there has been a wealth of Egyptianizing material that has been discovered in this area since the 16th century. In the paragraphs to follow, I will describe the complex of the Iseum Campense based on the details from the FUR and the most recent archaeological investigation. I will then focus specifically on the Domitianic version of the Iseum in light of current research that has been able to establish a fairly clear distinction between the interventions by Domitian, Hadrian, and Septimius
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1182 Eutr. 7.23.5 ; Chronogr. a. 354, 146 M; Hier. chron. a. Abr. 2105.
1183 Mart., Epigr., II.14. 7: “Hic quoque deceptus Memphitica templa frequentat”.
1184 Juv., Sat., VI.526-29: “si candida iusserit Io, ibit ad Aegypti finem calidaque petitas a Meroe portabit aquas, ut spargat in aedeIsidis, antiquo quae proxima surgit ouili”. See also, 6.486-91 and 9. 22-26.
1186 Fragments numbers according to Stanford numeration: 35n, o, z-aa, 35s, 35t , 35uv, 36a.
1187 See the plan by Roullet 1972 which shows the finds spots of fragments of sculptural and architectural decoration, fig. 158.
Severus. My conclusions will show that we can suggest a different reconstruction of the Iseum that better fits with the archaeological and visual evidence.

The complex follows a north-south alignment and consists of three sectors (fig. 155). The northern sector was delimited at the north by a *vicus* corresponding almost exactly to the modern Via del Seminario and the ending arches of the ancient *Aqua Virgo*. The northwestern corner of this part has been identified in a few archaeological remains brought to light by the Soprintendenza in 1991 and published preliminarily by Alfano.\(^{1188}\) This sector consisted of a rectangular square measuring about 130 x 65 m, and was characterized by a long corridor (a typical Egyptian *dromos*) flanked by alternating small obelisks of pink Egyptian granite and, perhaps, sphinxes. The sides of this corridor might have been framed by *euripi* beyond which one can imagine rows of trees or other obelisks.\(^{1189}\) The location of the temple of Isis is not known, although various hypothetical reconstructions of the northern section of the Iseum Campense have been attempted.

The first reconstruction was put forward by Lanciani, who could rely only on scant evidence, and who created a topographical arrangement that has been almost completely disproven, with the exception of the *dromos* flanked by small obelisks and sphinxes that led toward the temple of Isis.\(^{1190}\) Gatti suggested placing the temple, surrounded by a precinct, in the southern sector of the rectangular piazza (fig. 157).\(^{1191}\) The temple's precinct would be accessed by a southern and northern staircase consisting of five steps, while the dromos would occupy the northern part of the piazza behind the temple. Another hypothesis came from Roullet, who placed the temple against the

---


\(^{1189}\) Coarelli 1996, 108. See below for a more detailed discussion about a reconstruction of this sector.

\(^{1190}\) Lanciani, 1893-1901, tavv. 15, 21.

\(^{1191}\) Gatti 1944, tav. IV.
northern wall, with the topographical emphasis on the long longitudinal *dromos* (fig. 158).\(^{1192}\) This hypothesis resulted from a combination of the scant archaeological evidence with the mention by Martial, who refers to the Iseum Campense as “*memphitica templum*”.\(^{1193}\) A comparison with the Serapeum in Memphis supports Roullet’s reconstruction of the sanctuary.\(^{1194}\)

The temple of Isis was placed by Lembke in the northern sector of the piazza, in association with a specular temple of Serapis (fig. 155);\(^{1195}\) however, this is not likely to have been the case, since the temple of Serapis was probably housed in the semicircular exedra to the south, and it is accepted that the Serapeum in the southern sector was built later by Hadrian, who was responsible for a major intervention in the area.\(^{1196}\) Ensoli hypothesized a temple located in the southeastern portion, corresponding to Via del Beato Angelico. This hypothesis is based on the excavations carried out in Via del Beato Angelico in 1852 by Canina, who noticed a sort of podium accessed by steps and surrounded by a canal that he identified as the front of the temple.\(^{1197}\)

In 1883, Lanciani conducted other excavations to the NE in Via di Sant’Ignazio di Loyola which yielded fragments of the so-called *caelatae* columns, one of which is in the Capitoline Museums.\(^{1198}\) These columns had a gray granite shaft of one diameter surmounted by a composite capital with palm leaves in Luni marble. The bottom part of these columns is decorated with figures of Isis priests in bas relief. Commonly these
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\(^{1192}\) Roullet 1972, 23-35, fig. 352.
\(^{1193}\) Mart., Epigr, II.14.7.
\(^{1194}\) *Contra* Malaise, 1978, 683. For Malaise the term “*memphitico*” can be regarded as a simple synonym of “Egyptian” and does not necessarily refer to the sanctuary in Memphis. Malaise placed the temple of Isis in the southern area of the piazza following Gatti’s previous hypothesis.
\(^{1195}\) Lembke 1994, 25, fig. a.
\(^{1197}\) Canina 1852, 348, 351.
\(^{1198}\) Lanciani 1883, 47; Malaise 1972a, 196, no. 357; Lembke 1994, 189, no. 7.
columns are dated to the restoration of the complex undertaken by Septimius Severus.\textsuperscript{1199} The data gathered from the findspot of these fragments led Ensoli to place the temple of Isis in the SE section of the piazza, indicated by the red square in the plan (fig. 157). This hypothesis is not convincing for several reasons. First of all, Ensoli's location itself betrays a design inconsistency, for it occupies an off-axis spot that is not coherent with the shape and orientation of the area. The rectangular space of the piazza requires the focal building to be located along the main axis, whether on the long or short side, while Ensoli's suggestion does not fit into either arrangement. In fact, the find spot of the podium by Canina is outside any symmetrical arrangement of the square, and despite the lack of any information for this sector of the Iseum, it would be hard to place the temple of Isis in such an awkward spot.

Secondly, the fragments of \textit{caelatae} columns do not necessarily belong to the temple, seeing that, as Ensoli explains in a note,\textsuperscript{1200} the one currently exhibited in the Capitoline Museums pertained to the southern portico. Finally, Canina's description does not provide solid grounds for reconstructing the structure as a temple podium that could alternatively be interpreted as a foundation for some other type of building. I would suggest instead that Canina's description and the location of the remains may indicate the presence of a fountain/nympheum. Canina recalls the presence of a canal surrounding the structure, while the excavations by Lanciani in 1883 and the more recent investigations by Alfano have established the presence of a complex system of water channels and sewage features that easily relate to the deep ties of the cult of Isis to the sacred waters of the Nile.\textsuperscript{1201}

\textsuperscript{1199} Ensoli 1998, 419-420.
\textsuperscript{1200} Ensoli 1998, 420, footnote no. 31.
\textsuperscript{1201} Alfano 1998; Ensoli 1998,
On the ground of this observation, Ensoli, in fact, proposes an alternative identification for the circles that appear in the FUR. Initially, these features, which appear in fragment no. 36a, were identified by scholars as columns. Coarelli later noticed the wide intercolumniations and suggested instead that they should be indentified as small obelisks. Ensoli, on the other hand, proposed a different reading of these circles as above ground wells which would allude to the “mistico deflusso sotterraneo del Nilo”. The archaeological evidence supports the strong presence of water features in the area of the Iseum, while the known aspects of the rituals also point to the need for water.

When we consider all the evidence, the reconstruction by D’Alessio with the placement of the main temple against the northern portico wall seems the most plausible (fig. 155). This reconstruction is based on the previous hypothesis by Lembke, but D’Alessio places at this edge of the portico only a single tetrastyle aedes rather than two facing temples. The dromos runs for the entire length of the piazza flanked by the obelisks and sphinxes, and is also bordered by two parallel euripi. The presence of the euripi is based on archaeological finds by Alfano, who found a stretch of a canal in the NE sector of the piazza and another stretch in the SW section. However, the reconstruction of the two euripi by D’Alessio needs reconsideration. The presence of shallow water channels is proven by solid, although fragmentary, archaeological evidence and is also consistent with a sanctuary dedicated to Isis, where the sacred landscape would have included lush gardens with exotic plants such as palm trees and
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1202 This fragment is only known through a Renaissance drawing from the Cod. Vat. Lat. 3439.
1203 Coarelli 1996, 108. In the reconstruction by D’Alessio the circles are identified as trees and the rows of obelisks and sphinxes are moved toward the inside of the square, D’Alessio 2012, tav. 236.
1204 Ensoli 1998, 419.
1205 This is the position of the temple in the reconstruction by D’Alessio published in the Atlante di Roma Antica although no explanation for the choices made is provided, D’Alessio 2012, tav. 236.
shrubs from Africa as well as water features of different size and functions. In D’Alessio’s reconstruction, however, the two euripi would have prevented the visitor from walking in an east-west direction for the entire length of the sanctuary.

The archaeological evidence uncovered by Alfano proves that a large portion of the central area was paved with high-quality opus signinum while others parts were paved with thick travertine and marble slabs. This appears to have been the result of a coherent, unified project. The opus signinum area was accessed by steps, seen first by Lanciani in 1883, and marked by several shallow water channels revetted in marble. We can imagine a series of different solutions for this network of water features, but we have to take into consideration the paths of traffic within the sanctuary in relation to the visitor’s experience and needs. The piazza is oriented along a decisively longitudinal axis; therefore, I suggest several water channels, although not continuous, along this axis, thus allowing for variations in visitors’ paths and also aimed at permitting visitors to enjoy the opulent landscape from various perspectives (fig. 160).

If this reconstruction is correct, it is impossible not to think of the arrangement in the Templum Pacis with the euripi dictating the paths of traffic within the space (fig. 3). In the Templum Pacis, shallow water basins ran for about 80 m along a NE-SW axis, directing the visitor in straight routes but allowing wide turns at the entrance and toward the back of the piazza. In other words, while the euripi were certainly aimed at ordering the paths of traffic, their arrangement would still allow visitors to walk around the piazza. In regard to the landscape, it is plausible that the circles on the FUR that have
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1207 Bommas 2012, 190-92.
been interpreted as small obelisks\textsuperscript{1209} or wells\textsuperscript{1210} instead represent potted plants or, more simply, trees.\textsuperscript{1211}

A marble relief from Ariccia, today exhibited in Palazzo Altemps,\textsuperscript{1212} is believed to depict a scene in the Iseum Campense (fig. 161).\textsuperscript{1213} The relief, represented on two registers, shows an Isiac ritual taking place in a portico. In the lower register, a group of devotees is watching the ritual from the top of a podium, while on the left, female dancers and attendants are performing a dance. The top register depicts the architectural setting with several details. A seated female figure occupies a central exedra, while three niches appear on either side of it. In the niches, we see in the central one a crouching figure flanked in the side niches by crouching baboons. The relief is fragmentary, but to the left of the niches there is an animal on a podium (an ox?) followed by a round aedicula with a standing statue inside. This side ends with a square aedicula supported by a male caryatid (an Egyptian Telamon) in the lower register.

Considering that the group performing the ritual is facing the left side, we must be looking at the eastern wall of the precinct of the Iseum Campense, where the temple should be at the far left of the scene. Due to the relief’s fragmentary state, it is impossible to place these details topographically with certainty, but an attempt is made here to at least include them in a hypothetical reconstruction (fig. 162). One of the most significant elements provided by this relief is the collection of landscape details. In the lower register, a row of flamingos appear below the dancing figures, while on the top, palm trees are clearly discernible to the sides of the round aedicula. The importance of

\textsuperscript{1209} Coarelli 1996, 108.
\textsuperscript{1210} Ensoli 1998, 419.
\textsuperscript{1211} Bommas 2012, 191.
\textsuperscript{1212} Museo Nazionale Romano, Palazzo Altemps, inv. 77255.
\textsuperscript{1213} Lembke 1994, tav. 42; Capriotti Vitozzi 2014, 254 and footnote no. 69; contra Ensoli 1998, 414-15, 431 who identifies in the relief the Porticus Divorum where she believes a temple of Serapis was housed.
gardens in the sacred landscape of *Isea* has been highlighted and demonstrated by the comparisons with fourth style frescoes from Herculaneum,\textsuperscript{1214} which strengthen the identification of the little circles on the FUR with trees, most likely palm trees.

The central sector of the Iseum Campense consisted of a rectangular space oriented according to an EW axis and accessed by two arches, the so-called Arco di Camigliano to the east, and a second one, the so-called “Giano della Minerva,” to the west (fig. 155). The Arco di Camigliano has been identified by some scholars\textsuperscript{1215} with the “arcus ad Isis” visible in the relief of the Haterii tomb of Flavian date. In this area of the Iseum, the FUR shows two small features: a square one directly on axis with the entire complex, and a round one to the west of the main axis (fig. 156). The square element has been plausibly identified as an obelisk which, according to some, could be the one that is now in the Fontana dei Fiumi in Piazza Navona.\textsuperscript{1216}

The round feature might have been a small fountain that could have been decorated with the bronze “pigna” now on display in the courtyard of the Vatican Museums.\textsuperscript{1217} Some small rectangular, modular features appear on the FUR fragments to delimit the southern end of this central sector of the Iseum Campense, and these may have been small water basins.\textsuperscript{1218} The proximity of the ending arches of the Aqua Virgo to the north of the Iseum and, as discussed above, the need for water in the rituals for Isis
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\textsuperscript{1214}Bommas 2012, 192. Bommas also analyzes the evidence for the presence of live animals in *Isea* such as crocodiles, ibises, and mammals (Bommas 2012, 192-94) which supports the depiction of flamingos as an accurate representation of the Iseum Campense.

\textsuperscript{1215}Castagnoli 1941; Gasparini 2009, 349; contra Kleiner, 1990, 131-34.

