

Chrystina Häuber

**The Cancellaria Reliefs and Domitian's Obelisk in Rome in
context of the legitimation of Domitian's reign.**

**With studies on Domitian's building projects in Rome, his statue of Iuppiter Optimus
Maximus Capitolinus, the colossal portrait of Hadrian (now Constantine the Great),
and Hadrian's portrait from Hierapydna**

in Honour of Rose Mary Sheldon

With Contributions by

John Bodel, Emanuele M. Ciampini, Amanda Claridge, Angelo Geißen, Laura Gigli,
Hans Rupprecht Goette, Peter Herz, Eugenio La Rocca, Eric M. Moormann, Jörg Rüpke, Franz X. Schütz,
R.R.R. Smith, Giandomenico Spinola, Mario Torelli, Walter Trillmich, Claudia Valeri, and T.P. Wiseman

FORTVNA PAPERS

Edited by Franz Xaver Schütz and Chrystina Häuber
Volume III, 2021

ISBN: 978-3-943872-24-8

(München: Hochschule München)

Impressum

The Cancellaria Reliefs and Domitian's Obelisk in Rome in context of the legitimation of Domitian's reign. With studies on Domitian's building projects in Rome, his statue of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus Capitolinus, the colossal portrait of Hadrian (now Constantine the Great), and Hadrian's portrait from Hierapydna. München: Hochschule München.

ISBN 978-3-943872-24-8

Autor: Chrystina Häuber

With Contributions by John Bodel, Emanuele M. Ciampini, Amanda Claridge, Angelo Geißen, Laura Gigli, Hans Rupprecht Goette, Peter Herz, Eugenio La Rocca, Eric M. Moormann, Jörg Rüpke, Franz X. Schütz, R.R.R. Smith, Giandomenico Spinola, Mario Torelli, Walter Trillmich, Claudia Valeri, and T.P. Wiseman

(= FORTVNA PAPERS, edited by Franz Xaver Schütz and Chrystina Häuber, Volume III, 2021)

Druck und Bindung: Universitäts-Buchbinderei Georg Konrad, München 2021.

The individual authors are responsible for the copyrights of all published materials (texts, images, illustrations) used in their individual contributions and comments.

Signed contributions and comments do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the editors.

© 2021 Beiträge bei den jeweiligen Autorinnen und Autoren

© 2021 des Bandes bei den Herausgebern

This book is provided free access at:

HM digital <http://www.bib.hm.edu/recherche/hmdigital/index.de.html>

<https://FORTVNA-research.org/FORTVNA>

Dedication

Ich widme dieses Buch meiner guten Freundin, der Militärgeschichtlerin Rose Mary Sheldon, Professor Emerita des Virginia Military Institute.

Rose Mary hat nichts Geringeres fertig gebracht, als mich zuerst nach Rom und dann nach Dumbarton Oaks zu bringen. Ihr ist es also zu verdanken, dass ich in Rom (nach vielen vergeblichen) Versuchen mein Dissertationsthema gefunden habe, und später in Dumbarton Oaks, dank eines Junior Fellowships, in aller Ruhe meine Doktorarbeit schreiben konnte.

Dass ich mit Hilfe von Rose Mary nach Rom, und damit zu meinem Lebensthema, der stadtrömischen Topographie, gelangt bin, lag daran, dass wir im Juli-August 1979 ein Zimmer geteilt haben. Das war bei den 'Corsi estivi di Lingua e Cultura Italiana dell'Università del Sacro Cuore di Milano', die im Collegio Denza auf dem Capo Posillipo bei Neapel stattgefunden haben. - Seither haben wir unsere Forschungsthemen miteinander diskutiert.

Ein sehr wichtiger Bestandteil dieser Kurse waren Exkursionen zu allen Museen und Ausgrabungen rund um den Vesuv und zu den Inseln im Golf von Neapel, die Mario Torelli von der Università Perugia durchgeführt hat.



Abb. 1. Mario Torelli, teaching us members of the 'Corsi estivi di Lingua e Cultura Italiana dell'Università del Sacro Cuore di Milano' in the summer of 1979. The photo shows Torelli in the Museo Archeologico Nazionale at Naples in front of the marble bust of Pindar, which he explains to us. Photo: Courtesy Rose Mary Sheldon.

Rose Mary hatte bei Torelli an der University of Michigan studiert, weshalb ich ihn durch sie persönlich kennenlernen konnte. So kam es, dass Mario von meinem (bereits vierten) Dissertationsthema erfuhr: 'Die Statuenausstattung der Villa dei Papiri'. Er wies mich dann freundlicherweise darauf hin, dass ich (auch) diese Arbeit nicht würde schreiben können, da dieses Thema bereits seit geraumer Zeit von einer Doktorandin der Università Perugia bearbeitet wurde. Mein Doktorvater, Andreas Linfert, hatte darauf bestanden, dass ich mein Dissertationsthema selbst finden solle - wofür ich ihm im Nachhinein sehr dankbar

bin. Es was ein langwieriger Prozeß, der von 1975-1981 andauern sollte: das erste Thema (begonnen 1975) lautete: 'Die Portraits der Ptolemäerinnen', das zweite: 'Der Statuentypus der Großen Herculanenserin'.

Unterstützt durch ein Gutachten von Mario Torelli, habe ich daraufhin erfolgreich ein DAAD-Stipendium für Rom beantragt. Gleichzeitig mit mir war Rose Mary in Rom, in der American Academy (von 1980-1982). Und als sie dann in Washington, DC, im Center for Hellenic Studies, beschäftigt war, hat sie mir 1984 einen Zeitungsausschnitt nach Rom geschickt, in dem das Center beschrieben wurde, 'das an den Park von Dumbarton Oaks grenzt'. Ich schrieb zurück: "Ist das das berühmte Dumbarton Oaks?". "Ja", antwortete Rose Mary, und fügte hinzu, "sie vergeben auch Stipendien", und legte ein Faltblatt bei, das sie für mich in Dumbarton Oaks besorgt hatte, in dem erklärt wurde, wie man sich dort um Stipendien bewirbt. Ich habe sogleich einen Antrag gestellt und im akademischen Jahr 1985-86 das Privileg genossen, mit einem Junior Fellowship ausgestattet, in 'DO' forschen zu können. Auf diese Weise waren Rose Mary und ich wieder zusammen, diesmal in Georgetown, in Washington, DC, wo sie wie immer lebhaft an meinen Forschungen Anteil nahm.

Durch einen glücklichen Zufall habe ich in Rom am 29. Dezember 1980 meine gute Freundin Amanda Claridge wiedergefunden. Amanda hatte im Juli 1973 Hansgeorg Oehler in Köln besucht, den Gründer und damaligen Direktor der 'Monumenta Artis Romanae', des 'Forschungsarchivs für Römische Plastik' am Archäologischen Institut der Universität zu Köln, und zwar just an dem Tag, an dem ich bei ihm als Studentische Hilfskraft angefangen hatte. Auf Amandas Einladung hin konnte ich dann seit dem 30. Dezember 1980 in der Bibliothek der British School at Rome arbeiten, wo sie inzwischen Assistant Director geworden war. Dort habe ich im Januar 1981 auch einen der Bibliothekare, Demetrios Michaelides, kennen gelernt. Am 2. März 1981 hat sich dann mein fünftes Dissertationsprojekt, 'Die Statuenausstattung der Villa von Chiragan' bei einem Gespräch im Musée Saint Raymond in Toulouse als nicht realisierbar herausgestellt. Diese römische Villa befindet sich in der Nähe von Toulouse und die entsprechenden Funde werden in diesem Museum aufbewahrt, das aber vom folgenden Tag an für fünf Jahre geschlossen werden sollte. - Danach entschloss ich mich, *nolens volens*, mein drittes Dissertationsthema wieder aufzunehmen: 'Die Statuenausstattung der *Horti Sallustiani* in Rom'.

