Augustus brought a new age of peace and prosperity to the Roman world. This “golden age” was celebrated in all aspects of Roman life, chief among which was religion. In the capital city, Augustus restored the temples of ancestral cults, while outside of Rome, the Imperial cult was established to proclaim his message of Roman rule.¹

Of the eighty-two temples he claims to have rebuilt at Rome,² many were restored in marble.³ These temples, together with those Augustus founded, became symbols for his new age. While his first foundations were experimental in their designs and the sources from which they drew,⁴ as his reign progressed, the architecture of Rome and her provinces became more conservative and the style, known as Augustan Classicism, was formalized.⁵ Combining the high podium and frontal emphasis characteristic of Italic temples with lavish ornamentation and materials drawn from Greece,⁶ Augustan temples created an impression of magnitude and opulence that surpassed most if not all Republican temples.⁷

¹ With its repertory of images developed for Hellenistic ruler cults, the Greek world provided a model for the Roman West to follow in honoring the Imperial cult. Zanker 1988, 297 and 304, and see below.
² R.Gest.div.Aug. 19-20; cf. Ov. fast. 2.61 and Liv. 4.20.7. This program was begun by Julius Caesar. Coarelli 1988, 71.
³ Augustus is said to have “found Rome a city of brick and transformed it into a city of marble” (Suet. Aug. 28).
⁴ Among these, the Temples of Divus Iulius, ca. 42-29 BC, included a variety of design elements, which fall short of canonical Augustan forms. Gros 1976a, 207-29.
⁵ Favro 1984, 206-8; Zanker 1988, 105 and 311.
⁶ The Temple of Roma and Augustus (#4) on the Athenian acropolis provides a good example of Greek influence on Augustan architecture.
⁷ Until the end of the Augustan period, temples readily increased in size, while their proportions became both broader and, through the use of the Corinthian order (see below), visually higher. Favro 1984, 221-4.
The principles of this style, crystallized in the Forum of Augustus,\(^8\) were upheld by his immediate successors. With the reign of Nero however, and the building opportunities opened up by Rome’s devastating fire of 64 AD, new trends began to emerge. While rebuilding the city, Nero took advantage of newly available land to construct his most lavish palace, the Domus Aurea. In this palace, Nero departed from the rules that bound his predecessors to exploit the untapped potential of interior space, light and shade. His architects experimented with forms like domes,\(^9\) used to great effect in the Domus’ octagonal room, which mark a significant step in the development of Roman architecture.\(^10\)

II DISCUSSION

Augustus: (27 BC-14 AD)

During Augustus’ reign, round temples were constructed at Rome and Athens.

The Pantheon, Rome (#50)

The Pantheon (#50), virtually intact thanks to its conversion into a church in 609 AD,\(^11\) is one of the most remarkable architectural achievements of ancient Rome.\(^12\) Although the present Pantheon is Hadrianic, its inscription,\(^13\) ancient

---

\(^8\) For the forum, see Kockel 1995, 289-95. After completing projects begun by Caesar, including the building program finished by Agrippa (see below), Augustus embarked on a series of new constructions, of which his forum and its Temple of Mars Ultor were among the most important. Coarelli 1988, passim.


\(^10\) The dome of Nero’s octagonal room prevised that of Hadrian’s Pantheon (#50), see Chap. VI ‘Roofing techniques.’

\(^11\) At the request of pope Boniface IV, the Byzantine emperor Phocas transformed the Pantheon into S. Maria ad Martyres (*LPD* 1.317 and *VZ* 2.251).

\(^12\) Among its admirers, the 4th c. emperor Constantius (Amm. 16.10.14) remarked that the Pantheon looked “like a rounded city-district, vaulted over in lofty beauty.”
sources, and walls excavated beneath its porch, intermediate block and drum, date its foundation to the reign of Augustus. M. Vipsanius Agrippa\textsuperscript{14} is credited with erecting the Pantheon as part of his large-scale building program in the Campus Martius.\textsuperscript{15} This program, which included the completion of the Saepta Iulia to the east\textsuperscript{16} and the construction of the Basilica Neptuni and the Baths of Agrippa to the south,\textsuperscript{17} provided a frame for his Pantheon and emphasized the important position it occupied, both real and symbolic, in Augustan Rome.

In the late 1890s, L. Beltrami carried out a series of excavations beneath the Pantheon. He was able both to establish the Hadrianic date of the standing structure through brick-stamps\textsuperscript{18} and to uncover some information about previous building phases. Travertine and tufa blocks found under the porch and intermediate block and two levels of concrete paving discovered below the drum’s floor, bounded by a round wall, serve as the principal evidence for any reconstruction of Agrippa’s Pantheon.\textsuperscript{19}

Without the means to date the pavement precisely, most scholars have assumed that the lower level pertained to Agrippa’s building and the upper, faced with marble slabs, to a rebuilding under Domitian. E. La Rocca, however, links the former with work undertaken in the area prior to Augustus and the latter with Agrippa’s Pantheon. Based on his alternative dating, he offers a new reading of the stone blocks, which formed the foundation of Agrippa’s building, and of the round wall, generally

\textsuperscript{13} The inscription (\textit{CIL} VI 896.1 = \textit{ILS} 129) implies that Agrippa founded the Pantheon during his third consulate in 27 BC, though it is generally accepted on the basis of Cassius Dio (53.27.1-2) that the building was completed in 25 BC. Coarelli 1983b, 43-4; Ziolkowski 1999, 54.

\textsuperscript{14} \textit{RE} IXA Vipsanius 2, 1248-50.

\textsuperscript{15} Sen. \textit{benef}. 3.32.4. Platner and Ashby 1929, 382; Coarelli 1983b, 43-4, and 1995k, 301 and 327; Godfrey and Hemsoll 1986, 196-7; Richardson, jr. 1992, 283.

\textsuperscript{16} Remains of the Saepta Iulia, begun by Lepidus, include a Hadrianic niched wall running parallel to the Pantheon, see Gatti 1999, 228-9.

\textsuperscript{17} For the Basilica, see Viscogliosi 1996e, 341 and below, and for the Baths, see Ghini 1999b, 40-2. Agrippa’s program also included the creation of an artificial lake and the construction of aqueducts, a retaining wall for the Tiber, and other utilitarian projects (Frontin. \textit{aq.} 98 and Cass. Dio 49.31).

\textsuperscript{18} Chap. VI #50.

\textsuperscript{19} de Fine Licht 1966, 172-7; Ziolkowski 1999, 54-5; La Rocca 1999b, 281-2.
considered a perimeter wall or a buttress for the ring foundations of Hadrian’s Pantheon.

According to Beltrami’s reconstruction, the rectangular cella of the Augustan building lay beneath the Hadrianic porch and its pronaos extended under the intermediate block. Its south-facing entrance corresponded to the door of Hadrian’s drum, while it shared its successor’s north-south axis and proportions, its width identical to the drum’s diameter and its depth comparable to that of the Hadrianic porch and intermediate block. The paved area in front of Agrippa’s Pantheon served as a forecourt shared by it and the Basilica Neptuni, which mirrored Agrippa’s building both in its symmetrical placement and in its plan and design.

La Rocca, after a theory proposed by W. Loerke, suggests instead that the first Pantheon prevised the form and orientation of Hadrian’s building. Drawing from recent excavations, he identifies an Augustan pronaos of comparable form incorporated into the Hadrianic porch. Like its successor, this porch faced north instead of south, the traditionally-held orientation of Agrippa’s Pantheon. La Rocca maintains that the porch, fronted with eight or ten columns, extended underneath the intermediate block to join a round court. Bounded by a thin wall, this court was partly, if not entirely, open to the sky. In support of his reconstruction, he suggests

---

20 Platner and Ashby 1929, 384-5; MacDonald 1976, 60-2; Ziegler 1979b, 473; Boatwright 1987, 43-4; Richardson, jr. 1992, 285; Coarelli 1995k, 327; Ziolkowski 1999, 54.
21 Ziolkowski 1999, 54.
22 Likely to have been identical in plan to the Agrippan building, the standing Hadri anic Basilica recalls the contemporary Pantheon in its use of apses, niches, semi-domes, and brick-faced concrete, as well as in the design of its pavement, cornices, and Corinthian columns. Moreover, under Hadrian, they were visually connected by a series of vaulted chambers. Gatti 1940; de Fine Licht 1966, 157-62; Boatwright 1987, 49-50; Richardson, jr. 1992, 285; Ziolkowski 1999, 55-6.
24 Although higher and wider than the Hadrianic porch, Agrippa’s pronaos may have been accessed by two sets of stairs and fronted by a row of columns. La Rocca 1999b, 281; cf. Virgili 1999, 284.
25 La Rocca 1999b, 281.
26 8 columns and 2 antae: see Loerke 1982, 49; 10 columns: Virgili 1999, 284, Ziolkowski (1999, 55; cf. Gruben and Gruben 1997, 72 n. 217) claims that this area, wider than the Hadrianic pronaos, was too large to function as a porch.
that the marble pavement beneath Hadrian’s drum was too fine for a public forecourt, and cites the court at Pella (#25) as a comparandum for the Pantheon’s form.\footnote{La Rocca 1999b, 280-1.}

Though the Hellenistic court to which he refers is both round and unroofed,\footnote{The court is abutted by two tholoi, while a third stands just outside.} unlike La Rocca’s building, it lacked a monumental entrance comparable to the Pantheon’s porch.\footnote{The court at Pella is similar in form to the Sanctuary of the Kabiroi at Thebes (ca. 1000 BC-400 AD), which locates three tholoi around an oval perimeter formed from a theater and boundary walls. Heyder and Mallwitz 1978, esp. 28-30, 38-40, 44-7, and 68; Seiler 1986, 25-8.} Similarly problematic is M. Wilson Jones’ suggestion of the fourth century Temple of Artemis at Stymphalos (#61). While it consists of a drum and a rectangular pronaos,\footnote{At least in form, the Temple has some known parallels in Rome, including 3\textsuperscript{rd} and 4\textsuperscript{th} c. buildings like the Mausoleum of Maxentius (see Chap. VII #52) and probably Aurelian’s Temple of Sol (#53).} the Temple is too small to have served as a model for the Pantheon. His second proposal of the Skias at Athens (#6), rebuilt with a columnar porch in the Augustan period, is somewhat better but, like the Temple at Stymphalos, its drum was roofed. For Beltrami’s reconstruction, the Temple of Concordia at Rome, whose transverse cella is bisected by a porch, serves as a close parallel, but does not reflect the court that would have linked the Pantheon and the Basilica Neptuni.\footnote{Ferroni 1993, 316-20.}

By suggesting that the Pantheon faced north, La Rocca weakens its links to the Basilica Neptuni, though significantly, he opens up the possibility of a visual and ideological connection to the Mausoleum of Augustus. Cassius Dio suggests that Agrippa intended the Pantheon to function as a temple to Augustus. When he refused this honor, Agrippa commemorated the emperor and himself with statues set on the Pantheon’s porch and placed a statue of Augustus’ adoptive father, Julius Caesar, inside the building together with images of Mars and Venus.\footnote{See #50.} Further, Agrippa used
Syracusan bronze capitals as well as caryatids and pedimental sculpture crafted by Diogenes of Athens to decorate his Pantheon. La Rocca proposes that, as in the Forum of Augustus, Agrippa may have incorporated the caryatids into an attic level, here to mask the springing of an annular vault that hemmed the round court.

In addition to outlining the Agrippan focus of the building, Cassius Dio speculates about its function. He suggests that, according to Greek precedent, the word ‘Pantheon’ signified a ‘temple to all the gods.’ In a Roman context however, he considers it more likely that ‘Pantheon’ referred to the building’s lofty dome, designed to imitate the heavens. However, most scholars would refute this explanation on the basis that Dio responded to the dome of Hadrian’s Pantheon.

Despite Cassius Dio’s remarks, it seems likely that ‘Pantheon’ was only a nickname attributed to the building prior to 59 AD, when the Acta of the Arval Brethren record a meeting that took place in Pantheo. Similarly, a tribunal of Hadrian was located inside the Pantheon, suggesting that it functioned as an Imperial court or audience chamber. Coupled with this secular function, the

---

33 Agrippa’s use of caryatids was inspired by the Athenian Erechtheion, which also served as the model for the Temple of Roma and Augustus at Athens (#4 and below). See Lloyd-Morgan 1990, 143-51 and Baldassarri 1998, 62 n. 79, for caryatids in Greek and Roman architecture.

34 See #50. This could imply that Diogenes was Agrippa’s architect.

35 While La Rocca (1999b, 281) models this reconstruction after vaults used in the Terrace of the Hemicyles at Praeneste and the Teatro Marittimo at Hadrian’s villa, it is problematic in so far as there are no parallels for a partially vaulted round court, and more fundamentally, no foundations for columns or pillars to support an annular vault have been discovered.

36 Will 1951; de Fine Licht 1966, 192; Ziegler 1979b, 468-71; MacDonald 1982, 118-9. Although his interpretation is not generally accepted, it is significant to note that temples to the twelve gods, like the round Tychaion at Alexandria, were frequently linked to ruler cults. See Aristotle in Philo Aet. 3.10, Will 1951, passim, Gros 1996a, 178, and La Rocca 1999b, 283.

37 Cass. Dio 53.27.

38 Richardson, jr. 1992, 283.

39 CIL VI 2041 = ILS 229. Through this connection, Ziolkowski (1999, 56) suggests that the Pantheon was afforded some sort of sacred status. For an analysis of Arval rites and practices, see Scheid 1990.

40 Cass. Dio 69.7.1; Cod. Theod. 14.3.10. The Saepta also included a tribunal under Tiberius (Suet. Tib. 17; Cass. Dio 56.1). Gatti 1999, 288.

41 Secular precedents for Hadrian’s domed rotunda, namely free-standing round halls like the ‘Temple of Mercury’ at Baiae, a 1st c. bath building, or rotundas incorporated into larger complexes like the octagonal hall of Nero’s Domus Aurea, might support the idea that non-religious activities took place inside the Pantheon. MacDonald 1976, 44-60 and 68-9; Godfrey and Hemsoll 1986, 202-5.
Pantheon may have played a religious role, implied by the statues of Divus Julius, Mars and Venus displayed in its interior as well as by Agrippa’s intention to build it as a temple to Augustus. Many scholars have proposed that, once thwarted, Agrippa founded a temple to the *gens Iulia*, rebuilt by Hadrian as a means of renewing his links to Augustus. However, A. Ziolkowski has pointed out that the Pantheon, built in Agrippa’s private *horti*, could not have been intended as a public temple, that Augustus as a living emperor would not have been honored with a temple either public or private, and that Mars, though the father of Romulus, was not a patron god of the Julian family.

Instead, Ziolkowski suggests that Agrippa’s Pantheon served as a temple to Mars, a god associated with land victories, while the nearby Basilica Neptuni acted as its counterpart, namely a temple to commemorate Agrippa’s sea victories. His arguments are compelling, especially as Caligula’s hatred of Agrippa might explain why his grandfather’s temple became known by a nickname, but they depend on the plan of the first Pantheon. While Beltrami’s reconstruction supports his theory, if La Rocca is correct, it is hardly likely that Agrippa paired a building of modest proportions and the same orientation with his Pantheon.

---

42 The Basilica Neptuni, rather than the reported Pantheon, may have served as a library under Alexander Severus. *POxy* 3.412.63-8; Boatwright 1987, 49; vs. Gros 1993, 54-7 (libraries inside the Temple of Apollo Palatinus).
43 In function, it would be comparable to Julius Caesar’s Temple of Venus Victrix, dedicated in 46 BC. Gros 1996a, 140.
44 Platner and Ashby 1929, 382; de Fine Licht 1966, 192-3, 198 and 201; MacDonald 1976, 76-92; Coarelli 1983b, 43, 1988, 74 and 1995k, 330; Richardson, jr. 1992, 283. As his statue was excluded from its cella, the Pantheon could not have been a temple to Augustus.
45 Agrippa’s *horti* only became public in 19 BC, when he ceded them to the Roman people on his death (CIL VI 39087). For the extent of his *horti*, see Coarelli 1997, 546-55.
46 However, Ziolkowski (1999, 56) suggests that the Pantheon could have honored a private cult, which later became public.
47 This would have been offensive to most contemporary Romans. Godfrey and Hemsoll 1986, 197-8.
48 Ziolkowski 1999, 56.
50 Suet. Cal. 23.1-2.
Although not perfectly aligned, La Rocca’s north-facing Pantheon could have been intended to complement the Mausoleum of Augustus. The Mausoleum, erected two years earlier, was built to serve as the resting place of Augustus and his descendants. The Pantheon may have marked the site where Romulus, with whom Augustus identified himself, ascended into the heavens. By including a statue of Divus Julius in its interior and by establishing a visual link between the Pantheon and the Mausoleum, Agrippa may have intimated that Augustus, like Romulus and Caesar, would be divinized on his death. This connection is strengthened by Hadrian’s incorporation of an eagle, a possible symbol of Augustus’ apotheosis, into the pediment of his Pantheon, and the recent discovery of a plan for the Hadrianic building on the grounds of the Mausoleum. While this evidence suggests that it served as a dynastic monument, much like the Mausoleum, based on the unresolved form and orientation of Agrippa’s building, it is best to conclude that he implied, but did not formalize, this function in his Pantheon.

**The Temple of Mars Ultor, Rome (#46)**

During the Battle at Philippi in 42 BC, where Octavian defeated the murderers of Julius Caesar, the young victor vowed a temple to Mars Ultor, the avenging god whose aid he felt had secured his victory. While the ultimate outcome of this vow

---

51 Coarelli 1983b, 44.
52 Gros 1996a, 176; von Hesberg 1999, 276; Wilson Jones 2000, 50 and cf. 206-7 (close correspondences to Hadrian’s Pantheon). La Rocca (1999b, 281-2) lists Augustan monuments between these two buildings (see ‘Temple foundation and layout’ below), which may strengthen their ideological links.
53 It would also recall the Philippeion at Olympia (#22). Moreover, Wilson Jones (2000, 179; cf. Ziegler 1949, 741-2 and Will 1951, passim) notes that Agrippa’s intention to group Augustus’ statue with those of Venus and Julius Caesar is comparable to Hellenistic Pantheia, where the ruler’s image was displayed amidst gods.
54 Suet. Aug. 29. For an overview of the Augustan buildings in which Mars appears, see Siebler 1988, 153 and 158-60.
was an octastyle temple in the Forum of Augustus, dedicated in 2 BC, literary and numismatic evidence has raised the possibility of a second temple to Mars Ultor (#46). Cassius Dio records Augustus’ construction of a Temple of Mars on the Capitoline “built on the model of Jupiter Feretrius.” Like the temple to Jupiter, which housed war spoils from the times of Romulus and Marcellus, the Temple of Mars may have stored Roman military ensigns and eagles recovered from Parthia. Their return in 20 BC, though achieved by diplomatic means, was hailed as a victory for the Roman people, while Augustus was voted honors by the Senate and celebrated with commemorative coin issues throughout the empire.

In the absence of physical remains, these coins, in addition to Cassius Dio, form the principal evidence in favor of a Temple of Mars Ultor on the Capitoline. The first Roman issues minted by M. Durmius, like the cuirass of the Augustus from Prima Porta, show a kneeling Parthian soldier returning the ensigns to Rome. This scene is replaced on cistophoroi from Ephesus and Pergamon with a triumphal arch, a

---

56 Cass. Dio 54.8.3. Like the Shrine of Vesta on the Palatine (#56 and below), this Temple of Mars Ultor is not mentioned in Augustus’ *Res Gestae*. However, its omission may be explained as a result of the Senate having undertaken its construction.
57 Cassius Dio’s (54.8.3) “model” cannot refer to the form of the temple, if its identification with the round temple illustrated on Augustan coins (see below) is correct.
59 Fest. p. 202-4 L, Val. Max. 3.2.3-5, Flor. anth. 1.1.11 and 1.20.4-6, Sol. 1.20, *Vir. ill.* 2.4 and 25.1-2, Serv. *Aen.* 6.859, Liv. 4.20.3-11 and *perioch.* 20, Plut. *Rom.* 16 and *Marcell.* 8.3-6, Hor. *carm.* 4.15.6, and Insclit XIII.3 70 no. 86.
61 After Rome made several unsuccessful attempts, Augustus was able to recover the ensigns by convincing the Parthian king Phraates IV that a peaceful settlement was the best option for both powers. van der Vin 1981, 119.
62 These honors included *supplicationes, Augustalia* to mark the day of his return, the construction of an altar to Fortuna Redux, and the re-dedication of an arch (see below). Rich 1998, 125-7. For coins connected with these events, see Baldassarri 1998, 59-60 n. 70 and below.
63 The Roman soldier depicted on the cuirass may represent Mars Ultor. Zanker 1988, 192.
hexastyle temple, and a round temple. While the arch has been identified with an arch in the Forum, altered as part of Augustus’ honors, and the hexastyle temple may represent that of Roma and Augustus in Pergamon, the round temple depicts the Temple of Mars Ultor on the Capitoline. Celebrating Augustus’ achievement, these coin issues helped to spread his personal and political propaganda. By emphasizing the ensigns, they enabled Augustus to court popular approval for the methods he used in their recovery, while by associating him with Mars Ultor, the avenger of Caesar and Rome, they underlined his ability to withstand the threat of internal and foreign enemies.

Dated to 19-18 BC, the third type of cistophoroi shows a round temple set on a five-step podium with Corinthian columns, an architrave, antefixes, and a dome topped by a finial. Visible between its central columns is a military vexillum, while walls may fill out its remaining intercolumnations. A similar round temple appears on aurei and denarii minted at Colonia Patricia and Caesaraugusta in Spain. These issues, which also show the triumphal arch, depict a monopteros ornamented with a wide range of cult objects. On some coins, these objects, including chariots, eagles, ensigns, and a small quadriga, are replaced by the figure of Mars Ultor. Mars, shown youthful, naked except for his helmet, and holding an eagle and ensign, is

---

64 All three types share a common obverse in the head of Augustus. Sutherland et al. 1970, 36-7.
66 This temple was built prior to 20 BC by the Commune Asiae. van der Vin 1981, 125-7.
67 Morawiecki (1976, 65 n. 53; vs. Rich 1998, 85) claims that the round temple represents the Temple of the Imperial cult at Ephesus. Her hypothesis is highly unlikely as the temple at Ephesus was rectangular, and moreover, the monopteros, which she identifies with it, probably formed the second story of a niched monument, see Bammer 1968-1970, 23 fol. figs. 14 and 39, and Torelli 1997, 152.
68 van der Vin 1981, 132.
69 Bonnefond 1987, 274. Here Mars Ultor is bis ulтро, “twice avenged” (Ov. Fast. 5.579-96), first for Caesar’s murder and secondly, for the death and capture of Roman soldiers in Parthia.
70 See #46. The Senate decreed that Augustus should re-enter Rome in a chariot. Although he refused this honor, and moreover, may have entered the city by night, it is likely that an empty chariot was set up in the Forum of Augustus (R.Gest.div.Aug. 35.1). Rich 1998, 115-25.
depicted both inside the round temple and on his own. Similarly, cult objects may appear as isolated images, intended to symbolize the temple or more generally, Augustus’ success in Parthia.

As the best evidence for the Capitoline Temple’s appearance, the coins may allow for its reconstruction. They depict it as round with a stepped podium, Corinthian columns, an ornate entablature, and a domed roof. According to Cassius Dio, the Temple sheltered ensigns and eagles, possibly in penetrale. Some scholars have suggested that they were accompanied by a cult image of Mars Ultor. Contrasting the youthful Mars shown on Spanish issues with the older, bearded and armor-clad Mars of the Ara Pacis Augustae, considered the cult statue of the temple in Augustus’ forum, J. van der Vin and M. Siebler have identified the former as the cult image of the Capitoline Temple. Although appealing, T. Kraus presents convincing arguments for seeing the youthful Mars as a symbolic device, like the cult objects and the legend MAR(T) VLT, used on coins to clarify the function and attribution of the round temple.

While both Cassius Dio and the coins support the existence of a second Temple of Mars Ultor, other sources raise difficulties sufficient for many scholars to conclude that the round temple, though planned, was never built. Horace, for example, contradicts Cassius Dio’s assertion that the Temple was erected to hold the ensigns and eagles recovered from Parthia. Instead, he states that the ensigns were

---

71 Giard 1976, nos. 1090a and 1095, and 169 fol. nos. 1115-20 pls. 44-5.
72 BMCEmp I 67 nos. 384-9 pl. 8.10; Giard 1976, 46-8 and 175 fol. nos. 1174-84 pls. 46-7.
73 It is difficult to tell from the coins whether the Temple had cella walls.
74 This term, which Augustus (R. Gest. div. Aug. 29) uses in the context of his forum temple, may connote a restricted area within its cella or simply the Temple’s interior. Quicherat 1967, 860; Gros 1976a, 128-9. 
76 van der Vin 1981, 127; Siebler 1988, 155.
77 Kraus 1964, passim. The Temple of Jupiter Feretrius, to which the Capitoline Temple is compared, lacked a cult image.
entrusted to Jupiter Feretrius, until the completion of the Forum of Augustus. To account for this discrepancy, scholars have labeled Horace’s remark as a kind of “poetic license,” whereby he intended Jupiter Feretrius to serve as a topographical indicator or as a personification of the Roman state.

More troubling however are the problems that arise in connection with the ludi Martiales or games celebrated in honor of Mars. These games are noted in the sources as having been held on 12 May and 1 August. T. Mommsen proposed that both dates and sets of games were connected with the dedication days of the two temples of Mars Ultor, the former with the round Temple and the latter with the temple in the Forum of Augustus. Although widely accepted, F. Cassola criticizes Mommsen’s premise, noting that none of the preserved fasti mention ludi occurring at the Capitoline Temple on either date. Moreover, several ancient sources record ludi Martiales celebrated to mark the dedication of the Temple of Mars Ultor in the Forum of Augustus on 1 August 2 BC. These ludi were repeated every year until 41 AD, when Claudius moved the festivities to celebrate his birthday on that day.

---

78 It is possible that the statue or temple of Mars Ultor shown on the Sorrento base represents the god’s Capitoline Temple. For difficulties connected with the base’s interpretation, see #56 below.
80 Bonnefond (1987, 272; vs. Rich 1998, 91) considers the transfer of ensigns from one god to another unusual, if not sacrilegious. However, it should be noted that, during its construction, the cult image of the Temple of Magna Mater on the Palatine (see Pensabene 1996a, 206) was placed inside the Temple of Victory.
81 Cassola (1981, 107-8; cf. Hor. carm. 4.15.6) suggests that “ensigns returned to Jupiter” signified “ensigns returned to Rome.”
82 InscrIt XIII² 456 (Fasti Maffeiani, 12 May). Ov. fast. 5.545-98; Suet. Claud. 4.1-3 (12 May). Vell. 2.100.2; Cass. Dio 55.10.6-8 and 60.5.3; R.Gest.div.Aug. 22.2 and 23 (1 August).
83 Mommsen relies on Velleius Paterculus (2.100.2) and Cassius Dio (60.5.3) in constructing this argument. Cassola 1981, 105.
84 While Alföldy agrees with Mommsen in principle, he reverses the Temples’ dedication days, see Rich 1998, 84.
85 Though the fasti do record 12 May (InscrIt XIII² 456; Ov. fast. 5.545-98), their reports are ambiguous and inconsistent. Cassola 1981, 102 and 112-4.
86 See above.
87 Cass. Dio 60.5.3 (Claudius’ birthday on 1 August).
A reference to 12 May can be found in Ovid’s *fasti* and indirectly in a letter from Augustus to Livia recorded by Suetonius.\(^8^8\) Ovid portrays Mars as descending from the sky on 12 May to visit his temple in the Forum of Augustus. Cassola argues that this event refers solely to the forum temple and could not suggest a date for *ludi* held in commemoration of the Capitoline Temple’s *dies natalis*.\(^8^9\) Moreover, evidence pertaining to the date when the *ludi* were first celebrated shows that no games in honor of Mars took place before 2 BC.\(^9^0\) The most compelling solution therefore, that of Cassola, would connect both dates and games with the forum temple as a celebration of its dedication on 1 August and of its *constitutio* or consecration on 12 May.\(^9^1\)

Like Cassola, J. Rich concludes from this evidence that no Temple of Mars Ultor was ever erected on the Capitoline.\(^9^2\) He blames Cassius Dio for perpetuating the idea that the Temple, whose decree was commemorated on coins, was eventually built,\(^9^3\) and notes the Temple of Clemencia Caesaris as a comparable example of a building whose construction was agreed, but not completed.\(^9^4\) Additionally, the interval between Augustus’ recovery of the ensigns and the coin issues is too short to propose that the coins could have celebrated the Temple’s completion.\(^9^5\) It is best therefore to follow Horace in his placement of the ensigns and to consider the Temple

---

\(^8^8\) *Ov. fast.* 5.545-98; cf. Cassola 1981, 103-4.
\(^9^0\) Augustus (*R.Gest.div.Aug.* 22.2) remarks that the *ludi* were first celebrated during his thirteenth consulship (2 BC). Cassola 1981, 114-5; Rich 1998, 84.
\(^9^5\) van der Vin 1981, 126. This raises the possibility that a temporary temple, made of perishable materials, was constructed to store the ensigns, only to be razed when the Forum temple was completed. The Temple of Diana, built in 36 BC to hold trophies won in the Battle at Naulo and dismantled in 20, would be comparable, see Cic. *har. resp.* 32, *BMCEmp* I, 102 nos. 625 fol. pl. 15.9, 103 no. 634 pl. 15.15, and 104 no. 643, *RIC* I, 60 no. 4 pl. 3.50 and 63 no. 38 pl. 3.53 (coin evidence for the Temple of Diana), Coarelli 1968a, 191 fol., and Baldassarri 1998, 58; vs. Rich 1998, 82.
of Mars Ultor on the Capitoline an honor voted Augustus by the Senate, but refused in 
an anticipation of the much grander temple to be erected in his forum.

The Temple of Roma and Augustus, Athens (#4)

Unlike much of Greece, Athens was granted the special status of a *civitas* 
*libera et foederata* in the late Republic.96 The city remained free until 27 BC, when 
Octavian incorporated it into the Roman province of Achaia in the wake of the Battle 
at Actium. During his first visit to the city, he pardoned its inhabitants for siding with 
Marc Antony.97 As a sign of their gratitude, the Athenian people may have erected a 
monopteros on the Acropolis (#4) in connection with this trip or to mark his third visit 
in 20 BC, when Augustus passed through Athens after recovering the ensigns and 
eagles from Parthia.98

The monopteros, which honored both Roma and Augustus, was the first 
Temple dedicated to their combined cult at Athens. The cult of Roma, an outgrowth 
of Hellenistic city-state cults, was established at Smyrna in 195 BC,99 but had spread 
throughout the Greek world by the Augustan period.100 At Athens, Augustus Soter101

---

97 Athens was sacked by Sulla, and its free status revoked, in an uprising against Rome in 88 BC. 
Funded by wealthy Romans, the city was gradually rebuilt and its status restored in the 2nd half of the 
1st c., before its involvement at Actium. For an overview of Roman rule in the Julio-Claudian period, 
see Baldassarri 1998, 3-40.
98 The Temple’s dedicatory inscription (*IG* II² 3173 = *CIG* 478 and *IG* III 1276) narrows the date of its 
construction to 27-19 BC. Baldassarri (1998, 51-4) supports 19 BC on the basis of formal similarities 
between the monopteros and the Temple of Mars Ultor on the Capitoline (#46 and above), which, he 
believes, served as a model for the Temple at Athens.
99 Tac. *ann.* 4.56; cf. Mellor 1981, 954-72. From the middle of the 2nd c. BC, a festival known as the 
*Romaia* was held at Athens. *IG* II² 1054 and 1938; cf. Baldassarri 1998, 53 n. 43.
100 In 30-29 BC, Octavian sanctioned the construction of temples to Roma’s cult at Pergamon, Ephesus, 
Nicomedia, and Nicea, while inscriptions attest to temples of Roma and Augustus on Samos (see 
Herrmann 1961, 71 no. 1), Lesbos (*IG* XII² 58), and Thasos (*IG* XII.8 380) built during his lifetime. 
Mellor 1981, 977 and 982; Zanker 1988, 302. This trend can be contrasted with Augustus’ refusal to be 
honored with a temple in Rome, see Cass. Dio 53.27 and #50 above.
101 For this epithet, see Baldassarri 1998, 28 and 54-5.
was celebrated together with Roma in the Agora and the Theater of Dionysos\textsuperscript{102} as well as on the Acropolis, the most sacred area in the city. Through its location, the Temple best conveyed Augustus’ message of Roman rule, while, in its architecture, it acted in sympathy with its Greek neighbors.

The Temple stood in front of the Parthenon and near the Erechtheion,\textsuperscript{103} with which it had ideological and structural ties. As the Parthenon and Erechtheion commemorated Athena, the patron goddess of Athens, the Roman monopteros glorified both the personification of Rome and Augustus as the city’s protector and principal representative.\textsuperscript{104} Like the Erechtheion, the Temple employed the Ionic order, which, rare for round temples, demonstrates one of many architectural links.\textsuperscript{105} Based on their similarities, P. Baldassarri has even proposed that the same architect, who restored the Erechtheion in the Augustan period, may have designed and built the Temple.\textsuperscript{106}

Resting on a three-step krepis,\textsuperscript{107} the monopteros rose with a screen wall, nine columns and an inscribed entablature to a conical roof.\textsuperscript{108} The columns, notable for their Ionic capitals and fluted shafts with lotus and palmette collars, were evenly spaced, apart from the intercolumnation beneath the inscription that marked the Temple’s entrance. With this wide opening, the Temple could easily have displayed

\textsuperscript{102} Two annexes of the Stoa of Zeus Eleutherios were connected with their cult, whose priest had a seat in the Theater (\textit{IG II\textsuperscript{2} 5047 and 5114}). Mellor 1981, 982; Baldassarri 1998, 53.

\textsuperscript{103} 3\textsuperscript{rd} c. coins (see #4), which provide ‘bird’s eye’ views of the Acropolis, underline the proximity of the monopteros to these temples. Binder 1969, 45-7 and 125.

\textsuperscript{104} Binder 1969, 43-4.

\textsuperscript{105} See ‘Analysis’ below.

\textsuperscript{106} Baldassarri (1998, 62-3) suggests that Diogenes of Athens, who designed the caryatids and capitals of Agrippa’s Pantheon (Plin. \textit{nat.} 34.13 and 28; cf. #50 above), may have been in charge of these projects.

\textsuperscript{107} The Temple’s foundations have been identified with either a poros platform or a circular indentation cut into native rock. Baldassarri 1998, 48-9.

\textsuperscript{108} The roof is reconstructed as conical on the basis of Imperial coins (see #4 and above) and by analogy with the Rotunda at Corinth (see #9 below). Baldassarri 1998, 46-7.
cult statues of Augustus and Roma. These, in addition to an altar that may have preceded the Temple, would have emphasized the presence of their cult on the Acropolis.

**The Shrine of Vesta, Rome (#56)**

On his election to Pontifex Maximus on 6 March 12 BC, Augustus donated the *domus publica* to the Vestals and established a sanctuary of Vesta in his house on the Palatine. This not only allowed him to fulfill the requirements of the office, namely to live in the public domain and oversee the cult of Vesta, but also to enlarge the Vestals’ living quarters in the Forum. Ovid notes in his entry for 28 April how Augustus allotted space for Vesta in his house (*fast. 4.949-50*: *Phoebus habet partem, Vestae pars altera cessit; / Quod superest illis, tertius ipse tenet.* The parts occupied by the cults of Apollo and Vesta, in this context, appear comparable in importance and size. As a temple filled out the area of Apollo, some scholars have suggested that the area of Vesta received a similar treatment (#56).

In addition to Ovid’s *fasti*, two ancient calendars record a dedication made to Vesta in Augustus’ house. On 28 April, the *fasti Caeretani* note that a *sig(num) Vest(ae)* was set up *in domo P(alatina)*, while the *fasti Praenestini* remark on the

---

109 Binder 1969, 85. A statue of Augustus (or of Nero, see Coarelli 1978, 233) may have been displayed on the round base in the Sanctuary of Athena Nikephoros at Pergamon. For bibliography pertaining to this base, erected in honor of Attalos I’s victory over the Gauls, see Baldassarri 1998, 61 n. 75.


111 Augustus first used the Acropolis to demonstrate Roman supremacy when he turned the statue of Athena Parthenos westward to face Rome. Baldassarri 1998, 20.

112 The *domus publica*, previously known as the *domus rex sacrorum*, was the official residence of the Pontifex Maximus. Papi 1995, 169-70; Scott 1995, 165-6.

113 This was achieved by making part of his house public with the addition of Vesta’s and Apollo’s sanctuaries (Cass. Dio 54.27.2; Ov. *fast. 4.949-50*). Cappelli 1999, 128.

114 The *domus publica* was incorporated into the Atrium Vestae. Scott 1995, 165-6; Cappelli 1999, 128.

115 This temple, vowed in 36 and dedicated in 28 BC, was constructed in an area of Augustus’ house struck by lightning, see Gros 1993b, 54-7.
erection of a [...] ET [...] / VESTAE. For these lacunae, T. Mommsen reconstructed [AEDICVL]A ET [ARA]. Although once widely accepted, A. Degrassi has shown that [SIGNV]M ET [ARA] fits more comfortably into the space provided. This emendation accords well with the fasti Caeretani, while, as Degrassi has pointed out, it is more feasible that a statue, than a shrine, was erected together with an altar in the interval between Augustus’ election and their dedication day.

Though M. Guarducci agrees with Degrassi’s substitution of SIGNVM for [AEDICVL]A, she proposes [AEDIS] for the second lacuna, noting occasions when a temple’s dedication preceded its completion. Further, she responds to the absence of an aedes in the fasti Caeretani by remarking that, while the statue was set up in 12 BC, the Shrine was more likely to have been visible when the early Imperial fasti Praenestini were composed than when the fasti Caeretani, whose composition predated 12 BC, were amended.

In addition to the fasti, which may suggest that this sanctuary had a temple, two other written sources dealing with the contents of a shrine of Vesta may refer to this site. Augustus’ Res Gestae, intended as a compilation of his achievements, is silent about the Shrine’s construction, but does mention dona ex manubiis or war booty he set up at a shrine to Vesta. According to Guarducci, this passage fits with the Shrine on the Palatine and with the coins and reliefs, discussed below, which may

---

116 Fasti Caeretani: InscrIt XIII² 66 = CIL I² 213; Fasti Praenestini: InscrIt XIII² 132-3 = CIL I² 236. For both, see #56.
117 Although this inscription is badly preserved, it appears that 5 letters fit better than 7 and that M can be reconstructed as reliably as A.
118 Ov. fast. 6.295-6 (statue of Vesta). Degrassi 1955, 147.
120 Guarducci 1964, 159 and 167.
represent Augustus’ gifts.\textsuperscript{122} Further, she notes an epitaph from Privernum, which lists among the titles of a benefactor, \textit{praepositus palladii Palatini},\textsuperscript{123} as proof that Augustus stored a copy of the Forum temple’s Palladium in this Shrine on the Palatine.\textsuperscript{124} In response, Degrassi identifies the inscription as referring to Elagabalus’ transfer of the Palladium to his Palatine temple of Sol,\textsuperscript{125} and notes the unlikelihood of Augustus or the Senate having built the Shrine without recording its construction.

The coins to which Guarducci refers are dupondii minted under Tiberius, ca. 22-23 AD, and aurei of Vespasian, Titus and Domitian, 71-74 AD.\textsuperscript{126} Both series depict a round shrine with Ionic columns, grillwork, and a conical roof. Set between pillars that support a bull and a ram, the shrine appears on the Tiberian coins with a statue of Vesta and on the Flavian, with the Palladium and two Vestals. A base from Sorrento and a relief discovered in Palermo, both of Julio-Claudian date, illustrate a shrine with similar attributes placed before an Ionic portico. Scholars have sought to identify both the shrine and the portico by examining the base, which includes them in one of four scenes set at religious sites in Rome.

Though not complete, the base preserves a sacrificial rite played out before various buildings. The scene on side A sets a round altar, Vesta, five Vestals, and two goddesses\textsuperscript{127} against a backdrop of an Ionic portico and a round shrine, while side B

\textsuperscript{122} Guarducci 1964, 161, and 1971, 104; cf. Rizzo 1932, 33-5.
\textsuperscript{123} \textit{CIL} X 6441.
\textsuperscript{124} As support, Guarducci (1964, 161 and 169) cites the discovery of an Archaic head of Athena on the Palatine and depictions of the Palladium inside a shrine of Vesta (see #56 and below), only to retract her arguments (1971, 109-10) in agreement with Kolbe (1966-1967, 103-4), who considers it inappropriate that the Palladium, as a symbol of Rome’s power, should have been duplicated.
\textsuperscript{125} Degrassi (1955, 149-51; see Fraschetti 1990, 345 and Cappelli 1999, 128) bases his view on sources which note that the Palladium remained in the Forum until the time of Elagabalus (\textit{Hist.Aug.Heliog.} 3.4-7 and 6.9).
\textsuperscript{126} See #56.
\textsuperscript{127} They have been identified by Rizzo (1932, 46-7; cf. Guarducci 1971, 104-8) as the Roman counterparts of Demeter and Kore, Ceres and Libera.
shows the Temple of Apollo Palatinus. The House of Augustus\textsuperscript{128} and a statue or temple of Mars Ultor appears on side C and a temple of Magna Mater is depicted on side D.\textsuperscript{129} The Palermo relief is similar in content,\textsuperscript{130} while it also incorporates the Palladium and Augustus in the role of Pontifex Maximus.\textsuperscript{131} Like the coins, both reliefs include pillars supporting a bull and a ram,\textsuperscript{132} whose placement may mirror that of the armenta Myronis, four bull statues by Myron displayed before the Temple of Apollo Palatinus.\textsuperscript{133}

G. E. Rizzo, the first to study the Sorrento base in any depth, noted that, as scenes B, C and D take place on the Palatine, side A must represent the Shrine in the Palatine sanctuary of Vesta. He concluded that the base commemorated the dedication of the Shrine, its statue and altar.\textsuperscript{134} Guarducci concurred, stressing marked differences between these sources and the coins, reliefs and Renaissance drawings linked with the Forum temple.\textsuperscript{135} Their disparities, she suggested, prove the existence of two temples to Vesta in Rome.\textsuperscript{136} Although satisfied with most of Rizzo’s analysis, Degrassi followed S. Stucchi in identifying the round shrine on side A with the Temple of Vesta in the Forum.\textsuperscript{137} Unlike both Rizzo and Stucchi

\textsuperscript{128} Augustus’ house is identified by a corona civica or crown of oak leaves granted him by the Senate on 13 January 27 BC as thanks for his role in the Civil Wars. Rizzo 1932, 80.
\textsuperscript{129} For a fuller description, see Rizzo 1932, 51-99.
\textsuperscript{130} A fragmentary relief in the Villa Albani shows a seated Vesta and four Vestals sacrificing over a round altar, though omits the round shrine and Ionic portico in favor of a Corinthian peripteros. Cain 1989b, 421-5.
\textsuperscript{131} It is possible that Augustus was represented similarly on a lost fragment of the Sorrento Base. Cappelli 1999, 128.
\textsuperscript{132} Rizzo 1932, 32. Guarducci (1971, 102-8; see Cecamore 1994-1995, 21) connects the bull and ram statues to zodiac signs, under which she believes most of the work on the Palatine Shrine was completed.
\textsuperscript{133} Prop. 2.31.7 fol. If the base shows the Palatine Shrine of Vesta (see below), it is reasonable to assume that Augustus employed similar statue displays to unite the neighboring temples.
\textsuperscript{134} Rizzo 1932, 40 and 50.
\textsuperscript{135} See Chap. VII #57.
\textsuperscript{136} Guarducci 1964, 163-5.
\textsuperscript{137} Stucchi (1959, 90-1) links the Ionic portico with the Temple of Divus Iulius, whose inauguration may have been celebrated with the sacrifice on side A.
however,\textsuperscript{138} he suggested that the base, an illustration of Augustus’ religious devotion, included monuments from both the Forum and the Palatine.\textsuperscript{139}

Even if Rizzo and Guarducci are correct in locating the round shrine on the Palatine, the coins and reliefs they link with it might as easily commemorate the building’s vow as its completion. At most therefore, these sources reveal the intended appearance of the Shrine. In support of its construction, C. Cecamore points to a circular structure and a portico discovered near the Temple of Apollo Palatinus.\textsuperscript{140} These remains, which may incorporate Vеспasianic brick stamps and a \textit{fistula},\textsuperscript{141} she suggests, pertain to a Flavian rebuilding of the Shrine and its portico commemorated on the aurei.\textsuperscript{142} However, like the bricks, which may have been used during or after the Flavian period, the number and variety of finds on the Palatine\textsuperscript{143} work against identifying any individual building with certainty.\textsuperscript{144} Similarly, as both the written and the iconographic sources are ambiguous about the existence of a temple in Vesta’s sanctuary, it is best to conclude that the Shrine was never built.