\textsuperscript{1216}Coarelli reports that in the excavation carried out in 1923 the paving of the piazza showed the small square visible in the FUR that could represent an obelisk which could be the one in piazza Navona (Coarelli 1996, 108; Lembke 1996, 110-12). There is not agreement on the current location of the obelisk. For Grenier the obelisk in the Fontana dei Fiumi in piazza Navona cannot be the one previously located in the Iseum Campense (Grenier, 1999, 2009, 237-38) followed by Ensoli who identified the original location of the obelisk in the Serapeum on the Quirinal instead, (Ensoli 2000, 271).

\textsuperscript{1217}Coarelli 1996, 108.

\textsuperscript{1218}D’Alessio 2012, 518.
and Serapis support the suggestion of the presence of several water features. The cult of Isis was directly related to the Nile’s floods and the creative force of water,\textsuperscript{1219} thus calling for several water features in the sacred complex. This central sector was not a sacred area \textit{per se} but rather a monumental node to redirect the traffic to and through the three sectors of the Iseum while connecting the complex to the \textit{via Lata} to the east and the \textit{Saepta} to the west. Among the most noticeable finds belonging to the southern sector of the Iseum Campense are three recumbent statues of river gods, the Nile and the Tiber, at the Vatican Museums and the Louvre, respectively, and one of the Ocean now missing.\textsuperscript{1220} These statues fit perfectly in the context of an Egyptian cult in which water plays a primary role.\textsuperscript{1221} The statues, though, are more commonly dated to Hadrianic times and they belong to the later intervention by this emperor in the southern area.\textsuperscript{1222}

The southern sector of the Iseum Campense appears on the FUR as a large apsed portico encompassing a semicircular fountain basin (fig. 156). The modern Via del Piè di Marmo corresponds roughly to the northern border of this sector. The plan of this area can be reconstructed with a fair degree of certainty on the grounds of the FUR fragments,\textsuperscript{1223} which provide sufficient architectural details. A central elongated exedra projects out of the main apse while four other exedrae, semicircular and square, are placed asymmetrically along the outer semicircle. The inscription on the FUR has been securely integrated with the “Serapeum,” leaving no doubt about the interpretation of the fragment. To the southeast there is also a triangular feature known by the name of Delta that has been interpreted as a water basin.\textsuperscript{1224}

\textsuperscript{1219} Ensoli 2000, 276.
\textsuperscript{1220} Coarelli 1996, 108.
\textsuperscript{1221} Rose 2013.
\textsuperscript{1222} Ensoli 1998, 424, see footnote no. 45 with bibliography about the different dating of the statues.
\textsuperscript{1223} \textit{FUR} nos. 35 m, s, t, u, v.
\textsuperscript{1224} Coarelli 1996, 109.
This description of the Iseum Campense as divided into three sectors is based on evidence from the FUR in conjunction with archaeological finds. As already mentioned, the extensive research on the Iseum in the past few years\(^{1225}\) has achieved great results in the analysis of the different phases of the sanctuary. In light of this research,\(^ {1226}\) it is possible to attribute to Domitian a large unified project that included a complete remodeling of the Iseum, which certainly consisted of the northern sector with an *aedes* for Isis and the central rectangular piazza with the Arch of Camillano (fig. 155, Domitianic phase). However, as far as the southern area is concerned, several elements point toward a Hadrianic date (fig. 155, Hadrianic phase). The statues of the river gods, which were used to decorate the semicircular nymphaeum, have been dated to Hadrian’s time, while several fragments of Hadrianic statues were found in the southern area.\(^ {1227}\) An inscription attesting to the cult of Antinous was uncovered in the central sector. Finally, and most importantly, the shape of the southern sector of the Iseum bears remarkable similarities to later architecture under imperial patronage: the so-called Serapeum and, even more so, to the Antinoeion in Hadrian’s Villa.\(^ {1228}\) It is not possible to establish whether Hadrian built this sector *ex novo* or rebuilt/restored a previous Domitianic structure. Hadrian also built the giant arch that gave access to the central sector from the west, also known as “Giano alla Minerva”. It seems clear that Hadrian

---

\(^{1225}\) In particular, an international conference was held in Rome in May 2016 under the title “The Iseum Campense from the Roman Empire to the Modern Age: historical, archaeological, and historiographical perspectives”. The conference was organized by the CNR, the Thorvaldsen Museum on Copenhagen, the Egyptian and Danish Academies in Rome, and the KNIR within the Leiden VIDI project “Cultural Innovation in a globalizing society. Egypt in the Roman world”. The final publication edited by Versluys, Bülow-Clausen, Capriotti-Vittozzi is forthcoming in 2018.

\(^{1226}\) See Alfano 1992 and 1998 for the interpretation of the unitary Domitianic project of the northern area.

\(^{1227}\) Ensoli 1998, 424.

\(^{1228}\) For a description and analysis of the Antinoeion see Mari-Sgalambro 2007 where the authors also attribute to Hadrian the construction of the southern sector of the Iseum Campense.
carried out a massive coherent intervention that must be connected to the rebuilding of Agrippa’s (and also Domitian’s) Pantheon nearby.

Several architectural elements found in the southern area have been dated with certainty to the time of Septimius Severus. Considering that the cult of Serapis reached its peak under this emperor, some scholars\textsuperscript{1229} attribute to this period the introduction of the cult of Serapis into the exedra that subsequently became a consecrated \textit{aedes} and received the name “Serapeum” in the FUR.

\textit{V.c.2 The Porticus Divorum}

A monument with strong dynastic connotations, the so-called \textit{Porticus Divorum}, was built by Domitian to honor his deified father and brother in the area previously occupied by the \textit{Villa Publica} (fig. 155).\textsuperscript{1230} This original compound was part of a system of structures aimed at celebrating all members of the Flavian family which included the temple of the Divine Vespasian, the Arches of Titus, and the \textit{Templum Gentis Flaviae}. The building is mentioned as \textit{Divorum}\textsuperscript{1231} or \textit{Divorum Porticus}\textsuperscript{1232} in several sources, which clearly attribute the construction to Domitian. The scanty archaeological remains were seen during several interventions in the area starting in the early 19\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{1233} The discovery by Mancini of a few stretches of wall in 1925 allowed for the reconstruction of a fairly accurate plan of the \textit{porticus}, based mainly on the FUR, which remains the most accurate source for the plan and topography (fig. 156). The fragments 35 a-i\textsuperscript{1234} and

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{1229}] In particular see Ensoli 1998, 425-26; Ensoli 2000, 274.
\item[\textsuperscript{1230}] See Richardson 1976 for a convincing analysis of the evidence that supports the placement of the \textit{Porticus Divorum} in the area previously occupied by the \textit{Villa Publica}.
\item[\textsuperscript{1231}] \textit{Chronogr. a.} 354 146 M; \textit{Not. Reg. IX}.
\item[\textsuperscript{1232}] \textit{Hier. chron. a. Abr.} 2105; Eutr. 7.23.
\item[\textsuperscript{1233}] Canina 1831, 178; Pellegrini, 1870, 117; Hülsen 1903, 17-32.
\item[\textsuperscript{1234}] Numbering according to Stanford Digital Forma Urbis Romae Project, \url{http://formaurbis.stanford.edu/index.php?field0=all&search0=divorum&op0=and&field1=all&search1=}
\end{itemize}
Carettoni plate 31 and 46 show a large rectangular area surrounded by porticoes. The area measures about 180 x 76 m and is enclosed by a continuous wall interrupted by a rectangular exedra on the northeastern side, and preceded by three columns and another smaller exedra projecting out of the southwestern corner. The fragmentary state of the FUR fragments do not indicate how many of these exedrae might have existed along the outer wall.

The *Porticus Divorum* was accessed from the northern side through a three-bay arch preceded by three steps and perhaps from another access point in the south, though this is less legible on the FUR. The arch is flanked by two rooms consisting of two chambers each and overlooking the inside of the *porticus*. Two small symmetrical tetrastyle temples that face each other appear in the NW and NE corners of the piazza and have been identified as the temples to the deified Vespasian and Titus. A rectangular feature (8.3 x 6.5 m ca.) stands on the central axis on the southern side; four columns mark its corners, while three steps provide access from the northern and southern sides. An odd line engraved on the FUR that departs from the back of this rectangular feature and runs out of the portico toward the south has been interpreted as a channel. The interior of the *Porticus Divorum* is characterized by a large open area surrounded on three sides by columns, beyond which a couple of steps would have taken the visitor inside the central sector. A regular series of distantly spaced dots on the FUR most likely indicate rows of trees, which would have given this complex the appearance of a luxuriant park.

---

1236 The identification of the two temples is based in an inscription from the *collegium Aesculapi et Hygiae* that mentions the temple dedicated to Titus dated to AD 153, *CIL VI* 10234. Contra Ensol 1998, 414-15, who identifies a temple of Serapis and another to Anubis in the two *aedes*.
Despite the fragmentary character of the evidence from the FUR, there is a general consensus among scholars about the interpretation of individual elements, with the exception perhaps of the rectangular feature in the southern area with the four columns on its corners. The representation of this element on the FUR is unusual and has given rise to a series of different hypotheses. Richardson hypothesizes a pergola or an altar of Mars surrounded by columns or trees, perhaps to replace the feature that gave the Campus Martius its name and was most likely destroyed to build this complex. Coarelli tentatively identifies it as an altar surrounded by a tetrastyle pavilion. D’Alessio indicates the possibility of a podium for a statue or a fountain, based on the channel behind it.

According to Ensoli, this feature may be shown in the Ariccia relief which, in Ensoli’s view, depicts a ritual taking place inside the Porticus Divorum, where a group of people are standing on a podium. Ensoli identifies that podium with the rectangular feature on the FUR in the Porticus Divorum; the four circles could be the Egyptian Telamons visible in the relief supporting a sort of ciborium, which is also represented in sestertii of Marcus Aurelius. However, this argument is not sufficiently supported by the visual evidence. Even if we account for the usual liberties taken in representing architecture, the Ariccia relief, which is largely believed to represent the Iseum Campense rather than the Porticus Divorum, shows an isolated podium/altar that is not connected to the Egyptian Telamons. They appear to form the ending feature of the portico and support an upper niche, which houses a statue.

---

1238 Richardson 1976, 161-62.
1240 D’Alessio 2012, 518.
1241 Ensoli 1998, 414-15, 431. See also above the discussion about the Ariccia relief with regards to the Iseum, footnote no. 49.
Another recent interpretation of the southern feature with its corner columns in the *Divorum* was proposed by Marcattili in 2013. Marcattili examined the striking similarities between the urban *Porticus Divorum* and a suburban sacred complex at La Magliana, located about 6 km south-west of the core of ancient Rome,\(^{1242}\) which includes a *Caesareum* and a *Lucus Deae Diae* built during the Flavian period (fig. 163). Both the urban and suburban complexes consist of a large porticoed area oriented along a NS axis, complemented by a round sacred building – *Minerva Chalcidica* in the Campus Martius and the *aedes Deae Diae* at La Magliana – and a dedication to deified emperors. The *Caesareum* at La Magliana was the seat of the *Fratres Arvales* who were responsible for the cult in the suburban *lucus* of Dea Dia, for which their *Acta* provide a substantial amount of epigraphic evidence.\(^{1243}\) In several of these inscriptions, ritual banquets are often described as taking place in a structure called a *tetrastylum*, whose description corresponds perfectly to the feature appearing in the FUR inside the *Porticus Divorum*. Moreover, references to the *tetrastylum* and the *Caesareum* in the *Acta Fratrum Arvalium* begin with the principate of Domitian.\(^{1244}\) These meaningful areas of overlap between the *Porticus Divorum* and the *Caesareum* at La Magliana form a strong argument for the identification of the rectangular feature with corner columns as a *tetrastylum* for ritual *epula*.

Despite the poor archaeological evidence, there is not much doubt about the topographical position of the *Porticus Divorum* or the arrangement within it. The structure’s strong dynastic connotation has often been highlighted, especially given that it occupied the location of the Republican *Villa Publica*, whose functions as a gathering

\(^{1242}\) Scheid 2004.  
\(^{1243}\) Marcattili 2013, 51.  
\(^{1244}\) Scheid 1990, 109.
place for military service and census-taking or as a park were assumed by other areas.\textsuperscript{1245} The layout of this complex, however, warrants deeper consideration. Richardson rightly noticed the strict division of its parts, with a crowded section in the north comprising the arch and the \textit{aedes Divorum}, the “airy spaciousness” of the landscaped central area, and the isolated small \textit{tetrastylum} in the southern end (fig. 164).\textsuperscript{1246} In order to fully understand the space and landscape design of the \textit{Porticus Divorum} it is worth analyzing the proportions of the space occupied by each of these three sectors. The northern area, including the monumental arch, the two temples, and the pair of double chambers at the entrance, amount to roughly 8% of the total; the \textit{tetrastylum} occupies about 1%, leaving 91% of the total space occupied by the portico and the trees. These numbers are not extraordinary \textit{per se}, given that other large porticoed areas, such as the Imperial Fora, are characterized by similar proportions, as the graphs in fig. 165 show.

However, in each of the Imperial Fora, the focus is always a temple on a monumental scale, which is offered to the visitor’s gaze unobstructed by trees or other structures. Moreover, the emperor’s ideological agenda was discernible in every detail of the architectural and sculptural decoration, leaving little or no space for landscape. The only imperial complex that made space for landscape was the \textit{Templum Pacis}, not a proper forum, whose open central area was marked by \textit{euripi} and bushes of “Gallic” roses that did not interfere with the temple’s visibility.