Demetrios Michaelides, der mich am 19. März 1981 in der British School auf die *Horti Sallustiani* ansprach, hatte dann die rettende Idee. Eugenio La Rocca, der Direktor der Kapitolinischen Museen, hatte Demetrios soeben ein Angebot zur Mitarbeit in einem Projekt unterbreitet, das dieser aber nicht annehmen konnte, weil er nach Zypern zurückkehren musste. Demetrios fragte mich deshalb, warum ich nicht die 'Statuen aus den *Horti* des Maecenas' untersuchen wolle, ich könne diesbezüglich doch einmal La Rocca ansprechen. "Hatte Maecenas auch Statuen?", fragte ich ungläubig. Demetrios erzählte mir von La Roccas Angebot an ihn, und dass ich La Rocca am folgenden Tag, dem 20. März 1981, anlässlich einer Tagung in der American Academy, kennen lernen könne: *The Topography of ancient Rome: New Developments and suggestions* - da La Rocca dort einen Vortrag halten werde. Zu dieser Tagung erschien selbstverständlich auch Rose Mary, sowie glücklicherweise auch Mario Torelli. Mario hat mich auf meine Bitte hin Eugenio La Rocca vorgestellt, und dieser lud mich ein, ihn am Morgen des 23. März 1981 in seinem Büro in den Kapitolinischen Museen aufzusuchen.

Eugenio La Rocca hat mir am 23. März 1981 ein Thema zur Bearbeitung angeboten, das, nach Absprache mit meinem Doktorvater, mein Dissertationsthema werden sollte. Ich habe zunächst die Neufunde der Archäologischen Kommission in Rom nach 1870 identifiziert, von denen sich die meisten in den Musei Capitolini, sowie früher auch im Antiquarium Comunale auf dem Caelius befanden, und dann, darauf aufbauend, 'Die Statuenausstattung der *Horti Maecenatis* und der *Hort Lamiani* auf dem Esquilin' studiert. La Rocca war außerdem so freundlich, mich an diesem Morgen einzuladen, gleich damit anzufangen, zeigte mir das Material, das zu bearbeiten sei, und stellte mich allen Mitarbeitern seines Museums vor. Die Kapitolinischen Museen sind daraufhin für die folgenden fünf Jahre mein Zuhause geworden.

Als ich nach dem Gespräch mit Eugenio La Rocca die *Cordonata* des Kapitols hinuntergehüpft bin, hat mich ein sehr alter Römer gefragt: "Warum singen Sie denn so fröhlich?". Ich hatte das gar nicht bemerkt, und nachdem ich ihm die ganze Geschichte erzählt hatte, hat er gelächelt und gesagt, dass er mich nun sehr gut verstehen könne.

Dass das, was so vergnügt begann, gelingen konnte, hat natürlich Gründe: es ist tatsächlich nur der unendlichen Geduld, dem wissenschaftlichen Sachverstand und der unverbrüchlichen Freundschaft vieler Kollegen und Freunde zu verdanken. Sowohl denen, die ich bereits in Köln und Neapel kennen gelernt hatte, als auch den neu hinzugewonnenen in Rom und später in den Vereinigten Staaten, Greifswald, Bonn, Regensburg, Tübingen und München. Sie haben mich die entsprechende Methodik gelehrt und mir das entsprechende Wissen vermittelt, waren seither an meinen Forschungsprojekten beteiligt, wie zum Beispiel auch an diesem Buch, sind mir immer mit Tat und Tat beigestanden und haben mich durch alle wissenschaftlichen Schwierigkeiten hindurchgelotst.

Mit diesem Buch danke ich aber allen voran Rose Mary Sheldon. Ohne sie hätte ich es nie geschafft, am 3. Oktober 1980 überhaupt erst einmal nach Rom zu kommen, obendrein mit einem Stipendium versehen, zunächst allerdings nur mit dem Wunsch, dort eine Dissertation schreiben zu wollen. - Dass ich mich dann an Rom gewöhnt habe, und seither ausschließlich über diese Stadt forsche, war das sehr angenehme, völlig unvorhergesehene Ergebnis dieses Aufenthalts.

For the identification of the portrait of Pindar, visible on **Abb. 1**; cf. *infra*, at *The second Contribution by R.R.R. Smith: Note on the function of the 'Atrium House' at Aphrodisias*.

Chrystina Häuber
München, den 4. Oktober 2021

Vorwort der Herausgeber

Dedication

With *The second Contribution by R.R.R. Smith: Note on the function of the 'Atrium House' at Aphrodisias*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of illustrations

What this study is all about

Preamble: Domitian's negative image

- I. 'The intentional creation of Domitian's negative image', here presented by discussing relevant text passages from Markus Handy ("Strategien zur Legitimierung der Ermordung des Domitian", 2015) and from Peter L. Viscusi (*Studies on Domitian*, 1973)
- II. Conclusions: Domitian's representations of his military successes and his claims to be of divine descent and to possess a divine nature
- III. My own ideas about Domitian

Introductory remarks and acknowledgements

I. A survey of the scholarly discussion of the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here Figs. 1; 2)

- I.1. The discussion of the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here **Figs. 1; 2**), or the story of a dilemma: wrong shoes or wrong interpretations?
 - I.1.1. Summary of the scholarly discussion concerning the 'wrong shoes', worn by figures on Frieze B (cf. here **Fig. 2**), and the decision to pursue a different avenue of research

I.2. The amazon-like figure on Frieze A (cf. here **Fig. 1): *Dea Roma*, not *Virtus***

To chapter I.2. belongs:

- I.2. The wider topographical context of the Arch of Hadrian alongside the *Via Flaminia* which led to the (later) *Hadrianeum* and to Hadrian's Temples of *Diva Matidia* (and of *Diva Sabina*?). With discussions of Hadrian's journey from *Moesia inferior* to Mogontiacum (Mayence) in order to congratulate Trajan on his adoption by Nerva, and of Hadrian's portrait-type Delta Omikron (Δ) (cf. here **Fig. 3**). With *The fourth and the fifth Contribution by Peter Herz*, and with *The Contribution by Franz Xaver Schütz*
- I.2.1. **The consequence of the identification of the amazon-like figure on Frieze A as *Dea Roma* (cf. here **Fig. 1**): she and Domitian (now Nerva) separate from each other at the *pomerium* of Rome; with a discussion of the lictors and soldiers on both friezes of the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here **Figs. 1; 2**)**
 - I.2.1.a) The relationship of Domitian and *Dea Roma* on Frieze A of the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here **Fig. 1**): thoughts at 'second glance'

I.2.1.b) An anticipation of my tentative reconstruction of the Cancelleria Reliefs (cf. here **Figs. 1; 2**) as the two horizontal panels in the central bay of one of Domitian's arches (cf. *infra*, at I.3., and here **Figs. 1 and 2**, 'in situ')

I.2.1.c) The problems, connected with the lictors and soldiers on both friezes of the Cancelleria Reliefs (cf. here **Figs. 1; 2**)

I.3. Were the Cancelleria Reliefs (cf. here **Figs. 1; 2) the horizontal panels in the central bay of an arch, built by Domitian?**

I.3.1. M. Pentiricci's discussion (2009) of the excavations underneath the Palazzo della Cancelleria, his reconstruction of the stratigraphy of the excavated area, and his discussion of the two sculptor's workshops found there, and of the pertaining architectural and archaeological finds

I.3.2. A discussion of the question, whether the Cancelleria Reliefs (cf. here **Figs. 1; 2**) and the architectural finds from the area of the Palazzo della Cancelleria could have belonged to an arch, built by Domitian (cf. here **Figs. 1 and 2**, 'in situ')

II. Technical observations concerning the Cancelleria Reliefs (cf. here **Figs. 1; 2) and various hypotheses concerning their reworking**

II.1. My own discussion of these subjects

II.1.a) where exactly was the carving of the first phase of the Cancelleria Reliefs (cf. here **Figs. 1; 2**) conducted and do we have criteria that allow us to date these friezes?

II.1.b) which emperor commissioned those friezes (cf. here **Figs. 1; 2**), and had that first phase of the reliefs been finished? What evidence do we have that other emperors were also involved in the making of these friezes?

II.1.c) where should we assume those friezes to have been, when the face of the emperor on Frieze A (cf. here **Fig. 1**) was recut into a portrait of Nerva?

II.1.d) what can the state of the friezes (cf. here **Figs. 1; 2**) in which they were found, when excavated tell us?