\textbf{Tiberius: (14-37 AD)}

\textsuperscript{138} Rizzo 1932 and above; Stucchi 1959, 11, 14, 25, and 90-1.
\textsuperscript{139} Degrassi 1955, 154 and cf. 1966-1967, 103-8.
\textsuperscript{140} These are located below the triclinium and nymphaea of the \textit{domus Flavia}. Cecamore 1994-1995, 9-11 and 15-7.
\textsuperscript{141} Brick stamps: \textit{CIL} XV 664, 1449, and 1, 1248a; \textit{fistula}: Carettoni 1949, 71 and Cecamore 1994-1995, 9-10.
\textsuperscript{143} See Degrassi (1966-1967) for the topography of the Palatine, especially in relation to Augustus’ house.
\textsuperscript{144} The round building is usually identified as a \textit{cenatio}. Cecamore 1994-1995, 18. Other round structures used for this purpose are the Skias at Athens (#6), the tholoi in the Sanctuary of the Kabiroi at Thebes (see Heyder and Mallwitz 1978, 46), the court at Pella (#25), and Varro’s aviary (see Varro \textit{rust.} 3.5.9-12 and Chap. IV #38).
As Tiberius focused his building activity on Rome,\textsuperscript{145} it is unlikely that he had any direct involvement with the construction of the Rotunda at Corinth (#9), a Roman possession from 146 BC.\textsuperscript{146}

**The Rotunda, Corinth (#9)**

The Western terrace of the Lower Agora at Corinth was lined with a series of small monuments that faced onto the market place, its Central and Northwest shops, two basilicas, and the Peribolos of Apollo. From a detailed description of Pausanias and archaeological remains, R. Scranton has pieced together the appearance of this terrace, reconstructing six monuments erected over a span of nearly two hundred years. Among them is a Rotunda (#9) set on a rectilinear platform that can be linked to the prosperous Corinthian, Cn. Babbius Philinus. While inscriptions indicate that Babbius was responsible for other buildings in the area, the prominent location, size, and design of the Rotunda suggest that it was his principal donation.

Based on Pausanias,\textsuperscript{147} Scranton has envisaged the Western terrace as consisting of, from the south, the Temple of Tyche, the Pantheon, a ramp leading to a row of shops and Temple E, two temples probably of Herakles and Poseidon, Babbius’ Rotunda, and a temple to Hermes.\textsuperscript{148} As well as their remains, the terrace’s retaining wall\textsuperscript{149} and changes to the ground level of the Agora help to establish a chronology for these monuments.\textsuperscript{150} To the ramp and entrances by the Central and

\textsuperscript{145} While Tiberius completed the Augustan Temples of Castor and Concordia at Rome, few provincial buildings beyond the Temple of Roma and Augustus at Ankara can be dated to his reign. Gros 1996a, 161.
\textsuperscript{146} For L. Mummius’ conquest of Corinth, see Chap. IV ‘Introduction.’
\textsuperscript{147} Paus. 2.2.6-8 and 3.6.
\textsuperscript{148} Scranton 1951, 3-4 and 67-9.
\textsuperscript{149} The Western Terrace, in use since Greek times, was leveled, then regularized through the addition of this wall in the 2nd c. BC. Scranton 1951, 64.
\textsuperscript{150} The construction of the Rotunda coincides with one of these changes in the level of the Agora and the height of the terrace wall. Scranton 1951, 23-4.
Northwest shops, which formed part of the original terrace, the Temple of Hermes and the Pantheon were added in the early first century AD. These were followed by the Temple of Tyche, Babbius’ fountain to the north of the Temple of Hermes, his Rotunda, and his fountain to Poseidon. The first century also saw the construction of Temple K, sited behind the Rotunda, while the Temple of Poseidon replaced Babbius’ fountain in 185 AD, a few years before the Temple of Herakles was built.

Babbius’ Rotunda was set on a large platform that jutted out from the terrace wall and defined a kind of precinct for the building. The platform, comprising a concrete core and marble revetment, was flanked by stairs, which provided access to both the terrace and the monument. While its revetment bore Babbius’ main dedicatory inscription, the platform supported the stylobate, eight Corinthian columns, entablature, and cone-shaped roof of his monopteros. Like the platform’s base and cornice moldings, the carving of both the architrave and the roof cornice is ornate as are the blocks fashioned to represent wedge-shaped tiles, which, together with a finial, formed the roof’s ornament.

From its elevated position, this finely detailed monopteros would have been ideal for displaying statuary. In addition to its height, its location set apart from both the Temple of Hermes and the Fountain of Poseidon, would have enabled any statue it exhibited to be viewed from the Agora below, the West shops above, and the neighboring precinct of Hermes. Even with the construction of Temple K and the Temple of Poseidon, which framed its back and south sides, the Rotunda remained an effective means of displaying statues.

---

151 Scranton 1951, 64.
152 Robert 1939, 89; Scranton 1951, 16, 34 and 66.
153 The last means of access to the terrace was a set of stairs, preceded by columns, in front of the Temple of Hermes. Scranton (1951, 16) assigns these a late date.
154 Another, secondary inscription appears on the frieze course of the Rotunda. Scranton 1951, 32.
155 Scranton (1951, 30 pl. 12.4) suggests that the pinecone finial was sheathed in bronze.
While Babbius’ inscription does not mention the god to whom the Rotunda was dedicated,\textsuperscript{156} Pausanias lists statues of several divinities displayed on the Western terrace.\textsuperscript{157} Of these, Scranton has attributed all but the statue of Aphrodite, sculpted by Hermogenes of Kythera, to other temples.\textsuperscript{158} If a round shrine to Aphrodite,\textsuperscript{159} Babbius’ Rotunda would recall the famous Temple at Knidos (#16) as well as a monopteros erected near the agora at Sparta.\textsuperscript{160} This monopteros, mentioned by Pausanias, honored Aphrodite and Zeus, both of whom received temples on or near the Western terrace.\textsuperscript{161} Despite this Greek parallel and the proximity of the two monuments at Corinth, it seems likely that Babbius’ Rotunda celebrated Aphrodite independent of Zeus\textsuperscript{162} in the context best suited to display her striking Greek cult image.\textsuperscript{163}

\textbf{Claudius: (41-54 AD)}

Although he expanded the Empire, Claudius also retained an Italian focus, emphasized by his repair program that spanned temples, roads, aqueducts, and harbors. Notably, he built the port of Ostia at Portus, which served as Rome’s harbor.

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{156} The Rotunda’s identification as a temple stems from Babbius’ use of \textit{aedes} in his dedicatory inscription (see #9) as well as the number of temples present on the Western terrace.\textsuperscript{157} Scranton (1951, 70-1; cf. #9) has discovered statues comparable in range to Pausanias’ catalogue.\textsuperscript{158} Scranton 1951, 70-2.\textsuperscript{159} M. Torelli, cited by Gros (1996a, 160 and cf. 1976a, 131-3), attributes the Rotunda to the Augustan colony at Corinth. He claims that it was built on the model of the Temple of Roma and Augustus (#4 and above) to honor Agrippa as Augustus’ \textit{consors imperii}. Torelli’s theory seems unlikely based on Scranton, but cannot be debated without access to his text.\textsuperscript{160} Paus. 3.12.9-11.\textsuperscript{161} The precinct of Zeus, to which should be linked Pausanias’ three statues of Zeus (Paus. 2.2.6-8 and 3.6), lies to the north of the Temple of Hermes.\textsuperscript{162} At Rome, the two gods were celebrated together, as Venus and Jupiter, in the twice-yearly \textit{Vinalia}. Sabbatucci 1988, 132-8.\textsuperscript{163} Scranton (1951, 71) tentatively suggests that statues in the “Pergamene style,” which he uncovered during excavations, were sited on the edge of Babbius’ platform.}
through much of the Imperial period. Among the few temples constructed during his reign are round Temples at Rome (#37) and Ostia (#24).

**The Temple of Fortuna, Rome (#37)**

The foundations of the Temple of Fortuna (#37), located in the Horti Lucullani or Aciliorum as they came to be known in the second century AD, were uncovered by the garden’s excavators, H. Broise and V. Jolivet, during their 1998 campaign. The Temple crowns an elaborate complex of buildings, which were in use from the late Republic until the sixth century AD. In the course of their excavations, Broise and Jolivet have revealed much of the garden’s extent on the Pincio and have been able to impose a sequence of ownership onto the chronology suggested by the archaeological remains. Briefly, the gardens passed through the hands of L. Licinius Lucullus, who began construction in 66-63 BC, through various owners to the gens Pincia, who gave their name to the hill, to the emperor Honorius, and eventually to the papacy. While very few remains pertain to Lucullus’ garden, considered splendid by ancient authors, most of what is preserved dates to the period of

---

165 The Acilii Glabriones owned the property in the 2nd and 3rd centuries AD, having acquired it from the Imperial family. *CIL VI* 623; Plin. *paneg. 50*; cf. Broise and Jolivet 1987a, 751 and 1996a, 68.
166 Cassiod. *var. 3.10* (Horti’s buildings dismantled in 507-510 AD).
167 Frontinus (*aq. 22.2*) indicates that the *aqua Virgo* began *sub hortis Lucullanis*, providing the only ancient topographical reference to these gardens. For their extent based on physical remains, see Broise and Jolivet 1996a, 67-8.
169 For the sequence of ownership, see Broise and Jolivet 1987a, 749-53 and 1996a, 67-8.
170 These include parts of a water drainage system and a niched wall. Broise and Jolivet 1987a, 758 and 1996a, 67-8.
Valerius Asiaticus, consul in 46 AD, who undertook a grand building program in
the Horti.

P. Ligorio sketched a plan (1552-1564) of Asiaticus’ complex, which bears a
strong resemblance to the late Republican Sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia at
Praeneste. It shows a central stairway leading to a rectangular terrace, flanked by
rooms and crowned by a large hemicycle. Behind and perpendicular to this hemicycle
is a small round building identified as a “tempio.” This building consists of a cella,
whose wall, indented by seven rectangular niches, is faced with five pilasters and
fronted by a hexastyle pronaos. Ligorio’s drawing has been linked with a plan of L.
Bufalini (1551), which shows a similar, semicircular portico ending in antae and a
round building described as the “Templum Solis.” Although excavations have proven
that neither plan is accurate, the temple, curved exedra, terraces and rooms they
feature are principal components of the garden.

Remains of Asiaticus’ building program include walls that frame the Horti’s
perimeter and a huge complex set on axis with the Mausoleum of Augustus.

This complex comprises a semicircular portico with fountain niches, acting as both an
ambulatio and a sustaining wall for the terrace that opened before it and was bounded

---

172 PIR V 25. Asiaticus’ gardens were planned on such an impressive scale that they may have
Possibly as a result or by falling prey to Messalina’s (PIR V 161) greed and cunning (see Tac. ann.
committed suicide in 47 (Tac. ann. 11.1).
173 Tac. ann. 11.1; Cass. Dio 60[61].31.5.
Licinii Luculli and the Sanctuary at Praeneste to account for the similarities of plan. Although he
speaks in favor of the gardens as a strict imitation of the Sanctuary, it is more likely, especially as the
principal buildings date to the time of Asiaticus, that Ligorio creatively conflated the remains on the
175 In his city plan of 1552 (see #37), Ligorio refers to the round building as the “Templum Fortunae.”
176 X. Paciotti (1557), M. Cantaro (1576), S. Du Pérac (1577), and A. Tempesta (1593) also produced
plans of this site, see #37.
177 Broise and Jolivet 1999, 265-6.
178 The E and N walls were incorporated by Aurelian into his network of fortifications. Broise and
to the west by dining rooms.\textsuperscript{180} Dated to the reign of Claudius by a brick stamp,\textsuperscript{181} Asiaticus’ complex has been identified with the \textit{nymphaeum Iovis} located in Regio VII from a contemporary capital decorated with eagles and thunderbolts, attributes of Jupiter.\textsuperscript{182} The round temple located above the portico,\textsuperscript{183} at the end point of its axis with the Mausoleum, is considered a Temple to Fortuna. This attribution is based on an inscription that ties a mid-Republican sanctuary of Fortuna to this site.\textsuperscript{184}

In addition to this inscription, portions of perimeter walls, columns, and capitals have been linked to the first Temple of Fortuna.\textsuperscript{185} Of Asiaticus’ Temple, two boundary walls exist,\textsuperscript{186} while what remains of the Temple building dates to the fourth century AD, contemporary with Regionary Catalogues that refer to it as \textit{novum} or built “anew.”\textsuperscript{187} While Asiaticus may have been influenced by the pre-existing sanctuary in constructing his Temple and nymphaeum, the orientation of his complex suggests that he intended to link it both visually and ideologically to the Mausoleum of Augustus. Through this connection, he may have sought to strengthen his political ties with the deified emperor and, by extension, with Imperial command.\textsuperscript{188} His Temple of Fortuna, the goddess who shaped human destiny, and his nymphaeum to the all-powerful Jupiter were the most effective means in his power to achieve these aims and, by doing so, demonstrate his desire for an illustrious fate.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{180} The portico extends between the Villa Medici and Trinità dei Monti, while the dining rooms are preserved beneath the convent. Broise and Jolivet 1996a, 69. \\
\textsuperscript{181} While a brick stamp could point to construction undertaken during his successors’ reigns (see #56 above), based on the extent of Asiaticus’ building program, it seems likely that the complex dated to his ownership. \\
\textsuperscript{182} Broise and Jolivet 1990, 473-4, and 1996a, 69; De Spirito 1996b, 353. For later modifications to this complex, see Richardson, jr. 1992, 200, and Broise and Jolivet 1996a, 70. \\
\textsuperscript{183} The Temple was probably accessed via a set of ramps or stairs from the exedra. Broise and Jolivet 1996b, 455. \\
\textsuperscript{184} CIL VI 184; cf. Broise and Jolivet 1990, 474. \\
\textsuperscript{185} See #37. The Temple of Fortuna lies underneath a Renaissance pavilion known as the Parnassus. \\
\textsuperscript{186} See #37. \\
\end{flushright}
The Shrine of the Lares Augusti, Ostia (#23)

A small circular building (#23) at the center of Ostia’s Forum has been identified as a Shrine to the Lares Augusti, protectors of the Imperial household, based on seven inscribed plates found in its vicinity. These plates, discussed by H. Bloch, indicate the Shrine’s founders as well as the dates of its dedication and a key ceremony connected with the cult. While four of these plates signal donations made at the Shrine, the curvature of three corresponds to that of its remains, a brick ring encircled by a cornice and embedded with six rectilinear niches. The three curved plates formed part of the revetment and architrave of the Shrine, otherwise enigmatic due to its absence of columns, commonly employed in aediculae, and more significantly, of an entrance.

Although it is difficult to tell how the Shrine functioned from its remains, the first two inscriptions studied by Bloch identify it as a Laribus Augustis sacrum, set up during the reign of Claudius by magistri primi de sua pecunia. These magistri primi are named in the third and fifth inscriptions as L. Seius Hermeros, L. Seius Primus, and L. Seius Diomedes, while the dates of the Shrine’s dedication, 1 January 51 AD, and lustratio, 26 June, appear in the fourth inscription. The magistri primi, also alluded to in the sixth and seventh inscriptions, were the first...
stewards of the cult at Ostia. Though the cult of the Lares Augusti was established in Rome as early as 7 BC, it took Claudius, who embraced the religious policies of Augustus, to promote its introduction to Ostia in 51. The *magistri primi*, whom he assigned to oversee the cult, began their first term on the Shrine’s dedication day and took part in the *lustratio*, a cleansing ceremony connected with its inauguration.

While the cult of the Lares Augusti was not among the most prominent in the Empire, the Shrine’s location is significant as it demonstrates the importance of the Imperial cult, underlined by the nearby Temple of Augustus and Roma, at Ostia. This relationship is stressed further by a reorganization and amplification of the cult in the late first century AD and by the construction of a seat or hall of its magistrates on the Decumanus Maximus in the mid-second century.

**Nero: (54–68 AD)**

While his contributions to the development of Roman architecture had a significant impact on later round temples, Nero was only directly responsible for rebuilding the Temple of Vesta (#57) at Rome.

**The Temple of Vesta, Rome (#57)**

---

197 For the organization of the cult at Rome and a discussion of its shrines and altars, see Bloch 1962, 219-20 n. 16, and Bakker 1994, 129-32 and 201.
199 See Bloch 1962, 222-3, for evidence of the Lares at Ostia prior to the Claudian period.
200 Bloch 1962, 221.
201 Bakker 1994, 122-3. For a Roman shrine of the Lares Augusti, which refers to this ceremony on its *architrave* (*CIL* VI 451), see Bloch 1962, 222.
202 Alföldi 1973, 42.
204 Pavolini 1989, 213-4; Pensabene 1996b, 214-5.
Based on Tacitus, who lists a *delubrum Vestae* among the sanctuaries destroyed in 64 AD and restored by Nero, R. Scott has suggested that both the Temple of Vesta (#57) and its Area Sacra were repaired at the end of Nero’s reign. His hypothesis is supported by Julio-Claudian brick stamps used to restore a collapsed drain and to restructure the east side of the precinct, as well as by representations of the Temple on Neronian coins. These aurei and denarii, minted after 64, depict the Temple as a monopteros set on a stepped podium with Ionic columns and a domed roof. The Temple is identified by a seated figure of Vesta, holding a scepter and a patera, who appears beneath a smoke hole. Nero’s coins, which closely resemble those minted to celebrate Caesar’s reconstruction, suggest that, though he repaired the Temple, he did not significantly alter its design.

**Round temples dated to the Julio-Claudian period:**

As part of Augustus’ commitment to reviving traditional beliefs, new temples to established gods were built throughout the Julio-Claudian period.

**The Perirrhanterion, Rome (#51)**

Excavations near the Theater of Marcellus in Rome have uncovered the foundations of a circular building (#51) illustrated on the Severan Marble Plan. The

---

205 However, some work on the Shrine of Venus (#55) may date to his reign as Vacca (et al. 1704, 58) notes that Neronian pipes were found in its vicinity. Due to their exceptionally large diameter, Lanciani (1888, 6) considers it unlikely that they signal the Shrine’s conversion into a nymphaeum.

206 Tac. *ann.* 15.41 and *hist.* 143.

207 Scott (1993a, 17) believes that *delubrum* refers to the Area Sacra of Vesta, not only to the Temple, while Nero’s rebuilding work also included additions to the Atrium Vestae.

208 *CIL* XV Suppl. 309-10; cf. Gatti 1899c, 50, and Scott 1993a, 17 and 1999b, 126.


210 See #57. The presence of the smoke hole proves that the Temple lacked a cult image (Ov. *fast.* 6.925-8; vs. Scott 1999b, 127, who implausibly proposes that a cult statue of Vesta was introduced in the 1st c. AD).
foundations, sited at the level of the Julio-Claudian pavement, appear on Fragment 31 in of the plan as one of two circles in an area delimited by the theater, the Porticus of Octavia, and the Temple of Apollo Medicus. Supporting a monopteros, whose remains date to the reign of Vespasian, they may mark a site connected with the worship of Apollo from the Archaic period. Literary sources refer to a sanctuary of Apollo in *prata Flaminia*; known as *Apollinar*, this sanctuary centered around a natural spring used for purification rituals. Based on its proximity to the Temple of Apollo, erected in the sanctuary in 433 BC, and possible parallels, E. La Rocca has proposed that the monopteros provided a shelter for the spring from the first century AD.

In addition to Frontinus, who refers to the spring as a source of Apollo, Plutarch may mention it in his narration of the murder of M. Marius Gratidianus. He describes how Catilina, after decapitating Marius, washed his hands of blood in the *perirrhanterion*. This term, which lacks a Latin equivalent, seems to refer both to a lustral source and to the implements employed in ritual cleansing. By using this term as well as language common to descriptions of human sacrifice, Plutarch may imply that Catilina followed traditional purificatory rites in his attempt to cleanse himself.

---

211 In addition, the Hellenistic Rotunda at Ilion (#14) may have been restored, while the Shrine of Apollo Delphinios at Miletos (#19) was rebuilt during the early Julio-Claudian period.
212 La Rocca 1993, 23-4, vs. 1999a, where he suggests that the foundations could be Flavian.
213 Rodríguez Almeida (1993a, 42) remarks on the limited accuracy of this fragment.
214 La Rocca (1993, 23-4 and 1999a) has identified the other circle as the Columna Bellica.
215 See Chap. VI #51.
216 Liv. 3.63.7, 4.25.3 and 40.51.6; cf. Aronen 1995a, 257. La Rocca (1993, 23) considers this one of three such sites in Rome.
217 For a discussion of the temple and its connection to lustral rites, see Viscogliosi 1993, passim.
218 La Rocca 1993, passim, and 1999a.
219 Frontin. *aq.* 1.4.
221 La Rocca 1993, 22 and 1999a.
223 La Rocca (1999a) speculates that the rituals undertaken at the source of Apollo may have been intended for victorious generals returning to triumph in the city.
If the monopteros served as a shelter for the *perirrhanterion*, then, La Rocca suggests, it may find parallels in the Rotunda at Ilion (#14), the Monopteros at Pompeii (#28), and the Shrine of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste (#30).\(^{224}\) However, although they rested on wells, there is no evidence to show that any of these monuments either originated as natural springs or were employed in ritual purification. Moreover, their prime locations suggest that they functioned as the Mundi of their cities.\(^{225}\) A closer match is the Shrine of Venus Cloacina, a circular platform surmounted by a balustrade, whose involvement with ritual cleansing is attested in the sources.\(^{226}\) Like the Perirrhanterion, which may have been fed by a pipe alongside the Temple of Apollo Medicus,\(^{227}\) the shrine of Venus found a constant water supply in the Cloaca Maxima.\(^{228}\) For its use of a monopteros however, the Perirrhanterion may have more in common with Hellenistic tholoi at Argos and Miletos (#19), which served as monuments to the healing and cleansing powers of Apollo.\(^{229}\)

**The Shrine of Hercules, Rome (#41)**

Although not attested in written sources, significant archaeological remains point to the existence of a round Shrine (#41) beside the Tiber. The Shrine stood in an area adjacent to the later Pons Aelius, which may have served as a port in the late Republican and early Imperial periods. Local finds of marble fragments as well as an

---

\(^{224}\) La Rocca 1993, 20.

\(^{225}\) The same reasoning applies to the Mundus in the Roman Forum (#49), which La Rocca (1993, 21) also cites as a possible parallel.


\(^{227}\) La Rocca 1993, 23. This pipe may have been installed after the natural source ran dry.

\(^{228}\) The shrine is only a valid parallel if, like the Perirrhanterion, its source was once natural.

\(^{229}\) For the Tholos in the Sanctuary of Pythian Apollo at Argos, see Robert 1939, 6 and 421.
inscription naming a *portus vinarius* have led scholars to propose that the port serviced the marble or wine-producing industries. Through its location, the Shrine may have had some involvement in the trading activity of the port.

The Shrine rested on an earlier pier projecting at an angle into the river, which its excavator D. Marchetti identified as part of a bridge. This pier, formed of tufa *opus quadratum*, extended beneath the Shrine and a hemicycle. Consisting of fifteen columns and two projecting antae, the hemicycle was aligned with the back of the Shrine, most likely a monopteros, which in turn was preceded by a rectangular altar. The altar, which features a bucranium above the crossing of two plane branches, is stylistically comparable to work of the Julio-Claudian period.

In addition to the altar, three capitals have been found which pertain to the Shrine or the hemicycle. Highly unusual, they appear wrapped by a lion skin, while, like the altar, their rich detail and naturalistic carving date them to the Julio-Claudian period. Though the lion skins suggest that the Shrine honored Hercules, Marchetti prefers Liber based on a fragmentary inscription discovered nearby. This

---

230 *CIL VI 9189-90*, cf. 9181a-c and 9182, *CIL VI 8826*, and Flambard 1987, 201-10.
231 Marble: Marchetti 1891, 53-60 and Flambard 1987, 204; wine: Rodríguez Almeida 1993c, 154-5.
232 Marchetti (1891, 46-7; cf. Rodriguez Almeida 1993c, 154) dates the pier to the Augustan period, but attributes the Shrine to the third century AD (see Chap. VI #41). As he notes, the relative positions of both structures go against assigning them the same date, though it is more likely that the pier was Republican and coincided with the opening of the port. See Flambard (1987, 203-4 n. 52) for the dating limits imposed by the pier’s use of both Grotta oscura and Anian tufa.
233 Marchetti 1891, 45.
234 Strong 1961, 92; Paris 1979, 264-5. Though Marchetti (1891, 46) identified them as vines, their slender branches and broad leaves with five three-toothed lobes are typical of plane or sycamore trees. Uncommon in the Roman decorative repertory, plane branches also appear on brick stamps of the *figlinae Platinianae*. Coarelli 1996n, 94.
235 See “Statuary” below.
236 The cult image of the Temple of Hercules *in foro Boario* (#43) incorporates this motif (see Chap. IV “Statuary”). However, hoping to support his attribution of the Shrine to Liber (see below), Marchetti (1891, 46; cf. Azzurri 1892, 175-7 and Dayan 1979, 334) interprets the animal skin as a panther’s.
237 von Mercklin 1962, 278; La Rocca 1984, 63. However, Dayan (1979, 334) dates the capitals to the 2nd c. and Marchetti (1891, 46) to the 3rd, while Rodriguez Almeida (1993c, 154) believes that the base was reused and does not speculate on the date of the capitals.
inscription, now lost, read LIB[ER] and may have adorned either the Shrine’s architrave or a round base.\textsuperscript{239}

Like the Shrine’s remains, its location is of limited help in determining the god to whom it was dedicated. If sited in a port, it recalls the Temple of Hercules Victor \textit{ad portam Trigeminam} (#44), which may have honored Hercules for his military might, symbolized by his labors, or for his role as the patron of merchants.\textsuperscript{240} While both aspects of Hercules could be represented, it is equally possible that, if the port was employed in the wine trade, the Shrine honored Liber-Bacchus, the god of wine. To account for both possibilities, E. Rodríguez Almeida suggests that the cults of Hercules and Liber were fused in this area of the port.\textsuperscript{241} However, lacking verification of Marchetti’s inscription, Hercules seems the better choice based on the capitals, which employ one of his most potent attributes.

\section*{III \ ANALYSIS}

\subsection*{TEMPLE FOUNDATION AND LOCATION}

Many of the principles that guided the foundation and location of temples in the late Republic remained valid in the Julio-Claudian period.\textsuperscript{242} In the tradition of “victory temples,” the Senate decreed a Temple to Mars Ultor on the Capitoline (#46), while to express his allegiance to Vesta, whom he served as Pontifex Maximus, Augustus set up a sanctuary in his house on the Palatine (#56). Once private, his house became public with the incorporation of her sanctuary and the Temple of Apollo. Agrippa’s Pantheon (#50) also began as a private foundation as did Valerius

\textsuperscript{239} Architrave: Marchetti 1891, 46, Platner and Ashby 1929, 251, and Dayan 1979, 334; altar: Gusman 1901-1914, pl. 30.
\textsuperscript{240} See Chap. IV #44.
\textsuperscript{241} Rodríguez Almeida 1993c, 154.
Asiaticus’ Temple of Fortuna on the Pincio (#37). Among the public temple foundations, the Rotunda at Corinth (#9) was vowed by a local magistrate, while the Athenian people founded the Temple of Roma and Augustus (#4) and religious orders set up the Shrine of the Lares Augusti at Ostia (#23).

As in the late Republic, the Campus Martius proved an appealing choice for temple foundations. Central to this area were Agrippa’s horti, which served as the focal point of his building program. The Pantheon, its main feature, may have opened towards the south to face the Basilica Neptuni or the north in the direction of the Mausoleum of Augustus. Even if, by facing south, the Pantheon was tied to Agrippa’s military prowess, its location near the site of Romulus’ apotheosis lends it a dynastic quality. This quality would be enhanced by its orientation of 355°, if the Pantheon faced north, which marks the region of the sky in which Julius Caesar’s famous comet of 44 BC appeared. Moreover, a northern orientation would establish sight lines not only with the Mausoleum, but also with Augustus’ Horologium and Ara Pacis. Coarelli has suggested that the Pantheon, linked to other significant projects of his reign, formed the centerpiece of buildings which, albeit indirectly, promoted the Imperial cult in Rome.

By orienting his Temple of Fortuna towards the Mausoleum, Valerius Asiaticus may have drawn on the same ideology in attempting to link his fate with

---

242 See Chap. IV ‘Temple foundation and location.’
243 As private dedications, they may be comparable to the late Republican Shrine of Venus (see Chap. IV #55).
244 Until further excavations reveal which reconstruction is correct (see #50 above), the implications of both should be considered.
245 If Ziolkowski is right (see #50 above), the Campus Martius would be fitting for Agrippa’s victory monument.
246 This comet marked the beginning of the ludi Victoriae Caesaris (Plin. nat. 2.93). Nissen 1873, 549; Hautecoeur 1954, 166; Gros 1976a, 149.
247 La Rocca 1999b, 282.
248 Coarelli (1988, 74-5) suggests that Augustus was inspired by Hellenistic cities like Alexandria, where buildings as diverse as gymnasia, temples, and mausolea were brought into the service of the ruler cult.
Augustus’. Even more than the Campus Martius, hill sites like Asiaticus’ horti allowed sight lines to be created with ease, while providing space for new constructions.

As for the Pantheon and the Temple of Fortuna, the locations of the Perirrhanterion (#51) and the Shrine of Hercules (#41) were determined in relation to important landmarks. The Perirrhanterion may have been built to shelter a natural spring of Apollo next to the Theater of Marcellus. This role would explain its awkward proximity to the Theater, as well as its orientation towards the Temple of Apollo in Circos. Similarly, the Shrine of Hercules’ location near a port, facing the Campus Martius, may reflect the god’s role as both a protector of merchants and a patron of military victors.

Outside of Rome, prominent locations were held in high esteem. The Shrine of the Lares Augusti occupied a central position in the Forum of Ostia, while the Rotunda rose above the Lower Agora at Corinth and the Temple at Athens, crowning the Acropolis, stood among the most sacred buildings of the city. Sited on axis with the Parthenon, the Temple was near the Erechtheion, from which it drew its proportions and ornament.

The Julio-Claudian period reveals a duality in the relationship between round temples and their environment. The Temple at Athens, the Rotunda at Corinth, the Shrine at Ostia, and more subtly, the Pantheon’s round court, stand in sharp

---

249 The impact of Fortuna as the goddess of fate is enhanced by the complex’s similarities to the Sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste, see #37 above.

250 This is also characteristic of late Republican temple foundations, see Chap. IV ‘Temple foundation and location.’


252 See ‘Decorative details’ below. In both the Greek and Roman periods, temples to the ruler cult were sited in significant locations, cf. Ephesus and Caesarea (Ios. antiqu. 15.339). Zanker 1988, 298.

253 Like the Shrine at Ostia, that of Apollo Delphinios at Miletos (#19) was framed by a rectilinear court, but was balanced or harmonized (see below) by two semicircular exedras.
contrast to the rectilinear buildings or porticoes that frame them. The Temple of Fortuna, the Perirrhanterion and the Shrine of Hercules rather strive to harmonize with neighboring features, echoing the curves of the semicircular portico on the Pincio, the Theater of Marcellus and the hemicycle. Inspired by the Temple at Praeneste (#31), which mirrors the form of the portico that precedes and almost conceals it, these temples are successful in creating continuity by reflecting and engaging with their surroundings. Both of these trends will have an impact on the location of future round temples.

**BUILDING MATERIALS AND TECHNIQUES**

**Masonry techniques**

Two of the masonry techniques employed in the construction of late Republican round temples found favor in the Julio-Claudian period. *Opus quadratum*, the Greek method used to best advantage in the Temple of Hercules Victor ad portam Trigeminam (#44), appears in the foundations of Agrippa’s Pantheon (#50) and is simulated in the marble revetment of the platform at Corinth (#9) and of the Shrine of the Lares Augusti at Ostia (#23). Similarly, *opus reticulatum*, known from the Temple of Fortuna Huiusce Diei (#38), is used in the platform’s core as well as in the perimeter walls of the Temple of Fortuna on the Pincio (#37).

Both of these techniques, employed in the foundations of the Perirrhanterion (#51), are frequent features of early Imperial architecture. While *opus quadratum* is

---

254 As in the Hadrianic Pantheon (see Chap. VI #50), the contrast between round and rectilinear forms in these buildings, hemmed in by their surroundings, may have been more apparent from their interiors.

255 The hemicycle in turn reflects the banks of the Tiber.

256 See Chap. IV #31.
usually confined to large-scale building projects, *opus reticulatum* is more widespread. Its ease of production and suitability for a range of building types ensures its use through the early second century AD,\(^{258}\) when it is eclipsed by *opus testaceum* or brickwork. *Opus testaceum*, formed from courses of kiln-fired bricks, was first used in selected monuments of the early Julio-Claudian period\(^{259}\) and more widely to rebuild Rome following the fire of 64 AD. This method, quicker and more economical than *opus reticulatum*, was employed in the wall of the Shrine at Ostia.\(^{260}\)

**Roofing techniques**

Like the majority of late Republican round temples, most dating to the Julio-Claudian period employed timber roofs. The Rotunda at Corinth (#9) preserves sloping marble plates, carved as tiles, and a finial indicative of a timber roof.\(^{261}\) Though no longer extant, timber roofs can be reconstructed for the Temple of Roma and Augustus (#4) and probably for the Perirrhanterion (#51) and the Shrine of Hercules (#41).\(^{262}\)

Although the time-tested pattern afforded by Greek roofs was appealing to most round temple builders, some may have begun to experiment with the possibilities of Roman domes and vaults. While the Temple at Praeneste (#31) may have been roofed by an early dome, coins depict a dome on Nero’s Temple of Vesta (#57). Moreover, according to La Rocca’s reconstruction, an annular vault may have

\(^{257}\) The foundations and screen wall of the Temple of Roma and Augustus at Athens (#4) may have employed this technique.  
\(^{258}\) Adam 1994a, 133 and 141.  
\(^{259}\) The first large-scale building project to employ brick was Tiberius’ Castra Praetoria, 21-23 AD. Adam 1994a, 145. The other masonry technique developed at this time, namely *opus vittatum*, was not used in Julio-Claudian round temples. Adam 1994a, 135 and 139, and see Chap. VII ‘Masonry techniques.’  
\(^{260}\) Almost all buildings constructed in Ostia from the 2nd c. AD were brick. Adam 1994a, 145-6.  
\(^{261}\) For comparable Greek roofs, see Chap. IV ‘Roofing Techniques.’
ringed the round court of Agrippa’s Pantheon (#50). This vault, formed from concrete poured on a wooden scaffolding, would have resembled those known from Praeneste’s Terrace of the Hemicycles. Though a key feature of later round temples, Roman domes and vaults were not in wide enough use until the second century AD to support the existence of a dome on the Temple of Vesta or a vault in the Pantheon.

**BUILDING COMPONENTS**

As in the late Republic, the foundations and podia of Julio-Claudian round temples, where known, follow both Greek and Italic trends. Like the Temple of Hercules Victor *ad portam Trigeminam* (#44) and the Shrine of Hermes and Maia on Delos (#10), the Perirrhanterion (#51) rests on rings of stone blocks, albeit arranged around a concrete core. Roman concrete is also employed in the ring foundations that enclose the circular court of the Pantheon (#50) and in the platform beneath the Rotunda at Corinth (#9).

Both the Pantheon and the Rotunda moreover include Roman podia. According to either reconstruction, the Pantheon is reached by a stepped porch. While, if La Rocca is correct, this porch might resemble a Hellenistic propylon, the height and access stairs of its podium would recall almost any Republican or contemporary Roman temple. Similarly, the Rotunda at Corinth rests on a high platform that serves as its podium. Accessed by side stairs, it is less conventional, but

---

262 A concrete dome, too heavy for any of them to support, would have been especially out of place in the Temple of Roma and Augustus.
263 In the 1st centuries BC and AD, domes were confined to bath buildings like the “Temple of Mercury” at Baia. Sear 1982, 79-80; Adam 1994a, 186-7. For Nero’s contributions to the history of the dome, see ‘Introduction’ above.
264 The Temple of Roma and Augustus and the rectangular cella or porch of the Pantheon rest on stone blocks, while the Rotunda at Corinth may have incorporated a poros layer between its core and revetment.
265 The Temple of Vesta’s (#57) concrete foundations remained unchanged from the late Republic (see Chap. IV ‘Building components’).
does have parallels in the Temples of Apollo in Circo, Venus Genetrix and Divus Iulius.\textsuperscript{268} While the Shrine of the Lares Augusti at Ostia (#23) lacked a podium, like the Perirrhanterion (#51), the Temple of Roma and Augustus at Athens (#4) employed a Greek krepis to support its colonnade.\textsuperscript{269}

Comparable to the moldings favored in the late Republic, those extant from the Rotunda at Corinth and the Shrine at Ostia employ forms common to the Greek repertory. Likewise, the preserved Attic column bases from the Temple of Roma and Augustus are near copies of those used in the Erechtheion, as are the shafts with lotus and palmette collars, Ionic capitals and entablature. The Attic bases of the Rotunda at Corinth, its Corinthian capitals and Ionic entablature also have Greek origins, albeit less clearly defined, as do the Corinthian capitals of the Pantheon. Perhaps the best expression of Greek influence on Augustan round temples is the Pantheon’s caryatids which, not previously attested in Roman architecture, are attributed to a famous Greek craftsman.\textsuperscript{270} To balance this influence, the figurative capitals of the Shrine of Hercules (#41), unusual for any period,\textsuperscript{271} use a Roman Corinthian capital as their base.

In their overall form, most of the round temples datable to the Julio-Claudian period are reminiscent of their late Republican and Greek precedents.\textsuperscript{272} Among the few exceptions are the Pantheon, whose round court would have few parallels, the Shrine at Ostia, a drum without an entrance, and the Shrine of Hercules, whose hemicycle lacks clear comparanda. These exceptions, inspired by the experimental

\textsuperscript{266} Loerke 1982, 52.
\textsuperscript{267} Temple of Divus Iulius serves as a good contemporary example.
\textsuperscript{268} Favro 1984, 220 n. 93 and 222.
\textsuperscript{269} The Rotunda at Corinth rests on a single step.
\textsuperscript{270} Diogenes of Athens is credited with the bronze capitals and caryatids of the Pantheon (see #50 above). For the caryatids used in the forum of Augustus, see Gros 2001, 477.
\textsuperscript{271} See ‘The column capital’ below.
\textsuperscript{272} For comparable monopteroi, see Chap. IV ‘Building components.’ The screen walls of the Temple of Roma and Augustus may find parallels in the Temple of Aphrodite at Knidos (#16).
spirit of the first Augustan architects, like the more conventional round temples, fit within the framework of Augustan and Julio-Claudian architecture as it develops in Rome and the provinces. Taken as a microcosm of Roman architecture at this date, they show Augustus’ emphasis on traditional Greek and Italic forms and use of exuberant ornament, combined with developments in the Corinthian order that will comprise his legacy.

DECORATIVE DETAILS

The podium molding

As in the late Republic, the molding preserved from Julio-Claudian round temples relies heavily on the Greek cyma recta and reversa.²⁷³ The simple, angular crown of the platform at Corinth (#9) incorporates a cyma recta between two sets of fascias and fillets, while its base molding consists of a torus, fascia, and cyma reversa, surmounted by two fillets. Between a torus and fillets, the base molding of the Shrine of the Lares Augusti at Ostia (#23) employs a deeply sloping cyma reversa.

While the Shrine’s projecting molding recalls the base of the Temple of Hercules at Ostia, ca. 75-70 BC, both it and the Rotunda at Corinth, whose verticality is shared by the Temple of Juno Sospita in the Forum Holitorium, follow many Julio-Claudian temples in eschewing the extravagant profiles of the late Republic.²⁷⁴

²⁷³ See Chap. IV ‘The podium molding.’
²⁷⁴ Adam 1994b, fig. 37 nos. 7 and 12. Comparable Augustan moldings may be found in Temple A of the Area Sacra di Largo Argentina and in the temples of the Forum Holitorium (Adam 1994b, 50-1 fig. 37; Gros 1996a, 134-5), while the moldings of the Temples of Fortuna Huiusce Diei (#38) and of Portunus are among the most exuberant of the late Republic, see Chap. IV ‘The podium molding.’
Instead, their use of moldings recalls that of Classical Greek temples, whose elegant and refined finish was much admired by Augustan architects.\textsuperscript{275}

**The column base**

Developed during the late Republic,\textsuperscript{276} the Roman version of the Attic base is used in almost all Julio-Claudian monuments, both in Italy and in the provinces.\textsuperscript{277} Of the round temples, the Temple of Roma and Augustus at Athens (#4)\textsuperscript{278} and the Rotunda at Corinth (#9) had bases of this type. Resting on the krepis of the Athenian Temple and the stylobate of the Rotunda, their bases consisted of two tori separated by a scotia and two fillets. Like most Julio-Claudian bases, they are carved independently of the column shafts,\textsuperscript{279} but do not rise from plinths, a common feature of the late Augustan period.\textsuperscript{280}

**The column shaft**

Like the Pantheon’s (#50) caryatids, the form and ornament of the Temple of Roma and Augustus’ (#4) column shafts derived from the Erechtheion at Athens. Not only are their spacing and entasis comparable, but their collars decorated with alternating palmettes and lotus flowers are direct quotations of the column collars.

\textsuperscript{275} The strip that surmounts the crown molding of the Rotunda adds to its finished effect. First used in the Temple of Fortuna Huiusce Diei, in the Augustan period, it appears in Temples of Juno Sospita and of Janus in the Forum Holitorium. Gros 1996a, 134.
\textsuperscript{276} See Chap. IV ‘The column base.’
\textsuperscript{277} Augustus’ Temple of Mars Ultor preserves several good examples (see Kockel 1995). Strong and Ward-Perkins 1962, 7-8.
\textsuperscript{278} The massing of the base is similar to that of the more complex Ionic bases along the east side of the Erechtheion. Binder 1969, 77.
\textsuperscript{279} This marks a departure from late Republican practice, see Chap. IV ‘The column base.’
\textsuperscript{280} Though common in the Classical and Hellenistic periods, this practice was not favored in the late Republic. Strong and Ward-Perkins 1962, 5 and 11-2; Gros 2001, 495.
used along the Erechtheion’s east façade. This decorative band, framed by bead-and-reel and egg-and-dart molding courses, native to fifth century Greece, is reflected in ornament of the Basilica Paulli and the Milliarium Aureum at Rome.

**The column capital**

As in the late Republic, Julio-Claudian architects preferred to use the Corinthian order for most new temple foundations. Appealing for their ornamental quality, Corinthian capitals were especially valued in Rome for their adaptability and associations with Greek culture. In Greece however, all three orders were employed through the Augustan period, when Ionic capitals featured in the Temple of Roma and Augustus (#4). These capitals, topped by a band of egg-and-dart molding, are closely related to the capitals of the Erechtheion’s east face, though their abacus is larger and their volutes are wider and more pronounced.

While their basic form and components were established by the late Republic, the style and proportions of Corinthian capitals were not yet formalized. The first Augustan examples, in contrast to the rich and organic decoration of late Republican capitals, appear both flat and stylized. Their leaves, with deep nerves, lobes symmetrically opposed, and uniform hollows, are set beneath caulicoli whose
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281 Binder 1969, 78-84. See ‘The entablature’ below, for the comparable frieze course of the Rotunda at Corinth (#9).
282 Locri provides a more organic 5th c. BC example. Binder 1969, 85 pl. 9.
283 By comparison to the collars of the Temple of Roma and Augustus, their ornament appears more rigid and geometric. Binder 1969, 87 and pl. 10b.
284 See Chap. IV ‘The Corinthian capitals of the round temples.’ Nero’s repair of the Temple of Vesta (#57) retained the Ionic order employed in the late Republic.
285 Favro 1984, 210; Zanker 1988, 106. It is the adaptability of Corinthian capitals that allowed them to serve as a base for the figurative capitals of the Shrine of Hercules (#41), see below.
286 Gros 1996a, 160.
287 See Strong and Ward-Perkins (1962, 17) for examples of this motif used on the abacus of Corinthian capitals.
289 Gros 1996a, 145; cf. Chap. IV ‘The Corinthian capital in the late Republic.’
vertical ridges and broad rims open up to a controlled flourish of volutes and helices.  

By the later Augustan period however, a trend towards natural and autonomous forms begins to emerge, wherein leaves are shown elongated and spread more freely across the surface of the capital. Most notable in capitals from the Temple of Mars Ultor, this increased naturalism soon surpasses that of late Republican capitals, whose two-block construction restricted both the height and spread of their ornament. Like the late Augustan capitals, those of his successors couple an interest in naturalism with high quality carving.

Although few in number, the Corinthian capitals preserved from Julio-Claudian round temples adhere to the trends set by Augustan architects in Rome. The capitals of the Rotunda at Corinth (#9) employ two tiers of acanthus leaves, whose rigid nerves are combined with lightly folded lobes and irregular hollows. As these tiers begin to invade the zone of the volutes and helices, a third extends from the calices to frame the volutes. This unusual feature, which also appears in the Tiberian Temple of Castor, is complemented by a second, a rosette rising on a thin stem to rest on the capitals’ abacus.

Onto the form of the Corinthian capital, the capitals of the Shrine of Hercules (#41) graft a lion skin, widening at the top where the paws supplant the volutes.

290 This is especially true of the capitals of the Temples of Divus Iulius, Saturnus, and Apollo Palatinus. Strong and Ward-Perkins 1962, 13-5; Gros 1976a, 209-10, 1996a, 145, and 2001, 476.
291 Gros (1996a, 145; cf. Heilmeyer 1970, 50-1) links this development to influences from Asia Minor, where asymmetrical arrangements of forms, particularly the leaves of capitals, were common.
292 Heilmeyer 1970, pl. 2.1 and 3.3; Gros 2001, 476-8. Slightly earlier, and less naturalistic, examples may be found in the Temple of Apollo in Circo. Leon 1971, 149-50, 157-8, 160, 162, 164-5, and pl. 60.1, 62.1 and 63.1-2; Gros 1996a, 145; Viscogliosi 1996a, 88-9 and 108-9.
293 Chap. IV ‘The Corinthian capital in the late Republic.’ By the mid-1st c. AD, all capitals, regardless of size, were carved from a single block. Strong and Ward-Perkins 1962, 12; Gros 2001, 477.
294 Heilmeyer 1970, 127; Gros 2001, 484.
295 Heilmeyer 1970, 61 and 67 (comparable capitals at Roman Corinth). Their use of the Corinthian order, in contrast to the Athenian Temple’s Ionic, may be a conscious reference to Rome.
Symmetrically modeled, the lion’s head is finely carved with deep hollows used to define its eyes, mouth, and mane. These hollows, effecting a contrast between light and shade, lend an organic quality to the capitals’ surface. Like their refined execution and use of naturalistic forms, comparable subject matter on a capital of late Republican or Augustan date may help to assign them to the Julio-Claudian period. This capital, depicting a lion’s scalp with its mane wrapped around clubs, though less finely modeled, uses deep carving, light and shade to define the lion’s features. Less typical of Julio-Claudian capitals than those of the Rotunda at Corinth, the lion skin capitals, nonetheless, partake of the experimental spirit shared by many Julio-Claudian craftsmen.