When trying to recreate the impact on the visitor to the \textit{Porticus Divorum} the landscape seems to have dominated over the temples dedicated to the deified Vespasian and Titus. Furthermore, the proportions of the \textit{Porticus Divorum} are highly distinctive: the two temples are about one-fifth the average size of the temples in the imperial

\textsuperscript{1245} Richardson 1976, 161.  
\textsuperscript{1246} Ibid.
fora, while the total area covered by the Porticus Divorum is larger than the average size of the fora. The arrangement of the two facing temples seems designed to create a contained area at the entrance that was just the right size for appreciating the vistas of such small buildings. At the same time, this layout caused a sharp distinction between the northern sector, comprising the monumental arch and the temples, and the rest of the complex; it also prevented the visitor from looking straight at the façade of either temple from outside the northern sector. Although the total loss of the decoration of the Porticus Divorum, which must have been lavish, represents a severe lacuna in our understanding of the complex, the current reconstruction nonetheless points toward an interpretation of the Porticus Divorum as a park that also housed two small temples. We can think of this layout as a means of preserving in part the character of the Villa Publica, where the Republican Romans used to gather and take the census, which was relevant to Domitian personally, as he assumed the title of censor perpetuus in 85 A.D. This striking combination of a sacred area devoted to the imperial cult with such an extensive and rich landscape constitutes, once again, an unprecedented architectural type.

1247 The temples in the Porticus Divorum cover an area of about 230 square meters, while the temples in the imperial rank as follows from smallest to largest: Temple of Minerva in the Forum Domitiani 720 square meters, temple of Peace in the Templum Pacis 943 square meters, temple of Venus Genetrix in the forum of Caesar 1,020 square meters, temple of Mars Ultor in the forum of Augustus 1,655 square meters.

1248 The Porticus Divorum covers an area of about 14.5 square km while the average for the imperial for a amounts to 12.2 square km where only the Templum Pacis surpasses the Porticus Divorum with an area of about 19.6 square km.

1249 See Richardson 1976, 162, for a similar analysis of the character of the Divorum in relation with the Villa Publica. I elaborated this idea further by adding the numeric analysis of the proportions and the comparison with the imperial fora. See also Darwall-Smith 1996, 158-59, and Jacobs & Conlin 2014, 150.
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V.c.3 Minerva Chalcidica

The Regionary Catalogues place Minerva Chalcidica in the Campus Martius, between the Iseum et Serapeum and the Divorum in the Regio IX (figs. 155, 166, 167). A Minerva Chalcidica is also mentioned in later sources and the preservation of “sopra Minerva” in the name of a church in the area may also provide indications about its topographical location. The FUR fragment that represents this Domitianic building is lost; however, a drawing of the fragment by O. Panvinio shows a round, unusually shaped building between the Serapeum and the Divorum (fig. 166). Initially Hulsen identified the round building as a fountain, based on the fragmentary inscription that reads JVACHR[---]A, for which lavacrum seemed the easiest restoration. Sjöqvist provided further support for this identification, recreating the inscription as L]AVACR[VM] / A[GRIPPAE] on the model of the Baths of Agrippa.

However, a decisive identification was provided by L. Cozza in 1960, when a second fragment (35f) was matched to the first, giving the correct interpretation of the inscription, which in fact reads MI[JNE]RVA CHA[LCIDIC]A. In light of the correct reading of the inscription, Cozza interpreted the building as a temple to Minerva whose epithet indicates a sort of entrance to the complex of the Divorum. Castagnoli proposed a similar hypothesis in 1960, when he identified the building as a monopteros.

---

1250 Curios. urb. P. 125 VZ I.
1251 Itin. Eins. 195 VZII; Mir. 22, 50 VZ III.
1252 Hulsen 1927, 347. The church is Santa Maria sopra Minerva in piazza della Minerva. However, the most accurate location for Minerva Chalcidica is in the area occupied by a deconsecrated church nearby in piazza del collegio Romano by the name of Santa Marta, Coarelli 2002, 287; de Caprariis 1993 (LTUR), 255; Torelli 2004, 89.
1253 Cod.Vat.Lat. 3439.
1254 Hulsen 1903, 39-46.
1255 Sjöqvist 1946, 99-105. A similar reading of the inscription had already been provided by G. Bellori as [LA]VACHR[VM] A[GRIPPAE] (Bellori, 1673, 23) while the term “thermae Agrippae” is found in Ammianus Marcellinus, 29.6.17.
1256 Cozza 1960, 97-100, tav. 31.
1257 Coarelli 2002, 287.
Further evidence for the temple’s shape may come from a coin minted around A.D. 94, showing a temple dedicated to Minerva. However, only one medieval source identifies it as a temple, and as I will show later, Hulsen’s initial interpretation of it as a fountain might be the most fitting.

Since no systematic excavation has ever been carried out in the area, there is no archaeological evidence for this building; therefore, we can rely only on Onofrio Panvinio’s drawing of the lost fragment of the FUR for the shape of the building. The accuracy of Panvinio’s drawing, which includes also parts of the porticus Divorum and the Serapeum, has been confirmed by the surviving fragments of the FUR, so there is no reason to doubt the correctness of his drawing of the Minerva Chalcidica. The building is included in a circle with a diameter of about 23 m, perhaps indicating some sort of fence or step (fig. 167). Inside the outer circle, a smaller round feature about 9 m in diameter is approached by four radial staircases alternating with semicircular niches. At the top, a rectangular base (4.3 x 2.8 m) is aligned with the staircases, most likely the base for a statue of Minerva. Nothing about the architectural typology as it appears in this drawing suggests a temple. The complete absence of the columns that define a monopteros temple in the drawing makes Castagnoli’s hypothesis problematic. Furthermore, nowhere in temple architecture do the four staircases that alternate with semicircular niches find comparanda.

They do, however, represent on a monumental scale the kind of fountain that was common in Roman domestic architecture. As already mentioned, the initial interpretation of the Minerva Chalcidica as a fountain was Hulsen’s and followed by

---

1259 BMCEmp II, 346 N. 241 tav. 76.7; RIC II, 178 N. 206.
1260 Mirabilia, 22, 50 VZ III.
Sjöqvist, but it is Torelli who provided the most convincing evidence for this argument in an article published in 2004, followed by Mercatili in 2013. The radial steps could provide the sought-after effect of the “water staircase,” of which we have numerous examples from residential architecture in the Vesuvius area. A particularly apt comparison is the fountain in the garden of the house of Octavius Quartius in Pompeii (fig. 168). The central element of this fountain is a pyramid with radial steps, over which the water would cascade from a central spout at the top of the pyramid.

The interpretation of Minerva Chalcidica as a fountain is corroborated not only by its shape, as it appears in the Renaissance drawing, and by the comparanda, but is also strengthened by its Domitianic context. Domitian displayed a strong interest in water features that appeared in more or less monumental forms in all of the areas where he intervened as a builder, as we have just seen in the Iseum: in the area of the Imperial Fora, Domitian's building activity included the unfinished but monumental so-called Domitianic Terrace, later concealed by Trajan's construction in his own forum. The Domitianic Terrace was a grand nymphaeum that would have added an extravagant feature to his unfinished forum project. In the Forum Domitiani, he most likely transformed the central area of the so-called Porticus Absidata into another, less lavish nymphaeum which also would have served to control traffic. A large fountain displaying the statue of the so-called Marforio, now in the courtyard of the Capitoline Museums, was also likely built by Domitian in the area between the carcer Tullianum and the Curia Iulia in the Roman Forum.

1261 See the discussion about this type of fountains in the section about the so-called Domitianic Terrace in section II.d.
1262 Torelli 2004, 93.
1263 See Nocera 2015 for a reconstruction and analysis of the architectural function of the porticus Absidata.
Additionally, in the area of the Lacus Iuturnae, a fairly well preserved fragment of a small marble fountain with a water staircase was found in the area of the church of Santa Maria Antiqua. The fountain is in Luna marble and displays four radial steps surrounded by carved decoration representing a natural landscape where 11 animals and 6 plants can be identified.\textsuperscript{1264} This fountain has been dated to the Flavian period and hypothetically placed in the area of the pool in Caligula’s palace on the Palatine.\textsuperscript{1265} It is therefore likely that this small fountain was one of the many elements Domitian added to the decoration of the Julio-Claudian palace.

These types of fountains have been studied and catalogued by several scholars,\textsuperscript{1266} and have been interpreted as miniature versions of monumental nymphaeum or water staircases commonly featured in a large number of houses in the area of Vesuvius.\textsuperscript{1267} Other examples of these fountains from the area of the Lacus Iuturnae strengthen the idea of Minerva Chalcidica as a fountain based on their shape. Fragment no. 2, examined by Tammisto, is the bottom section of a small fountain in Luna marble with a total maximum height of 26 cm, dated generally to the second century A.D (fig. 169). Six steps rise from a square base, forming a shallow basin that is octagonal in shape. Four cylindrical basins are placed in the four corners of the base, causing the steps to curve, forming a niche-like shape. The similarities of this fountain to the Renaissance drawing of the Minerva Chalcidica in the FUR are undeniable. The main difference is the Minerva Chalcidica’s round base versus the square/octagonal shape of the small fountain; however, the combination of steps and niches and the absence of columns point toward an identifiable architectural type, which is that of a fountain, rather than a

\begin{footnotes}
\item[1264] Tammisto 1989, 243.
\item[1265] Ibid.
\item[1267] Tammisto, 1989, 245.
\end{footnotes}
temple. The image of a temple of Minerva in several coins minted under Domitian must then refer to an unknown round aedes.

If we accept that idea that Minerva Chalcidica is a fountain, then what was its significance in this sector of the Campus Martius? To answer this question, it is necessary to analyze the monument in its topographical context. As already mentioned, Minerva Chalcidica was located between the sacred complex dedicated to Isis at the northwest, and the Porticus Divorum at the south (fig. 155). The Iseum Campense was rebuilt by Domitian after the fire of 80 A.D. in the same spot that the early sanctuary had previously occupied, while the Minerva Chalcidica and the Porticus Divorum were placed in this area by choice and as an integral part of a unitary, consistent project. As we have seen, the Porticus Divorum occupied the former location of the Villa Publica and was conceived of as a celebration of the Flavian dynasty. This arrangement suggests a clear topographical connection between the three buildings, in which Minerva Chalcidica seems to provide a sort of vestibule to the Porticus reflected in the epithet of “chalcidica”.

According to the drawing by Onofrio Panvinio, at the top of the fountain there is a rectangular base for the statue of Minerva. The dimensions of this base are 4.3 x 2.8 m and they could well have fit the common image of Minerva depicted in many numismatic types struck under Domitian, following the Athena Promachos iconography. In this image the goddess is advancing on one leg while holding a spear in the right hand and a shield on the left arm. This configuration would have required a rectangular base of

---

1268 See above the discussion of the archaeological finds in the Iseum, section V.c.1.
1269 Torelli has extensively examined the meaning of the term in architectural contexts, Torelli 2003 and 2004. See also Coarelli 2002, 287, for the interpretation of the term as “gatekeeper”, followed by Panzram 2008, 91-92. See also Bülow Clausen 2013.
1270 For instance, a sestertius from AD 82 (RIC II.1 104, p.271), a denarius from 88 (RIC II.1 562, p.304), another denarius from 95 (RIC II.1 771, p.322), and many others.
these proportions to allow enough space for Minerva’s stance.\textsuperscript{1271} There is a problem, however: the base as depicted in the FUR is facing the wrong way (figs. 155, 166). The rectangular base of the statue of Minerva is oriented along a NE-SW axis that does not correspond to the orientation of the Iseum nor that of the \textit{Porticus Divorum}, which are both built along a NS axis. In this arrangement, Minerva would be facing a direction that is perpendicular to the structures around her. This is at odds with what the visitor would expect. In fact, in its function as entrance to the \textit{Porticus Divorum} aligned along a north-south axis, one would anticipate the statue of Minerva to be facing the porticus. Moreover, if Minerva did occupy this NW-SW orientation, at no vantage point around the complex would there have been a meaningful sightline or point at which the visitor came face to face with Minerva.

Consequently, there is no good argument for the NW-SE orientation of the statue, and every reason why an axial NS arrangement makes good visual sense. Alternatively, we might imagine the statue rotated by 45° in order to engage the viewer who was approaching the monumental fountain from the southwest. According to the reconstruction of the street system based on the FUR and discernible in several stretches of the modern street plan, one could have gazed at the Minerva from the SW, walking along a narrow \textit{vicus} between the \textit{Saepta} and the \textit{Porticus Divorum}. Thus, we have to assume that there is a mistake in the orientation of the base that is preserved for us. Blaming inaccuracies on the drawing by Onofrio Panvinio does not do justice to an otherwise very accurate representation of the FUR fragments. It is plausible to imagine the \textit{marmorarius} missing the significance of the orientation of a round structure and

\textsuperscript{1271} There are other iconographic types of Minerva also variously represented on coins. For instance, Minerva standing on her left leg while holding a thunderbolt in the right hand and a spear in her left with the shield on the ground to her side (see a denarius from 93-94, \textit{RIC II}.1 763, p.322). In this arrangement, however Minerva’s legs are close to each other and it would be easy to imagine a square base rather than a rectangular one.
placing the *Minerva Chalcidica* in its correct topographical spot, but oriented improperly.

**V.d Domitianic Horrea in the southwestern Campus Martius**

Remains of an extensive, unified project aimed at building a series of *horrea* overlooking the Tiber have been found in the southwestern sector of the Campus Martius (fig. 138). This sector is about 200 m to the south of the theatre of Pompey and is limited to the northeast by Via S. Paolo alla Regola, to the southeast by Via del Conservatorio, to the southwest by Via delle Zoccolette, and to the northwest by Via dei Pettinari.