II.1.e) scenario, which tries to explain, why both friezes (cf. here **Figs. 1; 2**) were not found attached to a monument, but rather as intentionally discarded material in the deposit of a sculptor's workshop

II.2. My first conclusion, written before reading the account by M. Pentiricci (2009)

II.3. My second conclusion, written after reading the account by M. Pentiricci (2009)

The observations made in section II.3. allow new interpretations concerning the Cancelleria Reliefs (cf. here **Figs. 1; 2) and concerning Domitian's building policy in general**

II.3.1. Nerva's victory in the *bellum Suebicum* October AD 97, the architectural fragments, found together with the Cancelleria Reliefs (cf. here **Figs. 1; 2), comprising the architrave block carrying the inscription *PP FECIT* (CIL VI, 40543), Domitian's Forum/ the *Forum Nervae*, and Domitian's building policy: praising the *gens Flavia*, emulating Augustus and Nero**

II.3.1.a) Nerva's victory in the *bellum Suebicum* October AD 97

II.3.1.b) The architectural fragments, found together with the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here **Figs. 1; 2**), comprising the architrave block carrying the inscription *PP FECIT* (CIL VI, 40543), and Domitian's Forum/ the *Forum Nervae*

II.3.1.c) Domitian's building policy: praising the *gens Flavia*, emulating Augustus and Nero

II.3.1.d) A digression on Domitian's intention to emulate Augustus and Nero

Domitian built his Palace 'Domus Flavia' / the Domus Augustana on the Palatine deliberately at the site of the (real) House of Augustus. As the 'new founder of Rome', and again like Augustus, Domitian emulated also Romulus (or else compared the achievements of his entire dynasty with those of Romulus). With summaries of the recent discussion concerning the following subjects: the so-called House of Augustus; Augustus' Temple of Apollo Palatinus; the (real) House of Augustus (cf. here Fig. 35); a temple podium, which has been identified as that of the Temple of Iuppiter Invictus (but which has also been identified as that of the Temple of Iuppiter Stator, Iuppiter Victor, and as that of the Temple of Iuppiter Propugnator); Domitian's *sestertius*, issued in AD 95/96 (cf. here Fig. 30) and the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano" (cf. here Fig. 31), both of which represent in M. Torelli's opinion (1987) the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*

II.3.1.d); I. The 'House of Augustus', the 'House of Livia' and the Temple of Apollo Palatinus, and the (real) House of Augustus and Domitian's 'Domus Flavia' / the *Domus Augustana*

II.3.1.d); II. Domitian's *sestertius* (cf. here **Fig. 30**), which shows a building, the identification of which is debated, and the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano (cf. here **Fig. 31**)

II.3.1.d); III. T.P. Wiseman's (2017; *id.* 2019) location of the Temple of Iuppiter Stator, and his reconstruction of a 'new' old accession route from the *Forum Romanum* to the Palatine

II.3.1.d); IV. The temple podium in front of Domitian's 'Domus Flavia' / *Domus Augustana* which has been identified with that of the Temple of Iuppiter Stator, Victor, Invictus, and Propugnator, and the location of the hut of Faustulus

II.3.1.d); V. The debated location of the Temple of Iuppiter Stator and an earlier reconstruction of an old accession route from the *Forum Romanum* to the Palatine

II.3.1.d); VI. Augustus' emulation of Romulus and the hut of Faustulus on the Palatine. This hut stood on the Palatine, within the precinct of a Jupiter temple, which T.P. Wiseman (2019) identifies with the Temple of Iuppiter Victor. He assumes two sites for this temple, the first standing within the *area Palatina* to the north of the Temple of Apollo Palatinus, the second he identifies with the podium standing in front of the 'Domus Flavia' / *Domus Augustana*

II.3.1.d); VII. F. Coarelli (1996, 143) first attributed the temple podium in front of the 'Domus Flavia' / *Domus Augustana* to the Temple of Iuppiter Invictus. More recently (2012), he has proven that this temple podium does not belong to the Temple of Iuppiter Victor, and has attributed it in his turn to the Temple of Iuppiter Propugnator instead

II.3.1.d); VIII. F. Coarelli (2012) locates the 'cluster' of toponyms, surrounding the hut of Faustulus and the Temple of Iuppiter (Victor or rather of Invictus) not within the *area Palatina*, as Wiseman (2019) suggests, but instead at the Cermalus/ Germalus, to the south-west of the *area Palatina*

- II.3.1.d); IX. Conclusions concerning the discussions of: the Temples of Iuppiter Victor, Iuppiter Invictus and Iuppiter Propugnator, and concerning the identifications of these temples with the podium in front of the *'Domus Flavia' / Domus Augustana*
- II.3.1.d); X. The new excavations (2009-2013), conducted by Vincenzo Graffeo and Patrizio Pensabene (cf. *id.* 2014; 2016-2017) at the temple podium in front of the *'Domus Flavia' / Domus Augustana*, which the authors tentatively attribute to the Temple of Iuppiter Invictus, and at the "basamento" standing immediately to the west of it
- II.3.1.d); XI. Let's now return once again to T.P. Wiseman's location of the Temple of Iuppiter Stator and to his reconstructed accession roads from the *Forum Romanum* to the Palatine
- II.3.1.d); XII. Let's now return to our discussion of the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano", which shows Mars and Rhea Silvia and the she-wolf, suckling Romulus, and thus *'Rome's foundation-story'*
- II.3.2. Nerva's adoption of Trajan in late October AD 97 and the consequences which this had for the monument (an arch?), built by Domitian, that contained the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here Figs. 1; 2)**
- II.3.3. The Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here Figs. 1; 2), the panels of the Arch of Trajan at Beneventum (cf. here Fig. 46) and the importance of the hierarchy of scale**
- II.3.3.a) A Summary of the following sections:**
- I.3. Were the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here Figs. 1; 2) the horizontal panels in the central bay of an arch, built by Domitian?;*
- I.3.2. A discussion of the question, whether the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here Figs. 1; 2) and the architectural finds from the area of the Palazzo della Cancellaria could have belonged to an arch, built by Domitian (cf. here Figs. 1 and 2, 'in situ');*
- II.1.e) scenario, which tries to explain, why both friezes (cf. here Figs. 1; 2) were not found attached to a monument, but rather as intentionally discarded material in the deposit of a sculptor's workshop;*
- II.3.1. Nerva' victory in the bellum Suebicum October AD 97, the architectural fragments, found together with the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here Figs. 1; 2), comprising the architrave block carrying the inscription PP FECIT (CIL VI, 40543), Domitian's Forum/ the Forum Nervae, and Domitian's building policy: praising the gens Flavia, emulating Augustus and Nero;*
- II.3.1.a) Nerva' victory in the bellum Suebicum October AD 97;*
- II.3.1.b) The architectural fragments, found together with the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here Figs. 1; 2), comprising the architrave block carrying the inscription PP FECIT (CIL VI, 40543), and Domitian's Forum/ the Forum Nervae;*
- II.3.2. Nerva's adoption of Trajan in late October AD 97 and the consequences which this had for the monument (an arch?), built by Domitian, that contained the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here Figs. 1; 2)*
- II.3.3. The Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here Figs. 1; 2), the panels of the Arch of Trajan at Beneventum (cf. here Fig. 46) and the importance of the hierarchy of scale*
- II.4. Technical observations concerning the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here Figs. 1; 2) and various hypotheses concerning their reworking. Discussion of the above-mentioned subjects by other scholars**

III. A comparison of the interpretations of the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here Figs. 1; 2) by Tonio Hölscher (2009a) and Giandomenico Spinola

IV. Frieze B of the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here Fig. 2) and the Obeliscus Pamphilius/ Domitian's obelisk (cf. here Fig. 28)

IV.1. A letter by Giandomenico Spinola concerning the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here Figs. 1; 2) and the Obeliscus Pamphilius/ Domitian's obelisk (cf. here Fig. 28)

IV.1.1. The Obeliscus Pamphilius/ Domitian's obelisk (cf. here Fig. 28) - that was commissioned for the Iseum Campense, not for the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*