The entablature

Introduced into the Roman repertory in the late Republic, the modillion cornice, the defining element of the Corinthian entablature, becomes a regular feature of Augustan architecture in Rome. Outside of Italy however, standard Ionic entablatures continue to be used throughout the Julio-Claudian period. The Temple of Roma and Augustus at Athens (#4) preserves a modest example with a three-fascia architrave, a blank frieze course, and egg-and-dart molding in place of dentils.

296 Examples may be found in the Temples of Apollo Palatinus and Divus Iulius. Strong and Ward-Perkins 1962, 14.
297 Dayan 1979, 334-5.
298 For debates surrounding their date, see #41 above.
299 von Mercklin 1962, 277-8 no. 660.
300 Though less apparent in the architecture of Augustus’ successors (prior to Nero), architects and craftsmen did not entirely abandon their interest in experimentation when Augustan Classicism was formalized, see Gros 2001, 484 and below.
301 See Chap. IV ‘The entablature.’
302 Though omitted from Vitruvius’ treatise on Roman architecture (see Gros 1976a, 197-201), modillion cornices may be found in the Temples of Divus Iulius, Apollo Palatinus and in Circo, and Mars Ultor. Gros 1976a, 207-7, 210-1 (Divus Iulius), 221-7 (Apollo in Circo), and 231-4 (Mars Ultor).
Like the entablature on the east face of the Erechtheion, that of the Temple incorporates bead-and-reel astragals and a cyma reversa as frames for its frieze course.

These motifs, common from the Augustan period, also appear as crown moldings in the Ionic entablature of the Rotunda at Corinth (#9). This entablature includes a three-fascia architrave, an anthemion frieze course, and dentils. With comparable examples in the Temples of Mars Ultor and Castor and the Forum of Augustus, its frieze comprises palmettes alternating with S-shaped volutes. While the Rotunda’s frieze is more stylized than the Roman examples, anthemion friezes as such are common to Rome and her provinces from the Augustan period.

**Pavements**

Like temples of the late Republic, Julio-Claudian round temples incorporated mosaic flooring into their decorative programs. These lively, often multi-colored surfaces leave few traces, but may be reconstructed for the Rotunda at Corinth (#9) and perhaps the round court of the Pantheon (#50). R. Scranton, who excavated the Rotunda, has suggested that its rough stylobate provided a base for light mosaic

---

305 Both entablatures are remarkably similar in form, even though the Erechtheion incorporates a figured frieze. Baldassarri 1998, 47.
306 For Julio-Claudian astragals, see Strong and Ward-Perkins 1962, 24.
307 Based on Classical models, this cyma reversa closely resembles examples from the Basilica Paulli and the Forum of Augustus, see Ganzert 1988, 116-7 nos. 3-4.
308 Strong and Ward-Perkins 1962, 18.
309 The Rotunda’s cyma reversa finds parallels in Julio-Claudian buildings like the Basilica Paulli (see Leon 1971, 173 pl. 67.2; Ganzert 1988, 120 no. 12), the Forum of Augustus (see Leon 1971, 106 fol., 169, 174, and pls. 67.3 and 68.1-2), and the Temple of Castor (see Strong and Ward-Perkins 1962, 22-3).
310 Like all Augustan dentils, these are both tall in proportion to their width and closely set. Strong and Ward-Perkins 1962, 24.
312 Strong and Ward-Perkins 1962, 18; Wegner 1992, 43.
313 See Chap. IV ‘Stucco and mosaic work.’ No traces of wall paintings or ornamental stucco work have been preserved.
work.\textsuperscript{314} Similarly, if La Rocca’s Agrippan date for the layer beneath Hadrian’s floor is correct, its bedding and marble plates suggests that it carried an \textit{opus sectile} pavement like that of the Hadrianic Pantheon.\textsuperscript{315}

**Statuary**

Ancient sources, both written and iconographic, attest to the presence of statues in the majority of the Julio-Claudian round temples. As in the late Republic, the choice of statuary was closely tied to the intentions of the temples’ founders and the requirements of the cults.\textsuperscript{316} The Imperial cult was celebrated indirectly in the Pantheon (#50) and openly in the Shrine of the Lares Augusti (#23) and the Temple of Roma and Augustus (#4). Aware that Augustus was unwilling to be numbered among the gods in Rome, Agrippa placed his image on the Pantheon’s porch and in its interior, divine statues that may have signaled his future apotheosis. In the Shrine at Ostia, inscribed plaques allude to statues or altars that commemorated the \textit{genius} of Claudius, while outside of Italy, statues celebrating Augustus and Roma in the Temple at Athens equated the Imperial cult with Hellenistic ruler cults and the Greek gods.\textsuperscript{317}

Tied to his personal and political propaganda is the statue erected in the Sanctuary of Vesta on the Palatine,\textsuperscript{318} which emphasized her allegiance to Augustus. Moreover, if Torelli is correct, a statue of Victoria displayed in the Rotunda at Corinth (#9) may signal his gratitude to Agrippa. Alternatively, according to Scranton, the

\textsuperscript{314} Scranton 1951, 24.
\textsuperscript{315} Ziolkowski (1999, 55; cf. La Rocca 1999b, 280) also compares this pavement to the geometric flooring of Hadrian’s Basilica Neptuni.
\textsuperscript{316} See Chap. IV ‘Statuary.’
\textsuperscript{317} Similarly, the base built to honor Attalos I at Pergamon (see #4 above) set a statue of a Roman emperor in a sanctuary of Athena, the city’s protecting divinity.
\textsuperscript{318} See \textit{InscrIt} XIIIF 66 = CIL I\textsuperscript{5} 213 and #56 above.
Rotunda and its podium may have served as a display gallery for Aphrodite and other Greek statues. 319

The only sculpture preserved from the Julio-Claudian round temples is an altar linked to the Shrine of Hercules (#41). This altar, which depicts a bucranium above the crossing of two plane branches, is stylistically appropriate to the early Julio-Claudian period. Framed by molding, including rows of cyma reversa, 320 the altar’s central motif recalls the Ara Pacis in its realistic modeling and delicate execution of forms. 321

PROPORTIONAL ANALYSIS (Charts V.1-6)

Since Vitruvius was a contemporary of Augustus, his recommendations regarding temple and column design may be more applicable to early Imperial round temples than to their predecessors. 322 Unlike those of Greek tholoi and late Republican round temples, 323 the proportional relationships employed by the Rotunda at Corinth (#9) show a high correlation to Vitruvius’ monopteros. 324 The Rotunda, like his model, has a 10:1 ratio between its column height and lower column diameter, in turn related to its architrave height by 2:1. Moreover, its column height is almost equal to its stylobate diameter. Vitruvius’ relationship between column height and
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319 For arguments regarding its attribution, see #9 above.
320 The crown molding is similar to examples found in the Basilica Paulli (Ganzert 1988, 117-18 no. 3) and the Temple of Roma and Augustus (see ‘The entablature’ above), while the base molding recalls cyma reversas employed in the Temple of Apollo in Circo, the Ara Pacis, and the Forum of Augustus (Ganzert 1988, 117-20 nos. 8-10 and 13). The altar’s cyma reversa, with a pendant lotus flower, is more elaborate than that of the Rotunda at Corinth (see ‘The entablature’ above).
321 Characteristic of the Ara Pacis as a whole (see Torelli 1999), elegant modeling is a feature of the bucrania and garland frieze that spans the interior of its altar enclosure. Paris 1979, 264-5; Zanker 1988, 118 fig. 96.
322 But see ‘The entablature’ above (Vitruvius’ omission of modillions).
323 See Chap. IV ‘Proportional analysis.’
324 For references to Vitruvius, see Chap. II ‘Vitruvius on round temple design.’
lower column diameter is also followed by the Temple of Roma and Augustus at Athens (#4). 

In their proportions, the columns of the Rotunda at Corinth approximate Vitruvius’ pycnostyle arrangement, while those of the Temple at Athens come close to his prescriptions for diastyle. Within the Corinthian and Ionic orders however, neither building follows Vitruvius’ guidelines. Moreover, neither shows the 1:2 relationship between their base diameters and intercolumnation widths, which M. Wilson Jones suggests was popular from the Augustan period. Instead, the Rotunda’s base diameter to interaxial width is 1:2, while both it and the Temple enjoy comparable ratios among their base diameters, base heights, and lower column diameters.

The 6:5 rule for Corinthian column heights to shaft heights proposed by Wilson Jones is reflected in the Rotunda, while the Ionic Temple of Roma and Augustus fits his ratio of 10:9. For the relationship between column height and entablature height, Wilson Jones also ascribes a pattern to Corinthian temples, namely of 1:4, which is not picked up by the Rotunda. Interestingly, of the Roman temples he examines, the late Republican round Temples of Hercules Victor ad portam Trigeminam (#44) and at Tibur (#64) are farthest from his ideal.

---

325 None of the peripteroi or drums are sufficiently well-preserved to be compared to Vitruvius’ ratios. For the relationships applied to drums, see Chap. IV.
326 Wilson Jones (2000, 73) cites examples of this relationship, which he traces back to Hermogenes’ Temple of Dionysios at Teos and Pytheos’ Temple of Athena at Priene, in the Temple of Mars Ultor and the Maison Carrée.
327 Not surprisingly, their capitals, intercolumnations, and interaxial measurements differ significantly.
329 However, like the Temple at Athens, the Rotunda shows an almost 1:1 correspondence between its architrave and frieze.
330 Wilson Jones (1989a) draws conclusions about the proportions of the Corinthian order from nine well-preserved temples in Rome and Latium.
Returning to his concept of the critical dimension, the Perirrhanterion (#51) corresponds closely to the Rotunda in the relationship between its interaxial and external diameters. Beyond these correlations however, the Julio-Claudian round temples have little in common with each other, with Vitruvius or with Wilson Jones, even though as a group, they are more consistent in size than Greek tholoi and late Republican round temples.

IV CONCLUSION

With a rich architectural inheritance from the late Republic, Augustan architects had the freedom to experiment with forms and styles drawn from Italic and Greek sources. At the beginning of his reign, they enhanced buildings little different from their predecessors with lavish materials and decoration. While the Greek sources that inspired these early monuments were varied, by the late Augustan period, architects looked to Athens to provide material for their ornament. Among their models was the Erechtheion, after which the Temple of Roma and Augustus (#4) was styled.

The Erechtheion also inspired the caryatids of Agrippa’s Pantheon (#50). More than for its decoration, the Pantheon is significant as the first building in Rome to honor a living emperor. This type of dedication, attested at Athens in the Temple of Roma and Augustus and at Ostia in the Shrine of the Lares Augusti (#23), becomes widespread in Italy and abroad. Similarly, the styles and types of ornament employed

---

332 See Chap. IV ‘Proportional analysis.’ Unlike the Shrine of the Lares Augusti and the Perirrhanterion (#51), both the Rotunda and the Temple fit his criteria of simple ratios between parts (albeit loosely).
333 The total diameter serves as the critical dimension of both buildings.
334 The Rotunda, the Shrine at Ostia and the Perirrhanterion have critical dimensions of close to 5 meters, while the floor space of the Shrine of Hercules (#41), independent of its hemicycle, is comparable to that of the Rotunda.
335 Gros 1976a, 215 and 1996a, 144.
under the Julio-Claudians, including fully developed Corinthian capitals and modillion cornices, have an appreciable influence on the architectural decoration of the Flavian and Antonine periods.337

336 Moreover, the Temple of Mars Ultor employed cyma reversas and egg-and-darts that find parallels in the Erechtheion’s ornament. Strong 1953, 129.
337 See Chap. VI ‘Decorative details.’
CHAPTER VI: THE FLAVIANS THROUGH THE ANTONINES

I INTRODUCTION

After the reign of Nero, the Flavian dynasty returned to the ideals of Augustan Classicism through the conservative building program pursued by Vespasian and his son Titus. Vespasian’s second son Domitian, a more avid builder, completed many of their projects, while, in his own work, he emphasized interiors and light effects previously explored by Nero in his Domus Aurea.¹

Domitian’s monumental legacy is matched by that of Trajan, who inherited the empire from Nerva, to construct buildings of astonishing richness and beauty in Rome. In a sense, J. B. Ward-Perkins suggests, his architecture marks both the “climax and completion” of Augustus’ building program.² His successor Hadrian began a new era of experimentation, evident in his highly original Villa at Tibur and Pantheon (#50), both of which use rounded forms and the latest in building techniques to shape impressive, interior spaces.³

With the empire at its greatest expansion,⁴ Hadrian explored its limits for architectural inspiration more vigorously than any emperor had done before him. This is as evident from the buildings he constructed in Italy as from those that adorned the major provincial cities he visited throughout the Roman world.

II DISCUSSION

The Flavians: (69-96 AD)

¹ Ward-Perkins 1989, 100-4, and below.
² Ward-Perkins 1989, 84.
³ Ward-Perkins 1989, 105-11, and below.
⁴ Boatwright 2000.
**Vespasian: (69-79 AD)**

Unlike the excesses that characterized Nero’s building program, Vespasian’s was marked by both practicality and foresight. His first project, the rebuilding of the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, demonstrated his respect for traditional religion, while his second, the Temple of Divus Claudius, established his dynasty as the true successor of the Julio-Claudians. Allying himself with Claudius, he distanced his reign from Nero’s, underscoring this when he began construction of the Flavian Amphitheater on the site of Nero’s artificial lake. Finally, with the Templum Pacis, and possibly his rebuilding of the Perirrhanterion (#51), he established the Flavian period as an era of peace and prosperity.

**The Perirrhanterion, Rome (#51)**

Erected in the Julio-Claudian period, the Perirrhanterion (#51) was rebuilt under Vespasian. Remains from his reign include two Corinthian capitals and fragments of a curved entablature. The entablature, sculpted on both sides, consists of an inscribed, three-fascia architrave and a frieze course decorated with acanthus spirals and laurel branches. This course, surmounted by a modillion cornice, through its iconography and style, recalls the exterior frieze of the Temple of Apollo Medicus.

---

5 See Chap. V.
7 Rea 1993, 30-5.
8 The Templum Pacis was vowed and the Arch of Titus built in response to the capture of Jerusalem in 71 AD, see Santangeli Valenzani 1999, 285-6 and below.
9 His rebuilding is commemorated on the shrine’s architrave, see #51.
10 See below. The 2nd c. AD tholos in the macellum at Perge includes a similar double-sided entablature. De Ruyt 1983, 131-2.
Vespasian may have fulfilled a personal agenda in underlining the connection between these monuments, forged when the shrine was erected above the ancient spring of Apollo.\textsuperscript{12} E. La Rocca suggests that, by rebuilding the Perirrhanterion, the emperor commemorated Apollo for facilitating his and Titus’ victory over the Jews in 71 AD.\textsuperscript{13}

**Domitian: (81–96 AD)**

In addition to the building projects he inherited from Vespasian and Titus,\textsuperscript{14} Domitian undertook significant restorations at Rome. While most of his restoration work was focused on the Campus Martius, including the Temple of Fortuna Huiusce Diei (#38) and the Pantheon (#50), he also may have restored the Tholus of Cybele on the Sacra via (#34). Of his new constructions, many of which may have been designed by Rabirius,\textsuperscript{15} his most famous are the palace on the Palatine, the Forum Transitorium, and the stadium and Odeon in the Campus Martius,\textsuperscript{16} though he also built the ‘Temple of Minerva Chalcidica’ (#48) and a temple to his family, the *gens Flavia* (#40).

**The Temple of Fortuna Huiusce Diei, Rome (#38)**

Under Domitian, the Area sacra di Largo Argentina gained a travertine pavement, while its temples were restored.\textsuperscript{17} To the Temple of Fortuna Huiusce Diei (#38), layers of brickwork and stucco were added to fully incorporate its columns into

\textsuperscript{12} See Chap. V #51.
\textsuperscript{13} La Rocca 1993, 21-2.
\textsuperscript{14} These included the Amphitheater, the Baths of Titus, and the Temple of Vespasian. Ward-Perkins 1989, 73.
\textsuperscript{15} Rabirius is attested as the architect of the Palatine palace. Ward-Perkins 1989, 73.
\textsuperscript{17} Marchetti-Longhi 1970-1971, 9-13.
its first century BC cella wall. At a later date, the Temple received new travertine
stairs and a brick base and altar revetted in marble.

**The Tholus of Cybele, Rome (#34)**

Iconographic evidence has raised the possibility that Domitian’s reign saw the
rebuilding of a second round temple. The Tholus of Cybele (#34), dated to the late
Republic, has been linked with a denarius more commonly associated with a shrine in
the Circus Maximus. This coin shows a four-column temple, raised on a three-step
krepis, which carries an entablature, lion antefixes and a finial. Inside the temple is a
statue of Cybele holding a spear. Though difficult to determine its shape from the
coin, the temple has been interpreted as round, based on its similarities to coin
depictions associated with the ‘Temple of Minerva Chalcidica’ (#48).

More substantial than the coins are brick foundations found near the later
Basilica of Constantine and two terracotta reliefs discovered between the Temple of
Antoninus and Faustina and the ‘Temple of Romulus’ (#52). These reliefs show a
goddess carrying a patera and a long spear, while sitting on a high-backed throne
flanked by recumbent lions. The group appears on an oared boat.

Present on the Domitianic coin, the spear and lions are common attributes of
Cybele celebrated on later coinage, including a contorniate minted in honor of Diva

---

#38 and below) found inside the Temple may also date to the Domitianic period. Coarelli 1981a, 21.
19 These additions are not securely dated. Gros 1996a, 270.
20 Küthmann and Overbeck 1973a, 41-2 no. 77.
21 Unlike the elaborate cult image of the Temple of Magna Mater on the Palatine (Prud. perist. 10.156-
60, and Arnob. nat. 7.49; see ‘Statuary and reliefs’ below), it would have been conceivable to reorient
this statue (cf. Cass. Dio 46.33.3, and Chap. IV #34).
22 However, Küthmann and Overbeck’s arguments (1973a, 66 no. 127) are flawed as the coins linked to
Minerva Chalcidica may show a rectangular temple, see below.
23 See Chap. IV #34 and below.
25 These may be dated to the Flavian period based on comparable reliefs from Rome and Ostia. Simon
Faustina.\textsuperscript{26} This coin, which depicts Cybele seated inside a rectangular temple fronted by steps, though occasionally linked with her Tholus,\textsuperscript{27} is better associated with the Temple of Magna Mater on the Palatine.\textsuperscript{28} Similarly, the Palatine temple may be represented on the Haterii relief\textsuperscript{29} in the guise of a statue of Cybele.\textsuperscript{30} Like Faustina’s coin, this relief, together with an Antonine medallion that shows the Shrine of Hercules (#41),\textsuperscript{31} has been identified incorrectly with her Tholus on the Sacra via.\textsuperscript{32}

The Pantheon, Rome (#50)

The fire of 80 AD damaged or destroyed several significant buildings in the central Campus Martius.\textsuperscript{33} Among them were the Pantheon (#50) and the Saepta Iulia, constructed by Agrippa as part of his large-scale building program.\textsuperscript{34} Domitian’s restoration of both buildings is attested by the sources,\textsuperscript{35} and in the case of the Pantheon, by physical remains. These remains include an upper bedding layer found beneath the rotunda of Hadrian’s Pantheon.\textsuperscript{36} Its similarity to the Agrippan layer suggests that Domitian’s rebuilding, obliterated by lightning under Trajan,\textsuperscript{37} adopted the Pantheon’s original plan.

\textsuperscript{26} Kühthmann and Overbeck 1973a, 27-8 no. 44; Vermaseren 1977, 37.

\textsuperscript{27} Nash 1961-1962, Vol. 2: 34.

\textsuperscript{28} The building’s shape and steps are prominent features of the Palatine temple. See Hülsen 1895b, 28, for the role the stairs may have played in the Ludi Megalenses (Lucr. 2.618 fol., Cic. har. resp. 24, and Liv. 36.36.4-5).

\textsuperscript{29} For an analysis of the buildings represented on the Haterii Relief, see Richter 1885, 418-23, and Castagnoli 1941, 59-69.

\textsuperscript{30} It is unreasonable to suppose, like Castagnoli (1941, 67), that Cybele was a “filler” used in response to \textit{horror vacui}.

\textsuperscript{31} See #41 below.

\textsuperscript{32} Haterii relief: Vaglieri 1903, 28, Jordan and Hülsen 1907, 103-4, Esdaile 1908, 369, Graillot 1912, 334, Platter and Ashby 1929, 325, and Lugli 1946, 219 and 1947, 177-8. Medallion: see #41 below.

\textsuperscript{33} Cass. Dio 66.24.2.

\textsuperscript{34} See Chap. V #50.


\textsuperscript{36} It is possible that the stairs (#50 and Chap. V; cf. Wilson Jones 2000, 182) and the fragments of marble revetment (#50 and Gruben and Gruben 1997, 55) found beneath Hadrian’s pronaos are of Domitianic date.

\textsuperscript{37} Oros. \textit{hist. 7.12.5} and Hier. \textit{chron. a. Abr. 2126}.  
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Domitian’s so-called Temple of Minerva Chalcidica (#48) is known from a variety of sources, both written and iconographic. It is only within recent years however that these pieces of evidence have been taken together to locate and describe the building. The Regionary Catalogues place it in the Campus Martius, while a later source defines its position between the Temple of Isis and Serapis and the Pantheon (#50). An early Medieval church which preserves its name, S. Maria sopra Minerva, may also suggest its location, though it is only with new work on the Severan Marble Plan that the building has been sited accurately. In addition to placing it within its topographical context, the Plan indicates the building’s shape and scale, while a coin minted under Domitian and a drawing by the Renaissance artist, Onofrio Panvinio, may show its elevation.

Plate 31 of the Marble Plan has been restored to illustrate the Campus Martius from the Porticus Divorum to the Saepta Iulia. C. Hülsen identified a round building, located between the Divorum and the Serapeum, as a fountain. He based his hypothesis on a fragmentary inscription, ]VACHR[--]A, above the building, which he restored as lavacrum or ‘circular fountain.’ E. Sjöquist refined Hülsen’s theory, emending the inscription to [LA]VACHR[VM] A[GRIPPAE] in reference to Ammianus Marcellinus’ appellation of the Baths of Agrippa.

---

38 Curios. urb. p. 125 VZ I.
39 Mir. 22, 50 VZ III (see #48).
41 See #48.
42 Cod. Vat. Lat. 3439 f. 25r.
43 The Divorum was at least begun, if not completed by Domitian. Coarelli 1995a, 19-20.
44 Hülsen (1903, 39-46; cf. Petersen 1903, 320) erroneously attributed to it the pinea or gilded pine cone on display in the gardens of the Vatican.
45 Amm. 29.6.17; see Ghini (1996b, 40-2) for more common ways of referring to the Thermae Agrippae. This inscription was first interpreted by G. Bellori (1673, 23; cf. Sjöquist 1946, 99-105) as [LA]VACHR[VM] A[GRIPPINAE].
Through the discovery of an additional fragment, which reads MI, both Hülsen’s and Sjöquist’s readings have been proven incorrect. More likely is MI[NE]RVA CHA[LCIDIC]A, wherein her epithet may suggest links to a cult of Athena in Chalkis or the Chalcidicum, equivalent to the Atrium Minervae near the Curia. Based on the inscription, L. Cozza concluded that the building represented on the Plan was a temple to Minerva Chalcidica. A fourth century source links Domitian with a temple dedicated to this goddess in the Campus Martius, while Pliny records the existence, though not the location, of a temple of Minerva constructed by Pompey in 62 BC. Domitian’s temple may have been a restoration of Pompey’s or more likely, a new foundation.

The building illustrated on the Severan Marble Plan is highly unusual. Set within a circular precinct, it is approached by four sets of steps, linked by niches, while it includes a rectangular object that may represent a statue base. This depiction has been related to Panvinio’s drawing, based on a work of Pirro Ligorio, which shows half of a round temple with an external peristasis of twenty-four columns, a cella wall with four entrances, and an internal colonnade of sixteen columns. The subject of the drawing is identified in its margins as the Temple of Isis and Serapis or of Sol.

In addition to its label, elements of the building’s plan speak against associating the drawing with Domitian’s dedication to Minerva Chalcidica. While the

---

46 de Caprariis 1996, 255; vs. Lundström 1929, 369, and Schürmann 1985, 14. A round building was also used to honor Athena at Magnesia on the Meander (#18), see ‘The Antonines’ below.
49 Chronogr. a. 354 p. 146 M.
50 Plin. nat. 7.97.
52 Cod. Paris. f. 309.
53 Castagnoli 1952, 100-1.
Marble Plan shows four stairs, possibly suggesting four entrances, it does not include columns, which are normally depicted for peripteral temples.\textsuperscript{54} Moreover, the drawing omits the stairs and the rectangular base, for which L. Richardson’s suggestion, namely that they were removed as part of Septimius Severus’ restoration of the building, is purely hypothetical.\textsuperscript{55} The one element that can support a connection between the Plan and the drawing is their comparable size, which may be coincidental.\textsuperscript{56}

Like the drawing, a coin issued under Domitian, ca. 94 AD,\textsuperscript{57} has been associated with this building. It depicts a round temple on a three-step podium with Corinthian or Composite columns supporting a three-fascia architrave, a flat roof, and florette- and globe-shaped acroterial sculpture.\textsuperscript{58} A statue of Minerva, shown with a helmet, spear and round shield, appears inside the temple. This statue type is depicted on other Domitianic coins\textsuperscript{59} and recalls a statue of Minerva found in the vicinity of S. Maria sopra Minerva.\textsuperscript{60} While the statue may be associated with Domitian’s building, the coin is problematic in that it depicts columns and a flat roof, which makes the temple appear more rectangular than round.\textsuperscript{61}

Both the drawing and the coin would support a reconstruction of this building, namely with a stepped podium, cella,\textsuperscript{62} colonnade, and roof, which is almost

\textsuperscript{54} On the same plate, the Divorum and Serapeum are both depicted with colonnades.
\textsuperscript{55} Richardson, jr. 1992, 256.
\textsuperscript{56} The drawing includes foot measurements, see Castagnoli 1952, 100-1.
\textsuperscript{57} This forms part of a series of five coins minted by Domitian to celebrate temples constructed during his reign. Also included are depictions of the Temples of Jupiter Capitolinus, Cybele, Jupiter Victor, and Serapis. Hill 1989, 29.
\textsuperscript{58} Cf. Schürmann 1985, 14 pl. 16c (comparable gem).
\textsuperscript{59} Minerva is frequently shown on Domitianic coinage in her capacity as warrior goddess, both alone and with Domitian, see BMCEmp II 363 nos. 296-7, 370 no. 332, 381 no. 376, 386 no. 395, and 389 no. 408.
\textsuperscript{61} On coins, round buildings are usually shown with conical roofs, see #57 for examples illustrating the Temple of Vesta in the Roman Forum.
\textsuperscript{62} In order to reveal the cult statue, cella walls may be absent from the coin depiction.
incompatible with the depiction on the Marble Plan. Closer parallels to the Plan are provided by fountains, which share its round form, sets of steps, niches, and central ‘base’ or fountainhead. In Flavian examples found near the Lacus Iuturnae, basins, recalling the outer circle on the Marble Plan, support stepped structures down which water once cascaded. Moreover, the building known as ‘Minerva Chalcidica’ may follow lacus, as well as temples, by including a statue of the god to whom it was dedicated.

Though comparable in form, it should be noted that preserved fountains are much smaller than the building on the Marble Plan. Funerary monuments, known for reflecting other architectural types, may preserve both the form and scale of the round building. Among them are a tomb shown on an incised marble plan discovered on the via Labicana and a funerary monument known as S. Maria Capua Vetere. In plan, these examples combine a square base with a round core encircled by four niches, while in the elevation of S. Maria Capua Vetere, this plan translates to three levels: a base, an intermediary level with statue-filled niches, and a round monopteros. This elevation is corroborated by the commemorative monuments of the Julii at Glanum, ca. first century BC, and of C. Memmius, which forms part of the Domitianic forum at Ephesos.

---

63 Lugli’s reconstruction (1938, 110-2), though closer to the Marble Plan, is pure speculation based on Sangallo’s drawing of the ‘Temple of Portunus’ at Portus. Sjöquist 1946, 112-3 figs. 36-7.
65 This is usually interpreted as a circular precinct wall, see above.
66 The lacus Ganymedis and lacus Orphei serve as good examples. Aronen 1996a, 168; Coarelli 1996j, 171.
67 Tombs of this type may copy small fountains or their larger prototypes, if such buildings existed (cf. Tammisto 1989, 245).
68 Hülsen 1890, 52-60; Wilson Jones 2000, 72 figs. 4.4-4.5.
70 Rolland 1969; von Hesberg 1992, 121 and 139.
71 As C. Memmius was Sulla’s uncle, this building should be dated to the 2nd c. BC. Wiplinger and Wlach 1995, 79; vs. Weber 1990, 118-9 and cat. M24-6 (Augustan period).
Based on these parallels, it is probable that Hülsen and Sjöquist were correct after all in describing the round building on the Marble Plan as a fountain. This would suggest that the coin commonly linked to it represents an unknown temple of Minerva. Even without the coin evidence in support of its Domitianic date, the emperor’s well publicized devotion to the goddess⁷² makes it likely that the fountain, certainly earlier than the Severan Marble Plan, provided him another means of promoting his patroness and protector.⁷³

The Temple of the Gens Flavia, Rome (#40)

Domitian converted the domus of his family, the gens Flavia, into a Temple commemorating its divinized members (#40).⁷⁴ The Temple’s dedication can be dated to the last years of his reign, between the death of Titus’ daughter Julia in 89 AD,⁷⁵ whose ashes were interred in the Temple,⁷⁶ and Domitian’s death in 96. In addition to Julia’s, the ashes of Domitian⁷⁷ and most probably of Vespasian and Titus were contained in this monument,⁷⁸ praised by contemporary authors for its size and splendor.⁷⁹ Martial and Statius, in particular, commend the Temple as a reflection of the heavens.⁸⁰ Based on their testimony, modern scholars have concluded that it was both round and domed.⁸¹ The Pantheon (#50), often considered a monument to the

⁷³ Schürmann 1985, 14-5.
⁷⁴ Platner and Ashby 1929, 247; Rodríguez Almeida 1986, 57; Candilio 1995, 201; Coarelli 1995i, 368. Richardson, jr. (1992, 181) suggests that the domus may have been leveled to make room for the Temple. For the Sabine associations of the site, which may have influenced Domitian’s choice, see Torelli 1987, 570-2, and Paris 1994g, 78.
⁷⁵ See #40. Torelli 1987, 563; Coarelli 1995i, 368.
⁷⁶ PIR F 426.
⁷⁷ See #40.
⁷⁸ See #40. Rodríguez Almeida 1986, 57-8; Richardson, jr. 1992, 181; Candilio 1995, 201; Coarelli 1995i, 368.
⁷⁹ Martial and Statius (#40 and see below) also evoke the temple as a symbol of Rome’s aeternitas. Platner and Ashby 1929, 247; Richardson, jr. 1992, 181.
⁸⁰ Mart. epigr. 9.1.8-10, 3.12, and 34.1-2; Stat. silv. 4.3.19 and 5.1.240-1.
⁸¹ Altmann 1906, 88; Platner and Ashby 1929, 247; Richardson, jr. 1992, 181.
gens Iulia, has been taken as a precedent for this Temple in terms of its function, form, and celestial connotations.⁸²

Beyond describing the symbolic content of the Temple, the sources confirm its date, if simply by the coincidence that Martial’s and Statius’ poems which extol it can be dated to 95-96 AD,⁸³ and provide some indication of its location. Iconographic and architectural finds further define the Temple’s location and allow for its reconstruction. Suetonius notes that Domitian’s birthplace, namely his family domus, is sited in Regio VI ad Malum Punicum.⁸⁴ This is confirmed by the Regionary Catalogues, which locate the Temple of the Gens Flavia near that of Quirinus, the Horti Sallustiani and the Baths of Diocletian.⁸⁵ In addition, a cippus, found in the vigna Sadoleti,⁸⁶ and a water pipe, uncovered near the intersection of via XX Settembre and via Firenze,⁸⁷ both name T. Flavius Sabinus,⁸⁸ Vespasian’s brother, in whose domus Domitian was probably born.⁸⁹

Also near this spot on via Firenze were found several highly significant reliefs, whose date, refined workmanship, material, and subject matter suggest that they formed part of the Temple’s decorative scheme.⁹⁰ These Pentelic marble reliefs, excavated from an area to the north of the exedra of the Baths of Diocletian,⁹¹ show

---

⁸² Cass. Dio 53.27, but see Chap. V #50 as Agrippa’s Pantheon was not domed and may not have been round.
⁸³ Martial’s epigrammata IX and Statius’ silvae IV and V were written in late 95-early 96 AD. Torelli 1987, 563. Since both they and the Temple were vital to conveying Domitian’s dynastic message, Rodriguez Almeida (1986, 57-8) proposes that the Temple’s dies natalis, commemorated by the poems, was Domitian’s birthday, 24 October.
⁸⁴ Suet. Dom. 1.1.9, and see #40.
⁸⁵ See #40, and Paris 1994c, 16.
⁸⁶ CIL VI 29788: Inter duos / parietes / ambitus privat(us) / Flavi Sabini. The vigna was sited somewhere in the area defined by S. Andrea (whose construction led to the discovery of the water pipe), via XX Settembre, via Nazionale, and via delle Quattro Fontane. Rodriguez Almeida 1986, 56; Paris 1994c, 23.
⁸⁸ Tac. hist. 3.69; cf. PIR F 352.
⁸⁹ Coarelli 1995i, 368.
⁹⁰ For a full description of the fragments, see Paris and Gazda 1994.
⁹¹ Paris 1994b, 9, and 1994c, 23; Coarelli 1995i, 368.
both sacred and historical scenes that, as interpreted by R. Paris, have particular relevance for Domitian’s dynastic monument.\textsuperscript{92} Clearly recognizable among the relief fragments is the head of a flamen against the backdrop of a temple, whose pediment shows figures pertaining to the founding legends of Rome.\textsuperscript{93} Paris has identified the temple as that of Quirinus, or Romulus by his Sabine name, and sees the historical reliefs representing soldiers, Vespasian, and Victoria as an allusion to the Flavians’ success in the Civil War of 68-69 AD.\textsuperscript{94} She attributes the fragments to an altar-precinct laid out like the \textit{Ara Pacis Augustae},\textsuperscript{95} while Torelli and Coarelli associate the reliefs with an arch marking the entrance to the Temple.\textsuperscript{96}

A rare Roman sestertius minted under Domitian in 95-96 AD shows a decastyle temple set within two precincts, the first of which is dominated by an entrance arch.\textsuperscript{97} Another Domitianic coin, with a disproportionately large Jupiter seated inside a temple, may illustrate the elevation of this monument,\textsuperscript{98} while a relief found in the Forum of Trajan, which shows a decastyle temple behind a procession of two togati and four lictores, may depict its inauguration.\textsuperscript{99}

Two separate sets of remains have been attributed to the Temple of the Gens Flavia.\textsuperscript{100} The first, found beneath the Caserma dei Corazzieri, consists of a podium...
and the wall of a nymphaeum decorated with richly colored mosaics.\textsuperscript{101} Adjacent to the ‘Planetario’ of Diocletian’s Baths, the second forms part of a much larger rectangular precinct that stretches into the Piazza Termini, where traces of a substantial rectilinear podium have been uncovered.\textsuperscript{102} Both fall within the area defined by Suetonius and the find-spots of the \textit{cippus}, water pipe, and reliefs. Moreover, as both are of Flavian date, either podium may realistically pertain to the Temple.

Based on the evidence of the iconographic sources and physical remains, it seems impossible that the Temple of the Gens Flavia was round. Instead, Martial’s and Statius’ remarks regarding its celestial symbolism should be interpreted as referring to the apotheosis of the deceased interred inside it rather than to its form.\textsuperscript{103}

**Round temples rebuilt during the Flavian period:**

**The Temple of Vesta, Forum, Rome (#57)**

Aurei of Vespasian and Domitian may point to a restoration of the Temple of Vesta in the Forum (#57) during the Flavian period.\textsuperscript{104} Like the Neronian issues, which commemorated its rebuilding after the fire of 64 AD, they show a round temple on a stepped podium with Ionic columns and a domed roof. Vesta appears twice, on the apex of the roof as well as inside the temple, to aid in its identification.\textsuperscript{105}

\textsuperscript{101} Rodríguez Almeida 1986, 56; Torelli 1987, 568-9; Paris 1994c, 24-5; Coarelli 1995i, 369; de Vos 1996, 82. The Caserma is sited on via XX Settembre to the south-west of S. Susanna, a location which roughly corresponds to that of the \textit{Statua Mamuri} mentioned in the Regionary Catalogues. See #40 and Paris 1994c, 18.

\textsuperscript{102} Candilio 1995, 194-200.

\textsuperscript{103} See Torelli 1987, 563, and Chapter II ‘Cosmic implications of the round form?’

\textsuperscript{104} See #57. These issues do not, as Scott (1999b, 127) tentatively suggests, represent the Shrine on the Palatine, see Chap. V #56.

\textsuperscript{105} See Chap. V #57.
addition to their possible restoration of the Temple, Domitian restructured the Palatine ramp and began work on the Atrium Vestae.\(^{106}\)

**Trajan: (98-117 AD)**

Like Domitian’s, Trajan’s building program comprised both the restoration of significant monuments at Rome, including the Temple of Vesta in the Forum (#57), and new construction. Among his most important new buildings were his baths, forum and markets, designed by Apollodorus of Damascus.\(^{107}\)

**The Temple of Vesta, Forum, Rome (#57)**

In addition to completing Domitian’s restoration of the Atrium Vestae,\(^{108}\) Trajan undertook an ambitious rebuilding of her Temple (#57).\(^{109}\) To commemorate his reconstruction, illustrated on the contemporary Uffizi and Lateran reliefs,\(^{110}\) he reissued Cassius’ first century BC coinage.\(^{111}\) Like the coins, these reliefs show the Temple with an Ionic peristasis, suggesting that its order remained constant from the Republican period. On the reliefs, the Ionic columns are supported on plinths attached to a high podium. Grillwork fills the temple’s intercolumnations, while its interior is accessed by steps leading to a pair of doors. Its roof consists of a shallow

---

\(^{106}\) Scott 1999b, 127. The ramp ceased to be a link between the Forum and the Palatine with Trajan’s completion of the Atrium Vestae (see below). Steinby 1993, 149-59.

\(^{107}\) Ward-Perkins 1989, 84-5.

\(^{108}\) Trajan’s work on the Atrium Vestae is suggested by contemporary brick stamps found throughout the eastern part of the building and denarii minted under Trajan and Plotina, which depict the head of Vesta. Bloch 1936, 217-22. For the plan and building phases of the Atrium, see Bloch 1936, 216-25, Lanciani 1967, 228-34, Scott 1993b, 174-5, and Coarelli 1995k, 100-5.

\(^{109}\) Trajan, or the Senate acting on his behalf, may also have restored the nearby Regia. Scott 1999a, 189-92.

\(^{110}\) However, Cody (1973, 48) dates the Uffizi relief to the mid-first century BC, while the Lateran relief has been linked by its excavator, Santa Maria Serinari (1968, 189) with the base of the equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius, ca. 179 AD. Beyond their style, both reliefs show Ionic columns (see below), which date them to the Trajanic period or earlier, see Chap. VII #57 (Corinthian columns of the Severan period).

\(^{111}\) See Chap. IV #57.
cupola with a knob finial. The temple is framed by a tree and an Ionic portico on both reliefs and by four Vestals on the Lateran relief.

The reliefs probably inspired Renaissance drawings by an anonymous artist (Anonymous Destailleur), G. A. Dosio, and G. da Sangallo. In each of these, a round temple with Ionic columns, grillwork, and a cupola or conical roof is shown raised on a podium. In most cases, a tree and an Ionic portico appear behind the temple. R. Scott has associated the tree on the reliefs and drawings with the lucus Vestae located at the base of the Palatine and the portico with a series of rooms built by Trajan.

**Hadrian: (117-138 AD)**

To Hadrian’s reign can be attributed some of the greatest advances in round temple building since the late Republic. While the Pantheon (#50) ranks among his finest accomplishments, he also built round shrines or temples in his villa at Tibur (#63 and 65), Asia Minor (#27 and 59) and England (#8). Clearly fond of the round form, Hadrian even employed it for his mausoleum, an elaborate version of the Mausoleum of Augustus.

**The Pantheon, Rome (#50)**

---

112 Richardson, jr. (1992, 413) speculates that the knob may represent a statue base.
113 A 19th c. drawing by Canina is similar, see #57.
114 Cic. div. 145. Scott (1993a, 15-6, and 1999c, 129-30) reaches this conclusion based on analogies with scenes shown on medallions of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius and on remains of a pit discovered by Boni (1900, 172-83). He suggests that the reliefs commemorated the flowering or planting of a tree.
115 Scott 1999b, 127. Stucchi (1959, 14, 25, and 90-1) identifies the Ionic portico shown behind a temple to Vesta on the first century AD Sorrento Base with the Temple of Divus Iulius, see Chap. V #56.
116 His other major projects include the completion of the Temple of Divus Traianus in Trajan’s forum and the Temple of Venus and Roma on the Velia. Ward-Perkins 1989, 121 and below.
117 Medallions of Hadrian, which illustrate the Shrine of the Penates at Lavinium (#17; cf. Scott 1999c, 129), may suggest that it was restored or rebuilt during his reign. For the full extent of his building projects, see Boatwright 2000.
118 Wilson Jones 2000, 80.
Hadrian’s rebuilding of the Pantheon (#50), ca. 118-128 AD,\textsuperscript{119} was one of the most significant architectural projects of his reign. With much of the original building destroyed in 110 AD,\textsuperscript{120} his architects\textsuperscript{121} were free to construct a new Pantheon on its foundations. Unlike Agrippa’s building,\textsuperscript{122} his consisted of three parts: a pronaos, an intermediate block, and a rotunda. The pronaos was preceded by an entrance court, framed by porticoes, which aligned the Pantheon with neighboring buildings.\textsuperscript{123} A further set of buildings behind the rotunda, including the Saepta Iulia and the Basilica Neptuni,\textsuperscript{124} masked its curved exterior. By externally de-emphasizing its round form, they, like the Pantheon’s court, porch and intermediate block, helped to maximize its internal impact.\textsuperscript{125}

The pronaos of Hadrian’s Pantheon follows classical precedents in its design.\textsuperscript{126} Resting on a podium accessed by front and side steps,\textsuperscript{127} it displays eight Corinthian columns beneath an entablature and a triangular pediment.\textsuperscript{128} Four rows of columns fill its depth to create three aisles, two of which terminate in semi-circular niches and the third, in the rotunda’s entrance.\textsuperscript{129} Agrippa’s dedicatory inscription

\textsuperscript{119} See #50 (brick stamps).
\textsuperscript{120} Oros. hist. 7.12.5, Hier. chron. a. Abr. 2126, and above.
\textsuperscript{121} Strong stylistic similarities between late Trajanic and early Hadrianic buildings suggest that Apollodorus was involved in some of Hadrian’s projects. While these may have included the Pantheon, he did not take part in Hadrian’s designs for the Temple of Venus and Roma (cf. Cass. Dio 60.4.3) nor his villa at Tibur. Heilmeyer 1975, 316-47; MacDonald 1982, 129-37; Rasch 1985, 119; Wilson Jones 2000, 192 and 212.
\textsuperscript{122} See Chap. V #50. Both Beltrami’s and La Rocca’s reconstructions suggest that Agrippa’s Pantheon had two parts: either a rectangular cela and porch or a rectilinear porch and circular court.
\textsuperscript{123} MacDonald 1976, 27. The so-called ‘Arcus Pietatis’, found inside the court, is likely to have been a monumental statue base, vs. de Fine Licht 1966, 25-9, and Kleiner 1992, 253-5 (reliefs).
\textsuperscript{124} Hadrian rebuilt both buildings. Saepta Iulia: Hist. Aug. Hadr. 19.10, and Gatti 1999, 228; Basilica Neptuni: de Fine Licht 1966, 147-53, and Boatwright 1987, 48-9. The Basilica is connected to the rotunda by vaulted chambers, which may have served as buttresses for its dome.
\textsuperscript{125} MacDonald 1976, 62, and 1982, 111-8.
\textsuperscript{126} Gros (1996a, 176; cf. Cic. orat. 3.180) suggests that the traditional porch allows the domed drum, a form more common in bath buildings, to be understood as a sacred space.
\textsuperscript{127} Its front steps overlay an earlier set attributed to Agrippa or Domitian, see #50, above, and Chap. V.
\textsuperscript{128} For a plan of this pediment discovered on the grounds of the Mausoleum of Augustus, see Chap. V #50.
\textsuperscript{129} The porch’s bronze drop-vault ceilings were stripped by pope Urban VIII. MacDonald 1982, 98.
restored by Hadrian appears on the frieze course,\textsuperscript{130} while the positions of clamp holes suggest that an eagle and a \textit{corona civica} figured on the pediment.\textsuperscript{131} F. Coarelli has proposed that the eagle symbolized the apotheosis of Augustus,\textsuperscript{132} with whom Hadrian may have sought to associate himself by rebuilding the Pantheon.\textsuperscript{133}

The entablature, which runs beneath the pronaos’ pediment and roof,\textsuperscript{134} links it with the intermediate block. Its pavement serves as another visual link, though with the rotunda, as its geometric pattern continues into the rotunda’s interior.\textsuperscript{135} However, the intermediate block is the principal means of transition between the pronaos and the rotunda. Nearly as wide as the former and as high as the latter, it serves as the back wall of the pronaos and adapts to the curved form of the rotunda.\textsuperscript{136} The porch’s statue niches are embedded in the intermediate block,\textsuperscript{137} while pilasters flanking the niches visually continue the lines of the porch columns to the sides of the intermediate block as well as to the walls flanking the rotunda’s entrance.\textsuperscript{138} Between the pilasters are reliefs depicting sacrificial implements, garlands and candelabra\textsuperscript{139} which, together with the statues of Augustus and Agrippa that may have stood in the niches,\textsuperscript{140} fill out the intermediate block’s decorative scheme.\textsuperscript{141}

\textsuperscript{130} Other than the Temple of Trajan, Hadrian did not ascribe his name to buildings he built or restored (\textit{Hist. Aug. Hadr.} 19).
\textsuperscript{131} The \textit{corona civica} may reflect an honor granted Augustus by the Senate (\textit{R. Gest. div. Aug.} 34.2; Cass. Dio 53.16.4; Plin. \textit{nat.} 16.3-4), de Fine Licht 1966, 44-6; Boatwright 1987, 46.
\textsuperscript{132} Suet. \textit{Aug.} 97. Coarelli 1983a, 42-4, and Chap. V.
\textsuperscript{133} de Fine Licht 1966, 201-2; MacDonald 1976, 84.
\textsuperscript{135} de Fine Licht 1966, 38. For a description of the floor, see below and de Fine Licht 1966, 100-1.
\textsuperscript{136} de Fine Licht 1966, 59; Ziolkowski 1999, 58.
\textsuperscript{137} Additionally, the intermediate block contained two stairways, which provided access to the upper rooms and the rotunda’s roof. MacDonald 1976, 28, and 1982, 99.
\textsuperscript{138} For an analysis of the pilasters flanking the entrance, see Wilson Jones 2000, 205-6.
\textsuperscript{139} For the sacrificial implements, see Honroth 1971, 85 no. 86a-b.
\textsuperscript{140} Cass. Dio 53.27.
\textsuperscript{141} Herdejürgen 1990, 123-31; Ziolkowski 1999, 58.
Although the foundations of the pronaos and the intermediate block are continuous with those of the rotunda, some features of the Pantheon have caused scholars to doubt the cohesiveness of its plan and construction. Most notably, the brick fabric of the intermediate block and the rotunda is only bonded to a quarter of their total height. Further, the intermediate block displays a false pediment at a level visually more appropriate for the pronaos’ pediment, as well as two cornices which line up with the rotunda, but not with the pronaos.