Two sets of remains have been identified. The first set was found on the occasion of the construction of the Ministry of Justice building in 1914-15 and 1929, while the second was unearthed during the demolition and restoration of houses that were part of the Hospice founded by S. Filippo Neri during the 17th century. The only preliminary description of the finds in the area of the Ministry of Justice during the early 20th century excavations was published in 1931 without a complete plan.\(^{1272}\) The remains amount to a series of parallel walls with large doors exhibiting a building technique that indicates a late Flavian date for their construction. Stretches of *basolati* — heavy paving in basalt slabs — were also identified as belonging to areas with heavy traffic of wheeled vehicles.\(^{1273}\) The presence of travertine brackets projecting from some brick pillars suggests a convenient shelving arrangement for storage purposes that strengthens the identification of this building as a *horreum*.\(^{1274}\) No additional information can be gathered about these remains, as they now lie underneath the Ministry of Justice.

\(^{1272}\) Parisi 1931.
\(^{1273}\) Parisi 1931, 29-31 in Quilici 186-87, 190-91, footnote no. 27.
\(^{1274}\) Ibid.
The second set of remains, on the other hand, was thoroughly investigated by Lorenzo Quilici between 1978 and 1983.\textsuperscript{1275} The excavation revealed the presence of a large Roman building articulated in four stories, two of which were underground, while the others were above ground. The building was identified as an imperial warehouse built originally by Domitian and consisting of two stories.\textsuperscript{1276} A substantial restoration with several modifications took place under Septimius Severus when the floors of the \textit{horreum} were decorated with black and white mosaic and two stories were added.\textsuperscript{1277} Another radical restoration was undertaken by Constantine, likely to repair the complex after the damage suffered during the fire of A.D. 283.\textsuperscript{1278}

The \textit{horrea} unearthed in this area comprise a series of modular rooms — 6.6 x 4/3 m — arranged according to an orthogonal grid that followed the ancient street system in this sector of the Campus Martius. The topographical arrangement, with long fronts and \textit{vici} in between, formed several terraces slightly sloping toward the Tiber.\textsuperscript{1279} Toward the north, close to Via S. Paolo alla Regola, the complex shows larger open areas equipped with fences that might have extended west, north, and east.\textsuperscript{1280}

Despite some problematic aspects of the available archaeological evidence,\textsuperscript{1281} it seems clear that Domitian chose a convenient spot overlooking the Tiber to build a large complex of \textit{horrea} that remained in use through the reigns of Septimius Severus and Constantine, which attests to the importance of this particular imperial warehouse.

\textsuperscript{1275}Quilici published a first detailed archaeological report in 1986-87 followed in 2013 and 2014 by two additional short reports on a selected group of rooms.
\textsuperscript{1276}Quilici 2013, 149.
\textsuperscript{1277}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1278}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1279}Quilici 1986-87, 399.
\textsuperscript{1280}Quilici 1986-87, 402.
\textsuperscript{1281}As Quilici points out throughout his analysis of the area, the Domitianic remains are scattered and heavily altered by the subsequent interventions. However, Quilici’s rigorous study of the building technique resulted in an accurate reconstruction and identification of these warehouse, see Quilici 1986-87 \textit{passim}.
Quilici noted the consistency of the remains that can be attributed to Domitian based on the building technique. It appears that these *horrea* were meant to extend throughout the entire block today occupied by the Ministry of Justice and all the way to the east toward Via dei Pettinari. This area would have covered approximately 3 ha and would have represented the largest imperial warehouse in Rome. The proximity of the Tiber might easily account for the choice of location though it occupies a marginal sector which would not have been viewed from the central area. It is important to remember that the *Porticus Minucia Frumentaria*, an important space for grain distribution in the Campus Martius, was also likely restored by Domitian. The construction of these *horrea* together with the *horrea* Vespasian and horrea Piperata in the Roman forum served the purpose of constructing an image of Domitian as a reliable leader who prioritized the infrastructures to ensure food supplies for the city.

### V.e The Cancelleria Reliefs

In 1937 and 1939 two well-preserved marble reliefs of considerable size were discovered underneath the Palazzo della Cancelleria, located close to the stadium-*Odeum* complex, roughly 150 m to the southwest (figs. 170-172). A lot of controversy surrounds these reliefs, especially as far as the interpretation of the figures is concerned. Two accepted facts are the Domitianic date of the reliefs based on style and the evidence that one relief does show Vespasian (whether originally or itself being a recut Domitian), and also the other of these reliefs was recarved turning Domitian into Nerva. And the other was recarved turning Domitian into Vespasian. He leaves Rome as Nerva and returns as Vespasian. An interesting aspect about the discovery of these reliefs was their

---

1282 See Kleiner 1992, 191-192 for a summary of the hypotheses and ample bibliography on pp. 203-204.
findspot in an area that was likely occupied by a marble workshop.\textsuperscript{1284} Other pieces coming from the same spot, such as a marble fragment that shows the practice of carving a male in two different stages,\textsuperscript{1285} attests to the fact that the Cancelleria Reliefs were recarved on this spot for a new monument made for Nerva and never used. One thinks of the Aurelian reliefs on the Arch of Constantine. They had to be taken down and recut too, and they were never put back up again.

The two reliefs are usually referred to as Frieze A, better preserved but missing the left side, and Frieze B, more fragmentary but complete in its width of about 5.97 m, while the height of both was around 2.10 m.\textsuperscript{1286} Frieze A, the first one discovered, depicts a procession going from right to left (fig. 170). The emperor is the fourth figure from the left and it is represented as moving toward the left in the direction of a fragmentary winged figure, a Victory, and, most likely, a building whose loss is crucial in determining the correct interpretation of the scene. A lictor with \textit{fasces} is before Victory. Domitian, recut to Nerva, is preceded by Mars in armor and Minerva, also in armor and, expectedly, the closest to the emperor who extends his right arm toward her. Behind Domitian is a personification of Roma in Amazon costume who gently pushes him toward his final destination. Two male figures identified with the Genius Senatus and the Genius Populi Romani follow Domitian together with soldiers and another lector bearing a scepter.

In Frieze B the movement of the scene is less emphasized, as there are groups of figures that are standing while others are clearly moving (fig. 171). Despite the fragmentary state, the emperor can be recognized as Vespasian in the third figure standing on the foreground from the right. Dressed in a toga, he puts his right arm over

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{1284} Hölscher 2009, 58.  \\
\textsuperscript{1285} Ibid.  \\
\textsuperscript{1286} Last 1948, 9.
\end{flushleft}
the shoulder of a younger man, turned toward the emperor, identified by some in Domitian. To the right of Vespasian two lictors, one with fasces, follow. Behind the younger man the Genius Senatus and the Genius Populi Romani are recognizable. The group of standing figures on the left of the panel consists of a seated Roma in Amazon costume with helmet and a shield in her hand. A group of Vestal Virgins can be seen in front of Roma together with the Vestal’s attendant.

The various interpretations of the figures can be summarized as it follows. According to the traditional interpretation, Frieze A represents the profectio of Domitian on the occasion of the Sarmatian Wars in 92-93 while the other frieze should depict the adventus of Vespasian in Rome after the conflicts that marked his accession to power. Both heads of the emperor in Frieze A and B bear signs of recarving and they’re both easy to identify with Nerva and Vespasian. Therefore, we have to imagine that Nerva had planned to set up these reliefs for a monument, where he was to be seen as the continuator of the Flavians, not just of Domitian the damned. Signs of recarving are also visible to the side of the head of Vespasian (fig. 172). Considering the unanimous dating of the reliefs during Domitianic times, we should imagine the image of this emperor as the original one in both panels. As far as the meaning of the scenes there is controversy.

In fact, for some scholars, both reliefs represent a scene of adventus in which case Frieze A with the Vestal Virgins could interpreted as a civil adventus while Frieze B might instead represents a military adventus. Tonio Hölscher lists several elements that appear in Frieze A and point toward this identification, and he makes a convincing argument for it.

---

1287 See Kleiner 1992, 191-192 for a concise presentation of all the hypotheses.
1288 See especially Hölscher 2009 for a more in depth analysis of the elements that points toward the identification of both panels as adventus scenes.
There might never be agreement on the interpretation of the scenes as the intended monument for these reliefs might never be discovered. Since the reliefs were found in the area of the workshop where they were probably recarved, they could, in theory, have come from any monument in Rome; there is no need, then, to look for a building in the vicinity as has been suggested. The Porticus Divorum, for instance, has been proposed as the location for the reliefs, since the propagandistic theme would fit well within the sacred park in relation to the dynastic cult. Moreover, the presence of the Minerva Chalcidica before it would have mirrored the Minerva in Frieze A. The arched gateway to the porticus would probably have been the most fitting location for the reliefs even in terms of dimensions, and I should note that although we do not know the exact length of Frieze A, we can assume it was the same as that of Frieze B. The reconstructed entrance to the Porticus Divorum is based on the FUR and not on archaeological evidence; however, the measurements fit roughly.

The temple of Fortuna Redux, associated by some with a Domitianic arch that has been identified with the Porta Triumphalis, has also been suggested as the original location of the Cancelleria Reliefs. The temple of Fortuna Redux is mentioned by Martial, and for Rodríguez Almeida it refers to a new project built by Domitian which included the temple and the Porta Triumphalis as a tetrapylon surmounted by a quadriga with elephants. Coarelli, instead, uses epigraphic evidence to posit the existence of a Julio-Claudian temple of Fortuna Redux which was only restored by Domitian. Both the temple and the Porta Triumphalis should be identified with
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1289 Kleiner 1992, 192.
1290 Ibid.
1291 Rodríguez Almeida 1993b (LTUR I), 92.
1292 Coarelli 1995 (LTUR II), 276.
buildings in the area of Sant’Omobono, according to Coarelli.\textsuperscript{1293} As already noted, while both these hypotheses are plausible, they remain speculative, and in theory, this elusive celebrative monument of Domitian could have been anywhere in Rome.

\begin{section}{V.f Conclusions: Augustus vs Domitian}

A direct comparison between the building program carried out by Augustus in the Campus Martius and the interventions by Domitian is inevitable. In fact, no other emperor left a similarly decisive mark in this area of the ancient city. In the northern sector the cluster formed by the Mausoleum of Augustus, the \textit{Horologium}, and the \textit{Ara Pacis} defined Augustus’ political and dynastic program through an architectural and topographical arrangement that aimed at showcasing the new golden age. Augustus’ presence was strong: the mausoleum was massive and revealed his preoccupation with projecting a superhuman status, but the somewhat remote location to the northern edge allowed for a nonintrusive self-representation. If we accept the interpretation of the Pantheon as a dynastic monument, a sort of \textit{Augusteum},\textsuperscript{1294} then its construction in the central area of the Campus Martius and the axial alignment with the mausoleum\textsuperscript{1295} could be seen as an attempt to utilize the Campus Martius as a site for the foundations of an imperial cult. Furthermore, in the central Campus Martius the extensive works carried out by Agrippa marked the area as a site for leisure, where the display of water management and landscape design was linked to the emperor’s power. In the southern sector the rebuilding and restoration of many temples together with the construction of the theatres of Balbus and Marcellus emphasized the importance of traditional religion.

\textsuperscript{1293} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1294} Wilson Jones 2000, 179-82; Coarelli 2002, 283-84.
\textsuperscript{1295} See La Rocca 2014 for an analysis of the topographical connections in the area.
while following in Pompey’s footsteps by tying them to venues of entertainment, though on a lesser scale.

Domitian’s building program for the Campus Martius was twofold. On one hand he had to repair, restore, and reconfigure most of the southern, central, and eastern sectors, all of which were severely damaged by the fire in A.D. 80. Although we are missing some archaeological data for the extensive restoration work carried out after the fire, it is clear that his plan was characterized by an emphasis on traffic regulation, order, and protection from the floods. The partial archaeological data for the imperial warehouse in the southern sector shows an attentive attitude toward the increasing needs of the imperial administration. Domitian can be easily defined as the emperor that built more warehouses in Rome than any other emperor. Besides the remains in the area of San Paolo alla Regola in the southern Campus Martius, we should remember the two warehouses in the Roman Forum that represented an extension and rebuilding of earlier structures.

On the other hand, he added new buildings that were grand, functional, and both imperial and personal in nature. The eastern and western edges of the Campus Martius offered Domitian the ideal spots for his most meaningful projects. At the east Domitian planned a sacred complex — the Iseum, Minerva Chalcidica, and Porticus Divorum — which combined all the elements necessary to celebrate the Flavian dynasty. The rebuilding of the Iseum marked the connection between the Flavians and the Egyptian cults that had earlier been chosen by Vespasian as a base for the legitimization of power. The Porticus Divorum, an original combination of forum architecture and a park, reinforced the foundations of power while celebrating the imperial cult—a cult that was

---

1296 For instance, see Domitian’s intervention in the sacred area of Largo Argentina where he raised the level and restored the vicus in front of the temples as a via tecta aimed at providing the citizens with shelter.
already highlighted in the city by the arch of Titus along the Sacra Via and the temple to the deified Vespasian in the Roman Forum. Between these two large complexes stood the round fountain dedicated to Minerva, to which Domitian claimed a special connection. The eastern compound fit well within Domitian’s self-representation as the last of the Flavians, a legitimate ruler who acted as a *civilis princeps* by honoring his deified father and brother under the aegis of Minerva and Isis. In this respect, the Campus Martius becomes the primary locus for the imperial cult for both Augustus and the Flavians, although there are significant differences in the architecture, scale, and directness of the message.