IV.1.1.a) A summary of the hypotheses of Jean-Claude Grenier and Filippo Coarelli, according to whom Domitian's obelisk (cf. here Fig. 28) was not commissioned for the Iseum Campense, but instead for the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*. With a discussion of the contents of the reliefs on the *pyramidion* of Domitian's obelisk and of the contents of its hieroglyphic inscriptions

IV.1.1.b) My first attempt to find arguments in support of the hypothesis that Domitian's obelisk (cf. here Fig. 28) was commissioned for the Iseum Campense

IV.1.1.c) Further research that was undertaken to clarify the question, whether or not Domitian's obelisk (cf. here Fig. 28) was commissioned for the Iseum Campense and G. Gatti's (1943-1944) correct reconstruction of the central *Campus Martius* (cf. here Fig. 78)

IV.1.1.d) E.M. Ciampini (2005) has observed that the contents of the hieroglyphic inscriptions and of the representations on the *pyramidion* of Domitian's obelisk (cf. here Fig. 28) are closely related to the structures called *mammisis* in Egypt. The (new) king of Egypt was legitimized by the 'royal rituals', which were performed there and elsewhere. With the article of Emanuele M. Ciampini (2005) and with *The first Contribution by E.M. Ciampini to this volume*

IV.1.1.e) J.-C. Goyon (1988) on the 'royal rituals', performed at the structures called *mammisis*, and P.G.P. Meyboom (2016) on the festivals connected with the Nile flood and on the 'royal rituals' at the festival of New Year

IV.1.1.f) What consequences has the fact that the contents of Domitian's obelisk (cf. here Fig. 28) refer to *mammisis*, in regard to our question, for which location this obelisk was commissioned?

IV.1.1.g) The controversy concerning the "ARCUS AD ISIS" that is visible on a relief from the Tomb of the Haterii (cf. here Figs. 89; 90): it cannot be identified with the Arco di Camilliano to the east of the Iseum Campense, but stood instead near the Temple of *Isis et Serapis* in *Regio III*

IV.1.1.h) The new findings by B. E. Borg (2019) concerning the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* support the hypothesis suggested here that Domitian's obelisk (cf. here Fig. 28) was commissioned for the Iseum Campense. With some observations concerning the Temple of *Divus Traianus* at Itatica, and concerning the Marble Forum at the *Colonia Augusta Emerita* (Mérida) in Spain. With *The Contributions by John Bodel, Eric M. Moormann, Mario Torelli, and Walter Trillmich*

V. Summary of the publications by S. Langer and M. Pfanner (2018), M. Wolf (2018), and K.S. Freyberger (2018), concerning the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here Figs. 1; 2) and the architectural fragments found together with them, which appeared when that part of this study was almost finished, which is dedicated to the Cancellaria Reliefs

V.1. Summary of the publication by S. Langer and M. Pfanner (2018) concerning the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here Figs. 1; 2), and comparisons of their conclusions with my own

V.1.a) The stratigraphy of the site, where the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here **Figs. 1; 2**) were excavated, the topography of the entire area, and the date of the dismantling of these panels

V.1.a.1.) My own comments on the passages, quoted from Langer and Pfanner (2018) in section V.1.a), and the 'First sculptor's workshop' and the 'Second sculptor's workshop' underneath the Palazzo della Cancellaria

V.1.b) The Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here **Figs. 1; 2**) under Nerva - as reconstructed by S. Langer and M. Pfanner (2018) and my own comments on their conclusions. With some remarks on the efforts of Septimius Severus to legitimize his reign

V.1.c) The Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here **Figs. 1; 2**) under Nerva - as reconstructed by myself in this study

V.1.d) The reconstruction, in my opinion erroneous, of the length of Frieze B of the Cancellaria Reliefs by S. Langer and M. Pfanner (2018) (cf. here **Figs. 1 and 2 drawing**) and the correct reconstruction of the length of Frieze B by F. Magi, whom I am following here (cf. here **Figs. 1; 2; and Figs. 1 and 2, 'in situ'**). With a discussion of how many Vestal Virgins we might expect to appear at public ceremonies, such as the one shown on this panel (cf. here **Fig. 2**), and with *The Contribution by Jörg Rüpke*

V.1.e) The hypothesis of S. Langer and M. Pfanner (2018) concerning the alleged 'footstool' on Frieze B, on which the *Genius Populi Romani* sets his left foot (cf. here **Fig. 2**)

V.1.f) My own hypothesis concerning the alleged 'footstool' of S. Langer and M. Pfanner (2018) on Frieze B, on which the *Genius Populi Romani* sets his left foot (cf. here **Fig. 2**) - it is a *cippus* of the *pomerium*-line of Rome

V.1.g) The gestures that the two emperors on both friezes (cf. here **Figs. 1; 2**) perform with their right hands

V.1.h) The hypotheses of S. Langer and M. Pfanner (2018) and myself concerning the togate youth on Frieze B (cf. here Fig. 2; in my opinion Domitian), and the allegedly recut portrait of Vespasian (cf. here Fig. 2; in my opinion from the beginning Vespasian) on Frieze B

V.1.h.1.) The passages of Langer and Pfanner (2018), in which they discuss the togate youth on Frieze B (cf. here **Fig. 2; in my opinion Domitian**), their "**Figure 12**" (cf. their "Abb. 2" on p. 19 = here **Figs. 1 and 2 drawing**)

V.1.h.2.) The passages of Langer and Pfanner (2018), in which they discuss the emperor on Frieze B (cf. here **Fig. 2; in my opinion from the beginning Vespasian**), their "**Figure 14**" (cf. their "Abb. 2" on p. 19 = here **Figs. 1 and 2 drawing**), who in their opinion was first Domitian, whose portrait was later recut into that of Vespasian

V.1.i) The hypotheses of S. Langer and M. Pfanner (2018) and myself concerning the design, manufacture, and meaning of both friezes of the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here Figs. 1; 2), the structure, to which they may have belonged, and the reason, why this structure was destroyed

V.1.i.1.) The hypotheses of S. Langer and M. Pfanner (2018) concerning the design, manufacture, and meaning of both friezes of the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here **Figs. 1; 2**), the structure, to which they may have belonged, and the reason, why this structure was destroyed

V.1.i.2.) My own hypothesis concerning the statue-type (?) of the *Dea Roma* on Frieze B of the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here **Fig. 2**): it is reminiscent of Vespasian's coins commemorating his revival of the archaic festival of the *Septimontium* (cf. here **Fig. 112**).

V.1.i.3.) My own hypotheses concerning the design, manufacture and meaning of both friezes of the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here Figs. 1; 2), the structure, to which they may have belonged, and the reason, why this structure was destroyed

After this section was written, I realized that the findings here summarized are complemented by observations, made by R. Paris (1994b) and J. Pollini (2017b). The hypotheses, published by these scholars are presented in the followed sections V.1.i.3.a) and V.1.i.3.b)

V.1.i.3.a) The reconstruction by R. Paris (1994b) of two of the marble reliefs of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*: 'Vespasian's *adventus* into Rome in October of AD 70' (cf. here Fig. 33), and 'Sacrifice in front of the Temple of Quirinus on the Quirinal' (cf. here Fig. 34). With some observations concerning Domitian's *sestertius*, issued in AD 95/96 (cf. here Fig. 30), the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano" (cf. here Fig. 31), and the *aureus* of Augustus, minted in 12 BC, showing the door of the (real) House of Augustus on the Palatine, decorated with the *corona civica* and laurel trees (cf. here Fig. 35)

V.1.i.3.b) J. Pollini's discussion (2017b) of the allegedly 'lost' Nollekens Relief (cf. here Fig. 36), which he compares with the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here Figs. 1; 2) and Domitian's '*Domus Flavia*'/ *Domus Augustana*. With *The Contribution by Amanda Claridge*

V.1.i.3.b); I. Introduction

V.1.i.3.b); II. The Nollekens Relief was found in the '*Aula Regia*' within the '*Domus Flavia*'/ *Domus Augustana*

V.1.i.3.b); III. Does the design of the Nollekens Relief reflect the topographical context, for which Domitian had commissioned it?