P. Davies, D. Hemsoll and M. Wilson Jones have proposed an appealing solution. They suggest that the fifty foot shafts intended for the pronaos were either lost in shipment or became impossible to acquire after construction of the Pantheon had begun. When the news was relayed, its architects adjusted the pronaos and intermediate block to suit more readily available forty foot shafts, while continued work on the rotunda resulted in the incomplete bond. Were the original design carried out, the pronaos and the intermediate block would have shared a roof and the cornice of the pronaos would have formed the second cornice of the rotunda.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[142] de Fine Licht 1966, 59-62.
\item[143] For a summary of previous scholars’ views, see de Fine Licht 1966, 186-9.
\item[144] de Fine Licht 1966, 85-7; Ziolkowski 1999, 58.
\item[145] Wilson Jones (2000, 206) suggests that this compromise (see below) may have been inspired by the Propylaea to the Athenian Acropolis.
\item[146] For additional incongruities, see Davies et al. 1987, 134-40, and Wilson Jones 2000, 203-6.
\item[147] Davies et al. 1987, 134-40. For a summary of previous solutions, see de Fine Licht 1966, 186-9.
\item[148] Fifty foot monoliths were used for the Column of Antoninus Pius, Trajan’s Baths, and the Temple of Divus Traianus. As Trajan’s adopted son, it seems reasonable that Hadrian, faced with a limited supply, used the larger and more impressive columns for the Temple of Trajan in preference to the Pantheon. Wilson Jones 1999, and 2000, 208-10.
\item[149] Several shipwrecks, including that at Mahdia, include fifty foot columns among their cargo. Wilson Jones 2000, 209.
\item[150] Forty foot monoliths appear in the Temples of Vespasian, Antoninus Pius and Faustina, and Saturn, and the Column of Phocas. By opting for shorter columns, Hadrian was able to employ granite from the prestigious Mons Claudianus and monoliths, which were considered more impressive than columns made of drums. Wilson Jones 1999, and 2000, 211-2.
\end{footnotes}
The rotunda with its vast cupola serves as the culmination of Hadrian’s Pantheon. Its foundations consist of a concrete ring from which a cylindrical wall rises in three tiers. Each tier is differentiated by exterior cornices and interior openings linked by vaults and arches. A cupola springs from the top of the wall, though its base is concealed on the exterior by the drum, taller externally than internally, and by a series of step rings.

The first level or tier of the rotunda’s interior is marked by an undulating surface of exedrae opening inwards alternating with aediculae, which in turn mask chambers opening outwards. Sited along the Pantheon’s north-south axis, are the two main exedrae: the rotunda’s entrance and a large apse, which may have housed a tribunal of Hadrian. Pairs of Corinthian columns flank the main exedrae and front the remaining six exedrae and eight aediculae. The exedrae and aediculae displayed statues against a marble veneer that corresponded to the rotunda’s paving.

The second tier of the drum, framed by entablatures, includes a plinth as the base for a series of pilasters and vertical bands embedded with circles and squares. In-between sets of four pilasters are windows that let light from the rotunda into floorless rooms above the exedrae and aediculae. Besides the windows, the decoration of this tier corresponds with the columns of the lower tier and the coffers.

---

152 The chambers, which are accessed from outside the Pantheon, may have served as storage areas, though their primary functions were to lighten the load-bearing wall and speed the curing of the concrete during construction. MacDonald 1982, 100-3; Wilson Jones 2000, 187.
154 This arrangement is reminiscent of the late 1st c. AD courtyard of the Temple of Jupiter at Baalbek. Sear 1982, 247-8
155 See ‘Statuary and reliefs’ below.
156 de Fine Licht 1966, 71 and 84.
158 Though stripped of its decoration in 1747-1752, a segment of this tier was reconstructed by A. Terenzio based on descriptions and Renaissance drawings (Cod. Chigi F. vii.9; for existing fragments, see Micheli 1984, 55-64).
159 MacDonald 1982, 105-9.
of the cupola on the cardinal axes. Similarly, the rotunda’s floor is aligned with the drum and cupola on the north-south axis. Their use of the same, brightly colored stones helps to establish a rhythm between the floor and the two tiers, which enhances the climax achieved by the Pantheon’s dome.

Rising from the second tier, the dome, a hemisphere atop a cylinder, culminates in an oculus. The oculus worked together with the bronze sheathing that once plated the dome’s coffers to illuminate the rotunda. While its round form may have inspired Cassius Dio’s comparison of the Pantheon to the heavens, the dome is more likely to have reflected Roman interest in symmetry and perfect numbers than the celestial vault. Even in the absence of cosmic imagery, the Pantheon, with its richly ornamented space shaped by unprecedented feats of engineering, successfully conveys Hadrian’s Imperial message.

**The Temple of Zeus Asklepios Soter, Pergamon (#27)**

---

160 Wilson Jones 1999, and 2000, 189 and 194. Wilson Jones (2000, 192) cites the Porta dei Leoni and the Porta dei Borsari at Verona, the nymphaeum at Miletus, and the Library of Celsus at Ephesus as example of monuments whose lower and upper tiers are partially aligned.


162 The same relationship between drum and dome appears in the Domitianic bath building at Albano and the ‘Tor de’ Schiavi. Wilson Jones 2000, 184, cf. Vitr. 5.10.5 (bath buildings) and Gros 1996a 176.

163 Constantius II removed the bronze plates, leaving the bronze ring of the oculus, in 663 AD (LPD 1.149 and 343 and VZ 2.251 and 264). The lead plates which replace bronze on the exterior of the dome date to the papacy of Gregory III (731-741 AD; LPD 1.149 and 2.544; VZ 2.264).

164 The coffers, arranged in groups of five over twenty-eight rows, are asymmetrical, allowing their central field to be seen from anywhere in the rotunda. Wilson Jones 2000, 194.

165 They form a marked contrast to the exedrae, which, in shade for most of the day, break up the solidity of the drum. Ward-Perkins 1989, 116.

166 Cass. Dio 53.27.

167 The number twenty-eight, perfect as it equals the sum of its factors, is picked up by the number of columns and pilasters in the pronaos. Gruben and Gruben 1997, 68.

168 Ziolkowski 1999, 61, cf. Chap. II; vs. Hautecoeur 1954, 166, de Fine Licht 1966, 198-200, Passuello and Dissegnaf 1976, 65-6, MacDonald 1982, 119-21, and Gros 1996a, 178. Wilson Jones (2000, 182-3) suggests that the 28 coffers be understood as the phases of the moon, the oculus as the sun (whose course may have been tied to specific astronomical events), and the 5 rows of coffers as the remaining planets. He links the ground plan, divided into sixteen parts, to the Etruscan templum (see Chap. III ‘Augural divination in Archaic Italy: defining the Roman templum’).

169 Stierlin (1984, 106-11) suggests that, by employing such imagery, the Pantheon’s dome would have proclaimed Hadrian the cosmocrator.
The Temple of Zeus Asklepios Soter (#27)\textsuperscript{170} shows marked similarities, both structural and decorative, to the Pantheon (#50).\textsuperscript{171} Located in the Asklepieion at Pergamon, the Temple formed the focal point of the sanctuary, founded in the early fourth century BC.\textsuperscript{172} In the Hellenistic and Julio-Claudian periods, the sanctuary received some attention,\textsuperscript{173} though only during the reign of Hadrian, who took a personal interest in Pergamon,\textsuperscript{174} was it substantially rebuilt. In addition to the Temple, constructed by L. Cuspius Rufinus, consul in 142 AD,\textsuperscript{175} a massive propylon and three colonnaded halls were built to give definition to the sanctuary court. Other Hadrianic buildings at Pergamon include the Traianeum, the Sanctuary of the Egyptian gods, and part of the Gymnasium, which W. Koenigs and W. Radt have shown, probably employed the same workshop as the Temple of Asklepios.\textsuperscript{176}

Begun in the Hadrianic period, the new sanctuary court, accessed via a colonnaded street from Pergamon’s city center,\textsuperscript{177} was bordered by the propylon,\textsuperscript{178} the Temple and, along its north, south and west sides, by covered porticoes or halls.\textsuperscript{179} Under Antoninus Pius, a library, including a statue of the deified Hadrian, was added

\textsuperscript{170} For the Temple’s attribution, see Ael. Arist. 42.4, quoted by Habicht 1969, 13.
\textsuperscript{171} In addition to this Temple, Godfrey and Hemsoll (1986, 204-5) note that the Pantheon influenced the design of buildings connected with kingship, including the ‘Pantheon’ at Ostia (#24) and the Mausolea of Diocletian at Split and of Maxentius (see Chap. VII ‘The Temple of Romulus (#52)’). To this list can be added the Romano-Celtic Temple of Vesunna at Périgueux, cf. Gros 1996a, 184.
\textsuperscript{172} The early sanctuary, after its foundation by Archias, the first prytaneis of Pergamon, consisted of three small cult buildings and an Ionic temple of Asklepios. Radt 1988, 250-2.
\textsuperscript{173} For a discussion of the sanctuary’s late Hellenistic and early Roman building phases, which may have included a temple on the site of the rotunda (Ziegernae 1981, 30 and 39), see Radt 1988, 254-9.
\textsuperscript{174} Hadrian visited Pergamon in 123 AD, during the first of two trips to Asia Minor. Koenigs and Radt 1979, 340; Gros 1996a, 181.
\textsuperscript{175} Based on the date of Rufinus’ consulship, Wiegand (1932, 7; vs. Habicht 1969, 9-11) proposed that the temple was built in the Antonine period.
\textsuperscript{176} Koenigs and Radt 1979, 340-2; cf. Radt 1988, 49, for additional Hadrianic buildings at Pergamon.
\textsuperscript{177} The sacred way, which was elaborated with pillars, shops, and a series of funerary monuments in the early Imperial period, follows the primary Hellenistic approach. Radt 1988, 257-9.
\textsuperscript{178} The propylon, built by Claudius Charax, consul in 147, oriented visitors to the court’s east-west axis from the north-east axis pursued by the street. Radt 1988, 261-2.
\textsuperscript{179} Directly outside the sanctuary are a Hellenistic hall and a Hadrianic theater. Radt 1988, 264-5.
to the north of the propylon\(^{180}\), while in 200 AD, a round building employed as an Abaton (#26) was built beside the Temple.

Like the Hadrianic Pantheon, the Temple of Zeus Asklepios Soter consists of a columnar porch, an intermediate block, and a domed rotunda.\(^{181}\) Though only half the diameter of the Pantheon,\(^{182}\) the rotunda is very similar in construction and plan. Its concrete foundations, conforming to the natural slope of the terrain, are faced with ashlar masonry to the level of the podium. From the podium, the partially-preserved drum rose with courses of ashlar blocks to the springing point of the dome. The drum’s interior is punctuated by seven niches, arranged symmetrically,\(^{183}\) of which the largest, a round niche opposite the entrance, contained the Temple’s cult statue.\(^{184}\) Behind the Temple to the east, diametrically opposed to its entrance porch, is a free-standing tower linked by an arch. This tower included stairs to access the Temple’s roof,\(^{185}\) a dome with an oculus not unlike that of the Pantheon.\(^{186}\)

Similarly, elements of the Temple’s decorative and sculptural program recall the Hadrianic Pantheon. Its porch, accessed via steps, had four Corinthian columns supporting coffers and a sculpted pediment.\(^{187}\) To either side of the porch are pilasters set beneath an architrave and a pediment that framed the entrance to the rotunda, while directly below the dome, positioned for emphasis, is a cornice surmounted by an entablature and coffers.\(^{188}\) Inside the rotunda, the floor and the

---

\(^{180}\) The library was constructed by Flavia Melitine in honor of Hadrian. Radt 1988, 263.

\(^{181}\) For rooms formed by the junction between the intermediate block and the rotunda, see Ziegenaus 1981, 38-9.

\(^{182}\) Deubner 1938, 54; Radt 1988, 260.

\(^{183}\) Wiegand 1932, 11.

\(^{184}\) This statue may be depicted on coinage of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus. Deubner 1938, 54.

\(^{185}\) Wiegand 1932, 11-2.

\(^{186}\) A cistern beneath the rotunda’s floor formed part of the water catchment system associated with the oculus. Ziegenaus 1981, 41-4.

\(^{187}\) Radt 1988, 261.

\(^{188}\) Wiegand 1932, 12-4; Ziegenaus 1981, 47-59.
walls were revetted with marble to the level of a Corinthian entablature. Both the
niches, flanked by Corinthian pilasters, and the cupola displayed mosaics. 189

The sanctuary at Pergamon is consistent with what is known about the cult of
Asklepios and his worship in the city. While the Temple was the pilgrims’ first and
last point of contact with the god, the round Abaton, which supplemented Hellenistic
incubation rooms, 190 served as a location for effecting cures. 191 The sanctuary’s
connection to Hadrian, assured by building work begun during his reign, is
underscored by the fact that the emperor was frequently identified with Asklepios at
Pergamon. 192 As a site of particular interest to him, it is not unreasonable that
Rufinus’ architects chose to emulate Hadrian’s prized Pantheon in the Temple’s
design. Moreover, as a dedication to Zeus Asklepios Soter, its round form is not
without precedent. The fourth century BC Tholos in the Sanctuary of Asklepios at
Epidauros (#13) was one of the finest round buildings in the Greek world. 193

The round temples of Hadrian’s Villa, Tibur (#63 and 65)

Another major architectural project of Hadrian’s reign, his Villa at Tibur,
included two round Shrines. The smaller of the two, a domed drum that formed part
of his South Theater (#65), is known from physical remains as well as drawings by
Ligorio, Contini, Piranesi, Nibby, and Pannini. 194 Centered within a trapezoidal

---

189 Wiegand 1932, 13-4; Ziegenaus 1981, 60-5. The dome is formed of brick-faced concrete, see
Ziegenaus 1981, 46, and ‘Roofing techniques’ below.
190 Ziegenaus 1981, 76 and 97.
191 Robert 1939, 406-10; Radt 1988, 254 and 259-60.
71. A previous builder, Attalos III of Pergamon, also associated himself with Asklepios. Radt 1988,
254.
193 A small tholos may have covered the bothros in the Asklepieion at Athens. Robert 1939, 234-40,
325-6, and 406-7.
194 See #66. For a discussion of the South Theater, see MacDonald and Pinto 1995, 124-31.
precinct near the top of the cavea, the drum probably contained a statue base and may have been preceded, according to Ligorio, by a four-column porch supporting three statues. Fragments of a statue of Hercules found near the Shrine would suggest that its precinct incorporated some type of display, though whether this formed part of its porch cannot be resolved without further excavation.

As a shrine sited above a theater, the drum at Tibur has parallels in Pompey’s theater and temple to Venus Victrix in the Campus Martius, ca. 61-55 BC. In plan, it also recalls the Temple at Praeneste (#31), which rises above cavea, and, for its location in a private villa, the theater shrine in the Villa of M. Agrippa Postumus on Planasia.

The larger temple, the so-called Shrine of Aphrodite (#63), formed the centerpiece of an elaborate nymphaeum situated above the Valle di Tempe, the Villa’s eastern limit, and alongside one of its major entry routes. Though in a poor state of preservation, the nymphaeum, known as the Ninfeo Fede, can be reconstructed with a semicircular portico embracing the Shrine and two side apses, shaped as hemicycles. Ancillary rooms and a corridor complement this structure, all of which

---

195 MacDonald and Pinto (1995, 130) note that the shape and size of this platform is unusual for theater shrines.
196 The base is illustrated on an elevation by Pannini, cf. MacDonald and Pinto 1995, 128 fig. 159.
197 Ligorio’s porch is also notable for its multi-colored pavement, see ‘Mosaic and stucco work’ below. Hanson 1959, 72-3.
198 Winnefeld 1895, 125; Hanson 1959, 73.
199 Gros 1999, 120-1. The temporary tholos erected in honor of Zeus Sosipolis at Magnesia on the Meander may have stood above the city’s theater. Kern 1900, 98, 1.9, 44 (inscription); Fiechter 1937, 308; Robert 1939, 70-2; Roux 1992, 196.
200 See Chap. IV #31.
201 Hanson 1959, 73.
203 The Shrine appears on plans of Piranesi and Rossini. Aurigemma 1996, 44.
204 de Franceschini 1991, 140-2; Aurigemma 1996, 44.
rests on an artificial terrace.\textsuperscript{205} The Shrine, which faced west, consisted of twenty Doric columns supporting an entablature, coffers, and possibly a conical roof.\textsuperscript{206} Because of a copy of Praxiteles’ Aphrodite discovered in the nymphaeum,\textsuperscript{207} this monopteros is commonly associated with the sanctuary of Aphrodite Euploia at Knidos (#16). The sanctuary, which housed the original statue, may have been one of several famous sites that Hadrian recreated at his Villa.\textsuperscript{208} Although it is not mentioned among his copies,\textsuperscript{209} ancient sources and possible remains pertaining to the Knidian temple suggest that it was similar to Hadrian’s Shrine. In describing his visit to the Temple at Knidos, Pseudo-Lucian makes note of its garden precinct and two doors.\textsuperscript{210} Pliny also refers to the Temple, remarking that it “stands entirely open so as to allow the image of the goddess to be viewed from every side.”\textsuperscript{211}

Neither author assigns it a round form, but partly on the basis of the Shrine at Tibur, I. C. Love has identified a monopteros at Knidos as the Temple of Aphrodite Euploia.\textsuperscript{212} This fourth century BC Temple\textsuperscript{213} rises from an artificial terrace.\textsuperscript{214} Its eighteen columns rest on a stylobate fronted by steps, which are aligned with a rectangular altar. Inside the Temple is a marble statue base that may have supported

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{205} Lugli 1932, 112-4; de Franceschini 1991, 446 and 450.
\item\textsuperscript{206} de Franceschini 1991, 140. However, the columns may not have been strong enough to support a roof, see Coulton 1977, 84-5 and 154-9.
\item\textsuperscript{207} Schefold 1964, 56-9 fig. 2.
\item\textsuperscript{208} Hist. Aug. Hadr. 26.5. This incomplete listing includes places Hadrian visited as well as sites from the Underworld. Andreae and Ortega 1992, 69; Calandra 1996, 239 and 251. In this context, a shrine to Aphrodite Euploia, the patron goddess of sea travellers, seems particularly appropriate.
\item\textsuperscript{209} Andreae, Ortega (1992, 69) and Paribeni (1994, 16 n. 4) express concern that the Knidian Temple is absent from the list.
\item\textsuperscript{210} Ps. Luc. 11-18. Examples of tholoi with diametrically opposed doors may be found at Eretria, Aezani, and Taman. Roux 1992, 203-6 and 213-6.
\item\textsuperscript{211} Plin. (nat. 26.4.21) refers to the Temple as an aedicula, which Roux (1992, 198) considers worrying in view of the monopteros’ (and Hadrian’s Shrine’s) large size.
\item\textsuperscript{212} Pausanias (1.1.3) notes a number of temples to Aphrodite at Knidos.
\item\textsuperscript{213} Love 1970, 154-5, and 1972, 70-4.
\item\textsuperscript{214} Based on Hadrian’s Shrine, Love (1972, 74, and 1973, 424; vs. Calandra 1996, 250-1) assumed that the columns of the Knidian Temple were Doric and attributed the Corinthian capitals found on site to a later rebuilding.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Praxiteles’ Aphrodite,\textsuperscript{215} while Love links an area to the east with the gardens described by Pseudo-Lucian.\textsuperscript{216}

Neither the monopteros at Knidos nor Hadrian’s Shrine preserves doors. Though their absence has caused some scholars to identify a rectangular shrine to the west of the monopteros as the Temple,\textsuperscript{217} it is likely, as K. Schefold suggests, that her statue stood behind folding doors.\textsuperscript{218} Moreover, a round temple at Knidos would explain the long tradition of round shrines to Aphrodite.\textsuperscript{219} One of the first Roman temples to partake of this tradition is the Shrine of Venus in the Horti Sallustiani (#55).\textsuperscript{220} As the Horti belonged to Hadrian,\textsuperscript{221} this building may have influenced his decision to build the round Shrine at Tibur.

The use of a semicircular nymphaeum to enclose the Shrine may have a precedent in the Shrine of Hercules by the Pons Aelius (#41), a round monopteros set within a curved portico.\textsuperscript{222} By incorporating the Shrine into a nymphaeum, instead of a sacred precinct like the sanctuary at Knidos, Hadrian may have implied that his dedication was meant as a tribute to the goddess rather than a temple to her cult.\textsuperscript{223}

\textbf{The Temple of Tyche, Side (#59)}

\textsuperscript{215}Love (1972, 75-6) may have discovered a fragment of the Aphrodite statue, together with an inscription that may name Praxiteles.
\textsuperscript{216}Love 1972, 72; vs. MacDonald and Pinto 1995, 58.
\textsuperscript{217}For the rectangular shrine, see Love 1972, 75. Linfert (1981, 615) and Ridgway (1984, 80 n. 66) suggest that Hadrian’s Shrine conflated the statue of Aphrodite and the notable, but independent monopteros at Knidos.
\textsuperscript{218}Schefold 1964, 56. Folding doors may have been employed to restrict access to the cult statue of the Temple of Nemesis at Rhamnous. Roux 1992, 199.
\textsuperscript{219}MacDonald and Pinto 1995, 58-9. See Chap. IV #55 for an overview of this tradition, to which may be added a round shrine of Aphrodite at Roman Paestum. Sestieri 1953, 129-33.
\textsuperscript{220}See Chap. IV #55.
\textsuperscript{221}His active interest in the property is attested by brick stamps. Calandra 1996, 256.
\textsuperscript{222}See Chap. V #41 and below. Also comparable are coin depictions of the Macellum Magnum at Rome, which show a monopteros set against a portico, cf. Hill 1989, 40, and Pisani Sartorio 1996, 204-6.
\textsuperscript{223}Calandra 1996, 249-51.
The Hadrianic Temple of Tyche (#59), located in the Agora at Side, has been identified based on remains, both extant and described by early investigators, coins, and comparable temples. Remains of the Temple include its foundations, its podium fronted by steps, and part of its twelve-column peristasis. These Corinthian columns, echoed by twelve pilasters, support a three-fascia architrave and a frieze course. While the frieze above the colonnade displays acanthus, that above the pilasters is more elaborate with putti, garlands, and sculptured heads. On top of both entablatures are coffers and a conical roof.

By far the most interesting part of the Temple is the drop ceiling of its cella. Along the base of the ceiling ran a ring of twelve images, each of which represented a sign of the zodiac. Although uncommon, comparable ceilings may be found in the adyton of the first century AD Temple of Bel at Palmyra, where the seven planetary gods appear encircled by the zodiac, and in the west apse of the Temple of Hercules at Sabratha. Here, Marcus Aurelius, riding an eagle, may be shown at the center of the zodiac.

In sculpture, this theme is explored in a round Nabatean plaque from Khirbet Tannur, probably of the first century BC, where the zodiac is used as a frame for an image of Fortuna. Although she does not appear on the ceiling at Side, A. Mansel suggests that the Temple conveys the same idea, namely that Fortuna controls human

---

224 Fragments of the ceiling, now lost, were catalogued by F. Beaufort (1818, 98-9) and E. Petersen (Lanckoronski 1892, 135-7).
225 Mansel and Bean (1956, 37; vs. Koenigs and Radt 1979, 348 n. 42) date the Temple by reference to its closest stylistic parallel, the gate of Hadrian at Antalya.
226 These heads may represent Tyche, see ‘The Entablature’ below.
227 Mansel and Bean (1956, 36 n. 30) point to comparable roofs on Syrian tombs.
229 Caputo and Ghedini 1984, 69-70. Stierlin (1984, 103-5) claims that Hadrian is depicted with a phoenix and zodiac band on coins minted in 121.
230 The plaque is carried by a winged Nike figure. Matheson 1994b, 28-9.
destiny by overseeing the movement of the stars or the zodiac. His attribution of
the Temple to Fortuna finds support in Imperial coinage. Coins minted by Gallienus
and Salonina, connected with Side, show a seated figure of Tyche inside a round
temple with a conical roof. Moreover, comparable coin depictions of the Temples
of Tyche at Antioch and Sagalassos, probably Hellenistic in date, show that they too
were round.

Possibly the earliest and most famous round temple to Tyche is that at
Alexandria. As described by Libanius, it was notable for its semicircular niches,
containing statues of the twelve gods, and its cult image of Tyche crowning
Alexander the Great. While the connection between Tyche and the ruler cult is
reaffirmed in the Imperial period by the Temple of Fortuna on the Pincio (#37),
the Hadrianic Temple at Side, like the Temple of Fortuna Huiusce Diei (#38), may
commemorate the goddess’ role in regulating everyday life.

**The Shrine of Sulis-Minerva, Bath (#8)**

Like the Temple of Zeus Asklepios Soter at Pergamon (#27), the round Shrine
of Sulis-Minerva at Bath (#8) may have been constructed in connection with
Hadrian’s visit to the city in 122 AD. This substantial monopteros, whose diameter
approximates the width of Bath’s principle temple to Minerva, consists of twelve

---

231 Mansel and Bean 1956, 33 and 36-7 n. 40; cf. Stierlin (1984, 145) for Greek and Roman
conceptions of the zodiac.
232 See #59.
233 Mansel and Bean (1956, 35) see a pomegranate on top of the roof.
38.15; cf. Mansel and Bean 1956, 36 n. 32, and Szilágyi 1966, 1940-1. For other temples to Tyche, see
Paus. 2.2.7-8, 2.20.3, and 4.30.3-6.
236 Will 1951, 239; La Rocca 1999b, 283.
238 See Chap. IV #38.
239 Cunliffe 1995, 87.
240 Richmond and Toynbee 1957, 97-105; Cunliffe 1966, 199-204.
Corinthian columns supporting an elaborate entablature and a conical roof.\textsuperscript{241} The entablature, carved on both sides, combines a tendril motif on its inner face with floral and animal designs on its exterior.\textsuperscript{242}

The monopteros, set within a rectilinear precinct to the north of the city’s baths, was aligned with the main temple of Sulis-Minerva.\textsuperscript{243} In addition to its shared axis and comparable size, the monopteros celebrated the same goddess, whose cult is unique to the thermal complex at Bath.\textsuperscript{244} However, the temples were dramatically different in style, as the monopteros recalls Hadrianic architecture in Italy and the Greek world rather than Romano-Celtic buildings.\textsuperscript{245}

The Antonines: (138-192 AD)

Antoninus Pius: (138-161 AD)

Unlike Hadrian’s, Antoninus Pius’ building program, which focused on arches, columns, and temples to the Imperial cult,\textsuperscript{246} involved limited restoration and construction of round buildings in Rome.\textsuperscript{247} Outside of Italy, the only round monopteroi constructed during his reign formed part of the nymphaeum of Herodes Atticus at Olympia.\textsuperscript{248}

\textsuperscript{241} For difficulties that arise when roofing a monopteros of this size, see #63 above.
\textsuperscript{242} Cunliffe 1995, 86.
\textsuperscript{243} Cunliffe 1995, 85-7; cf. Wilson Jones 2000, 153 fig. 7.29.
\textsuperscript{244} For this healing cult, see Croon 1953, 79-83.
\textsuperscript{245} For Romano-Celtic round temples, which fall outside the scope of this thesis (Chap. I), see Horne and King 1980, 369-555 (Western Europe), Rodwell 1980b, 557-85 (Britain), and Grimal and Woloch 1983, 55-6.
\textsuperscript{246} The most significant temples include those of Divus Augustus (Torelli 1993, 145-6), Hadrian (Cipollone 1996, 7-8), and Faustina (Cassatella 1993, 46-7). Ward-Perkins 1989, 124-6.
\textsuperscript{247} Like Hadrian (see above), Antoninus Pius may have commemorated a restoration of the Shrine of the Penates at Lavinium (#17) on medallions.
\textsuperscript{248} Schleif and Weber 1944, 53-82; Binder 1969, 107. Based on Herodes’ wife Regilla’s status as a priestess of Demeter, Robert (1939, 399-402) mistakenly attributes the monopteroi to Zeus.
The Pantheon, the Shrine of Bacchus, and the Shrine of Hercules, Rome (#50, 32, and 41)

Among the temples Antoninus Pius is credited with restoring are the Pantheon (#50) and the Shrine of Bacchus (#32) in Rome. Though recorded by literary sources, the lack of any archaeological evidence for Antonine work on the Pantheon suggests that his repairs were minimal.249 An inscribed entablature however links Antoninus Pius with the late Republican Shrine.250 This block, which depicts a Maenad or follower of Bacchus,251 is all that remains of the modest shrine in summa sacra via, whose existence along with a Tholus to Cybele (#34) is attested by Martial.252

A medallion minted under Antoninus Pius has been thought to refer to both the Shrine and the Tholus.253 This medallion shows a monopteros set within a two-storied colonnade. The colonnade is fronted by antae and topped by a plain, three fascia architrave and a series of objects, possibly Bacchic masks. Resting on a high podium, the shrine is depicted with four columns supporting a blank architrave and a domed roof. Garlands hang from the architrave and a globular finial tops the roof. The shrine contains a cult image commonly identified as Bacchus and is preceded by a tripod and a basket of grapes.254 While G. Lugli has proposed that the colonnade was sacred to Bacchus and the shrine to Cybele,255 other scholars see the colonnade

---

249 Hist. Aug. Pius 8 and see #50.
250 Though fragmentary, the inscription (#32) identifies the Shrine’s rebuilding with Antoninus Pius and dates it to 143-161 AD. Gatti 1899a, 147-8, and 1899b, 223; Hülsen 1902a, 241, and 1902b, 95; Vaglieri 1903, 27-9; Lugli 1946, 219, and 1947, 147.
252 See Chap. IV #34 and above.
253 Hülsen 1902a, 241, and 1902b, 95-6; Jordan and Hülsen 1907, 104; Lugli 1946, 219, and 1947, 174; Coarelli 1982, 36.
254 Two figures approach the shrine, one leading an animal for sacrifice and the other carrying fruit. Brown 1941, 19-20.
255 Lugli 1947, 176.
and the monopteros as a shrine to Bacchus and imagine that the shrine to Cybele was not dissimilar.  

A closer parallel for the image illustrated on the medallion is the Shrine of Hercules (#41) located near the Pons Aelius. This Shrine, founded in the Julio-Claudian period, was enclosed within a semicircular portico. Although probably one-story, the portico, when combined with the Shrine, is reminiscent of the image on the medallion. Moreover, as the identification of the shrine on the medallion is not secured by a legend, its attribution to Liber-Bacchus is only based on attributes. As a result, this medallion may indicate that Antoninus Pius rebuilt the Shrine of Hercules or alternatively, that round shrines set within colonnaded courts were not uncommon in Rome.

**The Shrine of the Genius Senatus, Rome (#39)**

Coins minted under Antoninus Pius, ca. 158-159 AD, may point to the construction of a Shrine to the Genius Senatus or “spirit of the Senate” (#39). They show a small monopteros with two columns supporting a curved pediment or a dome, flanked by two additional columns. Inside is a togate cult image standing on a low base. The attributes of this figure are difficult to interpret, but may represent a scepter and a branch, both highly appropriate for the Genius Senatus. This attribution must remain speculative however as the coins lack legends to identify the figure.

---

256 Hülsen (Jordan and Hülsen 1907, 104; cf. Brown 1941, 21) suggested that the two tholus-shaped Shrines of Bacchus and Cybele formed part of a symmetrical entrance to the Palatine.

257 See Chap. V #41.

258 See #39.

259 Hill (1989, 39) speculates that the Shrine was located inside the Curia.

260 The pediment or dome is topped by fleurettes along its ridge and statuettes at its corners. Hill 1989, 17.

261 Birt 1845, 1613-25. Strack (160, quoted in *BMCEmp* IV lxxiv) has identified the figure as the emperor in the guise of a ‘*pacator orbis*.’
Moreover, if a segmental pediment rather than a dome, there is no evidence to suggest that they represented a round shrine.  

**Commodus: (180-192 AD)**

The reign of Commodus saw even less new building than that of Antoninus Pius, though it did include a round Shrine at Portus (#29), the port of Ostia.

**The Shrine of Liber Pater Commodianus, Portus (#29)**

To Commodus’ reign can be attributed a small peripteral Shrine (#29) sited near the north-east corner of Trajan’s harbor at Portus. Consisting of a high socle, Corinthian columns and a fragmentary entablature, its remains can be identified with the Shrine of Liber Pater mentioned in an inscription and depicted together with a statue of Bacchus on the Torlonia harbor relief. For its location, the Shrine may honor Liber Pater as a protector of merchants, an attribute derived from the Greek Dionysos. This would be appropriate in view of the Shrine’s closest architectural parallels: the Monument of Lysicrates at Athens (#3) and the Rotunda at Termessos (#62).

**Round temples dated to the Antonine period:**

---

262 In his short description of this monument, Hill (1989, 17 and 39) does not state that he believes the image on the coin to represent a round shrine, though, as he identifies the Shrine of Spes Vetus (see Chap. III #54) in the same series as round, it is possible to infer that he holds this view.  
264 For its inscription (CIL XIV 666), see #29.  
265 Although used for a variety of gods, Pater became the established epithet of Liber in the Imperial period. Bruhl 1953, 13-4.  
266 This inscription (CIL XIV 30, #29, and ‘Foundation and layout’ below), which commemorates a dedication *ex voto* to Liber Pater Commodianus, was found near the shrine. Lanci 1864, 81; Meiggs 1973, 385. For Commodus’ dedications to Liber, see Bruhl 1953, 190.  
268 This attribute of Liber was usually commemorated in port cities outside of Rome. Bruhl 1953, 210-1. For an earlier dedication to Liber at Ostia (CIL 14.28-9), see Bruhl 1953, 205.
Also Antonine in date are round monopteroi at Argos (#2), Athens (#5), and Isthmia (#15) and a tholus at Magnesia on the Meander (#18). Unlike the monopteroi, the tholus is too fragmentary to be reconstructed, though an inscription notes that it was dedicated by Apollonius to Athena Poliouchos.

**The Temple of the Nymphs, Argos (#2)**

The second century AD monopteros in the Agora at Argos is identified as a Temple to the Nymphs (#2) by an inscription on its architrave. Encased within a rectangular socle, its foundations consist of three courses of radiating blocks laid out around a pit. The pit is accessed both by steps and by a corridor that extends to the northern limit of the socle. A circular stylobate resting on the socle provided support for eight columns with Attic bases, monolithic shafts, and Corinthian capitals. Above the columns was an entablature with a three-fascia architrave, an inscribed frieze course, a modillion cornice, and lion-head water spouts. A timber roof, topped by an acanthus finial, crowned the Temple.

The pit, reminiscent of *bothroi* in the Tholos at Epidauros (#13) and the Temple of Hercules Victor *ad portam Trigeminam* (#44) as well as of the *favissa* of the Temple of Vesta in the Roman Forum (#57), was probably integral to the cult. As

---

269 A curved entablature, now lost, has been attributed to this building by Fiechter (1937, 309) and Robert (1939, 73 and 412).
270 Kern 1900, no. 216.
271 Will (1951, 239) and Roux (1992, 178 and 196) speculate that the Shrine was founded on Athens’ behalf.
272 Roux 1957, 665, vs. 1954, 162 (peripteros).
274 Courbin 1953, 107; Roux 1954, 162, and 1957, 663.
275 Roux 1954, 160, and 1957, 664. As a monopteros on a high socle, it resembles the Rotunda at Corinth (see Chap. V #9).
276 Roux 1957, 664.
a Temple to the Nymphs or *Nymphaeum*, a term commonly used to describe fountain houses, its pit may have contained an hydraulic apparatus, allowing the monopteros to function as both a fountain and a temple.

**The Rotunda, Athens (#5)**

Not the first rotunda to occupy the Athenian Agora, the monopteros (#5) added in the mid-second century AD stood in marked contrast to the fifth century BC drum known as the Skias (#6). Functionally too, the two buildings differed, the earlier serving as the meeting place of the prytaneis into the Imperial period, and the later as a shrine or fountain house. The foundations of the monopteros, though little of its elevation, are extant near the northern end of the Stoa of Attalos. They overlie the western portion of a square peristyle court, which was built in the fourth century BC and dismantled in the second century AD, a few years before the Rotunda was erected. A substantial deposit of lead seals, naming Zeus, Athena, Poseidon, Asklepios, and other gods, was found in a Roman stratum in the area. Like the destruction date of the court, this deposit acts as an effective *terminus post quem* for the Rotunda, and would, moreover, endorse its identification as a religious building.

278 Frontin. *aq.* 3. Robert (1939, 6) may have found a Greek precedent for this Temple in a round shrine of the Nymphs on Delos.
279 Roux 1954, 162.
280 For a third round building in the Agora, which functioned as a fountain, see Shear, jr. 1971, pl. 46; vs. Robert (1939, 388-9) and Thompson and Wycherley (1972, 121-3), who incorrectly identify it as a shrine known as the Leokorion (cf. Strab. 9.1.16).
281 The foundations of the building, strong enough to support a water basin, and a water channel found in its vicinity have been used as evidence to see the Rotunda as a fountain house. Dinsmoor, jr. 1974, 425-7.
282 Townsend 1995, 76.
283 Shear 1936, 412.
The Rotunda consisted of deep foundations\textsuperscript{284} supporting a three-step krepis and eight Corinthian columns.\textsuperscript{285} Above the columns rose an architrave, an entablature, a sima with lion-head water spouts, and a brick dome.\textsuperscript{286} Positioned to correspond with the upper story of the Stoa of Attalos,\textsuperscript{287} this lofty monopteros, throughout its relatively short existence,\textsuperscript{288} made a notable contribution to the building and religious repertory of the Athenian Agora.

\textbf{The Temple of Palaimon-Melikertes, Isthmia (#15)}

In the Antonine period, a round temple was constructed in the precinct of Palaimon-Melikertes at Isthmia (#15). The precinct, a replacement of an earlier cult site,\textsuperscript{289} is located beside the starting gates of the Stadium\textsuperscript{290} and to the south-east of the peribolos of Poseidon. Stoas were added to the peribolos at the same time as the Temple was built by Publius Licinius Priscus Iuventianus. As high-priest of Poseidon, Iuventianus sought to demonstrate his status and religious fervor by enlarging and ornamenting two of Isthmia’s main cult sites.\textsuperscript{291}

The Temple of Palaimon, centered along the east-west axis of the precinct, was preceded to the east by an altar and an open area used for cult rituals.\textsuperscript{292} Of the Temple building, little remains beyond its high, square socle, which contained a pit.

\textsuperscript{284} Deep foundations may have been necessary to support the Rotunda’s heavy dome, see below.
\textsuperscript{285} Binder (1969, 107-10; cf. Thompson and Wycherley 1972, 203) prefers to see ten columns with Composite capitals.
\textsuperscript{286} Dinsmoor, jr. 1974, 420, and see ‘Roofing techniques’ below; vs. Binder 1969, 108-10 (concrete).
\textsuperscript{287} Shear 1936, 424-5.
\textsuperscript{288} The Rotunda was destroyed during the Herulian invasion of 267 AD. Shear 1936, 412 n. 5.
\textsuperscript{289} Will 1955, 170; cf. Bronneer (1973, 99-106), for a detailed description of the precinct’s development in the 1\textsuperscript{st} and early 2\textsuperscript{nd} centuries AD.
\textsuperscript{290} The stadium fell into disuse after the destruction of Corinth in 146 BC. Bronneer 1973, 4.
\textsuperscript{291} Iuventianus also reconstructed the nearby theater. Bronneer 1973, 5.
\textsuperscript{292} Lamps involved in nocturnal rites were found throughout the precinct. They may endorse the identification of the Temple as a heroon, possibly like the Tholos at Epidaurus (#13). Hawthorne 1958, 95.
and a corridor linked to a reservoir. Although the corridor suggests that water played a part in cult practice, the pit functioned as more than a fountain base.

According to Pausanias, it served as an adytum where oaths were taken, possibly by athletes and officials involved with the Isthmian games.

Like its pit and corridor, the Temple’s elevation recalls that of the Nymphs at Argos (#2). Coins minted under Hadrian, Marcus Aurelius, Caracalla, and Geta depict it as a round monopteros with a stepped podium, Corinthian columns, and a cupola ornamented with acroterial sculpture. Inside the temple is a statue of Palaimon reclining on the back of a dolphin, while sacred trees, the entrance to the adytum, and a priest leading a bull to sacrifice appear nearby.

Based on the coins, O. Broneer has reconstructed the Temple with a square podium, accessed via four steps, and eleven Corinthian columns. The central intercolumnation is wider to showcase the statue of Palaimon on a dolphin, while the Temple’s cupola, topped by a finial, is ornamented with floral and dolphin-shaped acroterial sculpture. Though unusual, the Temple’s odd number of columns and wide central intercolumnation has a precedent in the Temple of Roma and Augustus.

---

293 The corridor, also accessed via the Temple’s cella, was coated with water-tight stucco. Broneer 1973, 107-10.
295 Paus. 2.2.1.
296 Robert 1939, 156-9 and 177-9; Broneer 1973, 42-3 and 111-2.
297 For other round temples that contained pits, see #2 above.
298 The Hadrianic coins may commemorate its construction. Broneer 1973, 112.
299 The Uffizi and Lateran reliefs depict a sacred tree, representing the lucus of Vesta, beside her Temple in the Forum (see #57 and above; cf. Smith 1950, 27 n. 52).
300 Festivals in honor of Palaimon involved the sacrifice of a black bull (Philostr. imag. 420); cf. Robert 1939, 156-7 and 177-9 (chthonic significance).
301 As this motif is common on coins, it may not signify that the Temple’s intercolumnations varied in width.
302 Broneer 1973, 110-11. Similar marine decoration appears on the tholus of the macellum at Puteoli (De Ruyt 1983, 150-8) and in the fountain to Poseidon, which Babbius Philinus built in conjunction with his Rotunda at Corinth (see Chap. V #9; cf. Scranton 1951, 16, 34 and 66).
on the Athenian Acropolis (#4). The central intercolumnation in both buildings may simply enhance their ability, as round monopteroi, to exhibit their statuary.

In his description of the Temple, Pausanias mentions statues of Palaimon, Leucothea, and Poseidon, who oversaw the Isthmian games, in its precinct. The presence of these statues is appropriate in view of Palaimon’s mythical origins. As Melikertes, the son of Ino-Leucothea, he was rescued from drowning by a dolphin which carried him to Isthmia. Following his later death and apotheosis, the city’s leader Sisyphus honored him by founding the Isthmian games.

Although Palaimon and Leucothea first appear in Homer, the majority of sources that deal with the myth date to the early Imperial period. As a result, J. Hawthorne assigns the cult’s foundation to the re-establishment of Corinth as a Roman colony in 46 BC. The archaeological evidence, if only by its absence prior to the first century AD, supports Hawthorne’s idea that the cult of Palaimon originated at Isthmia in the Roman period. As attested by the Temple, the cult reached its height in the second century AD.