On the other side, the massive construction of the Stadium- *Odeum* complex was generated purely by his personal desire to equip the city with Greek style games in a sector of the Campus Martius that had not been hit by the fire. As we have seen, Rome’s venues for entertainment were vast and located not only in the Campus Martius, but also, since Vespasian, in the Valley of Colosseum, to which Domitian contributed in accordance with a plan that followed his father’s vision. The addition of the Stadium- *Odeum*, however, goes beyond a simple combination of Greek tradition with Roman architecture. As Pierre Gros pointed out, the Stadium- *Odeum* is a sort of manifesto of Hellenism that stood in the heart of the Roman imperial city.

The unitary project of stadium and *Odeum* finds several comparanda in the Greek east that may suggest a physical connection between the two. In light of this observation, I would like to highlight one unusual feature of the stadium for which no
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1297 Suet., *Dom.*, 4.4, 15.3.
1298 See Wallace Hadrill 1982 for the definition and analysis of a “*civilis princeps*”.
1299 The exact function of the Pantheon in fact remains up for debate.
1300 See section III.j.5 for the projects in the Valley of the Colosseum.
1301 Gros 2014, 92. *Gros speaks of an altérité incluse*, something “other” than Roman that is inserted in an established system of self-representation of power within the urban fabric of the Campus Martius.
1302 Gros 2014 *passim*. 
explanation has been given. It is accepted that Colini’s work is generally accurate and that goes also for the documentation of the oblique short southern side of the stadium, the one facing the *Odeum* (fig. 5, 11). This element of asymmetry must have an explanation that could be found, for instance, in topographical constraints; however, the proximity of the *Odeum* suggests that it might have played a role in this extravagant design. Though difficult to visualize, the orientation of the short southern side of the stadium seems to react to the proximity to the *cavea* of the *Odeum*. Therefore, we might think of this lack of symmetry as the result of a connection with the *Odeum*.

The construction of the stadium in the Campus Martius should be viewed in conjunction with the other stadium-shaped structures that are attributed to Domitian. The imperial palace on the Palatine featured a stadium-garden located in the private sector of the palace that was aimed at offering the emperor and his entourage a rather lavish venue for leisure, and perhaps some sort of shows viewed from the opulent *pulvinar*. The function of this beautifully landscaped area was primarily that of a park, and it was the largest green area of the imperial palace.

A similar feature can be found in Domitian’s villa in Castel Gandolfo where the personal taste of the emperor found full expression. Lugli, who excavated the villa, identified the structure as a hippodrome, but the lacunose archaeological data does not allow us to interpret the building specifically. The shape is that of an extraordinarily long rectangle with a hemicycle on one end. The building was certainly used for the *Quinquatria*, the games established by Domitian to honor Minerva that consisted of theatrical shows and *venationes*. The complex theatre-porticus in the villa at Castel Gandolfo in combination with this stadium provided the perfect venues for these games.

---

1303 Lugli 1917.
1304 *Suet.*, *Dom.*, 4.
Finally, Domitian’s own forum built between the forum of Augustus and the Templum Pacis exhibits an original stadium shape which, as has been shown, was the product of a choice and not merely the result of topographical limitations. It appears that the stadium shape had a special importance for Domitian beyond the architectural function. As we know from the sources, Rabirius is the court architect responsible for the project of the imperial palace, and it is highly likely that he supervised all major projects that were included in the emperor’s new urban plan, including the Stadium-Odeum compound.

The building program by Domitian in the Campus Martius is complex and nuanced. The motivations for the interventions on several old and new buildings were varied. There is a clear intention that one can discern, which was to surpass Augustus’ establishment of the site as a stage for the imperial cult and the legitimization of power. The foundation of this new program would be the buildings of Augustus on the northern side — the Mausoleum of Augustus, the Horologium, and the Ara Pacis; to them, Domitian added monuments on the eastern side that were intended to connect the deified Flavians with Isis and Minerva, thereby producing a complex architectural narrative that united Augustus with the Flavians under the aegis of their tutelary deities. While similar intentions are evident, the end result is quite different.

Of a completely different nature is the construction of the Stadium-Odeum complex. The architectural features that contributed to the creation of a venue focused
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1305 Nocera 2015.
1306 Mart., Epigr., 7.56.
1307 Nocera 2015.
1308 Contra Panzram 2008 and Moormann forthcoming. For Moormann the reconstruction of the Iseum is a re-making of Egyptian Augustan Rome.
on audience comfort and entertainment were unprecedented, and seem to indicate a specific target for these competitions: the members of the aristocracy. Domitian succeeded in bringing to Rome not just the Greek style of the competitions but the full Greek configuration of the event. The survival of both the architecture and the games through Late Antiquity is a testament to Domitian’s ability to integrate an unparalleled set of elements into Roman entertainment. This project finds no comparison in Augustus’ program, which produced only two traditional theatres.

The eastern and western complexes in the Campus Martius exhibit a decidedly Domitianic trait which is best appreciated through topographical analysis. These sets of buildings created two massive bastions that provided a Flavian frame for the Campus Martius. In terms of spatial experience, Domitian’s projects gave the Campus Martius a sense of containment and regulation that is typical of other interventions, such as his own forum. These borders must have had a dramatic impact on the paths of traffic that could be more easily regulated and channeled through the new buildings. The large unencumbered area in the western edge was radically changed into an almost continuous arched façade — that of the stadium and Odeum — offering only one passage in between the two buildings. The impact of the flow in this area must have been substantial. On the eastern side the change was perhaps less drastic but still significant. In particular, the Minerva Chalcidica acted like a hub providing a new tool for traffic control which is similar to the role played by the Meta Sudans in the Valley of the Colosseum. Two round buildings were placed at the crossroads of important routes.
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1309 Bernard, Ciancio Rossetto 2014, 142-53. The innovative features of the stadium have been identified by Bernard and Ciancio Rossetto in the large halls, the lighting and water system, the paths of traffic, etc., see supra section V.b.3.
1310 Bernard, Ciancio Rossetto 2014, 153.
1311 See section III.j.5 for a discussion of the Meta Sudans.
In sum, a direct comparison between the goals and results of Augustus’s and Domitian’s building programs in the Campus Martius points to a similar vision for a regulated urban plan which included areas for the imperial cult, religious piety, landscape design, and entertainment. However, Domitian’s pushed the limit even further by creating these two massive boundaries that symbolized Flavian power over the heart of the city and simultaneously fulfilled his own philhellenistic interests.
VI: CONCLUSIONS. THE ROME OF DOMITIAN

Domitian’s identity as a builder has been defined by past scholarship\textsuperscript{1312} in terms of its lavishness, grandiosity, and innovative architectural design generated by the creative mind of Rabirius.\textsuperscript{1313} This holistic study has shown, however, that Domitian’s building program was multifaceted and complex, and exceeded those limited boundaries. The main contribution of this analysis lies in having uncovered new aspects of Domitian’s Rome, such as the attention to traffic control and the importance of water features and landscaping. It is clear that Domitian does not fit the mold of the “Flavian” label, which, it becomes apparent, is no longer sufficient to encompass the spectrum of his vision as a builder.

In the aforegoing chapters, Domitian’s building program in Rome was analyzed and interpreted according to topographical criteria. At the end of each chapter, detailed conclusions were drawn to enable the reader to assess the relationship between architecture and power, perception of space, architectural and landscape design, and, finally, Domitian’s connection with the legacy of earlier rulers. The role of these final remarks will be to recapitulate and to synthesize those conclusions in order to discern the significance of Domitian’s intervention in its entirety.

In the next sections, I will briefly summarize the main characteristics of Domitian’s building program in Rome and what made these interventions truly “Domitianic”. Then, to further comprehend the genesis of Domitian’s projects and their fate after his death, I will provide a short assessment of how Domitian dealt with the inherited legacy of the most significant emperors before him, specifically Augustus, Nero, and Vespasian. Finally, I will mention some important points of connection with

\textsuperscript{1312} See especially MacDonald 1982, 47-74, Ward Perkins 1981, 73-84.
\textsuperscript{1313} Mart., Epigr., 7.56.
Trajan, Hadrian, and Septimius Severus that attest, beyond any damnatio memoriae, to the indelible mark left by this controversial emperor on the urban fabric of ancient Rome.

VI.a Domitian the builder

In all the areas of Rome in which he worked, Domitian was confronted with different needs and, consequently, he developed different projects: those that he had to undertake or complete and those that stemmed from a more personal vision. Among the first group was the obligatory restoration of the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline, the second undertaken under the Flavians; the completion of the temple of the Divine Vespasian in the Roman Forum; and, most conspicuously, the finalization of the entertainment quarter in the Valley of the Colosseum. On the other hand, more personal projects were carried out, especially in the Campus Martius, where the construction of the stadium-Odeum complex gave Domitian the chance to realize fully an innovative architectural form for entertainment for Greek style competitions. The name of Rabirius as court architect, found in Martial, explains the consistency in terms of architectural innovations and topographic planning that is evident in almost all Domitian’s projects. What follows is a view of the most “Domitianic” aspects of his building program: regulation of paths of traffic and topographical connections, sightlines and vistas,\textsuperscript{1314} innovation in architectural design, sensorial experience of Domitian’s Rome, special interest in libraries and horrea, and, last but not least, the importance of water features and landscape design.

\textsuperscript{1314}Mario Torelli has identified and explained the importance of sightlines in the Flavian and, more significantly, Domitian’s buildings, Torelli 1987.
Vi.a.1 Traffic control, connective topography

One point of consistency in Domitian’s urban planning vision can be found in its attention to regulating paths of traffic and its consideration of topography, not just as space to build over but also as space perceived. The construction of the forum Domitiani in the region of the imperial fora served as connector between the previous fora which ceased to be perceived as individual piazzas and became a single topographical unit. At the same time, the forum Domitiani preserved the role of thoroughfare played by the earlier Argiletum, the Republican road that the forum supplanted. The unfinished project for his second forum in the area of the later forum of Trajan is an irrecoverable loss, but recent archaeological evidence indicates that this project would have extended and strengthened this program of transforming the entire area into a cohesive topographical unit. The unique form of the access point to the forum Domitiani from the Subura, through the so-called Porticus Absidata, shows a clear attention to traffic control. The design could also be motivated by the intention of separating the infamous Subura from the area of the forum through an architectonic barrier that served both a functional and symbolical purpose. The Porticus Absidata unites architectural design with functional purpose in an original way.

Traffic patterns were evidently a leitmotiv in the planning of the imperial micro-city on the Palatine. Despite the discovery of new evidence for pre-existing projects under Tiberius, Claudius, Nero, and Vespasian, it is with Domitian that the development of the Palatine complex reached its pinnacle. As we have seen, the varied configurations of space within the palace took into account the management of large and smaller crowds, while ensuring the safety of the emperor. In the upper level, multiple straight access lines to the large reception halls allowed for an easy flow of people in and out. At the same time, axial access points provided the emperor with the ideal settings for his
imperial appearances. An example is the shallow apse in the Aula Regia, the grandest reception hall in the palace where Domitian would most likely sit in full regalia. The stadium-garden, for instance, was only accessible to the close amici of the emperor since the only entry points were in the lower level. Certainly a high degree of crowd control was certainly present in the Flavian Amphitheater, a project by Vespasian, where the careful design of the vomitoria allowed the entire building to be filled or emptied in less than twenty minutes. However, the innovation in Domitian’s vision of traffic flow is the versatility of the solutions adopted, which is especially manifest in the imperial palace and its intricate passageways in the smaller and less formal spaces.

In the Campus Martius, the fire of AD 80 severely damaged the entire central and southern sectors, prompting Domitian to intervene extensively to repair, rebuild, and build new structures. The eastern complex consisting of the Iseum Campense - Minerva Chalcidica - Porticus Divorum had a perceptible effect on the paths of traffic in this area. The round Minerva Chalcidica, somewhat similar to the role played by the Meta Sudans in the Valley of the Colosseum, served as a hub between the rebuilt Iseum and the new Porticus Divorum that occupied a previously open space, probably the Republican Villa Publica. On the other side, the stadium-Odeum complex formed a physical boundary to this edge of the Campus Martius, impacting the flow of people visiting this area, while giving a sense of containment. The archaeological evidence for the Odeum is poor and the connection between the two buildings is unknown. However, on the grounds of comparanda with eastern examples,\textsuperscript{1315} it is possible to hypothesize that they were either very close to each other or even architecturally connected, thus creating a narrow channel for the people to pass in between. The construction of the Via Tecta to the

\textsuperscript{1315} See Gros 2014 for a detailed discussion on the inspiration for the architecture of the stadium-Odeum.
eastern edge of the sacred area of Largo Argentina is another example of attention to traffic flow and to creating more comfortable conditions for the people.

Perhaps the most striking use of innovative architectural solutions for traffic control is found in the original complex built by Domitian on the northern edge of the Palatine, known as the Forum Buildings. The combination of military architecture and the exceptionally daring ramp that connected the forum level to the top of the hill revealed a special attention to monitoring the access point to the palace complex from this side. The configuration of the space in the Forum Buildings would have let the emperor, for instance, enter the porticoed area with a large entourage, since the space certainly could have accommodated both chariots and horses. From there, he would have led them toward the ramp, only accessible from one entry point. The ramp can be interpreted as a sort of monumental, climbing *Via Tecta* through which the emperor could have passed in a very inconspicuous way to reach any area of the palace.