V.1.i.3.b); IV. The Nollekens Relief, Domitian's sacrifice at his *Porta Triumphalis*, and the controversy concerning the location of this building

V.2. Summary of the publication by M. Wolf (2018) concerning the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here Figs. 1; 2) and the architectural fragments found together with them

V.3. Summary of the publication by K.S. Freyberger (2018) concerning the architectural fragments found together with the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here Figs. 1; 2)

VI. Final Conclusions concerning the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here Figs. 1; 2)

VI.1. Summary of the hypotheses that have been published on the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here **Figs. 1; 2**) by other scholars

VI.2. Comparison of these Roman state reliefs with some portraits of politicians, made by Pietro Canonica

VI.3. Summary of my own hypotheses concerning the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here **Figs. 1; 2**) presented in this study, with an addition: My own tentative suggestion, to which monument or building the Cancellaria Reliefs may have belonged, and a discussion of their possible date

APPENDICES

Appendix I. The praefectus urbi T. Flavius Sabinus, Domitian's escape from the Capitolium on 19th December AD 69, which happened on the festival of the Opalia, one day of the Saturnalia, and the 'Isis ship', shown in the processions of the Saturnalia at Cologne

Appendix I.a) The praefectus urbi T. Flavius Sabinus. With a summary of the recent discussion concerning the locations of the buildings that belonged to the praefectura urbis over time

Appendix I.a); I. Introduction

Appendix I.a); II. The praefectura urbis at Rome was accommodated over time at different buildings. To be able to follow F. Coarelli's (2019a) relevant hypotheses, we need to define the locations of the following toponyms: *Velia*, *Carinae*, *Mons Oppius* and *lucus Iovis Fagutalis*

Appendix I.a); III. The location of the *Carinae*, which F. Coarelli (1999) was able to establish *inter alia* because of the toponym of the former Church of 'S. Maria in Carinis'

Appendix I.a); IV. The controversy concerning the location of the *lucus Iovis Fagutalis*, within which stood the *Domus* of King Tarquinius Superbus

Appendix I.a); V. The *lucus Iovis Fagutalis* was near the 'Sette Sale', *inter alia* because of the height above sea-level of the area in question, and because of the inscriptions dedicated to Iuppiter, found there

Appendix I.a); VI. The development of the praefectura urbis over time, as reconstructed by F. Coarelli (2019a)

Appendix I.a); VII. F. Coarelli (2019a) convincingly suggests that at the time of Vespasian the praefectura urbis was accommodated at the *Templum Pacis*

Appendix I.a); VIII. F. Coarelli's (2019a) discussion of the Temple of Tellus on the *Carinae*, close to which stood the praefectura urbis of late antiquity

Appendix I.a); IX. The hypothesis to identify the praefectura urbis of the Flavian period with the (presumed) Vespasianic 'edificio della >Città Dipinta<', found underneath the Baths of Trajan

Appendix I.a); X. My reconstruction of R. Volpe's (2000) new valley, in which the (presumed) Vespasianic building with the >Città Dipinta< once stood, and in which my old *Vicus Iovis Fagutalis* ran

Appendix I.a); XI. The locations of the *lucus Iovis Fagutalis*, as suggested by myself (2014a), and by F. Coarelli (2019a). Both hypotheses are based on our reconstructions of the course of the procession of the *Argei* on the *Mons Oppius*, as described by Varro (*Ling.* 5,45-54)

Appendix I.a); XII. A.M. Colini's (1977, 140) archaic 'village' in the former Villa Caserta, which I identify with the 'Domus of Tarquinius Superbus' within the *lucus Iovis Fagutalis*

Appendix I.a); XIII. F. Coarelli's (2019a) location of the praefectura urbis of late antiquity immediately to the north of the Basilica of Maxentius

Appendix I.b) Domitian's escape from the Capitolium - Introduction

Appendix I.c) The precise date of Domitian's escape from the *Capitolium*, M. Volusius' disguise as an Isis priest in 43 BC, and the hypothesis that because of this alleged precedent, Domitian's disguise on 19th December 69 as a priest of Isis should therefore be regarded as an invention

Appendix I.d) Domitian's escape from the *Capitolium* on 19th December AD 69, which happened on the festival of the *Opalia*, one day of the *Saturnalia*

Appendix I.d.1.) Statue of the mule Scudela. Pietro Canonica's 'Monumento all'Umile Eroe' (1937) ('monument of a modest hero'; cf. here **Fig. 41**), on display in front of the 'Museo Pietro Canonica a Villa Borghese' in Rome. With *The Contribution by Laura Gigli*

Appendix I.d.1.a) The stratagem, told in *The Taking of Joppa*, a town, 'taken' by Djehuty, a general of Tuthmosis III (around 1450 BC), compared with the escape of some of the Flavians from the Capitol on 19th December AD 69. With some remarks on what *The Taking of Joppa* has to do with Tuthmosis III's Lateran Obelisk (cf. here **Fig. 101**). With *The second Contribution by Emanuele M. Ciampini*

Appendix I.d.2.) The Temple of Ops Opifera in *Capitolio*, the *aerarium militare*, and the buildings visible on the fragments 31a-c and 499 of the Severan Marble Plan

Appendix I.e) It is conceivable that Vitellius (cf. Suet., *Vit.* 15,3), on December 19th AD 69, could actually have watched the fighting on the *Capitolium*, while staying at the 'Domus Tiberiana' on the Palatine

Appendix I.f) The procession, which Domitian joined, the festival of the *Opalia* on 19th December, the *Saturnalia*, the festival of *Fors Fortuna* on 24th June, and the 'Isis ship', shown in the processions of the *Saturnalia* at Cologne

Appendix I.f.1.) The procession, which Domitian joined, the festival of the *Opalia* on 19th December, the *Saturnalia*, and the festival of *Fors Fortuna* on 24th June

Appendix I.f.2.) The 'Isis ship', shown in the processions of the *Saturnalia* at Cologne

Appendix I.g) The shrines built by Domitian as a thanksgiving for his escape from the *Capitolium* (*sacellum* of Iuppiter Conservator, Temple of Iuppiter Custos, and in a certain sense also his [fourth] Temple of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus Capitolinus), and some other of his buildings in Rome, which are documented on his coins

Domitian's *denarii*, issued in AD 95/96, documenting some of the buildings he erected at Rome (cf. here **Figs. 80-84**), *inter alia* allegedly representing his Temple of Iuppiter Custos. These coins show in reality Domitian's Temple of Isis and his Temple of Serapis within his Iseum Campense and his Temple of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus Capitolinus. Other coin reverses, erroneously identified as Domitian's (alleged) Temple of Minerva Chalcidica, actually show a so far unidentified Temple of Minerva; a fragment of the cult-statue of a Temple of Serapis within the Iseum Campense?, the 'Piè di marmo' (cf. here **Fig. 85**); the reason, why the Temple of Serapis within the Iseum Campense stood in the central apse of the large Exedra in the southern part of the sanctuary; the cult-statue of Domitian's Temple of Isis within his Iseum Campense, the 'Madama Lucrezia' (cf. here **Fig. 86**); and a statue of the veiled Isis, the presumed copy of the cult-statue of Isis in her temple at the Iseum Campense, allegedly built by Caligula (cf. here **Fig. 87**); Septimius Severus' 'Serapis portrait-type' (cf. here **Fig. 88**), and Septimius Severus' restoration of the Iseum Campense; a *sestertius*, issued by Domitian in AD 95/96 (cf. here **Fig. 30**), and the Flavian date of the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano" (cf. here **Fig. 31**), both of which possibly represent Domitian's *Templum Gentis Flaviae*; Domitian's *sacellum* of Iuppiter Conservator, his Temple of Iuppiter Custos, and his (fourth) Temple of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus Capitolinus (cf. here **Fig. 83**)