III ANALYSIS

FOUNDATION AND LOCATION

\[303\] See Chap. V #4.
\[304\] This was probably a concern of Babbius Philinus, when he chose the round form for his monument (see Chap. V #9).
\[305\] Paus. 2.2.1. None of these statues have been found. Broneer 1973, 111.
\[306\] A statue base of Sisyphus was discovered to the north-east of the Temple together with a base dedicated to Iuventianus. Broneer 1973, 112.
\[307\] See #15. For interpretations of the myth, see Robert 1939, 156-9 and 177-9, Will 1955, 169-80 and 210-2 (who explores the conflated cults of Ino-Leucothea and Melikertes-Palaimon), and Käppel 2000, 1185.
\[308\] Hom. Od. 5.333.
\[309\] Hawthorne 1958, 92-8; vs. Will 1955, 169-80 and 210-12 (pre-hellenic).
Of the round temples rebuilt at Rome from the Flavian through the Antonine periods, most have been linked to individual emperors by coins, ancient sources, and building inscriptions.310 Through their depiction on official currency, the Temple of Vesta (#57)311 and possibly the Tholus of Cybele (#34) and the Shrine of Hercules (#41) may reflect projects carried out by the Senate on behalf of Vespasian, Domitian, Trajan, and Antoninus Pius. Ancient sources point to other Imperial projects, namely the restoration of the Pantheon (#50) during the reigns of Domitian and Antoninus Pius and its complete rebuilding, confirmed by brick stamps, under Hadrian. Similarly, dedicatory inscriptions from the Perirrhanterion (#51) and the Shrine of Bacchus (#32) attribute their rebuildings to Vespasian and Antoninus Pius.

Through their efforts, emperors were able to express their esteem for the temples’ cults and founders, most evident in the two restorations of the Temple of Vesta, a goddess linked to Rome’s foundation,312 and Hadrian’s rebuilding of the Pantheon as a tribute to Augustus and Agrippa.313 Of the new temple foundations, Hadrian’s round Shrines at Tibur (#63 and 65) fit within the program adopted at his villa by exploring his Greek sensibilities and interest in a variety of architectural forms.314

Outside of Rome, the Shrine of Liber Pater Commodianus at Portus (#29), built ex voto by a resident, honored both Commodus and Liber, while round temples founded in the provinces, namely the Temples of Zeus Asklepios Soter at Pergamon (#27) and of Tyche at Side (#59) and the Shrine of Sulis-Minerva at Bath (#8), may

310 An exception to this is the Temple of Fortuna Huiusce Diei (#38), which is indirectly linked to Domitian based on restoration work he undertook in the Area Sacra.
311 Scott (1999b, 127) suggests that Trajan was directly involved in the rebuilding of the Temple of Vesta.
312 The restoration of the Tholus of Cybele may be comparable, if it was meant to evoke the goddess’ importation to Rome as illustrated on the terracotta reliefs.
313 Similar is Vespasian’s rebuilding of the Perirrhanterion, should it have provided a means of honoring the god who oversaw his Jewish victory, see #51 above.
314 The incorporation of the Shrine into the theater marks an uncommon, though not unprecedented, use of the round form, see #65 above.
have celebrated visits of Hadrian together with commemorating their respective
gods. Of these, the founder of the Temple of Asklepios is known to have been a
local magistrate, while another provincial foundation at Isthmia (#15) can be
attributed to the high priest of Palaimon-Melikertes. Like the Temple at Isthmia,
round temples at Argos (#2) and Athens (#5) mark local dedications, which probably
had little to do with the Imperial cult or emperors’ initiatives.

Although its location remained constant, the Temple of Vesta was elevated on
a high podium by the Trajanic period to underscore its religious significance and
make it commensurate to the increasingly high buildings that occupied the Roman
Forum. Similarly, in his rebuilding, Hadrian’s architects preceded the Pantheon by
a long rectangular forecourt to emphasize its north-south axis and by doing so, align it
with neighboring buildings. This axis moreover underlined its symbolic connection to
the Mausoleum of Augustus, which probably proved decisive in Hadrian’s decision to
undertake such a sizeable building project.

The Temple of Zeus Asklepios Soter, though nominally a replacement of an
earlier temple, was built anew in the Hadrianic period in conjunction with a dramatic
restructuring of Asklepios’ sanctuary. Previously consisting of a few temples and
sacred springs, the sanctuary was redefined through the addition of porticoes on three
sides, and a propylon, a library and the Temple on the fourth. The appearance of
symmetry fostered by these buildings, arranged around a central axis, was
enhanced by the columnar porches of the propylon and the Temple, which, like the
Pantheon’s pronaos, helped to mask the latter’s round form.

315 The plan of the Temple of Zeus Asklepios Soter is a direct reference to Hadrian’s Pantheon.
316 This privilege was reserved for the city’s most sacred buildings, see Tac. *Hist.* 4.53 and Scott 1999b,
127.
317 Similarly, the Perirrhanterion’s proximity to the Temple of Apollo Medicus may have induced
Vespasian to rebuild it, see #51 above.
318 Deubner 1938, 33.
Similarly, the Temple of Palaimon-Melikertes was a new foundation located at an earlier religious site. Its position next to the precinct of Poseidon underlined similarities in their cults, while its proximity to the Earlier Stadium reflected the origins of the Isthmian games. The round monopteros of Sulis-Minerva at Bath was also sited in a pre-existing sanctuary, dominated by thermal baths and the goddess’ main temple, with which it shared its proportions and axis.\(^{319}\)

The remaining round temples founded in the Antonine period occupy secular spaces. Of these, the round Shrines from Tibur are the most dramatic; one is accessed by ascending the cavea of the South Theater,\(^{320}\) and the other, from a major entry route, though it is framed by a dramatic landscape spreading out below its artificial terrace.\(^{321}\) The Shrine of Liber Pater is sited beside Trajan’s harbor, while the Temples of Tyche and of the Nymphs and the Rotunda at Athens are located in their city’s principal agoras. Earlier structures may have influenced the off-center siting of the Temple at Side as well as the Rotunda at Athens, which is aligned physically, and possibly symbolically, with the neighboring Stoa of Attalos.\(^{322}\)

More so than in the Julio-Claudian period, buildings like the Pantheon and the Temple of Zeus Asklepios Soter focus on interior space, allowing porches, porticoes, and neighboring buildings to align them with their surroundings. By emphasizing their interiors, they stand in sharp contrast to the Temples of Tyche and Palaimon-Melikertes, the Shrine of Sulis-Minerva, and the Rotunda at Athens, wherein their round forms are deliberately accented against rectilinear porticoes or precincts.\(^{323}\) In-

\(^{319}\) Like the Temple of Palaimon-Melikertes, the Shrine appears to have stood in a rectangular precinct.

\(^{320}\) On reaching its platform, the Shrine is accessed via steps (see Hanson 1959, 72, for possible reconstructions based on Pannini and Piranesi).

\(^{321}\) Likewise, the late Republican Round Temple at Tibur (see Chap. IV #64) rests on an artificial extension of the city’s acropolis.

\(^{322}\) This may have provided a means of evoking Hellenistic Athens.

\(^{323}\) The Temples of the Nymphs at Argos and of Vesta, raised on an elevated podium, are comparable in so far as they stand out from neighboring rectilinear buildings.
between these extremes are the Shrines of Aphrodite and Liber Pater, which, by reflecting curved elements both built and natural, act in harmony with their environment.\(^ {324}\)

**BUILDING MATERIALS AND TECHNIQUES**

**Masonry techniques**

Like those of the late Republican and Julio-Claudian periods,\(^ {325}\) Flavian and Antonine round temples either employed *opus quadratum* masonry or simulated it in their revetment. Although badly preserved, the walls of the Temples of Zeus Asklepios Soter at Pergamon (#27) and of Tyche at Side (#59), as well as of the Shrine of Liber Pater Commodianus at Portus (#29), appear to have consisted of ashlar blocks. The Temple of the Nymphs at Argos (#2) and the Rotunda at Athens (#5) incorporate poros blocks into their foundations and podia, but employ a marble veneer to visually unite them with their elevations.\(^ {326}\) The Pantheon’s (#50) pronaos, intermediate block, and the interior of its drum,\(^ {327}\) as well as the podia of the Temples of Asklepios and of Palaimon-Melikertes at Isthmia (#15), also used marble revetment, while the stucco-facing of the Temple of Fortuna Huiusce Diei (#38) may have been painted to resemble ashlar courses.\(^ {328}\)

Beneath their revetment, several round temples employed *opus testaceum* or brickwork, a technique that was used in the Claudian Shrine of the Lares Augusti at

---

\(^{324}\) When seen from behind (i.e. above the curved cavea), the same may be said for the Theater Shrine at Tibur. See Chap V, for the comparable Perirrhaterion and Shrine of Hercules.

\(^{325}\) See Chaps. IV and V ‘Masonry techniques.’

\(^{326}\) For veneer and stucco work, also see ‘Pavements and wall revetment’ below.

\(^{327}\) Bronze plates were used as veneer on both faces of the dome.

\(^{328}\) The exterior of the Pantheon’s drum may have been similarly decorated to link it with the pronaos and intermediate block as well as with the lower step rings of its cupola, revetted with marble plates.
Ostia (#23). Brick filled out the walls of the Temple of Fortuna Huiusce Diei, may have formed the foundations of the Tholus of Cybele (#34), and comprised the walls of the Pantheon’s porch, intermediate block, and drum. The drum’s foundations and dome, like the foundations of the Temples of Asklepios and of Palaimon and the cupola of the Theater Shrine at Tibur (#65), were fashioned from poured concrete. Supported by wooden shuttering during construction, concrete bonded with layers of aggregate formed a monolithic mass that found favor, for its strength, versatility, and ease of construction, through the late Imperial period.

**Roofing techniques**

Several Flavian and Antonine round temples, especially those built in the provinces, follow late Republican and Julio-Claudian precedent in employing timber roofs. The Temple of Tyche at Side (#59) and the Shrine of Sulis-Minerva at Bath (#8), as well as the Temple of the Nymphs at Argos (#2), had conical roofs, formed, in the case of the Argive temple, from bands of leaf-shaped tiles decreasing in size towards its summit. In Italy, the Shrines of Aphrodite at Tibur (#63) and possibly of Liber Pater at Portus (#29) may have used conical roofs to reflect their closest architectural comparanda, the Temple at Knidos (#16) and Greek shrines like the Rotunda at Termessos (#62).

---

330 See #50 above, for the Pantheon’s use of relieving arches to lighten the load borne by its drum’s foundations and walls.
332 Concrete construction was used in the drum of the Theater Shrine, the terrace beneath the brick nymphaeum and its Shrine of Aphrodite at Tibur (#63), and to some extent, in the foundations of the Rotunda at Athens (#5).
333 See ‘Roofing techniques’ below.
334 See Chaps. IV and V.
335 The monopteroi incorporated into the 160 AD nymphaeum of Herodes Atticus at Olympia use similar roof tiles. Schleif and Weber 1944, 73-4 and fig. 15.
336 See above.
Vaulted roofs or domes, possibly employed in the Temple of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste (#31), Agrippa’s Pantheon (#50), and Nero’s rebuilding of the Temple of Vesta (#57), find wider use in the Flavian and Antonine periods, wherein coins attest to domed roofs on the Temples of Vesta and Palaimon-Melikertes (#15), and the Shrine of Hercules (#41). Concrete domes, used to roof round bath buildings from the Late Republican period onwards, were incorporated into Imperial palaces under Nero and the Flavians. Hadrian used domes to great effect in his villa at Tibur and more significantly, in his rebuilding of the Pantheon. With an internal diameter double that of any previous dome, the cupola which crowns the Pantheon ranks it as one of the greatest technical feats of Roman architecture.

The Pantheon’s drum was constructed using six bands of aggregate, decreasing in weight towards the oculus of its dome. Exedrae and chambers embedded in its walls, together with relieving arches, also helped to reduce the mass of the drum, while the oculus, acting as a compression ring, and external step rings aligned with its base ensured the dome’s long-term stability. During construction, the dome was supported on a complex wooden scaffolding, which included molds.

---

337 Domes were employed in baths at Baia, Pozzuoli, Misenae, and Cuma in the late Republican and Augustan periods, and again at Baia, Albano and Rome into the Antonine period. Sanpaolesi 1971, 14-6; Stierlin 1984, 60-3; Adam 1994a, 186-91. The late Republican or early Augustan Mausoleum of Caecilia Metella also included a dome, though set beneath a conical roof. De Angelis d’Ossat 1940, 250; Sanpaolesi 1971, 15.
338 For the domes of the Domus Aurea and the Domus Augustana, see Adam 1994a, 187-9.
340 Adam 1994a, 186 (chart).
341 The lightest aggregate, a volcanic lava stone from Vesuvius, was also used in the dome of the 3rd c. Mausoleum of Constantina. De Angelis d’Ossat 1940, 244-5.
342 Like the Pantheon, Domitian’s round bath building at Albano, incorrectly identified as a temple by Altmann (1906, 46 and 71), employed layers of aggregate and a brick and bronze ring around its oculus (cf. Vitr. 5.10.27-8). De Angelis d’Ossat 1940, 233 and 238. Adam (1994a, 181) suggests that the domes of the Central Baths at Pompeii were among the first to use this technique.
343 A series of rooms between the Pantheon and the Basilica Neptuni may have functioned as buttresses. Wilson Jones 2000, 191. All of these features worked together in stabilizing the dome despite stress fractures that appeared during construction.
344 Coarelli 1995k, 329.
for its coffers. Once plated in bronze, the coffers diffused light from the oculus, adding to the dramatic effects experienced by visitors entering the Pantheon’s drum.

The Temple of Zeus Asklepios Soter (#27), modeled after the Pantheon, included a rubble and mortar version of its dome, while the Rotunda at Athens (#5) was crowned by a brick cupola and the Theater Shrine at Tibur (#65) by a concrete dome. In Roman provinces outside of Italy, the materials and techniques used to construct domes were inherited from the capital as early as the Augustan period, though, as the Temple of Asklepios and the Rotunda at Athens demonstrate, were used to best effect from Hadrian’s reign.

BUILDING COMPONENTS

The foundations of Flavian and Antonine round temples follow late Republican and Julio-Claudian precedents. Like the Temple of Hercules Victor ad Portam Trigeminam (#44), that of the Nymphs at Argos (#2) comprised bands of radiating blocks laid out around a pit. The Temple of Palaimon-Melikertes (#15) similarly includes a pit, though set in concrete. Concrete is also employed in Hadrian’s Pantheon (#50), where he does not reuse Agrippa’s foundations, in the Temple of Zeus Asklepios Soter (#27), and in the terraces which support the Theater Shrine (#65) and the Shrine of Aphrodite (#63) at Tibur. With a ring of poros blocks set around a concrete core, the Rotunda at Athens (#5) combines both techniques, while the Tholus of Cybele (#34), if correctly identified with the ring found near the

---

347 The Hunting Baths at Leptis Magna, ca. 200 AD, provide impressive evidence of the continued use of domes in the provinces after the Antonine period. Rasch 1985, 124-5.
348 See Chap. V.
349 The 3rd c. BC *opus incertum* foundations and *favissa* of the Temple of Vesta in the Roman Forum (#57) are similar.
350 The foundations of the Perirrhanterion (#51) are comparable.
Basilica of Constantine, introduces brickwork into the material repertory of Imperial foundations.

Above their foundations, the Shrine of Aphrodite, the Shrine of Sulis-Minerva at Bath (#8), and the Rotunda at Athens (#5) are likely to have employed a Greek-style krepis. A high Greek socle, comparable to that of the Monument of Lysicrates in Athens (#3), was used to support the Shrine of Liber Pater at Portus (#29), while reliefs show that the Temple of Vesta in the Roman Forum (#57) rose from a high podium by this date. The Temple of Tyche at Side (#59) stood on a comparable podium, fronted by steps, which was as typically Roman as the columnar porches and podia of the Pantheon and the Temple of Asklepios. In Greece, the Antonine Temples at Argos and Isthmia followed the Tiberian Rotunda at Corinth (#9) in their use of a square socle.

The few Antonine round temples to preserve moldings, column bases, and entablatures employ forms common to the late Republican and Julio-Claudian periods. Their column capitals are also drawn from this repertory, though they use all three principal orders. In addition to Corinthian, common to the majority of round temples, Doric, previously employed in the Monopteros at Pompeii (#28), appears in the Shrine of Aphrodite at Tibur (#63), and Ionic, known from the Temples of Roma and Augustus (#4) and possibly of Vesta in the Roman Forum, forms part of

351 The Theater Shrine at Tibur rests directly on the terrace that defines its precinct.
352 Prominent examples of round temples that employed a krepis include those of Hercules Victor ad portam Trigeminam and of Roma and Augustus on the Acropolis (#4).
353 Scott 1999b, 127; cf. Tac. hist. 4.53 and above.
354 This is comparable to the late Republican podium of the Temple of Fortuna Huiusce Dies, which was not altered as part of its Flavian rebuilding.
355 See the relevant sections below.
356 See Chap. V.
357 See ‘The column capital’ below.
the Temple of Vesta’s Trajanic rebuilding and perhaps of the porch of the Theater Shrine at Tibur.\textsuperscript{358}

The majority of Flavian and Antonine round temples, as monopteroi and peripteroi, fit within the framework of earlier architecture.\textsuperscript{359} The few drums datable to these periods are not entirely without precedent. While the late Republican drum of the Temple of Fortuna Huiusce Diei (#38) was not dramatically altered by Domitian, that of the Pantheon, which inspired the Temple of Asklepios, may have recalled the plan of Agrippa’s building. Moreover, the Theater Shrine at Tibur resembles the Temple of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste (#31).\textsuperscript{360} Therefore, with the exception of the Pantheon, whose elevation marked a clear break with Julio-Claudian round temples, those built from the Flavian through the Antonine periods indicate a continuum from their predecessors.

**DECORATIVE DETAILS**

**The wall base molding**

Moldings preserved from the Hadrianic Pantheon (#50) and Temple of Zeus Asklepios Soter (#27)\textsuperscript{361} are stylistically related to those used in Julio-Claudian round temples.\textsuperscript{362} Along the base of the Pantheon’s intermediate block runs a molding, which echoes the form of its column and pilaster bases. Like them, it consists of a torus topped by a cyma recta, fillets, a cyma reversa, another fillet, and a torus. Inside

\textsuperscript{358} The capitals of the Temple of the Nymphs at Argos may have been Composite.
\textsuperscript{359} The form of the Shrine of Aphrodite at Tibur may copy that of the 4th c. BC Temple at Knidos (#16), see #63 above.
\textsuperscript{360} It is also possible that it recalled the problematic Shrine of the Lares Augusti at Ostia (see Chap. V #23).
\textsuperscript{361} Of the round temples which might have incorporated molding, none is extant from the Theater Shrine at Tibur (#65) nor the Temples of Tyche at Side (#59), of the Nymphs at Argos (#2), of Palaimon-Melikertes at Isthmia (#15), and of Liber Pater at Portus (#29).
\textsuperscript{362} See Chap. V.
the Pantheon’s drum, a second, simpler molding is preserved with a high fascia, a
torus, a cyma recta, and an astragal. The torus figures prominently in the exterior
molding of the Temple of Asklepios. Here a massive torus surmounted by a cyma
reversa defines the base of the Temple’s drum. Of these, the Pantheon’s moldings
produce a more elegant finish consistent with the rest of its design, while, through
their use of both types of cymas, they recall Classical Greek and Augustan
ornament.

The column base

Established as the canonical form in the Julio-Claudian period, the Attic
base is used extensively in Flavian and Antonine round temples. Such bases are
extant from the Temples of Zeus Asklepios Soter at Pergamon (#27), Tyche at Side
(#59), Sulis-Minerva at Bath (#8), Liber Pater at Portus (#29), and the Nymphs at
Argos (#2). Plainer than the Pantheon’s (#50) bases, they consist of two tori
flanking fillets and a scotia. This sequence of design elements, present in the bases
of the Temple of Roma and Augustus (#4) and the Rotunda at Corinth (#9), is used
widely in Rome and the provinces.

The column shaft

---

363 Ziegenaus 1981, 32-3. No external molding is preserved from the drum of the Pantheon.
364 Wiegand 1932, 11.
365 See Chaps. IV and V.
366 See Chap. V.
367 The monopteroi in Herodes Atticus’ nymphaeum at Olympia also employ Attic bases. Schleif and
Weber 1944, 72.
368 See ‘The Base Molding’ above.
369 This sequence is apparent from the best preserved bases at Side and Bath.
370 Two prominent examples are Hadrian’s Villa (MacDonald and Pinto 1995, 53 fig. 41) and his
library at Athens (Wilson Jones 2000, 30 fig. 1.17).
Though less elaborate than some of the Julio-Claudian column shafts,\textsuperscript{371} those of Hadrian’s Pantheon (#50), the Temple of Zeus Asklepios Soter at Pergamon (#27), and the Rotunda at Athens (#5) were nonetheless striking. Unlike most round temples,\textsuperscript{372} they employed colored granite or marble monoliths between white marble bases and capitals.\textsuperscript{373} In addition to enlivening their columns, colored stones, which were difficult and costly to obtain, underlined the wealth and power of their founders.\textsuperscript{374}

\textbf{The column capital}

As in the Julio-Claudian period,\textsuperscript{375} the majority of Flavian and Antonine round temples favored the Corinthian order. Doric and Ionic were used sparingly,\textsuperscript{376} confined to a few select buildings at Tibur and Rome. The Shrine of Aphrodite (#63) that forms the centerpiece of Hadrian’s nymphaeum at Tibur employs the Doric order.\textsuperscript{377} Combining a broad abacus and compact echinus, the Shrine’s capitals may recall those of the Temple of Aphrodite at Knidos (#16).\textsuperscript{378} Similarly, the Theater Shrine at Tibur (#65) may have used the Ionic order to underline Hadrian’s interest in Greek architectural forms.\textsuperscript{379}

\textsuperscript{371} See Chap. V #4.
\textsuperscript{372} Of those which preserved column shafts, the remaining Flavian and Antonine round temples employed fluting and materials comparable to their bases and capitals.
\textsuperscript{373} The Arch of Constantine provides a later example of colored monoliths used to add contrast and visual interest to a monument. Wilson Jones 2000, 124.
\textsuperscript{374} This is especially true in the case of the Pantheon. Wilson Jones 1999, 2000, 194-5, and below.
\textsuperscript{375} See Chap. V.
\textsuperscript{376} Tuscan, a variation of Doric, is used most widely in Imperial amphitheaters. Wilson Jones 2000, 110 (list of examples).
\textsuperscript{377} Other Doric buildings in Hadrian’s villa include the tholus that topped the West Belvedere or viewing tower and the Ceremonial Precinct. MacDonald and Pinto 1995, 51-2 and 60.
\textsuperscript{378} See above for the debate surrounding the original order of the Temple at Knidos.
\textsuperscript{379} See #66 and above (Ligorio’s porch). The Teatro Marittimo of Hadrian’s villa also had an Ionic colonnade. MacDonald and Pinto 1995, 82-3.
More significantly at Rome, the Temple of Vesta in the Forum (#57), reconstructed as Ionic from the late Republican period, is depicted with the Ionic order on both Flavian coins and Trajanic reliefs. Its continued use of Ionic, rare in the Roman Forum, reflects tradition rather than contemporary taste.

Of the Flavian round temples, only the Perirrhanterion (#51) preserves Corinthian capitals. With a closely overlapping pattern of leaves, noted for combining rigid nerves and folded lobes, they recall Augustan capitals from the adjacent Temple of Apollo Medicus. As Flavian capitals, they are less organic, but do overlap the scrolling helices in a manner suggestive of natural growth.

The Corinthian capitals of the Hadrianic Pantheon (#50) also betray some Augustan influence, though through the medium of Trajan’s Forum. Like the Trajanic capitals, they employ ornament that is more structured than the lush, thickly layered growth of capitals from the Forum of Augustus. On the Pantheon’s column and pilaster capitals, the leaf forms appear fragile, spread in thin, vertical layers across a background distinct from the naturalistic ornament.

---

380 For 1st c. BC coins, which show the Temple, see #57 and Chap. IV.
381 Overlapping leaves form part of the Italic tradition known from the Corinthian capitals of the Temple of Hercules Victor ad Portam Trigeminam (#44) and of the Sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste. Leon 1971, 149.
382 See Viscogliosi 1996a, 45-7, 88-9, 108-9. Leon (1971, 149, 159-60, and 164; cf. Gros 1996a, 145) dates the capital fragment to a partial restoration of the Temple of Apollo after the fire of 14 BC. Consequently, he suggests that it may have been influenced by capitals in the Forum of Augustus.
383 Gros 2001, 484. Heilmeyer (1970, 44-7; cf. Viscogliosi 1996a, 46-7) points to parallels from Asia Minor, namely Corinthian capitals from the Temples of Apollo at Didyma and Augustus at Antioch, for the capitals of Sosianus’ temple (these are less closely reflected in the 14 BC capitals, see above).
384 As Heilmeyer (1970, 134-6) notes, these fit many of the characteristics of Flavian ornament, exemplified by capitals from the Domus Flavia (Leon 1971, 89 and pls. 29.2-3 and 30.1-3).
385 For the influences of the Forum of Augustus on Trajan’s Forum, see Gros 2001, 486 and above.
386 Heilmeyer (1970, 155 and 158-60; vs. Gros 1996a, 188-9 and above) suggests that the same workshop carved the capitals of the Forum of Trajan, the Pantheon, and the Temple of Antoninus and Faustina. Freyberger (1990, 55-6 nos. 95 and 100-1) adds capitals from the Hadrianic rebuilding of the Basilica Neptuni to this list.
387 Leon 1971, 142 and 165 pls. 61.1-2; Gros 1996a, 178, and cf. 2001, 487.
388 Heilmeyer 1970, 151-3, 158-9, and pls. 54-5.
The play of light and shade achieved by the Pantheon’s capitals\textsuperscript{389} is an important feature of the Corinthian capitals from the Temple of Zeus Asklepios Soter (#27). Here, the leaf forms are thin and vertical, effecting a contrast between their projecting lobes and deeply carved ridges and hollows. As Pergamene capitals, they introduce non-canonical forms into their design, like egg-and-dart molding,\textsuperscript{390} which reveal indigenous traditions of architectural ornament.\textsuperscript{391}

More canonical capitals from the Traianeum at Pergamon\textsuperscript{392} are reflected in contemporary examples from the Temple of Tyche at Side (#59). These show a vertical pattern of leaves with rigid nerves, pointed lobes, and hollows designed to accentuate light and shade across the surface of the capital.\textsuperscript{393} With striking similarities to capitals from Hadrian’s Temple of Venus and Roma,\textsuperscript{394} it is not difficult to believe that they were carved by the same or a similar workshop.\textsuperscript{395}

The remaining capitals preserved from Antonine round temples, namely of Sulis-Minerva (#8), Liber Pater (#29), and the Nymphs (#2), are not in sufficiently good condition for study.\textsuperscript{396} However, it is likely that they show many of the same traits adopted by Hadrianic capitals: vertical, somewhat schematic growth and a strong interest in light and shade.\textsuperscript{397}

\textsuperscript{389} Heilmeyer 1970, 147 and 168; Gros 1996a, 178.
\textsuperscript{390} This motif is also incorporated into the Ionic order of the Temple of Roma and Augustus (#4), see Chap. V.
\textsuperscript{391} Heilmeyer 1970, 164; Wilson Jones 2000, 153. Comparable examples may be found in the Harbor Baths and the Library of Celsus at Ephesos (Heilmeyer 1970, pls. 27.3 and 28.1-2).
\textsuperscript{392} Heilmeyer 1970, 167 pl. 27.1; cf. Gros 1996a, 182.
\textsuperscript{393} Gros (2001, 486 and 489) notes that the play on light and shade, absent from Flavian capitals, was reintroduced to provincial architecture under Trajan, possibly as a result of local workshops returning from Rome.
\textsuperscript{394} Freyberger 1990, 57 no. 107.
\textsuperscript{395} Koenigs and Radt (1979, 337-40) have proposed that the same workshop executed the capitals of the Traianeum and the Temple of Venus and Roma, and Strong (1953, 133) has noted the influence of Pergamene workshops on the architectural decoration of Side.
\textsuperscript{396} Although its capitals are no longer extant, the leaf acroteria of the Temple of Palaimon-Melikertes at Isthmia (#15) are consistent with those of Antonine capitals in their use of deep ridges, regular hollows and well-defined lobes.
\textsuperscript{397} In their poor state of preservation, it is difficult to say how far their design was influenced by Augustan or Pergamene models, cf. Gros 2001, 489-90.
The entablature

The Doric Shrine of Aphrodite at Tibur (#63) and the Ionic Temple of Vesta in the Roman Forum (#57) employed corresponding entablatures, while the majority of Flavian and Antonine round temples used Corinthian entablatures. The Corinthian entablature, distinguished from the Ionic by the presence of fully developed modillions, first appears in the Julio-Claudian period. While prototypes existed in the late Republic, the Tiberian Temple of Castor, with its S-shaped volutes elaborated by acanthus leaves, set the standard for the modillion cornice.

The Perirrhanterion (#51) takes its inspiration from an earlier source, namely the exterior frieze of the Temple of Apollo Medicus. Its double-sided frieze course displays laurel and acanthus, whose naturalistic forms recall the rich ornament of Apollo’s temple. This course, framed by Lesbian cymatia, surmounts a three-fasciae architrave and is in turn topped by a diminutive dentil course, a modillion cornice, and a row of bead-and-reel ornament.

---

398 Although the Uffizi relief may show a Corinthian entablature surmounting the Temple of Vesta’s Ionic peristasis, this combination seems unlikely, cf. Wilson Jones 2000, 111-3 (on mixed orders).
399 Augustan examples may be found in the Temples of Divus Iulius, Saturnus, Apollo on the Palatine and in Circo, and Mars Ultor. Strong and Ward-Perkins 1962, 24-5; Gros 1976a, 200-1 and 234, and 1996a, 148-9.
400 For their origins and possible use in the Temple of Hercules Victor ad Portam Trigeminam (#44), see Chap. IV.
401 Strong and Ward-Perkins 1962, 25; Sear 1982, 67; Gros 1996a, 148; Wilson Jones 2000, 142, and below. Gros (2001, 494) suggests that this form was inspired by Classical precedents like the consoles used to crown the door of the Erechtheion at Athens.
403 The Temple of Fortuna Huiusce Diei (#38) may also incorporate acanthus spirals into its frieze, see Chap. IV.
404 Zanker 1988, 68; Viscogliosi 1996a, 48-9 figs. 45-6 and 48.
405 The three-fascia architrave is standard for Corinthian entablatures from the late Augustan period onwards. Strong and Ward-Perkins 1962, 18.
406 While the cymatia and bead-and-reel recall ornament from the Temple of Mars Ultor (Sear 1982, 63 fig. 34.27; Ganzert 1988, 121 Cat. 11), the modillions, which frame soffit panels (see below), are reminiscent of the Temple of Apollo Medicus (Leon 1971, 197 pl. 79.1 and 80.1; Viscogliosi 1996a, 51 fig. 49).
Both the exterior and interior entablatures of the Pantheon (#50) set a modillion cornice that is comparable to the Temple of Castor’s above a three-fascia architrave and a blank frieze course. Lesbian cymatia, bead-and-reel, and egg-and-tongue ornament, typical of early Hadrianic work, appear below the modillions and rosette soffits. Whereas the Perirrhanterion employed an elaborate anthemion, known from Flavian and early Augustan entablatures, the Pantheon’s blank frieze and more restrained decoration looks back to the Forum of Augustus.

By contrast, entablatures from the Temple of Zeus Asklepios Soter at Pergamon (#27) and the Temple of Tyche at Side (#59) are more ornate. At Pergamon, modillions with elaborate leaf motifs frame rosettes, while the cornice is decorated with dentils, egg-and-tongue as a frame for a wave pattern, and a band of lotus and palmette ornament. A better preserved entablature from the Hadrianic upper gymnasium employs richer decoration with egg-and-tongue used to frame its modillions and soffits.

Like the Pergamene palmettes which recall ornament from the Temple of Venus and Roma, many of the features used in the exterior entablature of the Temple at Side reflect styles prevalent in late Hadrianic Rome. Above a three-fascia architrave defined by bands of bead-and-reel, egg-and-tongue and elaborate Lesbian cymatia act as a frame for an anthemion frieze course. The entablature, which

---

407 Leon 1971, 191 pl. 80.3.
408 These may have been inspired by cymatia from the Forum of Augustus (Ganzert 1988, 117 Cat. 4; cf. Leon 1971, 171 pl. 70.1, for comparable ornament from the Temple of Roma and Augustus at Ostia).
410 Leon 1971, 108 pls. 36.3 (Domus Flavia) and 37.2 (entablature found in the Via di Teatro Marcello).
412 These fragments come from above the drum’s entrance. Ziegenaus 1981, 62-3. What remains of the entablature from the Temple’s pronaos and interior employs more typical molding, including egg-and-dart and Lesbian cymatia, together with a blank frieze course and an S-shaped modillion cornice. Wiegand 1932, 12 and 14; Ziegenaus 1981, 47-9 and 60-2.
413 Koenigs and Radt 1979, pl. 117.3-4.
414 Gros 1996a, 181. Strong (1953, 136) suggests that the palmette was a common Asiatic ornament employed by Pergamene architects in Rome.
surmounts the pilasters, includes a more detailed frieze with heads of Tyche shown above garlands and putti. While the garlands, bead-and-reel, egg-and-tongue, and cymatia are features of the entablature of Hadrian’s Mausoleum, comparable heads appear in frieze courses from the Traianeum at Pergamon and the small peristyle temple at Side.

Though its carving is less skillful, the frieze course from the Shrine of Sulis-Minerva at Bath (#8) is similar in its subject matter, combining leaf ornament with depictions of animals. Of the remaining Antonine round temples to preserve entablatures, the Shrine of Bacchus (#32), like the Mausoleum and the round Temple at Side, employs bead-and-reel and Lesbian cymatia as part of its three-fascia architrave and figured decoration in its frieze course. The preserved fragment of the entablature from the Temple of the Nymphs at Argos (#2) lacks ornament, while the sima of the Rotunda at Athens (#5) consists of a dentil course surmounted by bands of floral calyxes and acanthus leaves, alternating with lion-head water spouts. This elaborate sima, reminiscent of examples from the Traianeum at Pergamon as well as late Hadrianic architecture in Rome, sets the Rotunda apart from early Antonine buildings, whose plain simas were drawn from the Augustan repertory.

415 Kleiner (1980, 37 and 42-3) proposes that this type of relief originated in Pergamon.
416 Strong 1953, 144 fig. 6.
418 For the probable identity of this figure, see above.
419 The modillion cornice and lion-head water spouts mentioned by Roux (1957, 664 and above) have not been preserved for comparison.
420 The simas of the Rotunda at Corinth (#9) and the monopteroi at Olympia display similar ornament. Dinsmoor, jr. 1974, 417-9 n. 9.
421 Unusually, not all the water spouts are pierced and none connect to channels or gutters for the removal of rain water. Dinsmoor, jr. 1974, 419-20 and 424-5.
422 Good examples may be found in the Temple of Venus and Roma and the Mausoleum of Hadrian. Strong 1953, 128 fig. 3 and 144 fig. 6.
423 Strong 1953, 120 and 148.
Cornice soffits and ceiling coffers

The more elaborate Corinthian entablatures preserved from Flavian and Antonine round temples include soffit panels in-between the modillions of their cornices. These soffit panels contain rosettes, consisting of a single six-to-eight petaled flower in the cornices of the Perirrhanterion (#51), the Temple of Zeus Asklepios Soter (#27), and the Temple of the Nymphs at Argos (#2), and two overlapping flowers in those of the Pantheon’s (#50) pronaos and drum.

Rosettes also feature in the ceiling coffers of the Temple of Tyche at Side (#59). Consisting of a single, eight-petaled flower framed within a recessed panel, they are less elaborate than the ceiling coffers of the Temple of Hercules Victor ad portam Trigeminam (#44) and the Round Temple at Tibur (#64), which employ both flowers and acanthus plants.

Such ornament is absent from the coffers of the Pantheon’s dome and of the Shrine of Aphrodite at Tibur (#63). However, as the dome was originally revetted, rosettes, together with any elaboration of the coffers’ frames, may have been fashioned out of bronze. Considering the high level of detail possible in bronze work, coffers probably played a significant role in the Pantheon’s decorative program.

Pavements and wall revetment

---

425 See Chap. IV. No coffers are extant from Julio-Claudian round temples.
426 The coffers of the Temple of Hercules Victor and of many prominent Julio-Claudian buildings, like the Temple of Concord (Wilson Jones 2000, 142 fig. 7.16), were elaborated with egg-and-dart molding. By contrast, stucco may have comprised the Shrine’s ornament, cf. Ward-Perkins 1989, 119.
427 For their role in reflecting light, see above. Wilson Jones (2000, 142) notes the role soffits and coffers played in enlivening cornices or ceilings when seen from below.
Like their predecessors, Flavian and Antonine round temples employed *opus sectile* pavements as part of their decoration. Hadrian’s Pantheon (#50) provides the most conspicuous example, wherein a grid pattern containing circles and squares adorns the floor of its pronaos and rotunda. This pattern, aligned with the cardinal axes, is enlivened by colored stones, which appear in a similar arrangement in the drum’s wall revetment. These stones, drawn from throughout the Roman empire, not only underline Hadrian’s power and wealth, but also, in the context of the drum, place a greater emphasis on its dramatic effects than its structure.

White marble fragments and clamp holes suggest that a similar geometric revetment was used for the floor and walls of the Temple of Zeus Asklepios Soter (#27), while Ligorio notes the presence of a multi-colored pavement of interlocking rhomboids in the Theater Shrine (#65) at Hadrian’s Villa. Although nothing is extant of the Shrine’s pavement, a geometric pattern of gray marble has been reconstructed for its precinct. Similarly, pieces of white and colored marble found at the nymphaeum at Tibur formed part of its geometric pavement, which may have influenced the paving pattern used in the Shrine of Aphrodite (#63).

Following late Republican practice, stucco may have elaborated the exterior of the Pantheon’s drum and its brick cornices. Though stucco is a common

429 See Chaps. IV and V.
430 The bedding layer and marble fragments found beneath the drum’s floor suggest that Domitian’s Pantheon had a similar geometric pavement. Ziolkowski (1999, 55; cf. La Rocca 1999b, 280) proposes that it may also have been comparable to the geometric flooring of Hadrian’s Basilica Neptuni.
431 See #50. The use of complex geometric patterns in conjunction with round spaces was first explored in the pavement and revetment of Nero’s Domus Aurea. Ward-Perkins 1989, 118.
432 Ziegenaus (1981, 45 and 65) has not been able to confirm the existence of the colored marble fragments mentioned by Wiegand (1932, 14).
433 MacDonald and Pinto 1995, 130.
434 For a description of this pavement, which skillfully conforms to the curvilinear shape of the Ninfeo Fede, see de Franceschini 1991, 140 and 449-50.
435 Although its pavement is no longer preserved, based on the nymphaeum’s, it seems probable that the Shrine employed *opus sectile* or mosaic work.
436 See Chap. IV. The Domitianic rebuilding of the Temple of Fortuna Huisce Diei (#38) also used stucco on its walls, while Coarelli (1981a, 21) tentatively suggests that some of its *opus sectile* pavement may be preserved.
external facing for cupolas, bronze was employed for its dome. Like the Pantheon’s bronze revetment, the multi-colored marble and glass mosaics inside the cupola of the Temple of Asklepios belie its solidity and enhance the light effects achieved by its oculus.

**Statuary and reliefs**

As in the late Republican and Julio-Claudian periods, the sculpture and reliefs employed in Flavian and Antonine round temples reflected both their cults and the agendas of their founders. Hadrian’s Pantheon (#50) may have showcased images of Augustus and Agrippa438 in the niches of its intermediate block as well as statues of other deified emperors in the aediculae of its drum.439 Appropriate for a monument to the Imperial cult,440 these statues were complemented by an eagle and a *corona civica* on the pronaos’ pediment, which recalled Agrippa’s intention to elevate Augustus to the level of the gods.441 Similarly, the pronaos of the Theater Shrine at Tibur (#65) may have displayed a statue of Hercules,442 whom emperors favored for his role in supporting the Roman state.443

Whereas nothing is known of the other statues exhibited in the Shrine’s pronaos and cella, the cult images of the Shrine of Aphrodite (#63) and of the Temples of Zeus Asklepios Soter at Pergamon (#27) and of Palaimon-Melikertes at Isthmia (#15) are attested by physical remains and iconographic sources. The copy of

---

438 These statues are important features of Agrippa’s Pantheon, see Cass. Dio 53.27 (quoted in #50) and Chap. V ‘The Pantheon.’
439 Wilson Jones 1989a, 44-5, and 2000, 180; Ziolkowski 1999, 60. Parallels may be found in The tholos of the Sanctuary of Athena Pronaia at Delphi (#12), which Fiechter (1937, 313) believes was refitted with statues of Roman emperors, and in the nymphaeum at Olympia (see Schleif and Weber 1944, 54-61).
440 See Chap. V #50.
441 See Cass. Dio 53.27, and Chap. V.
442 See Coarelli 1987, 85-112 (important late Republican sanctuary of Hercules at Tibur)
Praxiteles’ Aphrodite discovered in the nymphaeum at Tibur, by linking the Shrine to the famous Temple at Knidos (#16), underlined Hadrian’s Greek tastes. His interest in the Greek world is also attested by the cult statue of Asklepios, with whom Hadrian was identified in the Temple at Pergamon.

Coins show that Palaimon on a dolphin formed the centerpiece of his Temple at Isthmia (#15) while Pausanias mentions statues of Palaimon, Leucothea and Poseidon in its precinct. Like the dolphin, which signals a pivotal point in the history of Palaimon’s cult, the boat illustrated on two reliefs from the Tholus of Cybele (#34) recalls the importation of the black stone of Magna Mater to Rome. The stone may have been incorporated into her cult image on the Palatine wherein, as on the reliefs, she appeared seated on a throne flanked by lions. Similarly, like the heads of Tyche shown on one of its exterior friezes, the zodiac images displayed on the ceiling of the Temple at Side (#59) may be closely connected to the cult.

In addition to its statues and pedimental sculpture, the Pantheon incorporated reliefs depicting sacrificial implements, garlands, and candelabra into its decorative program. Displayed on the intermediate block, these reliefs recall decoration on the enclosure of the Ara Pacis, where garlands topped by paterae hang from bucrania. Not only are the motifs and symbolic content similar, but the richly detailed ornament

---

444 While this statue appears in the main exedra, the smaller niches may have contained bases or altars to other gods. Ziegenaus 1981, 45. Moreover, it seems probable that the pedimental sculpture included Athena and a giant, see above.
445 See above.
446 This theme, celebrating the dolphin which saved Palaimon from drowning (see above), is picked up by the acroterial sculpture.
447 Paus. 2.2.1.
448 Ov. Fast. 4.273 fol. and 343 fol.; cf. Simon 1963c, 744-5, and 1966, 24-5. Though her cult appeared in Etruria, South Italy and Sicily in the early 3rd c. BC, it was introduced to Rome either directly from Phrygia or through Pergamon in 204 BC. Roller 1999, 263-71, 275-8, and 281.
449 Prud. Perist. 10.156-60; Arnob. Nat. 7.49.
450 This statue, shown carrying a patera and a scepter, was discovered during excavations of the Temple of Magna Mater on the Palatine. Hülsen 1895b, 25-7; Esdaile 1908, 371-2.
451 See above.
452 Kleiner 1992, 90.
of the Pantheon’s reliefs looks back to Augustan models and by extension, the building’s origins.

PROPORTIONAL ANALYSIS (Charts VI.1-8)

Although Vitruvius can hardly be considered an authority on buildings constructed after his lifetime, many of the ideas which he expressed, particularly of the importance of symmetry and proportion in temple design, remained current in Roman society. Monopteroi built from the Flavian through the Antonine periods, like their predecessors, employed the 1:10 relationship between their lower column diameters and column heights recommended by Vitruvius.453 This ratio is echoed by most drums, while both the monopteral Rotunda at Athens (#5) and the peripteral Temple of Tyche at Side (#59) show a 1:1 correspondence between their column heights and total exterior measurements.

In terms of columnar proportion, the Theater Shrine at Tibur (#65) fulfills the first of two requirements for pycnostyle and the Shrine of Sulis-Minerva at Bath (#8), as reconstructed by B. Cunliffe, fits the second for systyle. The Pantheon’s (#50) porch columns, like those of the Shrine at Tibur, are close to pycnostyle with a 1 5/8:1 relationship between their intercolumnations and lower column diameters and, like the Shrine at Bath, resemble systyle with a total height 9 5/9 times their lower column diameter.454

Vitruvius’ insistence on the lower column diameter as the determining factor for column design has more relevance in these periods. Not only does the Doric

---

453 This ratio is not applicable to the Doric Shrine of Aphrodite at Tibur (#63).
454 Wilson Jones (1989a, 49) suggests that systyle was intended in the Pantheon.
Shrine of Aphrodite at Tibur (#63) closely approximate his ideal relationships, but, when other elements of the columnar orders are compared to the lower column diameter, clear correlations emerge. With few exceptions, the base diameters are about 1 1/3 times the lower column diameters, while the base heights are one-half. Moreover, as in the Julio-Claudian period, the shaft height to lower column diameter ratio is close to 8:1.

There is more variation among capital diameters and especially among capital heights, which range from 5/8 to 1 2/5 times the lower column diameter. Even more divergent are the temples’ intercolumnations, interaxial widths and diameters. Moreover, Wilson Jones’ ‘rule’ of a 6:5 relationship between the column and shaft heights is only supported by the columns of the Pantheon’s exedras and of the intermediate block of the Temple of Zeus Asklepios Soter (#27). Though more popular in the Julio-Claudian period, this proportional relationship appears to have less relevance for round temple design than Vitruvius’ module.