**VI.a.2 Sightlines and vistas**

A complementary aspect to the regulation of traffic routes can be seen in the planning of sightlines and vistas, whose purpose was not only to create meaningful connections but also to exert control on what was available to the gaze of the viewer at any given moment. Visual connections were significant both in a broad topographical context and within the same building. The visual dialogue between the Arch of Titus, the *Meta Sudans*, and the Colosseum along the axis of the Via Sacra, was, for example, striking and outstanding. These three monuments demarcated an axis of Flavian topography which would have been immediately identifiable by the viewer. As Thomas points out, coming from the Roman Forum, the central fornix of the arch of Titus would
have framed the vertical element of the Meta Sudans,\textsuperscript{1316} while the Colosseum would have served as monumental backdrop for both. To this network of connections, Domitian added the other arch built along the ascent toward the Palatine. In a similar way, the fornix of the Domitianic arch would have framed the arch of Titus at the foot of the hill.\textsuperscript{1317}

Sightlines in the imperial palace can be identified in different parts and with different functions.\textsuperscript{1318} The enfilade that connected the northwest to the southeast section is not only visible on the plan of the palace but was also definitely perceptible to the visitor. Upon entering the palace from the secondary entrance on the northwestern side, one would have gazed directly to the other side of the palace through a straight sequence of openings. The presence of the two water features in the courtyards, though, would have prevented the visitor from following that straight sightline and instead would have forced the visitor to take a winding route to get to the terrace overlooking the stadium-garden. Here Domitian’s guest would have been offered a very open vista over the stadium-shaped garden and the opulent pulvinar on the opposite side of the terrace. In contrast to the openness of the vista, the visitor could not have easily accessed the garden as the entry points were located on the lower level of the palace.

The access points to the forum Domitiani, the Porticus Absidata at the northeast and the entrance from the Roman Forum side, revealed clever solutions which involved changing vistas. First of all, neither entrance was placed in the center of the space. Topographical constraints prevented the architect from planning for axial entry points. The entrance from the Porticus Absidata, besides involving a series of turns, would have

\textsuperscript{1316} Thomas 2004, 35.  
\textsuperscript{1317} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{1318} See also MacDonalnds 1986, 47-74 and Thomas 2004, 35, for observations on the enfilades in the imperial palace.
led the visitor into a small, fairly dark transitional space before entering the piazza. Narrow passageways prevented any glimpse into the lavish decoration of the forum. The sudden vista of the open piazza must have been visually stunning and even slightly disorienting. From the opposite side, one can reconstruct the gradual appearance of the temple of Minerva in the background and a more direct passage for those coming from the Roman Forum. Changing vistas, as we have seen for the palace, contributed to the enjoyment of the cityscape and the landscape while creating elements of expectation and surprise.

Interesting visual perspectives were employed also in the eastern part of the Campus Martius, including the Iseum Campense-Minerva Chalcidica-Porticus Divorum. As mentioned above, the Minerva Chalcidica was the pivotal element of the complex, and in its role as such, visibility was critical. In fact, Minerva Chalcidica was the only element visible from the streets, in a system where two large porticoed areas — the Iseum and the Divorum — were actually screened from the outside by tall walls. Minerva must have easily been understood by the viewer as the custodian of the two sacred areas that focused on the deified Flavians and their connection with the Egyptian gods. The visual experience inside the Porticus Divorum was also original and unprecedented. The two small temples were not the focal buildings of the porticus, whose space extended through the central axis and formed an unusually long rectangle. The presence of the two facing temples at the two sides of the entrance would have deprived the visitor of the traditional open space in front of a temple, typical of the imperial fora, emphasizing, instead, the landscaped park.

Finally, orientation and visual connections are crucial to an understanding of the most outrageous monument built by Domitian, his colossal Equus Domitiani in the middle of the Roman Forum. The analysis of possible visual links with other monuments
in the forum, the Palatine, and Domitian’s forum, has led several scholars\textsuperscript{1319} to formulate different interpretations and assessments of this huge statue. Some of the sightlines taken into account have proven inaccurate, as they can only be identified on the plan and would not have been perceived by the viewer.\textsuperscript{1320} Others would have been ineffective for the purpose of creating significant connections.\textsuperscript{1321} As we have seen, the puzzling choice of Domitian to orient his equestrian statue facing the temple of the Divus Caesar and with its back to that of the Divine Vespasian, might have signaled an intentional break with the Republican and early imperial legacy.\textsuperscript{1322}

\textit{Vi.a.3 Innovations in architectural design and urban planning}

From a mere architectural and topographical point of view, Domitian’s program was innovative and functional at the same time. The architectural achievements of Domitian, and thus of Rabirius, have been analyzed thoroughly by several scholars\textsuperscript{1323} who have consistently recognized the innovative quality of the design, the building technique, and the materials. The alternation of straight and curved lines visible in many Domitianic buildings, particularly in the imperial palace, stemmed from the original architectural design of Nero’s buildings, but was developed to new heights by Rabirius. The ability to take advantage of oddly shaped spaces, such as that of a stadium in the forum Domitiani to overcome the topographical restrictions, allowed Domitian to fill the complex with clever solutions. A similar example of ingenuity can be observed in the columns \textit{en ressaut}, present in the forum Domitiani and the Basilica in the palace, which

\textsuperscript{1319} Torelli 1987; Thomas 2004; Coarelli 2009.
\textsuperscript{1320} Torelli 1987, 575, fig. 4.
\textsuperscript{1321} Thomas 2004, 38, fig. 14.
\textsuperscript{1322} More details on the conflicting relationship with Augustus’ and Vespasian’s legacies will be discussed further on.
\textsuperscript{1323} See especially MacDonald 1982, 47-74, Ward Perkins 1981, 73-84; Gros 2009.
created a sort of “fake” colonnade, exploiting space limitations in ways that were creative, practical, and still lavish.

An unprecedented architectural concept can be seen in the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, the monumental sacred precinct built by Domitian on the Quirinal hill to serve both as a mausoleum and a temple for the imperial cult of the Flavians. Coarelli, fittingly and efficiently, defines the building as a combination of the Mausoleum of Augustus and the Pantheon.\(^\text{1324}\) In the Forum Buildings on the Palatine we see the unprecedented use of military architecture in an imperial residence which might have been the inspiration behind the imperial palace in Split built by Diocletian at the beginning of the 4\(^{\text{th}}\) century AD. While the stadium shape was not new in Roman architecture, Domitian’s use of it was unique. Three different stadium-shaped buildings appeared in Rome under Domitian: a proper stadium for Greek-style games in the Campus Martius, a stadium-shaped garden in his Palatine residence, and the forum he built between the forum of Augustus and the *Templum Pacis*, the last two of which are almost identical to each other. The recent examination of atypical architectural elements in the stadium in the Campus Martius led to the reconstruction of large and welcoming halls, not featured in the known examples of stadiums, which seemed to have been planned to offer comfort and luxury to those heading to the competitions, another peculiar use of known architectural features. In addition, one must not forget the long stadium in the imperial villa at Castel Gandolfo, which Domitian perhaps built to host *venationes* during the *Quinquatria*. It is easy to see the influence of the use of the stadium garden in the imperial palace on the Palatine on the design of the imperial palace in Constantinople.

In terms of building technique, the use of courses of *bipedales* bricks at regular intervals to facilitate horizontal alignment has been recognized as a truly Domitianic

\(^{1324}\) Coarelli 2014, 204.
trait, which allows for accurate dating of buildings phases. Moreover, the use of travertine fragments as *coementa* in concrete foundations, such as the *cella* foundation in the temple of the Divine Vespasian, can be easily identified as a component of the building technique employed in Domitianic structures. While the innovative character of Domitian’s architectural design has been a mainstay of scholarly discussion for quite some time, less attention has been given to his innovations in urban planning. In Rome Domitian created regulated routes, several functional and decorative water features, covered passages, and a new type of building for entertainment: the stadium in the Campus Martius. The city of Domitian was not just monumental and creatively built, but also functional and pleasant.

**VI.a.4 Beautification and senses**

Domitian’s Rome was certainly beautiful, but also dirty, ruined, and most of all, incredibly loud. The attention paid to the quality of marbles and the refinement and excessive degree of architectural decoration made Rome under Domitian a formidable rival to the city Augustus found in bricks and left in marble.\(^{1325}\) Considering the remarkable state of preservation of Domitianic architecture, itself evidence of his positive impact on the city despite his *damnatio memoriae*, it is possible to gather an idea of the magnificence offered to the gaze of the viewer. The best-preserved Domitianic building, the imperial palace, has yielded exceptional pieces of sculpture and architectural decoration. Despite the wealth of archaeological evidence and fragments of statues and marble slabs from the walls’ revetment, an accurate and complete attempt at

\(^{1325}\) According to Suetonius, Augustus took pride in declaring the amount of beautification that he implemented in the city, Suet., Aug., 28.3: “Urbem neque pro maiestate imperii ornatam et inundationibus incendiisque obnoxiam excoluit adeo, ut iure sit gloriatus marmoream se relinquere, quam latericiam accepisset”.
3D reconstructions of the palace is still needed. The various archaeological missions that have been conducted independently on the imperial palace have produced inconsistent and disjointed data sets, which have not yet been merged.\textsuperscript{1326} However, it is perhaps safe to believe Statius when he describes the sense of awe that the palace induces in those fortunate enough to be able to marvel at its splendid halls.\textsuperscript{1327}

A clear intention to beautify an otherwise shabby façade can be seen in the design and decoration of the \textit{Porticus Absidata}. As a connecting element between the two massive tufa walls that formed the back of the forum of Augustus and the northeastern side of the \textit{Templum Pacis}, this part of the \textit{forum Domitiani} could have simply conformed to the pre-existing buildings and could have been built as a consistent continuation of the tufa walls of the two earlier fora. But Domitian made a very different choice. The original curved façade, a sort of embrace for the visitor, was revetted in white marble, which would have been in striking contrast with the dark gray of the neighboring tufa walls. While the moldings of the cornices were fairly smooth and simple, ornate Corinthian capitals were used in the decoration of the pilasters. Whether or not statues were placed in the arcades, this horse-shoe shaped porticus stood out in contrast to the tufa walls and displayed an evident intention to beautify the entrance to the \textit{forum Domitiani} from the \textit{Subura}.

\textsuperscript{1326} A doctoral thesis about the imperial palace was completed by D. Bruno in 2012 with the title “\textit{Palatium. Analisi archeologica del complesso monumentale della domus Augustiana sul Palatino}”, unfortunately there is currently no publication plan for this thesis.

\textsuperscript{1327} Stat., \textit{Silvae}, IV.2.18-35: “\textit{Tectum augustum, ingens, non centum insigne columnis, sed quantae superos caelumque Atlante remissum sustentare queant. stupet hoc vicina Tonantis regia, teque pari laetantur sede locatum numina. nec magnum properes excedere caelum: tanta patet moles effusaeque impetus aulae liberior, campi multumque amplexus operti aethereos, et tantum domino minor; ille penates implet et ingenti genio iuvat. aemulus illi mons Libys Iliacusque nitet, % multa Syene et Chios et glaucae certantia Doridi saxa; Lunaque portandis tantum suffecta columnis. longa supra species: fessix vix culmina prendas visibus auratique putes laquearia caeli. hic cum Romuleos proceres trabetaque Caesar agmina mille simul iussit discumbere mensis, ipsa sinus accincta Ceres Bacchusque laborat sufficere.”
An essential part of the sensory experience of Domitian’s Rome can be identified in the noise of construction that must have characterized his entire fifteen years of rule. Archaeological evidence has proven that Domitian dealt with the damage of two great fires: the one from AD 64 and 80. It is indeed surprising to think that, for over ten years after the Neronian fire, some parts of the city were still in ruins. One might try to reconcile this disturbing image of ancient Rome covered in marble dust and debris by considering that the sites left unrepaired might not have been in such bad condition, but this is not corroborated by data. An outstanding example is the archaeological evidence that very recently has been gathered in the area of the Circus Maximus, the site of the outbreak of Nero’s fire. The analysis of Corinthian capitals which once decorated the Arch of Titus on the circus and brick stamps from the area that connected the circus to the Palatine has yielded clear evidence of Domitian’s interventions right after the fire.

The Curia Iulia and the temple of Venus Genetrix, which were perhaps not severely damaged by the fire, were certainly repaired by Domitian. Finally, extensive work was undertaken on the Capitoline hill and the Campus Martius, both of which were hit by the fire in AD 80. In addition to the repairs, the number of new projects that Domitian embarked upon must have necessarily generated continuous loud construction noise, such as hammering, squeaky wheels and pullies, metals and stones clashing, shouting of foreman to workers, and so on. It would be extremely interesting to attempt to map out the routes taken by the massive teams of slaves engaged in so many projects at the same time. In fact, besides the noise, a crucial element to the visual experience of Domitian’s Rome must have been the sight of men working all the time, almost

---


1329 The physical evidence for these repairs is very poor, with the exception of the magnificent bronze doors that Domitian added to the curia.
everywhere. Once again, Statius accounts for this aspect on the occasion of the erection of the colossal *Equus Domitianii* somewhere in the middle of the forum.\(^{1330}\)

\section*{VI.a.5 Water features in Domitian’s Rome: functions and meanings}

With the exception of the Capitoline hill, where there is no evidence of water features built by Domitian, in every other sector in which he intervened, fountains and water related structures were present with different functions and meanings.

Water features were common in the Imperial fora. The forum of Caesar featured the famous Appiades fountains to the sides of the staircase in front of the temple of Venus Genetrix. Traces of these fountains are still visible in the forum, and it has been possible to reconstruct them as simple square basins which were adorned by sculptural groups. This particular water display is one of the early examples of domestic luxurious features inserted in a public context. It has been demonstrated that the use of fountains by Roman leaders had a propagandistic aim,\(^{1331}\) but in this case we might also think of the presence of water as a symbol of abundance and fertility closely related to the divine motherly force of Venus, which was manifested in the use of Genetrix as the official epithet, employed here for the first time.