Appendix I.g.1.) Domitian's *denarii*, issued in AD 95/96, documenting some of the buildings he erected at Rome (cf. here **Figs. 80-84**), *inter alia* allegedly representing his Temple of Iuppiter Custos. These coins show in reality Domitian's Temple of Isis and his Temple of Serapis within his Iseum Campense and his Temple of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus Capitolinus. Other coin reverses, erroneously identified as Domitian's (alleged) Temple of Minerva Chalcidica, actually show a so far unidentified Temple of Minerva; a fragment of the cult-statue of a Temple of Serapis within the Iseum Campense?, the 'Piè di marmo' (cf. here **Fig. 85**); the reason, why the Temple of Serapis within the Iseum Campense stood in the central apse of the large Exedra in the southern part of the sanctuary; the cult-statue of Domitian's Temple of Isis within his Iseum Campense, the 'Madama Lucrezia' (cf. here **Fig. 86**); and a statue of the veiled Isis, the presumed copy of the cult-statue of Isis in her temple at the Iseum Campense, allegedly built by Caligula (cf. here **Fig. 87**)

Appendix I.g.2.) Did the colossal 'Piè di marmo' (cf. here **Fig. 85**) belong to an acrolithic cult-statue of a Temple of Serapis within the Iseum Campense commissioned by Domitian or by Septimius Severus?; Septimius Severus' 'Serapis portrait-type' (cf. here **Fig. 87**), and Septimius Severus' restoration of the Iseum Campense

Appendix I.g.3.) A sestertius, issued by Domitian in AD 95/96 (cf. here Fig. 30), and the Flavian date of the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano" (cf. here Fig. 31), both of which possibly represent Domitian's *Templum Gentis Flaviae*. With *The first Contribution by Claudia Valeri*

Appendix I.g.3.); I. S. Langer and M. Pfanner (2018) date the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano" to the Claudian period

Appendix I.g.3.); II. S. Langer and M. Pfanner (2018) make the important observation that the temple, visible on the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano" must have stood in Rome within the *pomerium*

Appendix I.g.3.); III. S. Langer and M. Pfanner (2018) reject the various identifications of the temple, which is visible on the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano", *inter alia* the hypothesis that it may represent the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*. But they base their latter judgement on wrong assumptions

Appendix I.g.3.); IV. The observations made by Claudia Valeri and myself while studying together the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano". With *The first Contribution by Claudia Valeri*

Appendix I.g.3.); V. A marble fragment of a state relief (cf. here **Figs. 32.A-E**), found in the Forum Romanum and published by H.R. Goette (1983), who attributes it to the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano" (cf. here **Fig. 31**)

Appendix I.g.4.) Domitian's *sacellum* of Iuppiter Conservator, his Temple of Iuppiter Custos, and his (fourth) Temple of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus Capitolinus (cf. here Fig. 83). With *The first Contribution by Peter Herz*

To Appendix I.g.4.) belongs:

A Study on Domitian's cult-statue of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus Capitolinus (cf. here Fig. 10)

I. The wall painting 'Aldobrandini Wedding' in the Vatican Museums and the statuette of the 'Euripides' in the Louvre (cf. here **Fig. 12**), which has been discussed together with it

II. The Capitoline Triad in statuette format at Guidonia Montecelio (Roma), Museo Civico Archeologico 'Rodolfo Lanciani' (cf. here **Fig. 13**) and the colossal statue of Jupiter at the Hermitage (cf. here **Fig. 10**)

Appendix I.h) Another one of Domitian's commissions, the fragmentary colossal marble statue of a standing Isis, one of the famous 'statue parlanti' at Rome, called 'Madama Lucrezia' (cf. here **Fig. 86**), which was possibly found at the Iseum Campense

Appendix I.i) Domitian's escape from the *Capitolium* and his Temple of Iuppiter Custos - Conclusions

Appendix II. Again on the Egyptianizing marble relief allegedly from Ariccia at the Museo Nazionale Romano, Palazzo Altemps (Fig. 111) - a representation of the Egyptian festival of New Year?

Appendix II.a) Introduction and Vespasian's *sestertius* representing the Iseum Campense (**Fig. 113**)

Appendix II.b) The provenance of the relief **Fig. 111**, its original function, and a summary of earlier interpretations

Appendix II.c) My own interpretation of the relief **Fig. 111**: datable in the Hadrianic period, and representing a sanctuary of Isis at Rome or elsewhere in Italy, it possibly shows the celebrations on the day of the Egyptian festival of New Year

Appendix II.d) The interpretation of the relief **Fig. 111** by G. Capriotti Vittozzi (2013; 2014): it is datable in the Domitianic period and represents the goddess Nehemet-awy, the *parhedros* of Thot, who was assimilated to Isis, in her temple at Hermopolis Magna in Egypt ('the city of the god Thot'), which was built by Domitian

Appendix II.e) Conclusions concerning the sections Appendix II.a-c

Appendix III. When was the Iseum Campense first built?

Appendix IV. D. Filippi (1998) has convincingly identified the 'first gate of the Capitolium' (Tac., Hist. 3,71,1-2) with the remains of an arch, excavated by A.M. Colini in the 1940s, with the Porta Pandana, and with the arch, visible on the 'burning of debt records' relief of the here-so-called Anaglypha Hadriani (Figs. 21; 22). With some new ideas concerning the Anaglypha Hadriani; and discussions of the colossal statue of Hadrian (now Constantine the Great) in the courtyard of the Palazzo dei Conservatori (cf. here Fig. 11); of the inscription (CIL VI 974 = 40524; cf. here Fig. 29.1), belonging to a colossal statue of Hadrian; of two headless cuirassed statues of Flavian emperors (Domitian? and Titus or Vespasian?) in the Vatican Museums (cf. here Figs. 6, left; 6, right) and of Hadrian's cuirassed statue from Hierapydna at Istanbul (cf. here Fig. 29)

Appendix IV.a) D. Filippi (1998) on the 'first gate of the Capitolium' (Tac., Hist. 3,71,1-2), an arch, excavated by A.M. Colini in the 1940s, the *Porta Pandana*, and the arch, visible on the 'burning of debt records' relief of the Anaglypha Hadriani (**Fig. 21**)

Appendix IV.b) Similarly as some of the hypotheses, already published by M. Hammond (1953), M. Fuchs (2019) suggests that the therefore here-so-called Anaglypha Hadriani (cf. here Figs. 21; 22) celebrate Hadrian's achievements, and that Hadrian's burning of debt records in AD 118 occurred at two sites: the burning of the debt records of the *fiscus* in the *Forum Traiani* (represented on the Chatsworth Relief), and the burning of the debt records of the *Aerarium publicum populi Romani* in the *Forum Romanum* (represented on one of the Anaglypha Hadriani; cf. here Fig. 21). With a discussion of the *suovetaurilia* that appear on both Anaglypha Hadriani (cf. here Figs. 21.A; 22.A), and with *The third Contribution by Peter Herz*

Appendix IV.b.1.) The meaning of the *suovetaurilia*, which appear on both Anaglypha Hadriani (cf. here Figs. 21.A; 22.A)

Appendix IV.b.2.) The *Aerarium publicum populi Romani* at the Temple of Saturn with the pertaining archive at the site of the *Porticus* of the *Dei Consentes*, called *Tabularium publicum*; Domitian's transfer of this archive to his Palace on the Palatine at the (later) Vigna Barberini, which was now called *Tabularium principis*, *tabularium Caesaris* or *sanctuarium Caesaris*, and the Anaglypha Hadriani (cf. Figs. 21; 22)

Appendix IV.c) The meanings of the statue group 'Marsyas and fig tree' which appears twice on the Anaglypha Hadriani (Figs. 21; 22), and of the Ogulnian monument (a statue group representing the she-wolf suckling Romulus and Remus, standing underneath the sacred fig tree *ficus Ruminalis* in the *Comitium*). With *The first Contribution by T.P. Wiseman*

Appendix IV.c.1.) Final remarks on Appendix IV.b) and Appendix IV.c): Hadrian's efforts to legitimize his reign at the beginning of his principate, as expressed in the Anaglypha Hadriani (Figs. 21; 22). Post Scriptum: Hadrian's situation in AD 117-118. With *The Contribution by Angelo Geißen*

To Appendix IV.c.1.) belongs:

A Study on the colossal portrait of Hadrian (now Constantine the Great) in the courtyard of the Palazzo dei Conservatori at Rome (cf. here Fig. 11). With The Contribution by Hans Rupprecht Goette