Across the Flavian and Antonine periods, there is little correspondence between round temples’ structural elements and critical dimensions, although individual temples show some significant proportional relationships. Most famous is

---

455 Vitruvius’ guidelines are not valid for the Corinthian order, where, with the exception of the aediculae columns of Hadrian’s Pantheon, all are in excess of a 1:1 correspondence between their capital heights and lower column diameters.
456 Most range between 1¼ and 1½.
457 This ratio applies to the Pantheon’s porch and aediculae columns (cf. ‘Type B’ in Wilson Jones 1989a, 43), and the columns of the Temples of Palaimon-Melikertes at Isthmia and of the Nymphs at Argos (#2).
458 See Chap. V ‘Proportional analysis.’
459 See Wilson Jones 1989a, 43 (‘Type C’). Exceptions include the reconstructed columns of the Temple of the Nymphs at Argos, the aediculae columns of the Pantheon, and the Doric columns of the Shrine of Aphrodite.
460 The only correspondence may be found in the porch and exedra capitals of the Pantheon, which are 1 1/3 times their lower column diameters.
461 The Pantheon’s porch columns, as reconstructed by Davies, Hemsoll and Wilson Jones (see #50 above), would fit this relationship.
462 Though close, the columnar proportions of the Temple of Palaimon-Melikertes at Isthmia (#15), the Shrine of Sulis-Minerva, and the Rotunda at Athens are less reliable since they include reconstructed measurements.
463 Wilson Jones (1989a, 56-9) acknowledges some limitations of the 6:5 ‘rule.’
the Pantheon’s 1:1 correspondence between its cella interior, measured at the interaxial diameter, and its height. This correlation has inspired scholars to inquire into the principles that informed the Pantheon’s design. Among the more popular interpretations are those of K. de Fine Licht, H. Geertman, and M. Wilson Jones. While de Fine Licht sees the radius of the rotunda, divided into sixteen sections, as the factor which determines most elements of the Pantheon’s plan, Geertman favors a more complicated approach. First he inscribes a square into a circle corresponding to the cella wall. Then he adds a square of the same dimensions to include the Pantheon’s intermediate block and porch. Finally, he uses complex relationships based on the 1:1 ratio between the sides of the squares and their diagonals at the square root of two to account for Agrippa’s plan and the plan and elevation of Hadrian’s Pantheon.

Wilson Jones adopts a similar approach, but employs the interaxial diameter of the cella at 150 Roman feet as the circle into which he inscribes the first square. This allows him to align the second square with the centers of the porch columns instead of with the porch exterior. He then follows de Fine Licht in determining the location of the Pantheon’s exedrae and aediculae from the circle divided into sixteen radial measurements and their corresponding angles. In all three approaches, geometry provides a means of setting out the basic form of the Pantheon, while, as Wilson Jones notes, arithmetic, namely fractions of its 150 foot critical dimension, determines many of its parts.

---

464 Moreover, de Fine Licht (1966, 195-8) notes that the circumference of Hadrian’s Pantheon is approximately ten times the length of Agrippa’s, according to Beltrami’s reconstruction.
465 Geertman 1980, 206-17. Wilson Jones (2000, 93) remarks that the use of the square root of two in the Pantheon’s plan is logical is so far as its drum is intersected by a square intermediate block and porch.
Taken as a group, the round temples built during the Flavian and Antonine periods are most closely related in terms of their columnar orders. Regarding their size, most were small, though they show a considerable range from the Tholus of Cybele (#34) with a floor space of nearly five square meters\textsuperscript{468} to the Shrine of Aphrodite, which exceeds two hundred.

IV CONCLUSION

Though firmly established by the end of the Augustan period,\textsuperscript{469} the movement that paid homage to Classical Athens began to evolve under the later Julio-Claudians.\textsuperscript{470} Augustan Classicism developed into an elaborate baroque style by the reign of Vespasian, who employed ornate ornament in many of his building projects.\textsuperscript{471} He and Domitian chose a more conservative style however for their rebuildings of Julio-Claudian round temples, most notably the Perirrhanterion (#51), whose links to the Augustan Temple of Apollo Medicus\textsuperscript{472} are underscored by its decoration.

In reaction to the florid ornament of the Flavians, Apollodorus returned to models like the Forum of Augustus in his design for Trajan’s Forum.\textsuperscript{473} This more severe style was also used in Hadrian’s early buildings like the Pantheon (#50), while many of his later works looked towards Asia Minor for their inspiration.\textsuperscript{474} A major

\textsuperscript{468} This dimension corresponds to the Domitianic foundations, which may be identified with this shrine (see #34 above).
\textsuperscript{469} See Chap. V ‘Decorative details.’
\textsuperscript{470} Strong (1953, 121) notes precursors to the rich Flavian style in the ornament of the Temples of Castor and of Concordia.
\textsuperscript{471} Gros 1996a, 185.
\textsuperscript{472} See Chap. V and above.
\textsuperscript{473} Strong 1953, 120; Leon 1971, 127-41 and 159.
\textsuperscript{474} Strong 1953, 120-1 and 130; Gros 1996a, 185.
workshop from Pergamon,\textsuperscript{475} which seems to have constructed the Temple of Zeus Asklepios Soter (#27), may have accompanied Hadrian to Rome to build his Temple of Venus and Roma.\textsuperscript{476} Despite his penchant for Asiatic ornament, some of the last monuments begun by Hadrian imitated the rich variety of forms found in early Augustan architecture.\textsuperscript{477} These forms also inspired Antoninus Pius, who revived traditional styles in many of his projects,\textsuperscript{478} including his rebuilding of the Shrine of Bacchus (#32).

Like their eclectic ornament, the round temples of the Flavian and Antonine periods are notable for their range of locations. Moreover, many employ brickwork and concrete as well as domes, which may feature in select late Republican and Julio-Claudian temples. The dome appears to best advantage in Hadrian’s Pantheon, whose design, based on simple geometric and arithmetic relationships, had a far-reaching influence on round temple design.

\textsuperscript{475} Strong 1953, 137; Heilmeyer 1970, 165, cf. 168-9 (other workshops from Asia Minor active in Rome). However, Gros (2001, 487-8) urges that caution be employed when identifying workshops based on stylistic similarities.

\textsuperscript{476} Strong (1953, 121; cf. 138) includes the Mausoleum of Hadrian and the Hadrianeum among the monuments influenced by Asiatic architecture.

\textsuperscript{477} The interior of the Hadrianeum built after his death imitates ornament from the Basilica Ulpia. Strong 1953, 130 and 137.

\textsuperscript{478} The Temple of Antoninus and Faustina, begun by Antoninus Pius (Cassatella 1993, 46-7), includes classical ornament evocative of the Augustan period. Strong 1953, 121.
I INTRODUCTION

After the collapse of the Antonine dynasty, Septimius Severus seized control over the empire. From an architectural standpoint, his reign and the reigns of his sons, Caracalla and Geta, coupled extensive repair work with new building. While the repairs focused on fire damage in the Forum, the new foundations took the form of huge imperial baths and temples celebrating the dynasty’s origins.\(^1\) Stylistically, most Severan work resembled Flavian architecture, its ornate decoration possibly inspired by Septimius Severus’ restoration of the Domus Augustana.\(^2\)

Though the Eastern excesses of Caracalla’s successor Elagabalus brought the dynasty into disrepute, Alexander Severus restored some semblance of order, while completing several Severan repair and building projects. Following his death however, the empire rapidly fragmented, with legionaries in the provinces elevating their commanders to the status of emperors. Prominent among them was Aurelian, who, unlike most of his immediate predecessors, focused his building activity on Rome. His vast circuit of walls attests to the uncertainty of his times. This is underscored by the next significant set of emperors, who partitioned the Roman world along strict boundary lines.

As a by-product of dividing their rule, the joint Augusti Diocletian and Maximian, aided by the Caesares Constantius and Maximianus, built widely in the

---

\(^1\) Ward-Perkins 1989, 132, and below.
provinces.³ Their successor Maxentius, Maximian’s son, however returned his focus to Rome, where he undertook a number of significant projects. Constantius’ son Constantine, on defeating Maxentius, resumed or re-dedicated much of this building work, prior to moving the empire’s capital to Constantinople in 330 AD.⁴

While late third and early fourth century buildings show limited development in their ornament,⁵ they do incorporate technical advances. Chief among them are new methods of constructing domes, which enable Constantine’s architects to explore the lighting opportunities opened up by windows.⁶

II DISCUSSION

The Severans: (193-235 AD)

Septimius Severus: (193-211 AD)

Septimius Severus’ vast building program comprised the restoration of monuments damaged in the Forum fire of 191 AD,⁷ additions to the Flavian palace on the Palatine,⁸ and significant new construction like his Temple of Hercules and Bacchus on the Quirinal. In conjunction with his projects at Rome, he commissioned a marble plan for the library of the Templum Pacis, which he restored,⁹ while, outside of Italy, he built widely in Lepcis Magna and saw the completion of the Sanctuary of Asklepios at Pergamon.

³ Though Diocletian rebuilt the Curia and constructed baths on the Viminal, his primary project was a palace at Split. Similarly, Constantius and Maximianus emphasized new construction in their capitals at Trier and Thessaloniki. Sear 1982, 263-8.
⁴ Ward-Perkins 1989, 415.
⁵ Some like the ‘Temple of Romulus’ (#52 and below) even reuse ornament from Flavian and Severan buildings.
⁶ See ‘Roofing techniques’ below.
⁸ Together with rebuilding the palace, he added the Septizodium, whose elaborate three-tiered design is characteristic of Severan architecture. Ward-Perkins 1989, 132 and below.
⁹ Ward-Perkins 1989, 128; Coarelli 1996m, 67-70.
To Septimius Severus’ reign may be attributed the reconstruction of two major Archaic foundations in the Roman Forum: the Mundus (#49) and the Temple of Vesta (#57). Fragments of the Mundus include brick foundations\textsuperscript{10} and marble blocks used to repair its Republican entablature. Contemporary with its rebuilding, steps were added to its precinct to allow the Mundus access from the south.\textsuperscript{11}

More extensive was the Severan reconstruction of the Temple of Vesta. Based on coins,\textsuperscript{12} Julia Domna, the wife of Septimius Severus, is thought to have taken charge of the project, which included rebuilding significant elements of the Trajanic Temple.\textsuperscript{13} As on the Uffizi and Lateran reliefs,\textsuperscript{14} the Severan Temple includes a podium with engaged plinths and columns. Instead of the Ionic order, Julia Domna employed Corinthian as illustrated on her coins, which also show the grillwork and domed roof known from the reliefs.\textsuperscript{15}

The Severan Temple, like the Regia and the Atrium Vestae until its 64 AD rebuilding,\textsuperscript{16} retains the eastern orientation of its predecessors. Resting on Republican foundations, its marble-revetted podium and plinths supported twenty Luna marble columns. These were mirrored by semi-columns attached to the interior and exterior of the cella wall. Above the colonnade were ceiling coffers and a Corinthian entablature, whose frieze displays sacrificial implements.\textsuperscript{17} While the Corinthian order is unique to the Severan Temple, these motifs may replicate earlier ornament as

\textsuperscript{10} The foundations may date to the late Severan period. Coarelli 1995k, 95.
\textsuperscript{11} Prior to the Severan period, the pavement level to the south was raised considerably. Coarelli 1983b, 217.
\textsuperscript{12} See #57.
\textsuperscript{13} Alternatively, some elements may have survived the fire of 191 AD. Scott 1999b, 127.
\textsuperscript{14} See Chap. VI.
\textsuperscript{15} On the coins, an image of Vesta is shown inside the Temple and Vestals appear sacrificing on a round altar in front. Mattingly 1950, 168-9; Cody 1973, 43; cf. Cecamore 1994-1995, 26 figs. 19 and 20.
\textsuperscript{16} Scott 1993c, 138-42, and 1999a, 189-92.
\textsuperscript{17} Lugli 1946, 206.
they find close parallels on a Roman denarius minted by P. Sulpicius Galba in 69 BC.  

The Abaton, Pergamon (#26)

The Abaton (#26) built at Pergamon in ca. 200 AD recalls the Hadrianic Temple of Zeus Asklepios Soter (#27) in its plan and ornamentation. Located next to the Temple at the south-east corner of Asklepios’ precinct, its two-storied round form was obscured by a cistern and a covered portico spanning the south side of the court. Like the Temple and the Hadrianic Pantheon (#50), the Abaton’s greatest impact was achieved on entering its domed drum. The drum and its six horseshoe-shaped apses form the building’s upper level. Its lower level, which is without parallel, comprises three full and one half rings of walls and pillars roofed with barrel vaults. The first or innermost ring consists of a central core, supporting the floor of the upper level, while a series of seventeen pillars forms the second ring, and windows and archways comprise the third. The fourth, half-ring, is open to the sky and channels traffic around the north-west side of the building.

In addition to the portico, a cryptoporticus opens into the Abaton’s lower level. This level in turn gives access to the upper level by a complicated set of stairways. Like the Temple, the upper rotunda was decorated with marble revetment

---

18 This coin, minted in honor of Vesta, shows a knife, a simpulum and an ornamental ax. Cody 1973, 47 pl. 5.8.
19 For the drum, see Ziegenaues 1981, 98-9, and ‘Roofing techniques’ below.
20 Ziegenaues 1981, 94-100.
21 Instead of windows on the south and east sides, the third ring is solid as it abuts the natural slope.
22 Wiegand 1932, 16-8; Ziegenaues 1981, 78-94.
23 Ziegenaues 1981, 86.
24 The stairways, which follow the Adyton’s NE face, are complemented by a ramp. Wiegand 1932, 19-20; Ziegenaues 1981, 82-7.
and mosaics, and its apses were flanked by pilasters.\textsuperscript{25} The layout of both levels coincides with what is known of Asklepios’ worship at Pergamon. While it seems likely that cures were effected on the lower level, using spring water piped through the cryptoporticus,\textsuperscript{26} the apses of the upper level may have functioned as medical consultation rooms.\textsuperscript{27} As an incubation site, the Abaton served as an ideal complement to the Temple of Zeus Asklepios Soter.

**Geta: (211-212 AD)**

Geta may have been responsible for a Temple in Greek Aigosthena (#1).

**The Temple of Melampous, Aigosthena (#1)**

Coins minted under Geta\textsuperscript{28} may illustrate a round Temple of the hero-god Melampous located in his sanctuary at Aigosthena (#1). Next to the domed monopteros shown on the coins is a tree entwined with a serpent, which F. Robert suggests has both chthonic and agrarian connotations.\textsuperscript{29} As a second set of coins may show Melampous suckled by a she-goat,\textsuperscript{30} such symbolism is appropriate in view of his upbringing and moreover, was reflected in his festivals or *Melampodeia*.\textsuperscript{31}

**Caracalla: (211-217 AD)**

\textsuperscript{25} Though no longer extant, the capitals have been reconstructed as Corinthian. Wiegand 1932, 19; Ziegenaus 1981, 97 and 100.

\textsuperscript{26} For the water distribution system, see Ziegenaus 1981, 88-92, 96 and 98.

\textsuperscript{27} Wiegand 1932, 30; vs. Robert (1939, 407-8), who points out that no ancient source attests to the building’s function, and suggests that the porticoes, which ringed the court, more closely resemble incubation areas at other sanctuaries.

\textsuperscript{28} See #1.

\textsuperscript{29} Robert 1939, 137; vs. Postolacca (1866, 336), who considers them symbolic of a tomb. However, as few parallels can be found for mausolea on Imperial coinage (see #52 below), Postolacca’s hypothesis is untenable.

\textsuperscript{30} Imhoof-Blümer and Gardner 1888, 9.

\textsuperscript{31} *IG VII* 219 and 223, cf. 207-8 (*Melampodeion* in which the festivals were held); Paus. 1.44.5, 2.7.8 and 8.18.7 (Melampous as a hero god).
Though mindful of his father’s restoration efforts, Caracalla focused on new construction, including his Baths and a temple to Serapis.32

**The Temple of Vesta, Forum, Rome (#57)**

Under Caracalla, a coin series was issued to commemorate his mother’s rebuilding of the Temple of Vesta (#57).33 In addition to the Temple, a Corinthian monopteros topped by a domed roof, he or Julia Domna appears as a participant in the sacrifice that accompanied its re-dedication.

**Alexander Severus: (222-235 AD)**

Principally interested in the repair of older buildings, like the Flavian Amphitheater and the Temple of Isis, Alexander Severus completed the Baths of Caracalla,34 and oversaw the construction of lavish round temples at Rome (#35) and Ostia (#23).

**The Temple of Dea Dia, Rome (#35)**

A round Temple (#35) built under Alexander Severus crowned the sanctuary of Dea Dia, a large complex of buildings overseen by the priestly college, the Fratres Arvales.35 The cult of Dea Dia,36 one of the earliest in the city, was considered by Romans of the late sixth and fifth centuries BC to mark a limit of the *ager Romanus*

---

33 See #57.
35 This priesthood was drawn from the highest sector of society (Plin. *nat.* 18.6; Gell. 7[6].7). Pellegrini 1865, 10; Henzen 1868, iii-iv.
36 Otherwise unknown, Dea Dia may be related to Ceres. Birt 1845, 964-75; Henzen 1868, iv; Lanciani 1868c, 107.
or territory of Rome. This limit corresponded to the fifth milestone of the via Campana-Portuensis. Using ancient sources, principally the Annals of the Fratres Arvales, modern scholars have identified building remains at La Magliana as part of this sanctuary. A thorough study of these remains has enabled the site’s excavators, J. Scheid and H. Broise, to reconstruct its layout as well as the placement and appearance of its principal buildings.

The Annals of the priesthood are among the most important religious documents of the Imperial period. They date from 14 BC, when Augustus first dictated that the acts or religious practices of the Arvals be written down, to the late third century AD. The greatest concentration pertains to the Flavian period. These three periods, the Augustan, the Flavian and the Severan, also mark key moments in sanctuary’s building history. Though the cult of Dea Dia dates from the sixth century BC, the first signs of religious occupation are third century, and the first structures pertain to a major reorganization of the cult and its buildings in the Augustan period.

In the context of yearly purification rituals, the Annals point to the existence of four major buildings and a series of minor structures in or near the sanctuary. The

---

37 For the other limits of the *ager Romanus* in this period, see Alföldi 1962, 187-213, and Scheid 1987, 583-5 and 592-4, and for the possible derivation of *ambarvalia*, purificatory rites involving circumambulation, from *arva*, meaning ‘boundary,’ see Varro *ling. 1.1.5*, 85, Pellegrini 1865, 3, Henzen 1868, iii, and Scheid 1987, 585-6, and 1990, 99-100.
38 Patterson 1999, 135. For the sources which locate the *lucus* of Dea Dia, namely mid-Imperial *Fasti* and late Imperial martyrologies, and the topographical difficulties they present, see Scheid 1976, 639-47, and 1990, 96-101.
39 Abeken (1841, 121-3) was the first to locate the Sanctuary of Dea Dia.
40 Pending their publication of the Temple, Lanciani’s (1868c, 105-6) remains the best reconstruction.
41 Henzen 1867a, 229-47; De Rossi 1868, 25-6. Almost 240 fragments are extant dating from 28 BC to 241 or even 308 AD. Broise and Scheid 1987, 2-4.
42 Henzen 1868, iii.
43 De Rossi 1858, 69-71, and 1866, 55-6.
44 The cult’s links to Romulus, its function as a limit of the *ager Romanus*, and a prohibition on the use of tools made of other materials than bronze in the *lucus* (Macr. *Sat.* 5.19, Serv. *Aen.* 1.448, and *CIL* I 603; cf. Henzen 1868, v) would suggest this date. Moreover, excavations in the area have revealed traces of occupation from the 7th-6th c. BC. Scheid 1987, 589-90.
45 Scheid 1987, 590, and 1990, 149.
46 The sacred grove was one of three locations for cult festivals. Some rites were enacted at the president’s house in Rome, while others took place at the Pantheon (*CIL* VI 2041 = *ILS* 229). Scheid 1990, 95.
major buildings include an *aedes Deae Diae*, a *Tetrastylum*, a *Caesareum*, and a circus, and the minor, a permanent altar, several *arae temporales*, *papiliones*, most likely living quarters,47 and a *balneum*.48 They also locate and describe some of these structures. The Temple of Dea Dia, situated within the *lucus*, is reached by ascending a *clivus* or slope from the *Tetrastylum*,49 which, together with the *Caesareum*, is sited at the base of the slope and near the circus, located *ante lucum* or outside of the grove.50

Moreover, the Annals note that the Temple had a *fastigium*, usually translated as a pediment,51 and three doors or more likely, a door with three sections. They also indicate that it was preceded by an altar, that it contained at least two statues, and that it was large enough to accommodate twelve marble seats.52 They even establish some kind of timeframe for the Temple, which they note existed in 53 AD and was restored in 183, as well as for the *Tetrastylum* and the *Caesareum*, which first appear in Annals of the Domitianic period.53

Remains of the sanctuary have helped to clarify the topographical information gleaned from the Annals. Prior to excavation, only the foundations of the Temple and a rectangular room which formed part of the *balneum* were visible. To these could be added Renaissance sketches of the *Tetrastylum* and the Temple.54 The sanctuary,

---

48 Scheid 1990, 103; cf. 131-40, for sources dealing with the minor structures in the sanctuary.
49 On 19 or 29 May, the Arvales completed the second day of the purification rites by celebrating morning rituals at the *Tetrastylum*, ascending to the Temple for afternoon rituals, and returning for further rites at the *Tetrastylum* in the early evening. Scheid 1990, 104-5. For a fuller description, see Henzen 1868, iv-vi, and Broise and Scheid 1993, 148-57.
50 Scheid 1990, 112 and 131-3.
51 Henzen 1868, xi; vs. Scheid 1990, 155.
52 See #35. The *subsellia marmorea* were used by the priesthood when they distributed bread to their *familia* and officials during the yearly festival. Scheid 1990, 105-9.
53 Scheid 1990, 109. For a discussion of the sources pertaining to the *Tetrastylum* and the *Caesareum*, see Abeken 1841, 121-3 (*Tetrastylum*), and Scheid 1990, 109-31. The *Tetrastylum* may have functioned as a banquet hall and the *Caesareum* as a statue gallery for divinized emperors. Pellegrini 1865, 10.
54 See #35 (Ligorio’s plan of the Temple). For references to S. Pernetti’s drawing of the *Tetrastylum*, ca. 1570, see Scheid 1990, 159.
extending from the balneum and papiliones at its base to the Temple at its summit,\(^{55}\) lies underneath a densely populated suburb of Rome and is bisected by two modern roads and the train line.\(^{56}\) Despite the difficulties of the terrain, Scheid and Broise have fully excavated the balneum, an adjacent hemicycle of twelve rooms, identified as papiliones,\(^{57}\) and the Temple.

The Temple rises from a terrace on axis with the bath-and-housing complex and, in its present form, like the balneum and papiliones, dates to the reign of Alexander Severus.\(^{58}\) At least one wall, which forms the western border of the sanctuary, and the circus, which may be linked with masonry discovered below the balneum, are older.\(^{59}\) The Tetrastylum and Caesareum, possibly one and the same building, are harder to locate, though the evidence provided by the Annals and a drawing of Peruzzi may situate them at the bottom of the slope, where a Flavian platform and series of bases and busts of emperors were discovered in the sixteenth century.\(^{60}\)

The foundations of the Temple rest on an artificial terrace delimited by two walls.\(^{61}\) The terrace followed the predominant north-south axis of the sanctuary\(^{62}\) with the Temple’s entrance facing south towards the slope and the buildings at its base.\(^{63}\) Its well-preserved foundations\(^{64}\) comprise an annular gallery, with eleven

---

\(^{55}\) The martyrium of S. Generosa forms the sanctuary’s northern limit. Scheid 1990, 143.

\(^{56}\) Broise and Scheid 1987, 2.

\(^{57}\) For a fuller description of these buildings, see Scheid 1990, 144-7.

\(^{58}\) Scheid 1990, 143-8 and 155-8.

\(^{59}\) For the remains of the circus, see Pellegrini 1865, 7. Soundings near the Temple have uncovered finds from the 2nd c. BC to the late Empire, while finds near the train station date to the 3rd c. BC. Broise and Scheid 1985, 543-4, and 1986, 399; Scheid 1990, 148-9.

\(^{60}\) De Rossi 1856, 59-60; Scheid 1990, 158-65.

\(^{61}\) In view of their opus latericium construction, the terrace walls probably date to the Augustan period, when this technique was still in use. Adam 1994a, 146-7.

\(^{62}\) The sanctuary’s orientation according to the cardinal points is typical of Archaic sites, see Chap. III ‘Augural divination in Archaic Italy: defining the Roman templum.’

\(^{63}\) Scheid 1990, 143-4; Broise and Scheid 1993, 147-8.

\(^{64}\) The foundations owe their state of preservation to late Imperial decrees, which denounced the vandalism of temples located outside the city limits (cf. Cod. Theod. XVI 10.3, quoted by Henzen
niches and an entrance, bisected by two straight galleries, set at right angles. This configuration takes the form of a cross superimposed on a circle.

Very little is preserved of the Temple’s superstructure, but based on a few fragments and Ligorio’s drawing, R. Lanciani has reconstructed it as a drum faced with Corinthian pilasters supporting an entablature and a sloping roof. He sets pilasters along the cella interior flanking fifteen niches, alternately rectilinear and semicircular. Finally, Lanciani proposes that the Arval Annals discovered nearby be incorporated into the Temple’s stylobate. Though appealing, his hypothesis is untenable, as the preserved plaques are rectilinear and their number would presuppose a monument of a much greater width. According to the Annals, the Temple was preceded by an altar. This may be identified with a round altar, which depicts a serpent and bucrania flanked by garlands.

The Temple of Dea Dia served as the crowning element of a vast sanctuary complex with its roots in the Archaic period, but its greatest expansion under the Empire. Little is known of the Temple in the Republican period and under Augustus, when the sanctuary had an east-west as opposed to its Flavian and Severan north-south orientation, nor even in the Flavian period, when the Tetrastylum-Caesareum was constructed. In its final phase, the Sanctuary of Dea Dia was laid out with strict

---

65 Lanciani 1868c, 105.
66 They are remarkably similar to the foundations of the ‘Temple of Portunus,’ a mausoleum at Portus drawn by Sangallo. Lanciani 1868c, 105; Sjöquist 1946, 115 figs. 35-6.
67 Lanciani makes no mention of the pediment cited in the Annals, which could suggest that the Temple’s drum was preceded by a porch as Henzen (1868, xi) proposes. However, this reconstruction is not supported by the remains.
68 Lanciani 1868c, 106-5.
69 Lanciani 1868c, 106; cf. De Rossi 1866, 56, and Henzen 1868, xii. Lanciani’s reconstruction recalls the Archaic ‘Rotunda of the Laws’ at Gortyna (see Robert 1939, 385-7) and the Hellenistic Tyghaion at Alexandria, a round temple containing niches and steles inscribed with city laws (see Liban. 25, Cod. Theod. 14.27, and Will 1951, 239).
70 It is more likely that the Annals were displayed in the lucus. Scheid 1990, 155-7.
71 The serpent may represent the genius loci of the grove. Henzen 1868, ix.
72 Broise and Scheid 1993, 147.
symmetry that reflected the importance of the Temple and set it apart from the lower buildings that played subsidiary roles in the cult.73

The ‘Pantheon,’ Ostia (#24)

The second round temple constructed during the reign of Alexander Severus was the ‘Pantheon’ at Ostia (#24). Built near the Forum, the ‘Pantheon’ is sited next to the Basilica.74 Its drum, masked by a portico, is preceded by a vast court that opens northward onto the Decumanus Maximus.75 The court, contained within the walls of the original Castrum,76 was first articulated in the late first century AD, when the Basilica was built.77 Once part of the Basilica complex, the ‘Pantheon’s builders adopted the layout of its court and reused architectural elements from the peristyle court beside the “Byzantine” baths as aggregate in its boundary walls.78

The court, accessed by steps, is spread out over two levels. At the lower level are six symmetrically placed drains, while at the higher, lining its long walls, are a series of statue niches topped by triangular and semicircular pediments.79 A door in the middle of the east wall, opening into the Basilica, is mirrored by a semicircular niche in the west wall. The court, paved and revetted in marble, served as an elegant atrium for the ‘Pantheon.’80

73 Scheid 1990, 165-6 and 170-3; Broise and Scheid 1993, 147-8.
74 For the layout of this area, see Bakker 1994, 172.
75 Briggs 1930, 162.
76 Briggs 1930, 162; Calza et al. 1953, 152.
77 Pavolini 1989, 103.
78 Among them were fragments of late 1st c. AD Tuscan capitals and marble pieces reused in its pavement. Pensabene 1973, 31 nos. 16-7 and n. 1, and 1996b, 202-4 and 209-10.
79 Unlike the Roman Pantheon’s forecourt, the Ostian court lacked porticoes. Briggs 1930, 164 and 167.
80 Calza et al. 1953, 152; Pavolini 1989, 110.
Raised on a high podium, the ‘Pantheon’ is fronted by steps and two horseshoe-shaped niches for fountains and statuary. Its pronaos, which recalls the porches of the Pantheon at Rome (#50) and the Temple of Zeus Asklepios Soter at Pergamon (#27), consists of ten columns, mirrored by pilasters along the wall of its intermediate block. Narrower than the intermediate blocks of the rotundas at Rome and Pergamon, it accommodates two stairwells giving access to its roof.

A pavement of multi-colored marbles extends from the porch into the drum, articulated by three large rectangular niches, alternating with four smaller semicircular niches. The rectangular niches, which follow the cardinal axes, protrude beyond the curved wall of the rotunda. In addition to enlivening its exterior, through their depth, they helped to showcase the ‘Pantheon’s statues. Columns supported on pedestals beside the niches framed its statue display, which included an image of Alexander Severus. This statue, together with the materials and techniques employed in its construction, helps to date the ‘Pantheon’ to his reign. Moreover, like his portrait statue, the luxurious marbles used as revetment for its complex may indicate that the ‘Pantheon’ celebrated the Imperial cult.

---

81 These niches, whose brickwork is not bonded with the podium, are likely to have been later additions. Briggs 1930, 164.
82 Based on their marble bases, Briggs (1930, 164-5) suggests that the pilasters and the wall of the intermediate block were revetted in marble.
83 MacDonald 1982, 98 and 100.
84 Alternatively, one well may have served as a storage area. Briggs 1930, 165.
85 As the walls are relatively thin for such a large building, it is more likely that the ‘Pantheon’ had a timber roof than a dome.
86 A small room, reached via steps, lies below the rectangular niche that shares an axis with the ‘Pantheon’s entrance. Briggs 1930, 166.
87 Comparable, though more dramatic, are the apses of the Abaton at Pergamon (#26), see above.
88 Briggs (1930, 165) suggests that, as in Diocletian’s Palace at Split, these columns helped to support the ‘Pantheon’s dome.
89 Pensabene 1996b, 201. Images of Gordian III and his wife were added to the ‘Pantheon’ at a later date, see #23 and Meiggs 1973, 81, and Pensabene 1996b, 201, for a comparable pair (S 4397-8) displayed in the Barracks of the Vigiles.
90 Pavolini 1989, 110. For other Severan work at Ostia, see Calza et al. 1953, 151-4, and Meiggs 1973, 146.
91 The sumptuous materials, as well as some features of the architectural decoration (see ‘Decorative details’ below), point to Eastern influences. Pensabene 1996b, 201.
Round temples refurbished during the Severan period:

The Pantheon, Rome (#50)

Below Agrippa’s dedicatory inscription is a second, which commemorates restoration work undertaken by Septimius Severus and Caracalla on the Pantheon in Rome (#50). While the extent of their work is unclear, it may have included reinforcing the masonry of the drum or restoring the marble revetment of its second tier.

The mid-to-late third century AD:

Philip ‘the Arab’: (244-249 AD)

The vast Sanctuary of Jupiter Heliopolitanus at Baalbek, begun in 16 BC, was completed under Philip ‘the Arab.’ His additions include a monumental propylon leading to the temple’s hexagonal and rectangular courts, and to the south of the complex, the round Temple of Tyche (#7).

The Temple of Tyche, Baalbek (#7)

Although known as the Temple of Venus, the round Temple at Baalbek (#7) is more likely to have commemorated Tyche. Coins minted under Philip ‘the Arab’

---

92 Meiggs (1973, 81; cf. Pensabene 1996b, 201) suggests that Alexander Severus made financial contributions to its construction.
93 For the political motivations which may have fueled this inscription, see de Fine Licht 1966, 190.
94 Cracks appeared in both the drum and the dome soon after Hadrian’s Pantheon was built. de Fine Licht 1966, 190.
95 Strong 1953, 119 n. 5.
96 Though his cult is attested as early as the 6th c. BC, Jupiter’s complex was begun after Baalbek became a Roman colony. Sear 1982, 245; Ward-Perkins 1989, 314.
97 The hexagonal forecourt may be contemporary with the propylon. Ward-Perkins 1989, 314; Gros 1996a, 190.
show a Typhaion that bears a striking resemblance to this building. As on the coins,\textsuperscript{98} the Temple is fronted by a porch, whose eight Corinthian columns, arranged in two rows,\textsuperscript{99} support a triangular pediment. The pediment was curved above the wide central intercolumnation\textsuperscript{100} that provides access to the cella from the porch’s three-tiered steps.\textsuperscript{101}

While the Temple’s foundations and the podium beneath its porch are rectangular, the cella rests on a curved extension, whose scalloped edges correspond to plinths supporting the four columns of its peristasis.\textsuperscript{102} These columns, with five-sided Attic bases and Corinthian capitals, are mirrored by pilasters, which flank five aediculae embedded in the cella wall.\textsuperscript{103} A garland and putti frieze runs above the aediculae, while inside the cella, a socle, fourteen half-columns and cornices define two tiers of decoration.\textsuperscript{104} Of these tiers, the lower may have accommodated statue bases in-between the columns and the upper includes five niches topped by alternating triangular and semicircular pediments. A Corinthian entablature, which corresponds to the entablatures of the porch and the drum exterior,\textsuperscript{105} runs along the base of the cupola.\textsuperscript{106}

The roofing system employed by the Temple is highly unusual. A sloping wooden roof probably extended above the columns and coffers of the porch as far as

\textsuperscript{98} While the coins may suggest that the Temple contained a cult image (see ‘Statuary and reliefs’ below), it has not been found. Wiegand 1925, 96.
\textsuperscript{99} The central columns of the back row are attached to the cella wall. Wiegand 1925, 92.
\textsuperscript{100} Wiegand (1925, 99 and 105) places a relief depicting an eagle in flight, comparable to the antefix block of the Temple of Hercules Victor ad portam Trigeminam (\#44), above the Temple’s door.
\textsuperscript{101} For the Temple’s complex stair arrangement, see Wiegand 1925, 93-5.
\textsuperscript{102} For the podium’s base and crown moldings, see ‘The base molding’ below.
\textsuperscript{103} The aediculae, whose semi-domes are ornamented with birds, are flanked by Composite pilasters. Wiegand 1925, 99.
\textsuperscript{104} The Propylon of the Sanctuary of Jupiter at Baalbek also employs two tiers of decoration. Wiegand 1925, 109.
\textsuperscript{105} The repetition of motifs in the interior and exterior entablatures helps to visually unite the building. Wiegand 1925, 93 and 104, and see ‘The entablature’ below.
\textsuperscript{106} This junction of elements features in the round exedras of the altar court at Baalbek. Wiegand 1925, 109.
the entrance wall. Here stone blocks continued its course to the center of the cupola. Disguising its vaulted ceiling,\textsuperscript{107} these blocks fanned out above the drum.\textsuperscript{108}

Besides its shape, the roof is notable for its use of ashlar blocks, which also feature in the Temple’s podium and drum.\textsuperscript{109} In terms of their decoration, its podium supports a multi-colored marble or mosaic pavement,\textsuperscript{110} while the blocks of its drum are carved with rich ornament, a distinctive feature of the Temple. Also noteworthy are the scalloped edges of the podium, whose undulating effect is enhanced by a repetition of columns, pilasters, and aediculae, and the cella’s elaborate two-tiered interior. These design elements lend the Temple a baroque quality shared by the Antonine Temple of Bacchus and the Temple and forecourts of Jupiter at Baalbek.\textsuperscript{111}

As a dedication to Tyche, it recalls the Temple of Tyche at Side (#59) as well as Tychaia shown on coins minted throughout Asia Minor.\textsuperscript{112} Though more elaborate, its plan, combining a rectangular porch and a drum, is similar to the Temple at Side as well as to the Temple of Fortuna Huiusce Diei at Rome (#38).\textsuperscript{113} However, as its porch is sizable enough to conceal its drum, it also takes inspiration from Hadrian’s Pantheon (#50).

**Trebonianus Gallus (251-253 AD):**

The reign of Trebonianus Gallus saw little new building beyond a possible Temple of Juno at Rome (#45).

\textsuperscript{107} More than disguising it, the entrance wall, set parallel to the steps, disrupts the circularity of the drum. Wiegand 1925, 98-9.  
\textsuperscript{108} For alternative reconstructions, see Wiegand 1925, 105-6.  
\textsuperscript{109} Wiegand 1925, 96-7. Similarly, the portico fronting the Temple of Jupiter employed stone vaults. Gros 1996a, 191.  
\textsuperscript{110} Wiegand 1925, 96.  
\textsuperscript{111} Wiegand 1925, 96.  
\textsuperscript{112} See Chap. VI #59.  
\textsuperscript{113} See Chaps. IV #38 and VI #59. Godfrey and Hemsoll 1986, 209 n. 71.
The Temple of Juno Martialis, Rome (#45)

Coins minted under Trebonianus Gallus in 251 AD\textsuperscript{114} attest that a Temple of Juno Martialis (#45), otherwise unknown from literary and archaeological sources,\textsuperscript{115} existed in Rome. Her epithet \textit{Martialis} may signify Juno in her capacity as the mother of Mars\textsuperscript{116} or more likely, may indicate that her Temple was sited in the Campus Martius, possibly near a temple to Mars.\textsuperscript{117} Alternatively, as P. Hill suggests, it may locate her Temple in the Campus Martialis at the base of the Caelian.\textsuperscript{118}

The coins depict Juno Martialis inside a Corinthian monopteros. Her cult figure, shown enthroned with a globe and ears of corn in her hands and a peacock at her side, is accompanied by two figures interpreted as children or herms.\textsuperscript{119} The Temple itself consists of steps, columns and an arched entablature hung with garlands. A dome, encircled by antefixes, rises from the entablature and is topped by an acroterial ornament.

To explain its absence from the sources and the brevity of its depiction on coins, D. Brown has suggested that the Temple was a temporary construction.\textsuperscript{120} However, it seems more probable that the Temple was planned, but never built, like the Capitoline Temple of Mars Ultor (#46).\textsuperscript{121}

**Aurelian: (270-275 AD)**

\textsuperscript{114} The legend appears in both its nominative and dative forms. Alföldi 1955, 62.
\textsuperscript{115} Steinby 1996a, 123.
\textsuperscript{116} Küthmann and Overbeck 1973b, 72; Roscher 1890-1897, 586. Alföldi (1955, 63-5) speculates that \textit{Martialis} either may signal Juno as the female counterpart of Mars or Apollo Salutaris, or may refer to some historical event.
\textsuperscript{118} Hill 1989, 17-8.
\textsuperscript{119} Alföldi 1955, 64.
\textsuperscript{120} Brown 1941, 128. It would have a parallel in a wooden tholos was re-erected yearly to mark the festival of Zeus Sosipolis at Magnesia on the Meander. Kern 1900, no. 98 (inscription); Robert 1939, 70-2; Will 1951, 239.
\textsuperscript{121} See Chap. V #46. This idea may be supported by the garlands, which, Alföldi (1955, 63-4) suggests, commemorate special sacrifices connected with the Temple’s (intended) inauguration.
Aurelian undertook two major building projects at Rome. By means of the first, a circuit of walls, he dramatically increased Rome’s defensive capabilities, while with the second, he commemorated Sol (#53), the god who oversaw his military victories.\footnote{Moreover, Sol was widely worshipped in the provinces, whose support Aurelian sought to re-unify the empire. Hautecoeur 1954, 145-56 and 168-70.}

**The Temple of Sol, Rome (#53)**

Unlike Elagabalus’ temples to Sol Invictus,\footnote{In addition to many provincial temples, he built a temple to Sol on the Palatine known as the Elagabalium (Hist.Aug.Heliog. 1.3.6; Aur. Vict. Caes. 23; Herod. 5.5.8; Chronogr. a. 354, p. 147 M; Hier. chron. a. Abr. 2291) and another ad Spem Veterem (Hist.Aug.Heliog. 13.4-5 and 14.2-3; Herod. 5.6.6). Halsberghe 1972, 74-6, and 1984, 2186-7.} which celebrated a Syrian cult considered excessive by the Roman people,\footnote{Born into a religious family at Emesa, Elagabalus, a high priest of Sol, hoped to establish Sol’s primacy over Jupiter Optimus Maximus at Rome. In addition to lavish temples, he instituted purificatory rituals involving abstention from pork, circumcision, and most notably, human sacrifice. Halsberghe 1972, 84-9.} Aurelian commemorated an indigenous sun cult in his Temple at Rome (#53).\footnote{In addition to many provincial temples, he built a temple to Sol on the Palatine known as the Elagabalium (Hist.Aug.Heliog. 1.3.6; Aur. Vict. Caes. 23; Herod. 5.5.8; Chronogr. a. 354, p. 147 M; Hier. chron. a. Abr. 2291) and another ad Spem Veterem (Hist.Aug.Heliog. 13.4-5 and 14.2-3; Herod. 5.6.6). Halsberghe 1972, 74-6, and 1984, 2186-7.} Its foundation formed part of a three-step plan of religious reform\footnote{Hist.Aug.Aurelian. 35.3. Homo 1904, 184; Halsberghe 1972, 133, and 1984, 2195.} initiated after his victory at Palmyra in 272 AD.\footnote{Hist.Aug.Aurelian. 35.3. Homo 1904, 184; Halsberghe 1972, 133, and 1984, 2195.} These steps consisted of the official recognition of Sol as the supreme god of the Roman Empire, the construction of the Temple of Sol and the introduction of the *Agones Solis,*\footnote{Chronogr. a. 354, p. 148 M; Hier. chron. a. Abr. 2291; Iulian. orat. 4, 115 B, p. 201. The games’ introduction coincided with the inauguration of Aurelian’s Temple. Halsberghe (1972, 144, and 1984, 2198; cf. Homo 1904, 186) would link them with games celebrated on 19-22 October, to be distinguished from the games in November, mid-December, and those marking the *Dies Natalis Invicti* on 25 December (Inscr. Ital. XIII² 261; cf. above, Caes. civ. 10.113-34, and Calzini Gysens and Coarelli 1999, 331-3).} and the creation of a college of *pontifices Dei Solis.*\footnote{Hist.Aug.Aurelian. 35.3; CIL VI 501, 846, 1397, 1418, 1673, 1739, 1740, 2151, and X 5061. For what little is known about the priesthood, see Homo 1904, 187-8, and Halsberghe 1972, 144-7.} The first of these...
reforms, celebrated on coin issues, elevated the status of Sol and Aurelian as his earthly personification, the second ensured that Sol would be housed and celebrated accordingly, and the third determined that his cult would be durable.

Aurelian’s Temple of Deus Sol Invictus, dedicated in 275 AD, can be located and described based on literary sources, Renaissance drawings and archaeological remains. The sources place the Temple in Regio VII and more specifically, in Campo Agrippae. Moreover, the Regionary Catalogues locate it in the vicinity of the Forum Suarium, the site for pork distribution, and the Cohortes Urbanae, a supervisory body in charge of pork and wine. This fits well with another reference to the Temple of Sol and an inscription discovered near S. Silvestro in Capite, which remark on cut-price wine stored in the Temple’s porticoes. Though not precisely located, this depot seems to have been sited near S. Silvestro.

In addition to noting the importance of its porticoes, the sources remark on the Temple’s splendor. Moreover, this opus magnificentissimum may be linked with a series of Renaissance drawings that attest to its grandeur. R. Lanciani was the

---

130 These coins (RIC V.1 301 no. 319-22) depict a bust of Sol with a radiating crown on the obverse and Aurelian with a scepter and patera sacrificing by an altar on the reverse. Homo 1904, 184-5; Sotgiu 1975, 1048.
131 Aurelian was the first emperor to take the title Deus during his lifetime, see Homo 1904, 191-2, Sotgiu 1975, 1043-4, and Halsberghe 1984, 2200 (for coins and undated inscriptions).
132 See #53.
133 Not. Reg. VII, 111, 172 VZ 1; Chronogr. a. 354, p. 148 M.
134 For these buildings, see Hülsen 1895a, 47-9, and Torelli 1992, 119-22. It was Aurelian’s policy to distribute wine, oil, bread, and pork to the Roman people (Hist. Aug. Aurelian. 35.2 and 48.1).
135 Richardson, Jr. 1992, 363.
137 The inscription (CIL VI 1785 = 31931) notes that stocks of vina fiscalia were transported to the Temple from an area ad Ciconias Nixas. For this area, see Platner and Ashby 1929, 111, and Virlouvet 1995, 56-9; vs. Flambard (1987, 191-201; cf. Lega 1993, 268), who sees it as a combination of two distinct toponyms.
138 Wine was also stored in the late Republican porticus Minucia Frumentaria. Virlouvet 1995, 55 and 146.
139 Hülsen 1895a, 50; Coarelli 1982, 48.
first to publish two drawings by A. Palladio, which have proven indispensable to the study of Aurelian’s Temple. The plan shown on the first drawing\(^{141}\) illustrates two large courts joined by a small square court. The first large court is oblong with two semicircular apses and four openings at the juncture of the apses and the side walls. A single colonnade is attached to the interior of walls, while double columns mark the openings. The second large court is rectangular with three projecting niches on three sides of its perimeter wall. This wall encloses a round temple\(^{142}\) with a three-stepped krepis, sixteen columns, and two openings along the long axis of the complex.\(^{143}\) The elevation illustrated on this drawing is two-storied with columns flanking niches on both stories together with a column of double height, which marks off an arched opening. The elevation on the second drawing\(^{144}\) is strikingly similar, but adds alternating flat and triangular lintels above the upper order of columns. Palladio identified the first drawing with gardens near the via Flaminia and the second with a basilica of Domitian.