Less ornate fountains were placed to the sides of the altar on the staircase of the temple of Mars Ultor in the Forum of Augustus. These examples seemed to have displayed a rather modest appearance where the water was mainly used for ritual purposes.

\footnotesize  
\(^{1330}\) Stat., Silvae, I.1.61-70, “Nec longae traxere morae. iuvat ipsa labores forma dei praesens, operique intenta iuventus miratur plus posse manus. strepit ardua pulsu machina; continuus septem per culmina ventis it fragor et magnae figit vaga murmura Romae. Ipse loci custos, cuius sacrata vorago famosique lacus nomen memorabile servant, innumeros aeris sonitus et verbere crudo ut sensit mugire forum, movet horrida sancto ora situ meritaque caput venerabile quercu.”

\(^{1331}\) Longfellow 2010, 19 and passim.
The water basins in the *Templum Pacis* stood out by comparison with these previous examples for they were a prominent and original feature in this unconventional public space. The idea of fountains as civic features\footnote{Longfellow 2011, *passim.*} is here fully embraced as the euripi regulated the traffic inside the compound, forcing the visitor to take straight designated routes along the NE-SW axis. The euripi in the *Templum Pacis* were not grand water features such as the *Meta* or the Domitianic Terrace; they were, instead, understated, soothing elements with a strong functional aspect. They occupied almost the whole length of the space, strictly regulating movement through the forum.

In a similar way, the *euripi* in the Iseum Campense, as they have been reconstructed in this dissertation, seem also to have been employed as features to mark the routes inside the space, together with their soothing effect. For another similar example of this particular function, assuming that its transformation into a nymphaeum occurred under Domitian, we may look at the *Porticus Absidata*, and identify similar characteristics such as the strict traffic control created by the architecture. As already mentioned, the two round fountains, the *Meta Sudans* and the Minerva Chalcidica, had a role in directing routes, while their monumentality was critical in conveying the meanings behind their topographical connections.

The innumerable water basins in the imperial palace contributed to a lush and vital landscape, particularly in the *Domus Tiberiana* and the palace proper. The Domitianic basin added to the central courtyard in the *Domus Tiberiana* was identical in design, though in reverse, to the basin in the second courtyard in the palace. As discussed above and in the dedicated section, the two basins in the upper level of the palace had a strong impact on the paths of traffic and the enjoyment of vistas and strolls. The very original twin fountains placed at the sides of the imperial triclinium, which
featured water effects on vividly colored marble slabs, had, on the other hand, a purely decorative function.

A functional and decorative fountain might have been built on the northern edge of the Roman Forum, between the temple of Concord and the Curia Iulia. This monumental fountain might have been decorated with the so-called Marforio, a personification of the Tiber. If this was a Domitianic project, then it shows unprecedented attention to the astonishing lack of functional fountains in one of the most frequented areas of the ancient city.

A different approach was employed in the concept of the Domitianic terrace. This water feature was meant to monumentalize the new, grand project for a public space that Domitian had planned in the area that was later occupied by the Forum of Trajan. At the same time, this nymphaeum functioned as the terminal fountain of the aqueduct that the emperor diverted for this project, and it might also have supplied water for the visitors to the area.

The Flavians – the label here is fitting – utilized water features in a way that follows a line of continuation from Augustus, such as in the famous example of the Meta Sudans in the valley of the Colosseum, but at the same time also employs an innovative approach that can be seen in the Templum Pacis and in Domitianic buildings.

---

1333 The Lacus Iuturnae behind the temple of the Castor consisted in a rectangular marble basin built originally in the 2nd century B.C. and restored by Tiberius, and was probably not a functional fountain. Its waters were used to heal and during religious ceremonies.
VI.b Legacies

In the previous chapters I discussed Domitian’s relationship with his predecessors with regard to two parameters: continuation and innovation. As the second largest building program in Rome, the projects of Domitian must necessarily be compared to those of Augustus. The trend in the scholarship is to interpret Domitian’s Rome as a “re-making of Augustan Rome”. This view suffers from the misleading use of the label “Flavian” which conflates the three members of the family into a single consistent entity. But, as explained in the introduction to this dissertation, this definition is misleading. While it is evident that Vespasian intended to create a link to the founder of imperial Rome and was consistent in pursuing this political agenda even in his building projects, Domitian’s program fully conveyed his own original vision for the city.

The forum Domitiani had no points in common with that of Augustus. The architectural design showed similarities only in the basic features of an imperial forum, while the original stadium shape was the product of ingenuity and creativity. The access points show a different attitude toward control of traffic to and from the Subura. The decorative programs in the two fora, as far as can be inferred for the forum Domitiani, could not be more opposite. On the one hand, the forum of Augustus was the locus of the administration of justice in connection with the most meaningful symbols of Republican Rome. The forum Domitiani, instead, represented the culmination of Domitian’s personal devotion to Minerva, his patron goddess, although they both featured images of subdued regions. In addition, it is crucial to remember that, in order to build his own

\[1334\] Verbatim in Moormann forthcoming.
\[1335\] The most direct reference to the Augustan pax was certainly the construction of the Templum Pacis. I would argue, however, that even Vespasian displayed new ideas in terms of the significance of his projects. The homage to Augustus was not without creativity and originality.
forum, Domitian dismantled one of the *exedrae* of the forum of Augustus. If we try to imagine the workers engaged in the destruction of this exedra, it is hard to see this as an act of emulation.

The Domitianic Campus Martius shows a more nuanced relationship with the legacy of the past. In this area, the presence of Augustus, and especially Agrippa, was prominent. The Domitianic eastern complex, *Iseum-Chalcidica-Divorum*, included a sacred area dedicated to Egyptian cults, tied to the power legitimization of the Flavians, in connection with a space dedicated to the deified Titus and Vespasian to highlight the sacred foundations of the dynasty, as the Pantheon had done for Augustus with its images of Venus and *Divus Iulius*. We can see in these buildings a development in continuity, although there were significant differences between Domitian’s projects and those of early imperial date. The architecture of the stadium-*Odeum* complex, on the other hand, strays sharply from Augustus’ theatres because of its monumentality, the nature of the competitions held there, and its architectural components.

The culmination of the imperial architectural design achieved in the construction of the Palatine residence highlights the contrast between Augustus and Domitian. The reports from the sources about the alleged modesty of the house of Augustus\(^\text{1336}\) indicate that it was not his intention to create a connection between the private dwelling of the emperor and the idea of luxury. That does not mean that Augustus did not built with opulence on the Palatine. The so-called *Area Apollinis* with the Porticus of the Danaids, most likely architecturally connected with his own residence, displayed costly materials, splendid sculptural decoration, and meaningful symbolic relations between Augustus

\(^\text{1336}\) Suet., *Aug.*, 72.1: “*Habitavit primo iuxta Romanum Forum supra Scalas anularias, in domo quae Calvi oratoris fuerat; postea in Palatio, sed nihil minus aedibus modicis Hortensianis, et neque laxitate neque cultu conspicuis, ut in quibus porticus breves essent Albanarum columnarum et sine marmore ullo aut insigni pavimento conclavia*”.
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and Apollo, though not a direct assimilation. However, his house did not have extensive colonnades or marble decoration on the floors.\textsuperscript{1337} Domitian’s palace is almost the antithesis of this, even though it was the continuation of a vision for the imperial residence started by Tiberius and extended by Nero as well.

Finally, the construction of the colossal \textit{Equus Domitiani} in the Roman Forum, the heart of Republican Rome and a place where Augustus’ interventions had been largely in line with past tradition, represented the most striking break with the past in terms of its scale and orientation. As has been shown, a comparison with the other statues in the forum, among which there were two or three dedicated to Octavian/Augustus, make this monument one of the most autocratic expressions of Domitian’s rule, hardly a homage to Augustus.

The \textit{damnatio memoriae} of Nero had a devastating effect on his building projects. The magnificent \textit{Domus Aurea} was dismantled to make space for the Flavian Amphitheater and other Vespasianic projects. However, recent studies on new archaeological evidence point to the unique degree of innovation that Neronian architecture achieved, also defining the extent of the debt owed to him by Domitian. There are two main areas of interaction between Nero and Domitian: architectural design and the urban planning. Points of contact have been identified fairly recently in the remains of Nero’s Domus Transitoria on the Palatine. The unique design visible in the presence of \textit{exedrae}, vaults, and certain uses of concrete in Nero’s buildings had a significant influence in Rabirius’ designs. In terms of planning, although we possess little evidence, some regulation of routes on the Palatine can be discerned and dated to Nero’s

\textsuperscript{1337} Ibid.
reign. In addition, both Suetonius\textsuperscript{1338} and Tacitus\textsuperscript{1339} remark on the advances in urban planning that Nero made in the aftermath of the fire.

Domitian’s relationship with Vespasian has been described as strained by the sources\textsuperscript{1340}. An attempt to disentangle what must have been very complicated family ties was undertaken by Waters in 1964 with the aim or redeeming, at least partially, the character of Domitian from the rhetorically negative portrait produced by the literary accounts. While it is hard to form an accurate image of the Flavians’ family life, it is possible to look at how Vespasian’s and Domitian’s projects compared with each other and interacted. The building program of Vespasian was primarily driven by the need to remind people that he was inaugurating a new age of peace and addressing the crimes committed by Nero. The \textit{Templum Pacis} was an excellent way of achieving the first goal, while the creation of the entertainment district in the Valley of the Colosseum succeeded in returning to the people those parts of the city that Nero had used for his own extravagant residence. Domitian did not participate in the construction of the \textit{Templum Pacis} but was, instead, largely involved in the projects in the Valley of the Colosseum, which he completed. A restoration of the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus was also undertaken by Vespasian and then continued by Domitian after the damage caused by the fire of AD 80. A limited intervention by Vespasian was identified on the Palatine; however, the unique design of the palace and related buildings was carried out by Domitian. The extent of Domitian’s building program is much larger than that of

\textsuperscript{1338} Suet., \textit{Nero}, 16.1: “\textit{Formam aedificiorum urbis novam excogitavit et ut ante insulas ac domos porticus essent, de quarum13solaris incendia arcerentur; easque sumptu suo exstruxit. Destinarat etiam Ostia tenus moenia promovere atque inde fossa mare veteri urbi inducere}”.

\textsuperscript{1339} Tac., \textit{Ann.}, 15.43: “\textit{Ceterum urbis quae domui supererant non, ut post Gallica incendia, nulla distinctione nec passim erecta, sed dimensis vicorum ordinibus et latis viarum spatiiis cohibitaque aedificiorum altitudine ac patefactis areis additisque porticibus quae frontem insularum protegerent. Eas porticus Nero sua pecunia exstructuram purgasque areas dominis traditurum pollicitus est}”.

\textsuperscript{1340} See Waters 1964 with bibliography.
Vespasian; however, these projects did not evince any open opposition or contrast between the two. The only exception to this seems to have been the odd orientation of the *Equus Domitianus* with its back to the temple of the Divine Vespasian and facing the temple of the *Divus Iulius*.

After Domitian’s assassination and his consequent *damnatio memoriae*, the *Equus Domitianus* was ravaged by the senators;[1341] his other buildings and monuments, however, were used, restored, and expanded. The palace on the Palatine had become the imperial residence *par excellence*.

Trajan’s relationship with Domitian has been analyzed in terms of their politics and military history. After an article by Waters, who called Trajan “Domitian continuator”,[1342] a more recent analysis has shown several points of contact between the two.[1343] In the area of the imperial fora, Trajan restored the temple of Venus Genetrix in the forum of Caesar, and then built his own grand public space with the historiated column, which still survives as a landmark in modern Rome. The planning of the forum of Trajan was largely influenced by the work carried out by Domitian, who cut the saddle between the Capitoline and Quirinal hill to make space for a large public forum. Of this second Domitianic forum, we have the remains of the impressive fountain known as the Domitianic Terrace, the sewage system, and the stretches of foundations that indicate the presence of an exedra in the area later occupied by the Markets of Trajan. In addition, strong similarities between the decoration of the triclinium in Trajan’s villa at Arcinazzo and the Domus Flavia led Tomei to hypothesize an earlier Domitianic phase of the villa.[1344]

---

The imperial palace on the Palatine sparked interest on the part of Hadrian, who was responsible for significant modifications. In the Sunken Peristyle, the water basin was decorated with a central feature with peltae motifs, while an elegant, wide semicircular exedra was added on the upper level on the façade overlooking the Circus Maximus. More interventions have been identified scattered throughout the rooms around the Sunken Peristyle. In the Campus Martius, Hadrian rebuilt the Domitianic version of the Pantheon, of which no archaeological trace remains. He then added the Serapeum to the Iseum Campense by building a semicircular sacred area featuring a large water basin. The shape of the Serapeum was then mirrored by the other Serapeum in his Tivoli villa and in the Antinoeion, the monument built to honor the cult of Antinous.

Finally, Septimius Severus expanded the horrea built by Domitian in the Campus Martius in the area of the church of San Paolo alla Regola, repaired the hemicycle of the Circus Maximus where the arch of Titus was built, and restored parts of the Iseum Campense. The additions to the Templum Pacis were also very important, although this was not a building by Domitian. The presence of Septimius Severus on the Palatine, on the other hand, was substantial. Recent examination of the archaeological evidence of the so-called Domus Severiana in the southeastern sector of the palace has shown that it belonged, instead, to the Domitianic phase. Nonetheless, other sectors in this area were clearly built by Septimius Severus, who created a connection between the palace proper and his magnificent nymphaeum, known as the Septizodium, on the slope that overlooked the Caelian hill.