I. The statue of Hadrian (now Constantine the Great) in the courtyard of the Palazzo dei Conservatori (cf. here Fig. 11), and the inscription (CIL VI 974 = 40524; cf. here Fig. 29.1). With *The Contribution by Hans Rupprecht Goette*

II. *La Marmorata*. With discussions of the 'Porticus Aemilia' (in reality identifiable as *Navalia*) and of the *Horrea Aemilia*

Appendix IV.c.2.) The Ogulnian monument (a statue group representing the she-wolf suckling Romulus and Remus, standing underneath the sacred fig tree *ficus Ruminalis*), and the she-wolf suckling Romulus and Remus on two headless cuirassed statues of Flavian emperors (Domitian? and Titus or Vespasian?) in the Vatican Museums (cf. here Figs. 6, left; 6 right) and on Hadrian's cuirassed statue from Hierapydna at Istanbul (cf. here Fig. 29). Exactly like the statue of the *ficus Ruminalis* on the Anaglypha Hadriani (cf. here Figs. 21; 22), the *lupa* and the twins on those cuirasses symbolize Rome's claim to eternal power and divine mission, and that it was the task of the Roman emperor to fulfill this obligation (cf. C. Parisi Presicce 2000, 28, 29). With a discussion of the meaning of the *lupa* and the twins on the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano" (cf. here Fig. 31), and with *The second Contribution by Claudia Valeri*

To Appendix IV.c.2.) belongs:

A Study on Hadrian's portrait-statue from Hierapydna (cf. here Fig. 29).

Appendix IV.d) The summary of the research presented in *Appendix IV*. has led to a summary of Domitian's building projects at Rome

Appendix IV.d.1.) Hadrian's situation after the Bar Kokhba Revolt

Appendix IV.d.2.) The 'Province' Reliefs from the Hadrianeum (cf. here Fig. 48), the Piroustoi in a labelled relief in the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias, the Piroustae in Domitian's Forum/ Forum Nervae/ Forum Transitorium (cf. here Figs. 50; 49), and the answer to the question: Does the presence of the 'nation' Piroustae in Domitian's Forum provide a date for the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here Figs. 1; 2)?

Appendix IV.d.2.a) Who invented this iconography of defeated and pacified 'nations' and what does it mean? With *The first Contribution by R.R.R. Smith*

Appendix IV.d.2.b) R.R.R. Smith (1988; 2013) on the series of 50 *ethne* in the *Sebasteion* at Aphrodisias, its model, the 'nations' within Augustus's *Porticus ad Nationes* at Rome, the *Piroustae* and their representation in the *Sebasteion* at Aphrodisias and in Domitian's Forum/ *Forum Nervae*/ *Forum Transitorium*

Appendix IV.d.2.c) Conclusions reached so far concerning the question, posed above: Who invented this iconography of defeated and pacified 'nations' and what does it mean?

Appendix IV.d.2.d) The meaning of the representation of the *Piroustae* within Augustus's *Porticus ad Nationes* at Rome. With H. Wiegartz's (1996) observations concerning the *Piroustae* and their representations; and a summary of the revolt of Arminius in Germany, which he planned because he had fought under Tiberius to suppress the revolt of the Pannonian-Dalmation tribes, *inter alia* of the *Piroustae*

Appendix IV.d.2.e) Did Domitian intentionally represent the *Piroustae* in his Forum/ *Forum Nervae*/ *Forum Transitorium*? With *The second Contribution by Peter Herz*

Appendix IV.d.2.f) Domitian's choice to represent the *Piroustae* in his Forum/ *Forum Nervae*/ *Forum Transitorium* and the date of the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here **Figs. 1; 2**)

Appendix IV.d.3.) Vespasian's situation after the Great Jewish War

Appendix IV.d.4.) Domitian's building projects at Rome, discussed in this study

Appendix IV.d.4.a) Domitian's building project 'Colosseum City'

Appendix IV.d.4.b) Domitian's building project comprising the *Campus Martius*, the Capitoline Hill and the *sella* between *Arx* and Quirinal. With detailed discussion of the *Templum Pacis*

Appendix IV.d.4.c) Domitian's building projects at Rome. Conclusions arrived at in *Appendix IV.d.* With *The Contribution by Eugenio La Rocca.*

As a result of this section it seems to be clear that Domitian, who destroyed the *sella* between the Quirinal and the *Arx*, in order to erect his huge forum there (now the 'Forum of Trajan'), had used this excavated material to fill in a valley on the *Mons Oppius*. This finding invited the further assumption that already Domitian had planned to erect at this site great public baths, the now so-called 'Baths of Trajan'. The confirmation that Domitian had actually started building those baths, reached me only afterwards.

Appendix V. Explanations concerning the ancient toponyms of the Palatine and its immediate surroundings, between the Velabrum and the Caelian, as marked on my map Fig. 73

Appendix V.; I. The (new) temple of the deified Augustus, the *Velabrum*, the *bibliotheca Domus Tiberianae*, the *Athenaeum*, Livia's *sacrarium* dedicated to *Divus Augustus* (his 'old' temple), and the *Curiae veteres* on the map **Fig. 73**. With *The second Contribution by T.P. Wiseman*

Appendix V.; II. The valley between Palatine and Caelian and the Temple of Fortuna Respiciens on the map **Fig. 73**

Appendix V.; III. The aqueduct, leading from the Caelian to the Palatine on the map **Fig. 73**

Appendix V.; IV. The (now six) different locations of the temple of Iuppiter Stator, marked on the map **Fig. 73**

Appendix V.; V. The two labels: "Meta Sudans" on the map **Fig. 73**

Appendix V.; VI. The Imperial Fora on the map **Fig. 73**

Appendix V.; VII. The ancient buildings in the former Vigna Barberini on the Palatine on the map **Fig. 73**

Appendix V.; VIII. The toponyms at the south-west corner of the Palatine on the map **Fig. 73**

Appendix V.; IX. The 'House of Augustus', The 'House of Livia', and the Temple of Apollo on the map **Fig. 73**

Contributions by other scholars:

John Bodel, Emanuele M. Ciampini, Amanda Claridge, Angelo Geißen, Laura Gigli, Hans Rupprecht Goette, Peter Herz, Eugenio La Rocca, Eric M. Moormann, Jörg Rüpke, Franz Xaver Schütz, R.R.R. Smith, Giandomenico Spinola, Mario Torelli, Walter Trillmich, Claudia Valeri, and T.P. Wiseman

- The Contribution by John Bodel: *A note on the religious status of imperial tombs*
- The first Contribution by Emanuele M. Ciampini: *La regalità domiziana: una nota egittologica*
- The second Contribution by Emanuele M. Ciampini refers to the Egyptian tale *The Taking of Joppa*
- The Contribution by Amanda Claridge: *A note for Chrystina Häuber: Drawings of the interior order of the Aula Regia of the Palace of Domitian on the Palatine, once in the British School at Rome*
- The Contribution by Angelo Geißen: *Bemerkungen zur frühen Münzprägung Hadrians in Alexandria*
- The Contribution by Laura Gigli concerning Pietro Canonica's statue of the mule Scudela
- The Contribution by Hans Rupprecht Goette on the reworking of the portrait of Hadrian (now Constantine the Great)
- The first Contribution by Peter Herz on the inscription (*CIL VI 2059.11*), which reports on a meeting of the Arvel brethren on 7th December 80 at the Temple of Ops in *Capitolio*, among them Titus and Domitian: Titus vows to restore and dedicate what would become Domitian's (fourth) Temple of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus Capitolinus
- The second Contribution by Peter Herz: *Anmerkungen zu Statius Marrax*
- The third Contribution by Peter Herz: *Der Übergang von Trajan auf Hadrian und das erste Regierungsjahr Hadrians*
- The fourth Contribution by Peter Herz: *Wann wurde Trajan von Nerva adoptiert?*
- The fifth Contribution by Peter Herz: *Der Ritt Hadrians nach Mogontiacum*