Accepting Palladio’s interpretation of the remains, Lanciani proposed a link between the gardens and the *horti Largiani* or the *nymphaeum Iovis* located in Regio VII. He identified the ruins of a large building whose stairs followed the slope of the Quirinal with Aurelian’s Temple.\(^{145}\) C. Hülsen, by contrast, considered the structures on the Quirinal as part of Caracalla’s Temple of Serapis, and connected Palladio’s drawings with the Temple of Sol.\(^{146}\) He interpreted Palladio’s plan as two porticoes, the first apsidal and the second rectangular, leading to a large rectangular temple

\(^{141}\) *RIBA* X 17r.
\(^{142}\) As the round temple lacks measurements, scholars from Lanciani (1894) to Calzini Gysens and Coarelli (1999) have doubted the veracity of Palladio’s reconstruction, see below.
\(^{143}\) Diametrically opposed entrances also feature in the Skias at Athens (#6) and the macellum tholus at Aezani (see De Ruyt 1983, 23-4).
\(^{144}\) *RIBA* XV 11v.
\(^{145}\) Lanciani 1894, 300-5, and 1895, 94-101; vs. Calzini Gysens and Coarelli (1999, 331-3), who note that the building on the Quirinal is located in Regio VI.
\(^{146}\) Hülsen 1894, 393-4, and 1895a, 39 and 51-4; cf. *CIL* VI 570.
absent from the plan.\textsuperscript{147} This style of complex, he suggested, recalled the Temple of Jupiter at Baalbek.\textsuperscript{148} Moreover, based on Palladio’s topographical notes and the sources which help to site the Temple,\textsuperscript{149} Hülsen located it near S. Silvestro in Capite. He assigned it a North-South orientation along the via Lata in the area bordered by the via del Gambero, the via dei Condotti, the via Borgognona, the via Bocca di Leone, and the Piazza S. Silvestro.\textsuperscript{150}

More recently, F. de Caprariis and M. Torelli have suggested an East-West orientation for the complex.\textsuperscript{151} Archaeological remains found near S. Silvestro seem to endorse this hypothesis. These include \textit{opus quadratum} walls seen by Piranesi at the intersection of the via della Vite and the via del Moretto, which may constitute the North-East corner of the rectangular court, and peperino walls and columns discovered along the via della Vite,\textsuperscript{152} possibly its Northern perimeter.\textsuperscript{153} In addition, most buildings in the area adopt an East-West orientation,\textsuperscript{154} providing reason to support de Caprariis’ and Torelli’s conclusions.

Like Hülsen’s ideas regarding the Temple’s orientation, his views on the articulation of its complex have been called into question. F. Castagnoli employed drawings by P. Ligorio and Renaissance maps to determine the layout of the Temple

\textsuperscript{147} Hülsen (1895a, 40; cf. Calzini Gysens and Coarelli 1999, 331-3) considered the round temple a figment of Palladio’s imagination.

\textsuperscript{148} Hülsen 1895a, 41-4. Richardson, jr. (1992, 364; cf. Lugli 1938, 281) speculatively identifies the Temple with a rectangular building found near the Campus Martius in 1794. As comparanda, the Temple of Sol alongside the Circus Maximus, described by Tacitus as \textit{vetus} (\textit{Tac. ann.} 15.74.1, cf. Ciancio Rossetto 1993, 276; vs. Tert. \textit{spect.} 8, and Turcan 1958, 257-62), was probably rectangular as was Probus’ depiction of a temple to Sol Invictus (\textit{RIC V.2} 55 no. 354, 62 fol. nos. 414-7, and 74 nos. 536-8; Hill 1989, 18 fig. 16, but see below). Castagnoli (1978, 385-6) does not consider this image representative of Aurelian’s Temple.

\textsuperscript{149} See above, #53 and Urlichs 1888, 98.

\textsuperscript{150} Hülsen 1895a, 57 pl. 4.


\textsuperscript{152} Hülsen 1895a, 55-8; Torelli 1992, 117-8; Calzini Gysens and Coarelli 1999, 331-3. For the walls, see \textit{CAR II} 162 no. 79.

\textsuperscript{153} Torelli (1992, 116-8; cf. Hülsen 1895a, 40-1) locates the S limit between the via di S. Claudio and the via delle Convertite, near the end of the Piazza Colonna. If his reconstruction is correct, S. Silvestro in Capite lies over the remains of the small square court, which may have been gardens in the 14\textsuperscript{th} c. (when the church was known as \textit{inter duos hortos}, cf. Calzini Gysens and Coarelli 1999, 331-3).

\textsuperscript{154} Torelli 1992, 112.
complex. These include a plan and an elevation of a complex identified by Ligorio as the “Septa Tributa” and three additional elevations. The first drawing\textsuperscript{155} illustrates a rectangular court with a monumental entrance projecting from one wall and a series of three niches in each of its remaining walls. The niched walls are fronted by a portico. At the center of this court is a temple with a columnar porch, a square intermediate block, and a circular cela.\textsuperscript{156}

Castagnoli noted the columns excavated near the via della Vite as evidence for an internal portico, even if lacking on Palladio’s plan,\textsuperscript{157} and the repetition of a round temple on both plans as proof that the Temple of Sol was round.\textsuperscript{158} Although Ligorio’s drawing makes no allusions to Palladio’s square and apsidal courts, the striking visual correspondences between the rectangular court illustrated on Palladio’s drawing and the complex shown here, together with the similar dimensions ascribed to both structures,\textsuperscript{159} makes Castagnoli’s connection compelling.

Three elevations with strong similarities to Palladio’s may be connected with this complex. The first\textsuperscript{160} is two-storied with half-columns flanking niches and topped by triangular pediments on the lower level, together with an entrance arch marked off by columns.\textsuperscript{161} The second\textsuperscript{162} shows a niche or apse framed by two monumental entrances, which is decorated with an ornamental colonnade surmounted by alternating triangular and segmented lintels. While Ligorio cautiously refers to

\textsuperscript{155} Cod. Turin. a. II 3 J. 16.
\textsuperscript{156} In addition to the Hadrianic Pantheon (#50), the plan closely recalls the Temple of Artemis at Stymphalos (#61).
\textsuperscript{157} See Hist. Aug. Aurelian. 35.3 and 48, and above (wine stored in the Temple’s porticoes).
\textsuperscript{158} Castagnoli 1978, 373-6.
\textsuperscript{159} Castagnoli 1978, 373, and see #53.
\textsuperscript{160} Coll. Albani-Dal Pozzo 10805 at Windsor.
\textsuperscript{161} The sketchy upper level seems to have included windows.
\textsuperscript{162} Coll. Albani-Dal Pozzo 10805 at Windsor.
these elevations as illustrating a “basilica” or “temple,” he assigns the third, wherein columns flank niches with comparable lintels, to the Temple of Sol.

Also relevant to the identification of the “Septa Tributa” and Aurelian’s Temple of Sol, as well as to a greater understanding of its layout, are a series of Renaissance maps, which show the area around S. Silvestro. These include two maps of Ligorio, one of which, ca. 1553, illustrates two unidentified Saepta, while the other, ca. 1561, depicts the “Septa Tributa,” the “Septa Curiata,” and the “Septa Centuriata.” They are echoed by maps of Panvinio, Du Pérac, and Cartaro, wherein all three Saeptas have an East-West orientation. While the “Septa Tributa” occasionally includes a rectangular temple, on Cantaro’s plan, a round temple appears inside the “Septa Curiata.” Moreover, most maps locate the “Basilica Domitiana” and an “Arcus Novus” or “Claudij” along the façade of the Saepta Curiata. Torelli connects the “Arcus” with the Arco di Portogallo, which, he suggests, may have functioned as a monumental entrance for the Temple complex.

Like the Hadrianic arch, the rectangular court may represent a rebuilding of an earlier structure, possibly the Porticus Vipsania, erected by Agrippa and his sister Vipsania Polla. To Aurelian’s reign may be attributed fragments of

---

163 Platner (cited in Castagnoli 1978, 377-8) identified these with the hemicyles of Trajan’s Markets.
164 BNP Cod. Ital. 1129, c. 315.
165 Moneti 1993a, 160 fig. 9 and 62.
166 See Castagnoli 1978, 376 fig. 5 (Ligorio, Cod. Turin).
167 Calzini Gysens and Coarelli (1999, 331-3, and see above) link the “Septa Curiata” and the “Septa Centuriata” with the Temple of Sol and the “Saepta Tributa” with the Forum Suarium.
168 This features on the maps of Ligorio (ca. 1561), Panvinio (ca. 1565), and Du Pérac (ca. 1574).
170 The main exception is Panvinio’s map (ca. 1565).
171 Torelli 1992, 118-9. However, as the arch was free-standing, this suggestion is difficult to support.
172 Coarelli 1995k, 294.
173 As depicted on a 17th century drawing by A. Giovannoli, this structure consists of stone and brick work, whose Diocletianic brick stamps suggest that it was rebuilt under his or Constantine’s reign. Moneti 1990, 14-6 figs. 9-10; de Caprariis 1991-1992, 179-80.
architectural sculpture discovered near S. Silvestro.\textsuperscript{175} They include part of the Temple’s or portico’s architrave, frieze and cornice, whose ornament is evocative of the Roman East.\textsuperscript{176} Similarly, the two tiers of statue niches illustrated on Palladio’s and Ligorio’s elevations recall prominent provincial buildings like the Severan Basilica at Leptis Magna and the Propylon and the Temple of Tyche (#7) at Baalbek.\textsuperscript{177}

In addition to these fragments, literary sources give some idea of the Temple’s decoration. They record that eight of its porphyry columns were re-used in S. Sofia at Constantinople.\textsuperscript{178} Moreover, they claim that the Temple contained vast quantities of gold and silver jewelry, precious gems, jewel-encrusted clothes, paintings, and statues.\textsuperscript{179} Although the decoration of his Temple of Sol may have recalled the excesses of the Syrian cult, the plan of Aurelian’s complex, by combining a round temple with a colonnaded portico,\textsuperscript{180} has strong Roman precedents. As early as the late Republic, both peripteroi and drums appeared in rectangular porticoes, prominent examples being the Temples of Fortuna Huiusce Diei (#38) and of Hercules and the Muses (#42).

Of these two forms, Ligorio’s drum preceded by an intermediate block and pronaos seems a more likely choice for Aurelian’s Temple.\textsuperscript{181} Its use of multi-colored stones, notably porphyry columns, recalls Hadrian’s Pantheon (#50), which exerted

\textsuperscript{175} For the findspots, see CAR II 160-2 nos. 69-79, 169-71 nos. 87-94, and 175-7 nos. 114-29.
\textsuperscript{176} Lanciani 1894, 306-7, and 1895, 95-6; Gullini 1960, 34-6 pls. 19-21; and see ‘Decorative details’ below.
\textsuperscript{177} Gullini 1960, 54; Richardson, Jr. 1992, 364; and see #7 above.
\textsuperscript{178} Ant. Constant. 4.1.66. Materials from the Temple were also employed in S. Giovanni in Laterano. Calzini Gysens and Coarelli 1999, 331-3.
\textsuperscript{179} See #53. In addition to statues of Jupiter and Aurelian, the Temple contained images of Bel and Helios (Zos. 1.61) in order to appeal to initiates of other sun cults. Homo 1904, 190; and Halsberghe 1972, 143 and 151.
\textsuperscript{180} Similarly, the round Shrine of Apollo Delphinios at Miletos (#19) is set within a porticoed court. Kawerau and Rehm 1914, 147-8.
\textsuperscript{181} Moneti’s (1992, 12-3 and fig. 1; cf. Cod. Magl. 2.1.429) unlikely conflation of the two plans results in a rotunda with an awkwardly large drum and long stairwell.
considerable influence on the design of second and third century buildings like the Temple of Zeus Asklepios Soter at Pergamon (#27) and the ‘Pantheon’ at Ostia (#23). Moreover, as a round temple to Sol, it has parallels in the Temple of Helios-Sebazios at Thrace, the Skias at Athens (#6), which was linked with the Phosphoroi, Helios and Selene, and the Marneion or temple to the sky god Marnas at Gaza.

Round temples rebuilt during the third century AD:

**The Temple of Fortuna, Rome (#37)**

Though founded in the Claudian period, the remains of the Temple of Fortuna on the Pincio (#37) date to the mid-third century AD. These consist of a segment of the cella wall, the inner face of which is marked by rectangular niches and a revetment of black marble veined with white. The flooring, similarly, consisted of white marble plates. Like the Hadrianic Pantheon (#50), the Temple may have been topped by a dome with an oculus and preceded by a rectangular pronaos, though the pronaos, if it existed, has not yet been excavated.

The fourth century AD:

**Maxentius and Constantine: (306-337 AD)**

---

182 In this case, Probus’ coins (see above) may illustrate the Temple’s porch.
184 Wachsmuth 1890, 319 n. 3; Robert 1939, 127-30.
185 This Temple, built in ca. 130 AD, was described by the 4th c. AD author Mark the Deacon as “round, being supported by two colonnades, one within the other… in the center was a dome puffed up and rising on high,” see Smith 1950, 14.
186 See Chap. V #37.
187 The Temple’s rebuilding may explain its description as *novum* in the Regionary Catalogues, see #37.
188 Broise and Jolivet 1998, 493. This connection may reflect its founder’s intention to link the Temple with prominent Augustan monuments, and by extension, the Imperial family, see Chap. V #37.
189 This is based on Renaissance plans and maps which depict the Temple, see #37.
Like Aurelian, Maxentius focused his building activity on Rome, where the devastating fire of 283 AD had destroyed much of the Velia.\footnote{Chron. a. 354, p. 148 M; Frazer 1964, 66-7.} He began by rebuilding Hadrian’s Temple of Venus and Roma and added his own Basilica Nova and the round ‘Temple of Romulus’ (\#52).\footnote{These buildings were completed or re-dedicated by Constantine. Ward-Perkins 1989, 426-9; Claridge 1998, 24.} His work also included baths on the Quirinal and a complex on the via Appia with a villa, a circus and a mausoleum.\footnote{Sear 1982, 270-1; Ward-Perkins 1989, 421; and see below.}

To Constantine’s reign can be attributed an arch commemorating his victory over Maxentius and several round buildings at Rome.\footnote{Sear 1982, 272.} Like Maxentius’ mausoleum and the contemporary Tor de’ Schiavi, which reflect the Pantheon (\#50),\footnote{Instead of an oculus, the Tor de’ Schiavi incorporates round windows into the base of its dome. MacDonald 1976, 101, and below.} Constantine employed a drum in the Tor Pignattara, the tomb of his mother Helena.\footnote{Ward-Perkins 1989, 429.} While this mausoleum lacked a colonnaded porch, his second, built for his daughter Constantina, encircled its drum with an barrel-vaulted ambulatory. An even more abstract version of the Pantheon’s drum may be found in the ‘Temple of Minerva Medica,’\footnote{Ward-Perkins 1989, 104; Carlucci 1996, 255-6.} a decagonal garden pavilion, whose brick-ribbed cupola raised on piers has little in common with the Hadrianic dome.\footnote{Rasch 1985, 137-8 and fig. 28, and see ‘Roofing techniques’ below.}

**The ‘Temple of Romulus,’ Rome (\#52)**

In 309-310 AD, Maxentius issued the first of two coin series to depict a round building surmounted by a cupola. These series, minted at Rome and Ostia, honored divinized members of his family, the *gens Valeria*.\footnote{Frazer 1966, 389-90; Arnaldi 1977, 271-2 and 274; Talamo 1981b, 23-6; Hill 1989, 13-5.} It is likely that Maxentius intended these series, by which he associated himself with successful members of his
gens, to legitimize and strengthen his rule.\textsuperscript{199} The first series, commemorating his son M. Valerius Romulus, who died in 309 AD,\textsuperscript{200} shows the youth on the obverse and the rotunda on the reverse, accompanied by the legend AETERNAE MEMORIAE.\textsuperscript{201} The rotunda consists of a two-step krepis supporting a cylinder of \textit{opus quadratum} masonry. The cylinder is elaborated with a double door, standing ajar, and an entablature decorated with vegetal imagery. A hemispherical dome crowns the monument and is in turn topped by an eagle.

In addition to Romulus, the second series coins, minted from 311 AD, honored Maxentius’ uncle and Constantine’s father, Constantius (d. 306 AD),\textsuperscript{202} Maxentius’ father, Maximian (d. 310), and his father-in-law, Maximianus (d. 311).\textsuperscript{203} As in the first series, their portraits appear on the obverse, while a round building is depicted with considerable variation on the reverse. The second series coins show a rotunda consisting of a krepis, a cylinder, a partly-open door, an architrave, and a dome surmounted by an eagle, but, unlike the first series, columns, grillwork and statuary obscure the building’s masonry, while disks or dentils ornament its entablature.

E. Talamo divided the second series emissions into three basic types:\textsuperscript{204} the first depicts a tetrastyle rotunda with a wide central intercolumnation to accommodate the door, topped by a triangular pediment, and side intercolumnations filled with grating; the second shows four columns, similarly spaced, incorporated into arches

\textsuperscript{199} King 1959, 73; Frazer 1966, 390; Arnaldi 1977, 279-80; Talamo 1981b, 26. For Maxentius’ ill-fated reign, see Frazer 1966, 385, and Fiore 1981, 64-6.
\textsuperscript{200} \textit{PLRE} I Romulus 6.
\textsuperscript{201} See #52, King 1959, 63-4 and 71-3 (mint marks), and Arnaldi 1977, 271-80 (\textit{aeternitas Augusti} on coins).
\textsuperscript{202} Maxentius may have included Constantius as an attempt to placate Constantine. Frazer 1966, 390; vs. King 1959, 73.
\textsuperscript{203} Constantius: \textit{PLRE} I Constantius 12; Maximian: \textit{PLRE} I Maximianus 8; Maximianus: \textit{PLRE} I Maximianus 9. See King 1959, 63-4 and 71-3 (mint marks). The first emissions of the second series may have reproduced the obverse and reverse of the first series. On the later emissions, Maxentius used the obverse legends to establish his connection to each of the \textit{divi}. Talamo 1981b, 23.
\textsuperscript{204} Talamo 1981b, 23-6 figs. 13-34.
beneath the drum’s architrave; and the third illustrates a hexastyle rotunda with two
groups of three columns flanking the door.205

Some coins of Talamo’s second and third categories include an important
variation, namely two statues in the side intercolumnations. These statues, which
appear on pedestals, are of young, naked males leaning on scepters or pilasters.206 In
view of the potent funerary symbolism of the partly-open door and the eagle,207 which
imply the apotheosis of the divus depicted on the obverse,208 scholars have interpreted
the statues as symbols of death and divinization.209

If not purely symbolic,210 the rotunda shown on these coins may illustrate a
memorial or funerary monument constructed during Maxentius’ reign. Two rotundas,
the mausoleum in his complex on the via Appia and the ‘Temple of Romulus’ (#52)
facing the via Sacra, are the most likely candidates. The mausoleum, consisting of an
ashlar-faced cylinder and a columnar porch, stands inside a large rectangular
precinct.211 The precinct forms part of a villa that is dated to the Maxentian period by
contemporary inscriptions and sources.212

One of the inscriptions suggests that Romulus was the first to be buried in the
mausoleum.213 As his resting place and part of a dynastic complex in honor of
Maxentius and his gens, it would be logical, as D. Brown, A. Frazer and F. Castagnoli
suggest, that the mausoleum on the via Appia be depicted on Maxentius’ coins.214

---

205 See #52.
206 See #52. Frazer (1966, 390-1, and see below) incorrectly identifies one figure as male and the other
as female.
207 Luschi 1984, 49-50.
209 Luschi 1984, and above.
210 Frazer 1966, 389 and 391; Küthmann and Overbeck 1973a, 26; Rasch 1984, 76-8.
211 Frazer 1966, 385 and 387. For a complete analysis of the mausoleum, see Rasch 1984.
212 See ‘Maxentius and Constantine’ above. Inscriptions and the Chronographus of 354 AD link the
mausoleum and circus to Maxentius. The villa is earlier, but was renovated when the rest of the
complex was built. Frazer 1966, 385.
214 Brown 1941, 304; Frazer 1966, 391, vs. 1964, 52-3 and 77; Castagnoli 1983b, 275-86.
Talamo, P. Hill, G. Pisani Sartorio, and R. Calza agree with this attribution for the first series coins, but prefer to identify the columnar building of the second series with the ‘Temple of Romulus’ on the via Sacra.\footnote{215}

However, difficulties arise in assigning even the first series to the mausoleum. Neither series shows the building’s projecting porch, while, more fundamentally, there is no sure parallel for a private mausoleum depicted on a coin.\footnote{216} Architecture shown on coins has a public character and, as Maxentius is not known to have illustrated monuments outside of Rome, a rotunda to which his coins may be attributed must be sought within the city limits.

The ‘Temple of Romulus,’ sited between the Temple of Antoninus Pius and Faustina and the Basilica of Maxentius-Constantine, with its round form and prominent public location, is an ideal candidate for depiction on both series.\footnote{217} The building consists of a domed rotunda whose thick walls are punctuated by an alternating pattern of four doors and four windows.\footnote{218} The doors provide access to the via Sacra and a series of three halls: two modest side halls that flank the rotunda and like it, open onto the via Sacra, and a much larger hall that stretches behind the rotunda and links it to the Templum Pacis.

The via Sacra façade of the rotunda and side halls is both lavish and monumental. Each of the side halls, which extend beyond the rotunda, is fronted by two cippolino columns raised on plinths. Concave walls, decorated with two tiers of statue niches, visually link the side halls to the rotunda.\footnote{219} The main entrance,

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \footnote{215} Pisani Sartorio and Calza 1976, 152 n. 127; Talamo 1981b, 23 and 25; Hill 1989, 13-5.
\item \footnote{216} Should it represent Constantius’ mausoleum at Trier, a coin noted by Küthmann and Overbeck (1973a, 27 n. 43) would be comparable.
\item \footnote{217} Discrepancies in both series may indicate phases in construction or planned and completed forms of a single building. Lugli 1947, 189; Coarelli 1986, 14. It is also possible that the model for Maxentius’ coins no longer exists. Lugli 1947, 186; Richardson, jr. 1992, 333.
\item \footnote{218} Fiore 1981, 67-8 and 72.
\item \footnote{219} Fiore 1981, 81. Based on Renaissance drawings of the monument, Frazer (1964, 107-9) only reconstructs the lower tier.
\end{itemize}
consisting of a marble portal and two-paneled bronze doors,220 is accentuated by two porphyry columns set against the concave walls and beneath an ornamental architrave.221 The dome of the rotunda rises above this façade,222 while the vaulted roofing of the side halls may have been obscured by the high concave walls.223 These walls also effectively mask the joins between the rotunda and side halls and, by abutting both, create two triangular spaces that act as light wells.224

In the sixteenth century, an inscribed epistle block was found in the vicinity of the building, which recorded the name of Constantine.225 Though the inscription is fragmentary, it is possible to deduce that Constantine either re-dedicated the building or had it dedicated in his honor by the Senate.226 Constantinian brick stamps support this date, while evidence for a rectilinear wall predating the concave wall of the entrance façade confirms that the monument had two consecutive phases.227 In view of Maxentius’ building activity in the area, it is possible that he initiated the construction of the ‘Temple of Romulus.’228 Constantine may have completed it or restructured its façade to tailor his rival’s building to his own ideological purposes.229

The rectangular hall to which the rotunda is connected is much earlier. This Flavian building formed part of Vespasian’s Templum Pacis and may have acted as

---

220 For the bronze doors, see Cima 1981 and Righetti 1981, 121-8.
221 On the coins, the architrave is shown resting directly on the column capitals. Fiore 1981, 81. See Frazer (1964, 122-4) for possible reconstructions.
222 For the drainage system necessitated by the oculus, see Frazer 1964, 85-6.
223 Frazer 1964, 89-90; Fiore 1981, 67 and 74. Some coins of the second series (Talamo’s second category), which show arcuation, may support this reconstruction.
224 Fiore 1981, 67 and 80.
225 The inscription (CIL VI 1147), shown on a drawing by Ligorio (Cod. Vat. Lat. 3439 f. 14), is confirmed by Panvinio (Cod. Vat. Lat. 6780 f. 45). Frazer 1964, 74 and 76-7.
226 Jordan and Halsen 1907, 10; Dörries 1954, 225; Flaccomio 1981b, 9-10; Grünewald 1990, 219 no. 249; Papi 1999a, 210; vs. Frazer 1964, 76-7 and 110-2.
227 Frazer 1964, 97-8; Fiore 1981, 67 and 80-1.
228 Alternatively, like the Temple of Venus and Roma (see ‘Maxentius and Constantine’ above), the ‘Temple of Romulus’ may mark the reconstruction of a building destroyed in 283. See Whitehead (1927, 14), for remains of a mid-1st c. AD pavement below the rotunda’s floor.
229 Lugli 1947, 189, and below.
an archive or library. Contemporary with the rotunda, an apsidal wall with a comparable diameter was added to the interior of the hall. This apse opening towards the rotunda, like the connecting door, suggests that the building of the rotunda and side halls and the restructuring of the Flavian hall was intended to result in a single, unified structure. The architectural evidence implies that the new building was designed as a monumental entrance for a pre-existing building, possibly put to a new use, which required both a shift in its orientation and an extension to reach the via Sacra. The relationship between the two parts was retained when the rectangular hall was converted into the nave of Ss. Cosma e Damiano with the ‘Temple of Romulus’ serving as its vestibule.

Architectural parallels can be found in a variety of buildings both at Rome and in the provinces. Thermae, like the Baths of Caracalla, incorporate round vestibules and caldaria into rectilinear complexes, while some Imperial residences, like the Palace at Lausos, and funerary monuments, like the mausoleum of Helena, combine rotundas with off-axis halls. For the tri-partite facade of the ‘Temple of Romulus’, comparanda can be found in triumphal arches, which employ columns on pedestals to create a monumental impression, and more specifically in two mausolea on the via Appia. Each mausoleum, illustrated in Renaissance drawings, consists of a rotunda with two projecting, rectilinear side halls visually linked by an arch.
arcuated façade. As in the ‘Temple of Romulus,’ the façades mask each building’s drum, while accentuating their domes.238

Due to the building’s striking architectural form and prominent location, many scholars have tried to determine its function. Though its architecture suggests that the ‘Temple of Romulus’ served as a fourth century vestibule for the Templum Pacis,239 Maxentius’ coins raise doubts about the accuracy of this attribution. The question of its identity is further complicated by the fact that Maxentius probably intended the building to fulfill one function, while Constantine re-dedicated it to serve another.

The name commonly ascribed to the building, the ‘Temple of Romulus,’ only appears in literary sources from the ninth century AD.240 Despite this gap, many scholars feel that Maxentius’ first and second series coins dedicated to Romulus provide sufficient proof that the rotunda they illustrate is the ‘Temple of Romulus’ built to honor Maxentius’ divinized son.241

The two male figures represented on some second series coins have been a springing point for additional theories. Both L. Luschi and F. Coarelli have examined these figures with different results.242 Luschi sees the two youths, distinguished by their heroic nudity and languid pose, as funerary symbols akin to erotes on Roman sarcophagi.243 Underlining this motif, together with the partly-open door and eagle, Luschi suggests that the rotunda acted as a dynastic temple to the divi of Maxentius’ family.244

---

238 See #52, and Lugli 1953, 1220 fig. 3 and 1221 fig. 4. Frazer (1964, 126-8) also compares the rotunda to nymphaeum and suggests moreover, that the ‘Temple’ replaced a nymphaeum on the via Sacra.
239 See #52.
240 See #52.
241 See #52. It is not clear how the other divi of the second series were honored, if not simply by association with Romulus’ temple.
242 Frazer (1966, 390-1) interprets the figures as Hercules and Victoria.
244 While Frazer (1964, 77) counters this argument by pointing out the lack of internal niches, the external niches may have been sufficient to display statues of the gens.
first consul, the *gens Valeria* gained special privileges, including the license to bury within the city walls. Maxentius, who used family connections to legitimize his power, may have revived this tradition with a dynastic monument near the site of his ancestor’s historic *domus* and tomb.\textsuperscript{245} Since a monument to the glory of Maxentius’ family would have been an insult to Constantine, such an attribution might explain why Constantine added a new façade, inscription and function to the building.\textsuperscript{246}

Instead of searching for parallel depictions, Coarelli looks for pairs of gods which might reasonably be represented on Maxentius’ coins. Discarding the Lares and Dioscuri as less likely candidates, he interprets the figures as statues of the *Penates*.\textsuperscript{247} While ancient sources site a Temple of the Penates on the Velia,\textsuperscript{248} Coarelli suggests that Maxentius, after demolishing much of the area to make way for his Basilica, re-erected the temple and other significant buildings nearby. In this context, he proposes that the side halls of the ‘Temple of Romulus’ functioned as the new Temple of the Penates.\textsuperscript{249}

Regio IV includes a sequence of buildings on the south side of the via Sacra.\textsuperscript{250} While most are firmly located, the Temple of Jupiter Stator, sited between the Basilica of Maxentius-Constantine and the Temple of Antoninus Pius and

\textsuperscript{246} Luschi 1984, 51.
\textsuperscript{247} Coarelli 1974, 94, and 1986, 16 and 19; vs. Luschi 1984, 44. For other coins which show the Penates, see Palombi 1997, 448 n. 51, while for the cult of the Penates, see Chap. III #17.
\textsuperscript{248} Varro *frg.* *Non.* p. 531; Sol. 1.22; *Don. Ter.* 256; Dion. Hal. 1.68.1; Liv. 45.16.5. Palombi 1997, 435-7. Whitehead (1913, 143-65) and Lugli (1946, 225-6) identified the Flavian hall as the original Temple of the Penates, while Palombi (1997, 438-9) links it to a temple illustrated on fragments 594 a-b and 673 of the Severan Marble Plan (cf. *Cod. Vat. Lat.* 3439).
\textsuperscript{249} Coarelli 1983b, 26-33, 1986, 18, and 1995k, 106-7. While Hill (1989, 13) points out that the coins show side intercolumnations, not side halls, in support of Coarelli’s theory, the sources site both buildings to the N of the *summa Sacra via*, cf. Ps. *Cic. exil.* 24. Castagnoli 1988, 104.
\textsuperscript{250} See #52. Coarelli (1983b, 26-31 and 33, 1986, 4-10, and 1995k, 106) convincingly limits this region to include the ‘Temple of Romulus.’
Faustina, has escaped attribution. Of the buildings alongside the via Sacra, Coarelli interprets the rotunda as the only possible candidate for a temple to Jupiter.251

According to tradition, the Temple of Jupiter Stator was erected by Romulus,252 while a few sources attest to its existence through the Republican period253 and again in the fourth century AD. Whether the temple remained active through the early and high Imperial periods is uncertain, though, if it fell into disrepair, it is not impossible that its site and connections to the origins of the city remained significant.

By naming his son after Rome’s founder and by associating himself with divine family members, Maxentius demonstrated his awareness of the importance of history. Erecting a monument in honor of his family on the site of Jupiter’s temple may have been a means of ensuring his place within the aeternitas of Rome.254 Constantine may have successfully negated Maxentius’ claim to rule by re-dedicating the site and the ‘Temple of Romulus’ to the ancient cults of Jupiter Stator and the Penates.255

Based on the evidence available, it is likely that the rotunda depicted on Maxentius’ coins is equivalent to the building on the via Sacra. Moreover, the coins’ symbolism suggests that the ‘Temple of Romulus’ served a commemorative function. Luschi’s hypothesis of a temple to the gens Valeria is the most direct means Maxentius could have chosen to honor his deceased relatives. Whether set in relation to his ancestor’s domus and mausoleum or built on the remains of Romulus’ temple to Jupiter, such a monument accords best with Maxentius’ desire to tie his rule to divine

253 Cic. Catil. 1.9; Cic. Phil. 2.64; CIL VI 435. Coarelli 1983b, 31-3.
255 Coarelli 1986, 18. However, this may be incompatible with Constantine’s Christian agenda, see Frazer 1964, 115.
members of his *gens*.\(^{256}\) As a commemorative monument, it is not surprising that the building was not recognized by its proper name in fourth century catalogues. Constantine would have been quick to transform the structure, possibly into the Temple of Jupiter Stator\(^{257}\) or into some other monument that might celebrate his own ideology. For its scale and complexity, the ‘Temple of Romulus’ makes a significant contribution to the via Sacra at a point where Maxentius’ influence, even with the interventions of Constantine, is most felt: in the shadow of the Temple of Venus and Roma and the Basilica of Maxentius-Constantine.

### III ANALYSIS

#### FOUNDATION AND LOCATION

Septimius Severus undertook a program of rebuilding in the Forum, which included additions to the Mundus (#49) and the reconstruction of the Temple of Vesta (#57). Coins attest to the involvement of his wife, Julia Domna, with the Temple of Vesta, while a dedicatory inscription shows that Septimius Severus and Caracalla repaired Hadrian’s Pantheon (#50). The important position held by each of these monuments reveals why the Severans took pains to restore them, while, as part of the Imperial domain,\(^{258}\) the reconstruction of the Temple of Fortuna on the Pincio (#37) may mark another high ranking project.

Though ostensibly a rebuilding, the Abaton at Pergamon (#26) completes the Sanctuary of Asklepios as redesigned under Hadrian. A prominent local figure, like

\(^{256}\) It is unclear why the ‘Temple of Romulus’ was built to complement the Flavian hall, if not to serve as a vestibule for the Templum Pacis. Possibly, its function necessitated more space than the rotunda and side halls, built on constricted piece of land, could afford.

\(^{257}\) It is also possible that Maxentius chose to honor the *divi* depicted on his coins by rebuilding Romulus’ Temple of Jupiter Stator. If so, Constantine may simply have rededicated it.

\(^{258}\) Following Valerius Asiaticus’ death in 47 BC (Tac. *ann.* 11.1), the Horti Lucullani became Imperial property. Broise and Jolivet 1987a, 750.
the consul who built the Temple of Zeus Asklepios Soter (#27), may have promoted its construction, while the Fratres Arvales, as her priesthood, probably re-erected the Temple of Dea Dia (#35). Coins attribute the Temple of Melampous at Aigosthena (#1) to Geta and the Temple of Tyche at Baalbek (#7) to Philip the Arab, and sources assign Aurelian the Temple of Sol (#53). As the god who oversaw his victory at Palmyra, it is not surprising that a temple to Sol was Aurelian’s most lavish building project.

Inspired by the Pantheon at Rome, Alexander Severus may have founded a temple to the Imperial cult at Ostia (#23). Similarly, prior to its re-dedication under Constantine, Maxentius’ ‘Temple of Romulus’ (#52) probably commemorated the gens Valeria.

While the settings of the Temple of Vesta, the Pantheon, and the Temple of Fortuna on the Pincio remained constant, the Mundus’ precinct, further defined by a rise in the surrounding pavement level, was enhanced by steps. Like these round temples, new temple foundations occupied prominent positions along major routes and in sanctuaries. Comparable to the Hadrianic Pantheon, the ‘Pantheon’ at Ostia was preceded by a rectangular forecourt that aligned it with neighboring buildings and the Decumanus Maximus. Similarly, the Temple of Tyche may have faced the Decumanus of Baalbek, while the ‘Temple of Romulus’ opened onto the via Sacra. The ‘Temple’s road frontage was a primary consideration for its architect, who employed the rotunda to re-orient, extend and embellish the Flavian hall.

Aurelian’s Temple of Sol may also have been accessed by a monumental entrance that formed part of its precinct. It is likely that the Temple occupied the

---

259 Similarly, a high priest founded the Temple of Palaimon-Melikertes at Isthmia (#15).
260 See Chap. VI ‘Foundation and location.’
261 If not the Arco di Portogallo (see above), it is likely that some type of monumental entrance fronted the Temple’s court.
center of the court, which, if pre-existing, was completely rebuilt to accommodate the cult.\textsuperscript{262} While the Temple of Melampous may have formed the centerpiece of his Sanctuary at Aigosthena,\textsuperscript{263} the Abaton at Pergamon stood at the periphery of the Sanctuary of Zeus Asklepios Soter. Fully visible from outside the precinct, the Abaton was obscured from the court by a cistern and portico. Like its atypical entrances, namely a side door from the South Hall and the cryptoporticus, the Abaton’s peripheral location must have enhanced its internal impact.

More prominent was the Temple of Dea Dia, situated on a terrace at the sanctuary’s summit. In addition to its location, the Temple’s round form set it apart from other buildings, which played subsidiary roles in her cult.\textsuperscript{264} Although elements of its decoration closely recall the nearby Sanctuary of Jupiter and Temple of Bacchus at Baalbek,\textsuperscript{265} the Temple of Tyche is also distinguished by its round form.\textsuperscript{266}

The Temple of Sol forms a marked contrast to its rectangular precinct, though its court aligns it with surrounding buildings. The ‘Temple of Romulus’ makes concessions to the via Sacra and neighboring buildings by employing rectangular side halls and screen walls to obscure its round form.\textsuperscript{267} The ‘Temple,’ appreciated from inside its rotunda, has a parallel in the ‘Pantheon’ at Ostia. Their interior focus, known from Hadrian’s Pantheon, is picked up by the Abaton at Pergamon, whose drum functions as a shell for two distinct levels.\textsuperscript{268}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{262} Le Glay (1987, 554) attributes the Temple’s siting in the Campus Martius to Aurelian’s desire to link himself with Augustus, the \textit{placator orbis}.
\item \textsuperscript{263} The Melampodeion, or festival hall, is the only other building known from the sanctuary.
\item \textsuperscript{264} The sanctuary’s north-south axis helps to tie its disparate buildings together.
\item \textsuperscript{265} Not only are the other temples rectangular, but they include an \textit{adyton} or ‘covered niche,’ a distinctly local feature absent from the Temple of Tyche. Gros 1996a, 192.
\item \textsuperscript{266} Even if the Temple of Tyche were contained within an enclosure, as Ward-Perkins (1989, 230) suggests, it is unclear how well this precinct would relate it to its neighbors.
\item \textsuperscript{267} Whereas most buildings on the via Sacra were rectangular, the Temple of Vesta (#57), the Tholus of Cybele (#34) and the Shrine of Bacchus (#32) may have been visible from the ‘Temple.’
\item \textsuperscript{268} Its domed drum is interrupted by protruding apses, which, hidden from inside the sanctuary, add to the dramatic effects achieved by the upper level.
\end{itemize}
Of the third and early fourth century round temples, the ‘Temple of Romulus’ employs the round form to the greatest effect since the Hadrianic Pantheon. Whereas the Pantheon fronted a drum with a rectangular intermediate block and porch, the ‘Temple’ employs a rotunda to mediate between a pre-existing rectangular hall, rectilinear side halls, and the via Sacra. For the first time in Roman religious architecture, the ‘Temple’ takes inspiration from bath buildings through its use of a rotunda to bind elements in an otherwise rectilinear plan.

BUILDING MATERIALS AND TECHNIQUES

Masonry techniques

Third and early fourth century round temples employed many of the same materials and techniques used in earlier periods, while adding some important variations. Ashlar masonry, popular since the late Republic, appears in the walls of the Temples of Vesta (#57), Dea Dia (#35), Sol (#53), and Tyche at Baalbek (#7). While the Temple at Baalbek is unusual for its stone dome, the Abaton in the Sanctuary of Zeus Asklepios Soter at Pergamon (#26) follows clear precedents in facing the concrete cores of its walls and pillars with ashlar blocks.

Brick is used as a facing for concrete in the foundations of the Mundus (#49) and of the ‘Temple of Romulus’ (#52), as well as in the marble-revetted walls of the ‘Pantheon’ at Ostia (#23). The ‘Pantheon’ incorporates opus vittatum mixtum into its foundations, a technique combining brick courses and rubble facing that first

---

269 See Chaps. IV-VI ‘Masonry techniques.’
270 See ‘Roofing techniques’ below.
271 These blocks are thicker than average revetment. Ziegenaus 1981, 100.
272 Brick foundations, though relatively rare, may have featured in the Domitianic Tholus of Cybele (#34).
273 If correctly identified with the Porticus Vipsania (see #53 above), parts of the Temple of Sol were rebuilt in brick-faced concrete under Diocletian.
appears in Augustan fortifications. In third century Ostia, it also features in tombs, the Schola of Trajan, and the House of Amor and Psyche, while at Rome, it forms the walls of the Temple of Fortuna on the Pincio (#37). *Opus reticulatum* and *opus latericium* are combined in repairs to the Pincian temple,276 in the foundations of the Temple of Dea Dia and significantly, in the dome of the ‘Temple of Romulus.’277

More so than poured concrete,278 popular under the Flavians and Antonines, brick-faced *opus concretum* is the main medium for new construction under the late third and early fourth century emperors. Not only did it allow large building projects to be completed quickly, like Aurelian’s walls,279 but, combined with other materials, it opened up new possibilities in roofing design.

**Roofing techniques**

While the Temple of Dea Dia (#35) employed a conical roof, laden with marble tiles and antefixes,280 most round temples of the third and early fourth centuries were topped by domes.281 Coins attest that the Temples of Vesta (#57) and of Melampous at Aigosthena (#1) were roofed with cupolas, while Renaissance drawings reconstruct domes for the Temples of Sol (#53) and of Fortuna on the Pincio (#37).

---

274 It appears in the Herculaneum gate at Pompeii, Hadrian’s Villa, and more widely, in Romano-Celtic buildings throughout Gaul. Adam 1994a, 135 and 141-2.
275 Adam 1994a, 142.
276 These techniques are too widespread to serve as an accurate dating device, though their use in rebuilding work is typical of the third and fourth centuries (e.g. Maxentius’ repairs to the Aurelian walls). Adam 1994a, 141 and 151.
277 See ‘Roofing techniques’ below.
278 Poured concrete features in the steps of the ‘Pantheon’ at Ostia, as well as in the lower vaulting of the Abaton.
280 This Greek-style roof was more popular in earlier periods, see Chaps. IV-VI ‘Roofing techniques.’
281 Although modeled after the Hadrianic Pantheon (#50), the ‘Pantheon’ at Ostia (#24) probably supported a timber roof (see above).
Fragments of poured concrete vaulting are preserved from the lower level of the Abaton at Pergamon (#26), as are parts of the semi-domes from the exedrae of its upper level.\textsuperscript{282} It is probable that a concrete dome, comparable to that of the Temple of Zeus Asklepios Soter (#27), crowned the Abaton.\textsuperscript{283} With its proliferation of domes, vaults, and exedrae, the Abaton recalls bath buildings, notably the contemporary Hunting Baths at Leptis Magna.\textsuperscript{284} Unlike the Hadrianic Pantheon (#50) and the Temple of Asklepios, little attempt is made by the Hunting Baths or the Abaton to disguise the round forms that define their design.

By contrast, the cupola of the Temple of Tyche at Baalbek (#7) is masked by an extension of its sloping porch roof. While the triangular pediment and wooden roof of its porch has many parallels, including the pronaos of the Hadrianic Pantheon, the stone cupola and pitched roof above its cella is both complicated\textsuperscript{285} and uncommon. In addition to using cut stone work, which also features in the late second century Arthur’s Oon, a round military trophy in southern Scotland,\textsuperscript{286} its cupola is unusual for its curvature, representing one-third of a circle,\textsuperscript{287} and its method of support. Unlike most cupolas, it rests on the cella’s Corinthian cornice, acting as a mensole, rather than directly on its walls.\textsuperscript{288}

The ‘Temple of Romulus’ (#52) is also exceptional for its materials and form. Comparable to the cupola of the Temple of Tyche, its dome is flatter than average,

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{282} Ziegenaus 1981, 80.
\item \textsuperscript{283} Ziegenaus 1981, 99.
\item \textsuperscript{284} Rasch 1985, 124.
\item \textsuperscript{285} See #7 above.
\item \textsuperscript{286} Wilson 1973, 32; MacDonald 1976, 10; for additional bibliography, see Godfrey and Hemsoll 1986, 72. Also comparable are the tufa domes of the bath buildings at Baia and the cupolas which form part of the Arch of Marcus Aurelius at Oea and the quadrifrons arch at Laodicea. De Angelis d’Ossat 1940, 243; Rasch 1985, 122.
\item \textsuperscript{287} De Angelis d’Ossat 1940, 226.
\item \textsuperscript{288} This facilitated construction by diminishing its span and as a by-product, resulted in its one-third curvature. De Angelis d’Ossat 1940, 242.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
adopting a double curvature like the Mausoleum of Maximianus at Thessaloniki.\(^{289}\) This late Antique convention is coupled by a second, the use of brick ribs and stone to shape its dome. Compartmentalized between the ribs, travertine, peperino, and tufa blocks are laid in horizontal layers, diminishing in weight toward the oculus.\(^{290}\) While this use of variously weighted materials has a strong precedent in Hadrian’s Pantheon,\(^{291}\) its construction techniques are closer to contemporary rotundas like the ‘Temple of Minerva Medica.’\(^{292}\) These early fourth century domes are lighter than the Pantheon’s, allowing them to incorporate windows and, in the ‘Temple of Minerva Medica’, less substantial support structures.\(^{293}\)

While the ‘Temple of Romulus’ explored the potential of this technique by including four windows, which opened up new lighting possibilities in its drum, it adhered to conventional methods of roofing in the concrete barrel vaults of its side halls. Used concurrently, the ‘Temple’ demonstrates how the roofing techniques popular in earlier periods remained in use through the early fourth century, even as clerestory lighting looks forward to early Christian architecture.\(^{294}\)

**BUILDING COMPONENTS**

With two prominent exceptions, the foundations and podia of third and early fourth century round temples follow Flavian and Antonine precedents. The Mundus (#49) and the ‘Temple of Romulus’ (#52) employ a brick ring comparable to the

\(^{289}\) The Baptistarium at Nocera has a comparable dome. Fiore 1981, 68-9; Rasch 1985, 129.
\(^{290}\) Fiore 1981, 68-71. The ‘Temple’ is one of the last rotundas to incorporate an oculus. De Angelis d’Ossat 1940, 233.
\(^{291}\) For the Pantheon’s aggregate, see Chap. VI #50, and ‘Roofing techniques.’ Amphorae were commonly used to lighten the domes of late Antique rotundas like the Tor Pignattura and the Mausoleum of Constantina. Sear 1982, 274; Ward-Perkins 1989, 424, 431, and 436.
\(^{292}\) Brick ribs, also used in the Flavian Amphitheater, the Villa of the Gordians, the Baths of Diocletian, and the Basilica of Maxentius-Constantine, provided support, while facilitating the construction of vaults and domes (like relieving arches). Ward-Perkins 1989, 433-5.
\(^{293}\) Sear 1982, 272-4. For the pillars which support its dome, see ‘Maxentius and Constantine’ above.
\(^{294}\) Sear 1982, 274.
Tholus of Cybele (#34), while in the Greek world, the Temple of Tyche (#59) rests on foundations and a podium of ashlar blocks, which figure prominently in the Temple of the Nymphs at Argos (#2) and the Rotunda at Athens (#5). The ‘Pantheon’ at Ostia (#24) and the Temple of Fortuna on the Pincio (#37) combine both materials in their foundations.