In sum, Domitian’s Rome was beautiful and opulent, functional and comfortable, a city for the emperor but also for the people. This city deserves to be examined and visualized in a way that is holistic, complete, and reflective of its patron’s innovative
vision. New architectural and topographical designs aimed at beautification, but also at
directing traffic and presenting the viewer with breathtaking vistas, make the Rome of
Domitian eternal beyond the emperor’s disgrace.

VI.c Future research goals

In light of what this study has revealed, specifically the characteristics of
Domitian’s architectural and topographical vision, a few remarks will be made here to
indicate possible directions for future projects and methodological approaches that will
advance our knowledge of Domitian’s Rome.

Further refinement of our understanding of building techniques and materials is
paramount in order to distinguish between Domitian’s projects and the earlier Flavian
phases. This topic has been studied in recent years by the German team which worked on
the Sunken Peristyle, and by Iacopi and Tedone, who were able to identify the minute
details of the foundation construction in the Vespasianic phase of the palace. With these
data in mind, a monograph on the historical development of the Palatine, especially
focused on imperial times, is certainly needed.

Many Domitianic buildings require more archaeological investigation to
understand critical features and functions. Some of these projects are more feasible than
others. For instance, it would be incredibly helpful to excavate a sector of the central area
of the Roman Forum to identify, once and for all, the location of the Equus Domitianii.
Considering the long on going excavation project in the area the Lapis Niger, it might be
possible to undertake an investigation for this purpose. An excavation in the central

---

345 The work by Coarelli, “Palatium: il Palatino dalle origini all’impero”, 2012, Roma, Edizioni Quasar, does
not encompass the entire imperial times and it is primarily based on literary sources and less on the
important data recently produced by secondary scholarship.
sector of the Porticus Absidata to verify that the transformation into a nymphaeum took place under Domitian will most likely be undertaken by the author soon. Another building that might yield some useful data would be the *Minerva Chalcidica* in the Campus Martius. An excavation should clarify the nature of the building and would allow for verification of the hypothesis that this was a monumental fountain. The uncertainty about its exact location might be overcome through geomagnetic sensing.
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Fig. 37: reconstruction of the staircase of the Domitianic Terrace, Bianchi et. al. 2015.

Fig. 38: stratigraphic relation between the back wall and the side wall of the lower opening in the Domitianic terrace, photo by author, drawing by author after Tortorici 1993.
Fig. 39: plan by I. Gismondi showing the Domitianic terrace and the remains behind it, after Gismondi 1933.

Fig. 40: an axonometric view of the archaeological remains and reconstruction of the Domitianic phases recently uncovered under the Markets of Trajan and in relation with the Domitianic Terrace, Bianchini, Vitti 2017.

Fig. 41: overlap of two maps of the Collis Quirinalis from the Forma Urbis by Lanciani, 1893-1901. In red the Templum Gentis Flaviae on the right and the temple of Quirinus on the left, in blue the Ara Incendii Neroniani.

Fig. 42: map of the Baths of Diocletian in the Forma Urbis by Lanciani, 1893-1901. In the red rectangle the area occupied by the Templum Gentis Flaviae, in the red circle the remains of the house of T. Flavius Sabinus.

Fig. 43: colossal statue of emperor Titus belonging to the Templum Gentis Flaviae, National Archaeological Museum, Naples.

Fig. 44: Hartwig-Kelsey Fragments: on the left, the joined fragments from the Rome and Ann Arbor series, on the left, the Kelsey fragment (KM 2430), head of Vespasian, http://exhibitions.kelsey.lsa.umich.edu/galleries/Exhibits/Empire2/objects/km2430.html

Fig. 45: Hartwig-Kelsey Fragments: Hartwig fragment of a relief with a flamen priest and the temple of Quirinus in the background, (MNR 310251), http://exhibitions.kelsey.lsa.umich.edu/galleries/Exhibits/Empire2/objects/mnr310251.html

Fig. 46: Hartwig-Kelsey Fragments: reconstruction of the entablature of the altar precinct with male caryatids, http://exhibitions.kelsey.lsa.umich.edu/galleries/Exhibits/Empire2/monument/reconstruct.html

Fig. 47: Hartwig-Kelsey Fragments: reconstruction of the relief with a scene of sacrifice and the temple of Quirinus.

Fig. 48: Hartwig-Kelsey Fragments: reconstruction of the relief with the adventus or reditus of Vespasian.

Fig. 49: plan of the archaeological remains of the portico of the Templum Gentis Flaviae, Candilio 1990-1991.

Fig. 50: on the left, plan of the Traianeum from Italica, on the right, plan of the library of Hadrian in Athens.

Fig. 51: on the top the reconstruction of the Templum Gentis Flaviae by Capanna 2012; on the bottom, the detail of the remains of the concrete platform of the podium of the temple by Lanciani 1893-1901, from Tartaro 2017.

Fig. 52: hypothetical reconstruction of the Templum Gentis Flaviae in Coarelli 2014.
Fig. 53: hypothetical reconstruction of the Templum Gentis Flaviae within the context of the Baths of Diocletian, after Lanciani 1893-1901, Candilio 1990-1991, Coarelli 2014, Tartaro 2017. The larger blue circle encloses the remains of the house of T. Flavius Sabinus, the smaller blue circle those of the Julio-Claudian house which could have been the birthplace of Domitian, drawing by author after Lanciani 1893-1901, Coarelli 2014, Tartaro 2017.

Fig. 54: view of the temple of the Divine Vespasian from the Codex Escurialensis before 1506, Angeli 1992.

Fig. 55: plan of the palace on the Palatine with straight and axial access points highlighted in green, plan by author after Wulf-Rheidt, Sojc 2009.

Fig. 56: plan of the palace on the Palatine with winding routes highlighted in magenta, plan by author after Wulf-Rheidt, Sojc 2009.

Fig. 57: the three surviving columns of the temple of the Divine Vespasian, photo by author.

Fig. 58: Du Perac’s view of the western edge of the forum, 1575. The columns of the temple of the Divine Vespasian appear to be almost completely buried, De Angeli 1992.

Fig. 59: view of the temple of the Divine Vespasian from the temple of Concord after 1882 with the modern road, De Angeli 1992.

Fig. 60: detail of the entablature and the frieze showing a series of sacrificial tools, drawing by author.

Fig. 61: Renaissance drawing by the Anonymous Destailler illustrating the frieze in the temple of Minerva in the forum of Domitian, von Blanckenhagen 1940.

Fig. 62: reconstruction of the aedicula of the temple with the fragmentary head of Vespasian. To the left detail of the capital with winged Victories, drawing and photo by author.
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Fig. 65: temple of the Divine Vespasian, view of the Corinthian capitals from the back, photo by author.

Fig. 66: fragment of reconstructed trabeation of the temple of the Divine Vespasian in the Tabularium gallery, Capitoline Museums, photo by author.
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Fig. 68: plan of the porticus Deorum Consentium, from Nocera 2012.

Fig. 69: porticus Deorum Consentium, detail of the inscription, photo by author.
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Fig. 87: the Codex Vaticanus Latinus 3439, from Tortorella 1988.
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Fig. 91: the arch of Titus on the Via Sacra, photo by author.

Fig. 92: the spoils relief in the fornix of the arch of Titus, http://www.learningsites.com/Rome/Titus_home.php, retrieved on 04/14/2018.

Fig. 93: the relief with Titus on the triumphal quadriga in the arch of Titus, https://vangogo.co/index.php/2016/06/09/arch-of-titus/arch-of-titus-bay-relief/, retrieved on 04/14/2018.
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Fig. 95: photomosaic of fragments Stanford #7abcd of the Forma Urbis. The image shows the hemicycle of the Circus Maximus with the arch of Titus in the center, http://formaurbis.stanford.edu/fragments/color_mos_reduced/007abcd_MOS.jpg, retrieved on 04/14/2018.

Fig. 96: a reconstruction of the arch of Titus in the Circus Massimo with indication of possible location of the sculptural fragments, Pergola, Coletta 2014.

Fig. 97: the Colosseum and the Meta Sudans in 1931, on the left Mussolini is about to address the crowd. The Meta will be demolished five years later, Wikimedia Commons, Bundesarchiv Bild library (no 102-12292).
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Fig. 99: reconstructed plan of the Ludus Magnus, to the left, and Moneta, to the right, Guidobaldi 1978.
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Fig. 101: topographical reconstruction of the area of the Meta Sudans, Panella 2013.
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Fig. 105: map of the Domitianic Palatine with the Hadrianic phase in the Sunken Peristyle, plan by author.

Fig. 106: plan of the libraries at the Sanctuary of Apollo and the drawing of the Forma Urbis fragment, Tucci 2013.

Fig. 107: view of the Domus Tiberiana from the forum. To the left the Hadrianic arcaded chambers, to the right the group of the Domitianic forum buildings.
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Fig. 109: excavations in the cryptoporticus of the Domus Tiberiana.
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Fig. 112: remains of the clivus Victoriae, photo by author.
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Fig. 119: coin hoard from Vigna Barberini, Villedieu 2001.
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Fig. 122: reconstruction of the Flavian phase of the Vigna Barberini complex, Villedieu 2009.
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Fig. 124: lead fistula bearing the name of general Mucianus, Villedieu 2001.
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Fig. 126: plan of the Flavian palace showing the different construction phases and the traditional names for some parts, plan by author.
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Fig. 130: the stadium-garden in the palace on the Palatine, photo by author.
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Fig. 132: plan of the Neronian nymphaeum and triclinium, Carettoni 1949.
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Fig. 134: plan of the remains of the Paedagogium, LTUR IV.
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Fig. 136: plan of the Campus Martius during Augustan times, Coarelli 1997.

Fig. 137: map showing the pomerial extensions by Claudius and Vespasian, Liverani 2007.

Fig. 138: the Campus Martius from the Late Republic to Hadrian, plan by author.

Fig. 139: computer rendering of the stadium of Domitian within the modern urban context in comparison with the current state, https://stadiodomiziano.com/stadio-domiziano-stadio-di-domiziano-piazza-navona-storia-di-roma-sotteranei-di-roma-sotterranei-piazza-navone-patrimonio-unesco-roma-antica-antica-roma-domiziano-sport-antica-roma-certamen/

Fig. 140: left, aerial view from Google maps of piazza Navona and corso Vittorio Emanuele II, in red the curved facade of Palazzo Massimo alle Colonne; right, view of the façade of Palazzo Massimo alle Colonne overlooking corso Vittorio Emanuele II, photo by author.

Fig. 141: a 3D reconstruction of the theatre of Pompey with the porticoed area, http://www.kvl.cch.kcl.ac.uk/masks/chromakey_results/pompey/ws3-pompey.html

Fig. 142: a reconstruction of the Crypta Balbi, the porticus Minucia and the sacred area of Largo Argentina, by Inklink.
Fig. 143: remains of the theatre of Marcellus, to the right remains of the temple of Apollo Sosianus.

Fig. 144: view of the plastic model realized by Italo Gismondi in 1933 showing the stadium and Odeum of Domitian.

Fig. 145: plan showing the radial medieval foundations underneath Palazzo Massimo alle Colonne, Fellague 2014.

Fig. 146: the revised plan and section of the stadium of Domitian after the recent research, Bernard, Ciancio Rossetto 2014.

Fig. 147: aureus of Septimius Severus representing the stadium of Domitian, Bernard, Ciancio Rossetto 2014.
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Fig. 153: a column that likely belonged to the stadium of Domitian, today in the café in the Hotel Martis in the Campus Martius, photo by author.

Fig. 154: Sestertius by Vespasian depicting the temple of Isis.

Fig. 155: eastern sector of the Campus Martius with the Iseum, Minerva Chalcidica, and the Porticus Divorum, plan by author after D’Alessio 2012.

Fig. 156: Carettoni Plate no. 31.

Fig. 157: reconstruction of the Iseum by Gatti, 1943. In the red the approximate location of the remains that Ensoli attributes to the temple.

Fig. 158: reconstruction of the Iseum by Roullet, 1972.

Fig. 159: reconstruction of the Iseum by Lembke, 1994.

Fig. 160: two hypotheses of reconstruction of the euripi in the Iseum, in black the archaeological evidence. In hypothesis A there are two long euripi per side with a central passage, while in hypothesis B there are three euripi per side forming two passageways along the east-west axis, plan by author after D’Alessio 2012.
Fig. 161: the Ariccia Relief, Flavian times, Museo Nazionale Romano, Palazzo Altemps.

Fig. 162: hypothetical reconstruction of the Iseum with additional features in purple based on the elements appearing on the Ariccia relief in figure 26, plan by author.

Fig. 163: plan of the sacred complex at La Magliana, from Marcattili 2013.

Fig. 164: the Porticus Divorum, plan by author after D’Alessio 2012.

Fig. 165: pie charts showing the percentage of space occupied by the focus building and the porticoed area in the forum of Caesar, Augustus, Templum Pacis, and forum Domitiani in comparison with the Porticus Divorum.

Fig. 166: Renaissance drawing by O. Panvinio of a FUR fragment with the Minerva Chalcidica.

Fig. 167: the Minerva Chalcidica, plan by author.

Fig. 168: pyramid fountain in the garden from the House of Octavius Quartius, Pompeii.

Fig. 169: small marble fountain with water staircase from the Lacus Iuturnae, Tammisto 1989.

Fig. 170: the Cancelleria Reliefs, Frieze A, http://www.rome101.com/Cancelleria/, retrieved on 04/14/2018.

Fig. 171: the Cancelleria Reliefs, Frieze A, http://www.rome101.com/Cancelleria/, retrieved on 04/14/2018.
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