Though stone and brick also feature in the Temple of Dea Dia (#35), its network of ring and perpendicular corridors surpasses the pits and passageways of the earlier Temples of the Nymphs and of Palaimon-Melikertes at Isthmia (#15). Even more complex is the lower level of the Abaton at Pergamon (#26). Using pillars and walls to define two annular corridors, lit via windows from the third, this level not only supports the cella, but accommodates cult practices to a greater extent than previous foundations.

Like some earlier round temples, that of Melampous at Aigosthena (#1) may have employed a Greek-style krepis. Most third and early fourth century temples however stood on Roman podia. In addition to the Temple of Vesta, whose podium was rebuilt to reflect its Trajanic reconstruction, the Temple of Dea Dia is raised on a high podium fronted by steps. Steps provide access to the columnar porches of the ‘Pantheon’ at Ostia and of the Temples of Tyche at Baalbek, Sol (#53) and Fortuna on the Pincio. The podium of the Temple of Tyche is also notable for its scalloped edge, which incorporates the plinths of its peristasis.

Its podium moreover, acting in concert with the drum’s aediculae, adds to the undulating quality of the Temple of Tyche. This type of effect, achieved by Hadrian’s

---

295 The foundations of the Temple of Vesta (#57) remained virtually unchanged since the late Republic.
296 For an early example of ashlar masonry used in foundations, see Chap. V ‘The Pantheon’ (#50).
297 While the Temple of Vesta’s ash pit is attested by Festus (p. 296 L), it is reasonable to assume that other complex foundations played a part in cult rituals.
298 See Chap. VI ‘Building components.’
299 The Abaton and the ‘Temple of Romulus’ lacked podia.
Pantheon (#50) through its alternating exedrae and aediculae, becomes more widespread in the third century. While the concave walls of the ‘Temple of Romulus’ include two tiers of aediculae, rectangular and semicircular niches are embedded in the walls of the Temples of Dea Dia, Sol and Fortuna on the Pincio. More dramatic are the exedrae that protrude from the portico of Sol, the main niche of the ‘Pantheon’ at Ostia, which extends beyond its drum, and the apses of the Abaton at Pergamon. Though opening onto the drum, the Abaton’s apses effectively begin where its cella wall ends.

Columns, often framing aediculae, form another important part of baroque ornament, not only of round temples, but also of other prominent Severan buildings like the Septizodium in Rome and the rectangular court of the Sanctuary of Jupiter at Baalbek. While plinths are an important addition to this repertory, the bases, shafts and capitals of third and early fourth century round temples, as well as their moldings and entablatures, follow Flavian and Antonine precedents. Important exceptions include the five-sided Attic bases and Corinthian capitals of the Temple of Tyche.

Similarly, as monopteroi, peripteroi and drums, they recall earlier round temples. While the ‘Temple of Romulus’ is unusual for including two side halls and a pre-existing rectangular hall, the drums of the Temple of Dea Dia and to some extent, the Abaton, have parallels in the Temple of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste (#31) and the Theater Shrine at Tibur (#66), while the ‘Pantheon’ at Ostia and the Temple of Sol

---

300 An apse, of comparable diameter to the drum, was also added to interior of the Flavian building.
301 The drum’s niches and portico’s apses are best illustrated in Ligorio’s drawing (Cod. Turin. a. II 3 J. 16).
302 The ‘Pantheon’s’ podium is also fronted by two statue niches, while its court is lined with aediculae.
303 Sear 1982, 258; Ward-Perkins 1989, 319-20 fig. 205.
304 Plinths, also employed in Elagabalus’ Temple of Sol (see Gros 1996a, 188), form part of the Temple of Vesta (preserved from its Trajanic phase) and the ‘Temple of Romulus.’
305 In addition to the Mundus, which took the form of a monopteros from the late Republic, the Temple of Melampous is depicted without cella walls.
imitate the Hadrianic Pantheon. With columnar porches fronting their rotundas, the Temples of Tyche and of Fortuna on the Pincio are distant reflections of the Pantheon, more akin to the Temples of Fortuna Huiusce Diei (#38) and of Hercules and the Muses (#42).

**DECORATIVE DETAILS**

**The podium and plinth molding**

The few podium and plinth moldings preserved from third and early fourth century round temples rely on ornament popular in the Flavian and Antonine periods. Along the base of the Severan Temple of Vesta (#57) runs a molding consisting of a fascia, a torus decorated with flowering buds, and a cyma recta, whose palmettes and floral motifs recall decoration from the Domus Augustana.306 Above this molding, both its podium and plinths employ frames of Lesbian cymatia307 and a simple bead pattern. Although the resulting panels are flat, they appear recessed and enhance the undulating effect achieved by the protruding plinths and podium.

Lacking floral decoration, the remaining moldings are plainer. Base moldings from the ‘Pantheon’ at Ostia (#23) and the Temple of Tyche at Baalbek (#7) consist of fascias, scotias flanked by tori, and cyma rectas. While the crown molding from Baalbek is more complex,308 the molding of the ‘Temple of Romulus’ (#52)309 is the most basic, relying on fascias, a torus, and a single cyma reversa to give its plinths definition. Unlike most of the ‘Temple’s ornament, it is probable that these plinths,

---

306 Leon 1971, 115 pls. 39-40. While the plinths and podium have no direct parallels, their use of lush floral ornament is common to Flavian architecture.

307 This ornament has close parallels in the external order of the Temple of Venus Genetrix as rebuilt by Domitian and completed by Trajan. Leon 1971, 104 and 113 pl. 35b.

308 This molding, which comprises an astragal, a torus, a cyma recta, and a cyma reversa in-between two fascias, is comparable to the crown moldings of the Temple of Bacchus and the propylon of the Sanctuary of Jupiter at Baalbek. Wiegand 1925, 94 and 108.

309 This molding pertains to the plinths that flank the side halls.
which have a close parallel in a fourth century statue base, were purpose-made.\(^{310}\)

With their simple, flaccid workmanship, both the base and the plinths give evidence of the decline in standards that characterizes fourth century carving.

**The column base**

While the Temple of Vesta (#57), like Hadrian’s Pantheon (#50), employs Ionic bases for its columns and pilasters, the Temple of Tyche at Baalbek (#7) and the ‘Temple of Romulus’ (#52), like most Flavian and Antonine round temples,\(^{311}\) use Attic bases. Though the Attic form is also adopted by the ‘Pantheon’ at Ostia (#23), its bases are unusual for their rich Asiatic ornament.\(^{312}\)

**The column shaft**

More so than in previous periods,\(^{313}\) third and early fourth century round temples employ pilasters. Used in the Abaton at Pergamon (#26) to flank the niches of its upper level and on the exterior of the Temple of Dea Dia (#35), marble-revetted pilasters mirror columns in the Temple of Vesta (#57), the ‘Pantheon’ at Ostia (#23), and the Temple of Tyche at Baalbek (#7).\(^{314}\) The peripteral columns and pilasters of the Temple of Tyche are joined by porch columns, half-pilasters and half-columns. While its porch shafts are a dramatic red granite, its peripteral columns and the half-columns of its interior, like the peristasis of the Temple of Vesta, employ white marble bases, shafts, and capitals.

\(^{310}\) See Frazer (1964, 93 n. 30) for the statue base of Fabius Titianus, a consul and *praefectus urbi* in 338 AD.

\(^{311}\) See Chap. VI ‘The column base.’

\(^{312}\) While the Temple of Fortuna Huiusce Diei (#38) also had Attic-Asiatic bases, the ‘Pantheon’\’s closest Roman comparanda are the Greek-inspired Ionic bases of the Temple of Apollo Medicus. Gros 1996a, 502 fig. 616; Viscogliosi 1996a, 45 fig. 42.

\(^{313}\) Though not uncommon in Greek tholoi like the Philippeion at Olympia (#22) and the Arsinoeion at Samothrace (#58), pilasters are not attested in Roman round temples prior to the Hadrianic period.

\(^{314}\) The Temple of Vesta also employs pilasters in its interior.
Colored stones, used to great effect in the shafts, paving and revetment of
Hadrian’s Pantheon, also feature in the ‘Pantheon’ at Ostia, the Temple of Sol (#53),
and the ‘Temple of Romulus’ (#52). By using cippolino and porphyry shafts, they not
only enliven their façades, but also underline their Imperial connections.315

**The column capital**

Unlike earlier periods, the capitals preserved from third and early fourth
century round temples employ the Corinthian order.316 Ionic through the Trajanic
period, Corinthian capitals formed part of Julia Domna’s reconstruction of the Temple
of Vesta (#57). These capitals followed Flavian styles317 through their combination of
rigid nerves, folded lobes and regular hollows. Like Flavian capitals,318 they
emphasize light and shade effects and the ornamental qualities of foliage. However,
as K. Freyberger points out, their execution is less skilled and proportions less
balanced than comparable capitals.319 He blames the volume of rebuilding work
undertaken by the Severans for their sloppy craftsmanship.320

More skillful are the capitals re-used in the ‘Temple of Romulus’ (#52), which
also resemble Flavian precedents,321 and the porch and peripteral capitals of the
Temple of Tyche at Baalbek (#7).322 Recalling capitals from the mid-second century
court of the Temple of Jupiter, those from the round Temple of Tyche as well as

---

315 This is especially true for the porphyry shafts of the Temples of Sol and of ‘Romulus.’ Fiore 1981, 81.
316 While the coins do not reveal the order of the Temple of Melampous at Aigosthena (#1), volute
fragments attest that the Temple of Dea Dia (#35) included Corinthian pilasters as did, most likely, the
Abaton at Pergamon (#26) on the model of the Temple of Zeus Asklepios Soter (#27).
317 Heilmeyer 1970, 164 pls. 59, 3-5; Leon 1971, 225; Freyberger 1990, 103 pl. 36a.
318 See Chap. VI ‘The column capital.’
319 Freyberger 1990, 103 pl. 36d (Temple of Ceres, Ostia).
320 Freyberger 1990, 103.
321 Cima (1981, 108-9) dates them to the Domitianic period based on their similarities to capitals from
the portico of the Forum of Caesar (Leon 1971, 93 pl. 32.2) and from the Flavian palace on the Palatine
(Heilmeyer 1970, 137-9 pl. 48.8).
322 The Composite? (see #7) pilaster capitals are no longer extant.
contemporary capitals from the Propylon at Baalbek look back to Antonine work. Their three tiers of leaves, characterized by projecting lobes and deep nerves, ridges and hollows, invade the zone of the volutes and helices. As in capitals from the Temple of Zeus Asklepios Soter at Pergamon (#27) and the Temple of Bacchus at Baalbek, this zone is crowned by a richly decorated abacus.

While the abacus molding reflects local influences, the capitals of the ‘Pantheon’ at Ostia (#23) borrow Asiatic ornament. In addition to spiky leaves, known from the Traianeum at Pergamon and the Temple of Tyche at Side (#59), the Ostian capitals employ a systematic arrangement of foliage. Their leaves, set at regular intervals, barely overlap until the level of the volutes and helices. Almost lost behind the foliage, the helices provide support for the eagles and theatrical masks displayed on the abacus.

Though the masks recall capitals from the Porticus of Octavia and the foliage finds parallels in Severan rebuildings of the Stadium of Domitian, the Domus Augustana, and the Flavian Amphitheater, the ‘Pantheon’s’ capitals are closest to examples from the Basilica at Leptis Magna and the Frigidarium of the Great Baths at Cyrene. For their comparable style and content, the Ostian capitals have been ascribed to an Asiatic workshop, possibly from Aphrodisias.

Inspired by Flavian, Antonine and Asiatic styles, capitals from third and early fourth century round temples employ ornamental foliage to overrun the register of

---

323 Wiegand 1925, 108-9 figs. 154 and 171.
324 See Chap. VI.
325 Wilson Jones 2000, fig. 7.34.
327 See Chap. VI.
328 Pensabene 1973, 95 no. 336 and pl. 33.
330 Pensabene 1973, 95; vs. Gros (2001, 491), who warns against assigning them to any particular workshop.
331 They form a marked contrast to the organic ornament of Julio-Claudian and Augustan revival capitals.
the volutes and helices. Moreover, like their precedents, they emphasize vertical growth, acanthus distinguished by deep ridges and pointed lobes, and in some examples, the play of light and shade achieved by richly carved ornament.

**The entablature**

While the Severan restoration of the Mundus (#49) included repairs to its Ionic entablature, Julia Domna’s rebuilding of the Temple of Vesta (#57) complemented its Corinthian columns with a corresponding entablature. Between its three-fascia architrave and modillion cornice runs a frieze course, which displays sacrificial implements. Compared to the Temple of Vespasian’s frieze and reliefs from the Pantheon’s intermediate block (#50), the Temple of Vesta’s frieze course includes many of the same motifs, though it lacks the rich detailing that characterizes their ornament.

Of the entablature blocks re-used in the ‘Temple of Romulus’ (#52), the anthemion frieze shows the lush modeling typical of Flavian decoration, while the cornice fragments are stylistically closer to the Arch of Septimius Severus. Similarly lavish decoration is employed in the Corinthian entablatures of the Temple of Tyche at Baalbek (#7). Both its interior and exterior entablatures comprise a three-fascia architrave, a blank frieze course, a variety of moldings, and a cornice whose S-shaped modillions alternate with rosette soffit panels. This cornice is topped by a

---

332 Gros 2001, 491.
333 See Chap. VI.
334 A Corinthian entablature was also a feature of the Trajanic temple, see Chap. VI.
335 Wegner 1992, 42 pl. 2a.
336 See Chap. VI ‘Statuary and reliefs.’
337 The mechanical copying of Flavian motifs is typical of mid-to-late 2nd c. ornament. Gros 1996a, 195.
338 For example, they employ the same distinctive Ionic cymatia. Wegner 1957, 55 and 68 n. 86; Frazer 1964, 96-7.
339 Among these moldings, including bead-and-reel and Ionic cymatia (whose darts are replaced by floral ornaments), the Lesbian cymatia resemble examples from the Temple of Jupiter at Baalbek. Wiegand 1925, 97 figs. 143-4.
sima decorated with acanthus and palmettes, while the exterior sima also includes lion-head water spouts.\(^{340}\)

With moldings and a cornice reminiscent of the Temple of Bacchus,\(^{341}\) the entablature which encircles the Temple of Tyche’s porch and drum includes a convex frieze, a common feature of Asiatic decoration that appears in Rome as early as the Hadrianic period.\(^{342}\) The shell motifs displayed on the sima of the Temple of Dea Dia (#35) recall ornament from the Temple of Jupiter at Baalbek\(^ {343}\) as well as from prominent Roman buildings like the Hadrianic Basilica Neptunium.\(^ {344}\) Other elements of its entablature\(^ {345}\) are distinctly Flavian like its Ionic cymatia and dentils, which find close parallels in the Domus Augustana.\(^ {346}\) Its combination of motifs reveals that the Temple of Dea Dia draws inspiration from a variety of sources, both Flavian and farther afield.

Similarly, the entablature of the ‘Pantheon’ at Ostia (#23), whose bases and capitals show clear Asiatic influence, combines Ionic cymatia characteristic of the Flavian period and Lesbian cymatia reminiscent of Augustan revival ornament.\(^ {347}\) Its two-fascia architrave moreover is a prominent feature of Hadrianic buildings like the Temple of Venus and Roma.\(^ {348}\) Ornament from Aurelian’s Temple of Sol (#53) includes an ornate Corinthian cornice, incorporating scrolling vines reminiscent of the

---

\(^{340}\) Similar water spouts may be found in the rectangular court of the Sanctuary of Jupiter at Baalbek and the Octogon at Ephesos. Wiegand 1925, 108; Wegner 1992, 41.
\(^{341}\) Likewise, molding preserved from the door frame finds parallels in the Temple of Bacchus. Wiegand 1925, 97 and 108-9.
\(^{342}\) While the Hadrianeum in Rome provides an early example, this feature becomes more widespread under Constantine, when it appears in his Arch and Mausoleum of Constantina. Strong 1953, 141; Gros 2001, 495.
\(^{343}\) Ward-Perkins 1989, 317. The palmette antefixes also have an Eastern flavor.
\(^{344}\) Lanciani 1868c, 107.
\(^{345}\) Although Lanciani (1868c, pl. 5) saw its entablature as Ionic, not enough is extant to confirm his reconstruction.
\(^{346}\) Wegner 1957, 55. Wilson Jones (2000, 20 fig. 1.5) notes that the ring tracery in-between the dentils is a common Flavian feature.
\(^{348}\) Strong 1953, 140; Gros 2001, 494.
Nymphaeum of Pollio at Ephesos,\textsuperscript{349} and two anthemion friezes. The more elaborate frieze depicts a head whose hair and beard are formed from acanthus leaves, as well as smaller human and animal figures. While fantastical elements first appear in anthemion friezes of the Flavian period,\textsuperscript{350} the Temple of Sol’s frieze more closely recalls ornament from Leptis Magna and Baalbek.\textsuperscript{351} Rather than imported products, G. Gullini suggests that the Asiatic ornament of the Temple of Sol, as well as comparable motifs from the Temple of Dea Dia and the ‘Pantheon’ at Ostia, be attributed to Eastern workshops active in Rome since the Hadrianic period.\textsuperscript{352}

Soffits panels and ceiling coffers

As in the Flavian and Antonine periods,\textsuperscript{353} most third and early fourth century round temples feature rosette soffit panels in their modillion cornices.\textsuperscript{354} More elaborate soffit panels are preserved from the Temple of Sol (#53). Recessed within a frame of Ionic and Lesbian cymatia, these long, rectangular soffits bulge with a band of oak leaf decoration. Though layered, the leaves appear flat and ornamental with any naturalistic detail overshadowed by the soffits’ massing and overlapping design.\textsuperscript{355} For their decoration, M. Wegner points to parallels from the Baths of Caracalla and the late third century rebuilding of the Macellum at Pozzuoli.\textsuperscript{356}

While the Temple of Vesta’s (#57) ceiling coffers, like its soffit panels, include simple rosettes, ceiling coffers from the porch of the Temple of Tyche at

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{349}{Koenigs and Radt 1979, pls. 118b-c.}
\footnotetext{350}{Wegner 1957, 43. The Domus Augustana and the Arch of the Argentari provide good examples.}
\footnotetext{351}{Gullini 1960, 35.}
\footnotetext{352}{Gullini 1960, 35-6.}
\footnotetext{353}{Gullini 1960, 36, and see Chap. VI.}
\footnotetext{354}{See Chap. VI ‘Soffit panels and ceiling coffers.’}
\footnotetext{355}{Rosette soffit panels are extant from the Temple of Vesta (#57 and see below), the ‘Pantheon’ at Ostia (#23), and the Temple of Tyche at Baalbek (#7).}
\footnotetext{356}{Wegner 1957, 27-8 and 56.}
\end{footnotes}
Baalbek (#7) feature an intricate central medallion. Each corner of the square medallion is elaborated by an arc whose central flower is encased in vine tendrils. Comparable to ceiling coffers from the Temple of Bacchus,\textsuperscript{357} these point to local influences on the decoration of the Temple of Tyche.

**Pavements and wall revetment**

Though less dramatic than the floor and wall revetment of Hadrian’s Pantheon (#50), the majority of third and early fourth century round temples employed \textit{opus sectile} as part of their ornament. Closest to the Pantheon are the Abaton at Pergamon (#26) and the ‘Pantheon’ at Ostia (#23), which included multi-colored geometric pavements. While diagonals framing roundels visually linked the Abaton’s apses and dome,\textsuperscript{358} the ‘Pantheon’s’ pavement helped to unite its porch and drum in a single composition. The white marble floors of the Temples of Vesta (#57) and of Fortuna on the Pincio (#37), and probably of the Temples of Tyche at Baalbek (#7) and of ‘Romulus’ at Rome (#52), had more basic designs, but played a similar role in unifying each Temple’s structural and decorative elements.

Black marble revetment added contrast to the walls of the Temple of Fortuna, while white marble facing related the walls of the ‘Temple of Romulus’ Flavian hall to its floors. Moreover, stucco work on the façades of its rotunda and side halls linked the ‘Temple’ with nearby monuments on the via Sacra.\textsuperscript{359}

Like the neighboring Temple of Zeus Asklepios Soter (#27),\textsuperscript{360} the upper level of the Abaton included multi-colored limestone and glass mosaics to accent its cupola and semi-domes. Fragments of this mosaic show that it combined geometric motifs

\textsuperscript{357} Wiegand 1925, 104.
\textsuperscript{358} Ziegenaus 1981, 95.
\textsuperscript{359} Frazer 1964, 98 and 114.
\textsuperscript{360} See Chap. VI.
similar to the paving’s with swirling vegetal ornament. While the Abaton’s marble pavement linked its floor and elevation, its mosaic work, like the mosaic decoration of the Temple of Asklepios, emphasized the dramatic qualities of its soaring roof independently of the massive foundations and superstructure necessary for its support.

**Statuary and reliefs**

While coins may depict cult images in the cellas of the Temples of Melampous at Aigosthena (#1) and of Tyche at Baalbek (#7) and in the side halls of the ‘Temple of Romulus’ (#52), the Arval Annals suggest that the Temple of Dea Dia (#35) contained at least two statues, one of which may have represented the goddess. Like these statues, which celebrated the Temples’ cults, the images of Alexander Severus, Gordian III and his wife, displayed in the cella or court of the ‘Pantheon’ at Ostia (#23) support its attribution to the Imperial cult. Somewhat different are Aurelian’s dedications at the Temple of Sol (#53). Though he included statues of Sol in his Eastern guises Bel and Helios, a statue of Jupiter and an image of himself as Sol’s earthly counterpart, most of his decoration comprised booty from Palmyra. By incorporating spoils like paintings, jewelry, gems, and clothing into the Temple’s decorative scheme, Aurelian revived a practice.

---

361 Ziegenaus 1981, 100.
362 See Chap. VI.
363 As has been suggested for the Temple of Vesta (see Chap. V #57), it is also possible that the gods provided a means of identifying the Temples illustrated on the coins. By this reasoning, the image of Juno Martialis (#45) is not inconsistent with a temporary temple or a temple that was vowed, but never built.
364 The Temple’s aediculae indicate that it once incorporated a sizable statue display.
365 Hadrian’s Pantheon (#50) may be comparable, see Chap. VI ‘Statuary and reliefs.’
366 See #53.
common in the late Republic, whereby successful generals used booty to fund and ornament their victory temples.367

The altar of the Temple of Dea Dia and reliefs above the aediculae of the Temple of Tyche are more typical of Imperial practice. While the sides of the altar depict garlands alternating with bucrania, the reliefs include garlands borne by putti.368 On the reliefs, the garlands appear beneath rosettes and heads,369 which recall motifs from the Temples of Tyche at Side (#59) and of Bacchus at Baalbek.370 To garland, bucrania, and putti friezes known from the late Republic,371 motifs like heads and animals were added by the Flavian period372 to become a common feature of Asiatic ornament under the Severan and third century emperors.373

PROPORTIONAL ANALYSIS (Charts VII.1-8)

Whereas the guidelines laid out by Vitruvius had some relationship to the design of Flavian and Antonine round temples,374 third and early fourth century monopteroi and peripteroi do not correspond to his ideals and, of the drums, only the Temple of Dea Dia (#35) shows a 1:10 relationship between its lower column diameter and column height.375 Similarly, in the columnar orders, few beyond Ligorio’s systyle Temple of Sol (#53)376 and the pycnostyle Temple of Vesta (#57)377 demonstrate a correlation to Vitruvius’ guidelines for proportion. Moreover, only the

367 See Chap. IV ‘Introduction.’ A good example of this phenomenon is the Temple of Hercules and the Muses (#42).
368 Garlands supported by putti figure in the Temples of Bacchus at Baalbek and of Bel at Palmyra. Wegner 1992, 40.
369 Wiegand 1925, 100.
372 The entablature of the Shrine of Sulis-Minerva at Bath (#8) serves as a good example.
374 See Chap. VI ‘Proportional analysis’
375 This ratio is employed by the peripteral Temples of Vesta (#57) and of Tyche at Baalbek (#7).
376 His reconstruction is systyle based on its intercolumnation to lower column diameter relationship.
377 The Temple is pycnostyle from its column height to lower column diameter, a relationship approximated by the Temple of Tyche at Baalbek (#7).
Temple of Dea Dia and the ‘Pantheon’ at Ostia (#24) echo the 1:1 relationship between the lower column diameter and the capital height which he recommends for the Corinthian order.

When the entire columnar order is compared to the lower column diameter, the resulting pattern is less coherent than for Flavian and Antonine round temples. Even so, relationships like the 1:10 ratio between column height and lower column diameter and the 1:8 ratio between shaft height and lower column diameter are employed. Moreover, a few temples approximate Wilson Jones’ 6:5 rule for column to shaft height.

More erratic are the results of a comparison of their structural elements to their critical dimensions. For example, the column heights range from about 1/5 to 3/5 of the critical dimensions, while the roof diameters, often close to critical dimensions based on stylobate or total exterior measurements, are as little as one-half. Moreover, individual temples are more inconsistent in their use of proportional relationships than in earlier periods, with structural elements representing both simple and complex fractions of their critical dimensions.

Finally, an analysis of their floor space and volume in relation to their critical dimensions shows a great deal of divergence. Notably, the Abaton at Pergamon (#26), with twice the critical dimension of the ‘Pantheon’ at Ostia, has a volume over seven times greater.

---

378 This ratio is employed by the Temples of Vesta, Dea Dia and Tyche at Baalbek.
379 This features in the Temples of ‘Romulus’ (#52), Dea Dia, and Tyche.
380 The ‘Pantheon’ at Ostia (#24), the Temple of Dea Dia and the Temple of Sol, as reconstructed by Ligorio, come close.
381 The roofs of the Temples of Vesta and ‘Romulus’ represent approximately half of their critical dimensions.
382 See #57, 52, and 24, for the range of fractions employed in the Temples of Vesta and ‘Romulus,’ and the ‘Pantheon’ at Ostia. Although Wilson Jones (1989b, 112-14) uses other critical dimensions for the ‘Temple of Romulus’ and the ‘Pantheon’ at Ostia, his fractional relationships are no more simple or satisfactory.
IV CONCLUSION

Although the rich ornament of the Flavians fell out of favor in the Antonine period, it experienced a renaissance under the Severan emperors, who chose Flavian-style decoration to elaborate many of their building projects. While they employed this style in the Temple of Vesta (#57), some of their works, like the Arch of Septimius Severus, show a closer allegiance to Augustan Classicism. Another distinct influence on third century ornament is Asiatic. As in Hadrian’s Pergamene-inspired buildings, round temples like the ‘Pantheon’ at Ostia (#23) and the Temple of Dea Dia (#35) include Eastern elements in their decoration. The same may be said for the Temple of Tyche at Baalbek (#7) and to some extent, the Abaton at Pergamon (#26), whose ornament reflects local styles.

Like the Severan round temples, the decoration of Aurelian’s Temple of Sol (#53) recalled earlier monuments, specifically the Baths of Caracalla. The early fourth century ‘Temple of Romulus’ (#52) goes farther by reusing ornament, a practice that finds favor in early Christian architecture. Coupled with its ornate Flavian and Severan decoration, the ‘Temple’ employs colored marble columns and niches to enliven its façade. Known from Hadrian’s Pantheon (#50), these features,

383 Strong 1953, 121-2, 140 and 147; Gros 1996a, 185.
384 Strong 1953, 151 n. 150.
385 Strong 1953, 140-1; Gros 1996a, 185; vs. Sear (1982, 257), who suggests that the Arch’s ornament anticipates late Imperial decoration. The reintroduction of Augustan Classicism after the Julio-Claudian period was inspired by Trajan and Hadrian, see Chap. VI ‘Building components.’
386 Economic prosperity in the provinces resulted in considerable building activity, whose influence was felt throughout the empire. Gros 1996a, 185.
387 See Chap. VI ‘Conclusion.’
388 Another prominent example is Caracalla’s Temple of Serapis. Ward-Perkins 1989, 134.
389 This is based on its location, since very little of its ornament is preserved.
390 Strong 1953, 141.
391 Strong 1953, 141; Frazer 1964, 104.
together with stucco and mosaic work, become common in the fourth century as the quality of carved ornament declines.\footnote{392 Ward-Perkins 1989, 430.}

Decline is also an aspect of the proportional relationships employed by third and fourth century round temples. Whereas clear patterns of proportions defined the columnar orders of round temples as a whole, as well as the structural elements of some individual examples, in the Flavian and Antonine periods, later round temples are widely divergent in the ratios and fractions they feature.

This is not surprising as their materials, techniques and plans become more varied. While the ‘Pantheon’ at Ostia and possibly the Temple of Sol take their lead from Hadrian’s Pantheon, buildings like the Abaton and the ‘Temple of Romulus’ are highly inventive. In-between is the Temple of Tyche at Baalbek which, in its combination of a porch and a peripteros, has precedents from the late Republic, but employs an abundance of rounded forms that lend it greater vitality than Republican temples like that of Fortuna Huiusce Diei (§38).
CHAPTER VIII: CONCLUSION

With a rich and varied history, round temples made a significant contribution to the development of Roman architecture. Literary tradition includes them among the earliest buildings in Rome, while they continue to form part of her architectural repertory until the Christian period. Throughout their use, round temples appear as monopteroi, peripteroi and drums. Whereas monopteroi and peripteroi, ringed by columns, emphasize their exterior, drums focus on shaping interior space. This distinction forms one of the defining features of Roman round temples, whose structural and stylistic similarities to rectangular temples situate them within the context of Roman architecture.

This thesis has examined round temples as an architectural type from the first attested examples through those of the early fourth century AD. Some of the earliest round temples, like the Mundus (#49), the Temple of Vesta (#57), and the Shrine of the Penates at Lavinium (#17), were closely tied to Rome’s origins. In the late Republic, they were joined by several new temple foundations, which celebrated the architectural legacy of Greece.

Greece provided models for form and ornament, whose influence may be felt throughout the Imperial period. Most relevant are Greek tholoi or round buildings, elements of which are reflected in the design of Roman round temples. As military campaigns opened up the Greek world to Roman rule, generals returned to Italy with booty and the desire to found temples, both round and rectangular. Round victory temples, like those of Hercules Victor ad portam Trigeminam (#44) and of Hercules and the Muses (#42), followed Greek trends in design and ornament as a way of drawing attention to their founders’ achievements.
In the early Imperial period, round temples began to spread throughout the Roman world. The first to be built outside of Italy, like the Temple of Roma and Augustus on the Athenian Acropolis (#4), were located in Greek areas. This Temple is also significant as one of several Greek examples to honor the emperor together with the personification of the Roman state.¹ Though not strictly the Imperial cult, Augustus may also be celebrated in Agrippa’s Pantheon (#50) at Rome.

Hadrian’s rebuilding of the Pantheon is the highpoint of the next era in round temple building. Not only was his monument one of the finest achievements in Roman architecture, but his reign marks the greatest expansion of the empire coupled with the widest distribution of round temples. The Pantheon’s design and use of rich materials and ornament influenced later round temples, notably that of Zeus Asklepios Soter at Pergamon (#27) and the ‘Pantheon’ at Ostia (#24).

The Ostian ‘Pantheon’ may be dated to the last phase of the type’s development, namely the third and early fourth centuries AD. Many of the elements that characterize earlier round temples continue to feature in this period, while two notable examples, the Abaton at Pergamon (#26) and the ‘Temple of Romulus’ (#52), introduce new variations. With the Abaton, the round form becomes a shell for two distinct levels, while in the ‘Temple of Romulus,’ a drum is bounded by rectangular halls.

This analysis of the historical development of round temples has highlighted reasons why the type had such a lasting attraction. Ancient authors attest to the appeal of the round form, specifically of round temples, when they attribute celestial connotations to domes and vaults.² Some modern scholars have drawn on these sources to explain the form of Hadrian’s Pantheon (#50). Although ancient and

---

¹ See Chap. V #4.
² See Chap. II ‘Cosmic implications of the round form?’
modern visitors alike may be reminded of the heavens when entering his drum, it is unlikely that the original Pantheon, built by Agrippa, could have elicited the same response.³

Based on studies of Greek tholoi, scholars have proposed that round temples honored chthonic or earth-bound gods in addition to Vesta as the goddess of the hearth.⁴ This analysis of round temples has shown that, while Vesta and hero gods like Hercules, Asklepios, Palaimon-Melikertes, and Melampous received round temples,⁵ their dedications are outnumbered by those to other gods and goddesses. Fortuna and her Greek counterpart Tyche were honored with seven,⁶ the Imperial cult with up to five,⁷ and Venus-Aphrodite with four.⁸ Moreover, many of the gods who had round temples were also commemorated with rectangular temples, suggesting that the round form was not a requirement of their cults.⁹

Even so, round temples may have had a special appeal for chthonic cults that employed pits in their rituals. As in the Tholos in the Sanctuary of Asklepios at Epidaurus (#13), pits were embedded in the foundations of the Temples of Vesta (#57) and of Hercules Victor ad portam Trigeminam (#44), while corridors were incorporated into the Temples of Dea Dia (#35), Palaimon-Melikertes at Isthmia (#15), the Nymphs at Argos (#2), and most prominently, the Abaton in Asklepios’ sanctuary at Pergamon (#26). Like the pit of the Temple of Vesta, which may have

³ See Chap. V #50.
⁴ See Chap. I ‘Introduction.’
⁵ Temples of Vesta: #57, Hercules: #41-4 and possibly #25, Asklepios: #13 and 26-7, Palaimon-Melikertes: #15, and Melampous: #1.
⁶ #7, 30-1, 36-8, and 59.
⁷ #22-4 and possibly #50 and 52.
⁸ #9, 16, 55, and 63.
⁹ See Chap. III #47 for a discussion of Servius’ statement (Aen. 9.406) that round temples were dedicated to Vesta, Diana, and either Hercules or Mercury.
collected ashes from her sacred fire,\textsuperscript{10} the pits and corridors employed in the other round temples probably fulfilled important religious functions.\textsuperscript{11}

Comparable to pits are the wells beneath the Monopteros at Pompeii (#28) and the Shrine of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste (#30), which may identify them as the mundi of their cities.\textsuperscript{12} The Shrines of Venus in the Horti Sallustiani (#55) and of Aphrodite at Tibur (#63) also responded to a religious imperative. They probably mirror the famous Temple at Knidos (#16), which, if correctly identified as round, would mark the beginning of a long-standing tradition of round shrines to Aphrodite.\textsuperscript{13}

Social considerations also contributed to the use of the round form, in so far as patrons had a significant influence on the appearance of their temples. In addition to late Republican victory temples, whose founders employed the form as a reflection of Greek tholoi,\textsuperscript{14} the patron of the Temple of Zeus Asklepios Soter at Pergamon (#27) may have imitated the design of the Pantheon (#50) in deference to Hadrian. Moreover, these buildings, like rectangular temples, used lavish materials and sculptural displays to underline the wealth and status of their founders.\textsuperscript{15}

Like the use of the round form, social factors influenced the location of some round temples. The placement of the Temple of Fortuna Huiusce Diei (#38) was determined by its patron’s desire to link it to the foundation of his illustrious “ancestor,”\textsuperscript{16} while the Temple of Fortuna on the Pincio (#37) lies on axis with the Mausoleum of Augustus, a potent symbol of the Imperial cult.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{10} See #57.  
\textsuperscript{11} See Chap. VII #26.  
\textsuperscript{12} See Chap. IV #28 and 30.  
\textsuperscript{13} See Chaps. IV #55 and VI #63.  
\textsuperscript{14} See above and Chap. IV ‘Introduction’  
\textsuperscript{15} See Chap. VI #50.  
\textsuperscript{16} See Chap. IV #38.  
\textsuperscript{17} See Chap. V #37.
Where social considerations cannot account for their location, the intrinsic advantages of areas like the acropolis at Tibur\textsuperscript{18} may explain the siting of some round temples. However, more common locations for round temples are sanctuaries and urban settings. While, in the former, round temples usually formed the focal point of a vast complex, like the Temple of Dea Dia (#35) and to some extent, the Temple and Shrine of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste (#30-1), those built in urban locations were often required to fit within rectilinear grids.

In the context of an urban grid, round temples could adapt or form a deliberate contrast to their surroundings. From the late Republic, porticoes accommodated round temples within grid patterns. The Temple of Hercules and the Muses (#42), for example, employed a portico to align it with the neighboring Porticus Octaviae and the Circus Flaminius. Set between the Shrine of the Camenae (#33) and a semicircular schola, the Temple was framed by complementary forms.\textsuperscript{19} In the sanctuaries of Palaimon-Melikertes at Isthmia (#15) and of Sol at Rome (#53), rectangular porticoes reserved open space around the temples to highlight their circularity from every angle.\textsuperscript{20}

Some drums like Hadrian’s Pantheon (#50), the Temple of Zeus Asklepios Soter at Pergamon (#27), and the ‘Pantheon’ at Ostia (#24) employ porches to lend their façades the appearance of rectangular temples. While both Pantheons also use forecourts to align them within urban grids, the Temples of Fors Fortuna (#36) and of ‘Romulus’ (#52) incorporate rectilinear elements like platforms and side halls into their design.\textsuperscript{21} In some cases, round shrines like the Perirrhanterion (#51) and the

\textsuperscript{18} See Chap. IV #64.
\textsuperscript{19} This also applies to the Shrine of Apollo Delphinios at Miletos (#19), which is flanked by semicircular exedrae.
\textsuperscript{20} The Temple of Tyche at Side (#59) and the Shrines of Hermes and Maia on Delos (#10) and of Sulis-Minerva at Bath (#8) were also set within porticoes.
\textsuperscript{21} See Chap. VII ‘Temple foundation and location.’
Shrine of Aphrodite at Tibur (#63) responded to curved forms in their built or natural environments.22

Whereas the use of rectangular porticoes marks a typically Roman response to the siting of temples, many follow Greek tholoi by occupying areas that lack clear architectural definition.23 Without porticoes, the Temples of Hercules in and around the forum Boarium (#43-4) rely on their round forms to distinguish them from neighboring buildings. This contrast is accentuated by the rectangular Temple of Portunus that stands next to the Temple of Hercules Victor ad portam Trigeminam (#44). Similarly, the rectangular temple that accompanies the Round Temple at Tibur (#64), together with its dramatic location, emphasizes its round form.

Like their locations, the ability of monopteroi to showcase statues from every angle was an important factor in some temples’ use of the round form. Prominent examples include the Rotunda at Corinth (#9) and the Shrine of Aphrodite in Hadrian’s Villa (#63), both of which exhibited statues of the goddess in a context reminiscent of her Temple at Knidos (#16). The display of cult statues was also an important consideration for the patrons of the Temple of Palaimon-Melikertes at Isthmia (#15) and probably of the Temple of Roma and Augustus on the Acropolis (#4).

Similarly, statue display was a factor in the design of the peripteral Temple of Fortuna Huiusce Diei (#38), which, like rectangular temples, exhibited its cult statue against the back of its cella wall.24 In its second phase however, the Temple was

---

22 See Chaps. V and VI ‘Temple foundation and location.’
23 This is also true for the Temple of Roma and Augustus (#4) and the Rotunda (#5) at Athens, the Shrine of the Lares Augusti at Ostia (#23), the Monopteros at Pompeii (#28), and the Temple of Vesta (#57), the Shrine of Bacchus (#32), and the Tholus of Cybele (#34) at Rome.
24 According to some Renaissance plans, the Theater Shrine at Tibur (#65) may have displayed its main statue in a similar way, see Chap. VI #65.
rebuilt as a drum to visually balance statue groups added to flank its stairs.\textsuperscript{25} Moreover, some round temples incorporated niches or aediculae, like the Pantheon (#50), to impress their visitors with statues on all sides.\textsuperscript{26}

In addition to their form, this thesis has addressed influences on the design and ornament of Roman round temples. Following her expansion into Greece, elements like ashlar foundations, stepped krepes and timber roofs known from tholoi feature in the Roman repertory. They appear concurrently with Roman brick and concrete foundations, podia, and domes. Round temple builders drew on both traditions in their designs, favoring the Greek for some buildings like the Temple of Hercules Victor ad portam Trigeminam (#44), which was intended to convey its founder’s Greek tastes, and the Roman for others like the Temple of Fortuna Huiusce Diei (#38). Required to fit within a complex of rectangular temples, this Temple used its Roman podium and steps to deny its roundness and lend it the same visual axis and orientation as its neighbors.

Beyond these design elements, Roman round temples employ the same basic forms as Greek tholoi. However, while their monopteroi and peripteroi are comparable, Greek drums, lacking cupolas, do not have the same volume or visual impact as their Roman counterparts. Similarly, the drum’s emphasis on shaping interior space, used to great effect in the Pantheon (#50), is more a feature of Roman round temples.

In their ornament, Roman round and rectangular temples alike draw from the Greek architectural repertory. Augustus’ architects, looking to Greece for inspiration, formulated the ‘Classical style’ followed by many of his successors. The perseverance of Greek motifs in Roman architecture is demonstrated by round

\textsuperscript{25} See Chap. IV #38.
temples built in the Greek world. In their decoration, temples like the Rotunda at Corinth (#9) are equally appropriate to Greece and Rome. The most prominent example however is the Temple of Roma and Augustus at Athens (#4), which derived its form and proportions, together with its ornament, from the Classical Erechtheion. The Erechtheion in turn inspired the use of caryatids in Agrippa’s Pantheon (#50) as well as in the Forum of Augustus at Rome. Although local influences are more apparent in the ornament of round temples built in Asia Minor,27 the Temples of Tyche at Side and Baalbek (#59 and 7) employ Roman podia and the Temple of Zeus Asklepios Soter at Pergamon (#27) imitates the design of Hadrian’s Pantheon.28

In their proportions, Doric round temples follow both Greek tholoi and Vitruvius, while Ionic and Corinthian examples begin to show a pattern of their own by the early Imperial period. Their columnar orders attain a consensus of proportions under the Flavian and Antonine emperors, though, in other aspects of their design, round temples are remarkable for their variety. As a result, their analysis has raised doubts about the approach of Vitruvius and M. Wilson Jones, who propose strict rules for temple design.

Though the range in proportions and size is remarkable for buildings of a single architectural type, round temples have some features in common. Most early peripteroi favor a 3:5 relationship between their cella and stylobate diameters, as recommended by Vitruvius,29 and many round temples place an emphasis on height. Unlike rectangular temples, whose main axis is horizontal, round temples focus on the vertical. This results in monopteroi like the Rotunda at Athens (#5), which appear

---

26 The Shrine of Venus (#55) may have included niches along the exterior of its cella wall, while the Temple of Tyche at Baalbek (#7) has both internal and external aediculae.
27 For example, see Chap. VII ‘Soffit panels and ceiling coffers.’
28 See Chap. VI #27 and ‘Proportional analysis.’
29 See Chap. IV ‘Proportional analysis.’
disproportionately tall for their diameter, and drums like the Pantheon (#50), whose volumes far surpass their floor space.\textsuperscript{30}

When choosing between round and rectangular forms for their temples, patrons must have evaluated the religious, social, topographical and aesthetic impacts of their decision. Though most preferred the rectangular form, those who built round temples would have been attracted to their versatility. Their ability to draw attention in virtually any setting must have been appealing to patrons who wanted to broadcast their religious devotion and social status. This may have contributed to round temples’ popularity in the late Republic, when Roman military conquests provided the primary impetus for their construction,\textsuperscript{31} and under the reign of Hadrian. His Pantheon (#50), described by its contemporaries as a reflection of the heavens,\textsuperscript{32} not only inspired the design of round temples into the early fourth century AD, but continues to act as a major landmark in Rome and a milestone in the history of her architecture.

\textsuperscript{30} See Chart VI.8.

\textsuperscript{31} This is assured by an analysis of the augural techniques employed in defining \textit{templum} spaces, which has demonstrated that the dearth of round temples prior to the late Republic cannot be explained as a reflection of legal or religious constraints. See Chap. III ‘Augural divination in Archaic Italy: defining the Roman \textit{templum}.’

\textsuperscript{32} See Cass. Dio 53.27 (quoted in #50) and Chap. VI #50.