- The Contribution by Eugenio La Rocca on the question, whether Domitian, who filled in the valley on the *Mons Oppius*, could already have planned to erect those large public baths there which should become the Baths of Trajan
- The Contribution by Eric M. Moormann: *Can We Reconstruct the Templum Gentis Flaviae?*
- The Contribution by Jörg Rüpke on the question, how many Vestal Virgins we might expect to appear at public ceremonies, such as the one shown on Frieze B of the Cancellaria Reliefs
- The Contribution by Franz Xaver Schütz: *Zur kartographischen Visualisierung historischer Landschaftselemente zwischen Rhein und Schwarzem Meer von Augustus bis Hadrian*
- The first Contribution by R.R.R. Smith on the iconography of the representation of the *Piroustaie* at *Le Colonnacce* in Domitian's Forum/ *Forum Nervae/ Forum Transitorium*
- The second Contribution by R.R.R. Smith: *Note on the function of the 'Atrium House' at Aphrodisias*
- The Contribution by Giandomenico Spinola on the Cancellaria Reliefs
- The Contribution by Mario Torelli on the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*
- The Contribution by Walter Trillmich on the headless marble *togati* found in the so-called Marble Forum at Mérida in Spain, one of which looks like the togate youth on Frieze B of the Cancellaria Reliefs
- The first Contribution by Claudia Valeri on the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano"
- The second Contribution by Claudia Valeri on the two headless cuirassed statues of Flavian emperors at the Museo Chiaramonti
- The first Contribution by T.P. Wiseman on the identification of the L. Scribonius Libo, who was the dedicant of the *puteal Scribonianus* (or *Libonis*)
- The second Contribution by T.P. Wiseman on the questions which ancient author explicitly records that Domitian had restored the *Templum (novum) Divi Augusti*, and that he had dedicated this temple in AD 89 or 90

Bibliography

Illustrations

IV. Frieze B of the Cancellaria Reliefs and the Obeliscus Pamphilius/ Domitian's obelisk (Fig. 28)

IV.1. A letter by Giandomenico Spinola concerning the Cancellaria Reliefs and the Obeliscus Pamphilius/ Domitian's obelisk (Fig. 28)

I asked Giandomenico Spinola to summarize for me what we had discussed on September 24th, 2018, while standing in front of the Cancellaria Reliefs. He was kind enough to write me on October 15th, 2018.

See *The Contribution by Giandomenico Spinola* in this volume.

As already discussed above (cf. *supra*, at III.), and written by himself in this letter (cf. *The Contribution by Giandomenico Spinola* in this volume), Spinola, in my opinion correctly, identifies the emperor on Frieze B from the very beginning as Vespasian, and the togate youth, standing in front of him as Domitian. According to Spinola, the gesture, the Emperor Vespasian is making on this panel with his right hand means that the emperor thus gives his son Domitian the 'legitimation' to become his successor as emperor (to this I will come back below; see also at V.1.i.3.); VI.3.).

As Spinola himself has written me in this E-mail, his interpretation of Vespasian's gesture is by no means new.

This idea was first formulated by Filippo Magi (1939, quoted *verbatim supra*, n. 112, at I.1., and repeated in MAGI 1945, 111, quoted *verbatim infra*). It was then followed by Heinrich Fuhrmann (1940; *id.* 1941, both quoted *verbatim infra*). George Maxim Anossov Hanfmann ([1964] 108; *non vidi*) mentioned it again, but Hanfmann's suggestion was rejected by Gerhard Koeppel (1969, 172, quoted *verbatim infra*).

At a later time (but in modified form) this idea was formulated by Anne Marguerite McCann (1972; cf. *supra*, n. 114, at I.1.). As we have seen above, McCann's hypothesis concerning the Cancellaria Reliefs has been refuted, because she (erroneously) dated them to the Hadrianic period. McCann was the first scholar to suggest that also the portrait of Vespasian on Frieze B had also been reworked (exactly like the original head of Domitian on Frieze A, whose face had been recut into the portrait of Nerva), suggesting that the alleged original portrait of the emperor of Frieze B had represented Trajan, which was later recut into one of Vespasian.

Heinrich Fuhrmann (1940, Sp. 471) wrote:

"Der ältere Mann [*i.e.*, Vespasian on Frieze B] hält wie segnend seine rechte Hand gegen den Jüngling hin". Cf. Sp. 472: "Wohl als erster hat S. Fuchs [for him, cf. *supra*, n. 5, at n. 113, and n. 191] in dem Kopf des älteren Togatus statt eines alten Tiberius das Porträt des Kaisers Vespasian erkannt. Der jüngere Togatus kann daher nur einer der beiden Söhne dieses Kaisers, Titus oder Domitian sein. Der Vergleich des Kopfes mit den Bildnissen dieser beiden ergibt, daß dieser jüngere Togatus der jugendliche Domitian ist [with n. 2, providing references]. Für die Deutung der dargestellten Situation ergibt sich in Hinsicht auf die Anwesenheit der Roma und der Vestalinnen und unter Berücksichtigung der Tatsache, daß Domitian zur Rechten des Vaters und gleichsam im Zentrum der Gesamtdarstellung steht, daß der geschilderte Vorgang nur als Einsetzung des Domitian zum Nachfolger des Kaisers durch diesen selbst in Gegenwart der Vestalinnen, des Genius Populi Romani und des Genius Senatus vor Roma verstanden werden kann [with n. 3: "Domitian hat sich immer als der wahre Nachfolger gegenüber dem älteren Bruder Titus gefühlt"]".

As we have seen above, Fuhrmann's assertion concerning the alleged observations by Siegfried Fuchs (1938) are not true; cf. Siegfried Fuchs (1937), discussed *supra*, at n. 113, in section I.1.

Cf. Fuhrmann (1941, Sp. 544-545):

"Zu den großen historischen Reliefs, die wahrscheinlich dem Schmuck der von Domitian auf das prächtigste neu ausgestatteten Porta Triumphalis angehörten, aber nach seiner Ermordung beseitigt wurden [with n. 2: "AA 1940, 466ff.], wird eine kurze Notiz der Fundumstände sowie eine Beschreibung unter Beifügung zweier Umrißzeichnungen gegeben, die die Plattenfolge der beiden Reliefs verdeutlichen [with n. 3, quoting F. MAGI 1939, quoted *verbatim supra*, n. 112, at I.1.]. Wohl nicht haltbar ist die Beziehung des einen Reliefs [*i.e.*, Frieze B] auf die Ankunft des Vespasian im Jahr 70 und dessen Empfang durch Domitian und damit die Deutung als *adventus*. Das verbietet die Ökonomie der Darstellung. Denn sie macht nicht Vespasian, sondern sinnfällig greifbar den jungen Domitian zum Mittelpunkt der Handlung und der Darstellung. Auch ist Vespasian nicht in der für die *adventus* üblichen militärischen Tracht des *imperator*, sondern in der Toga dargestellt. Es kann sich nur um die symbolische Bezeichnung des Domitian als den wahren Nachfolger durch den Vater handeln, zumal die Handlung in Gegenwart der Vestalinnen sich vollzieht, bei denen die römischen Kaiser ihre letztwilligen Verfügungen niederzulegen pflegten. Kaum anders als in dieser Richtung kann die Deutung gesucht werden, die Zeugnis für die bestimmte Auffassung des Domitian über die Thronfolge und sein Anrecht auf den Thron ablegt, der doch bekanntlich Titus geradezu die Verfälschung des väterlichen Willens vorgeworfen und sich als wirklichen Nachfolger immer betrachtet hat", with n. 1: "Sueton v. Dom. 2,3".

Langer und Pfanner (2018, 63, in the text of their Abb. 14) interpret Fuhrmann's above-quoted passages as follows: "Abb. 14 Deutungen Relief B: Auswahl der Interpretationsvorschläge", at: "Fuhrmann 1940/1941 / **Inthronisation des Domitian** / Domitian (Fig. 12) wird durch seinen Vater Vespasian (Fig. 14) in Gegenwart des Genius Senatus (Fig. 11), des Genius Populi Romani (Fig. 13), der Vestalinnen (Fig. 3-7) und Roma (Fig. 2) als Kaiser eingesetzt" (the passage in bold has been highlighted like this by the authors themselves).

For Langer and Pfanner's (2018, 63) numbering of the represented figures on Frieze B; cf. here **Figs. 1 and 2 drawing**.

Magi (1945)⁴⁶³ wrote: "E il gesto del braccio del padre e della mano accostata alla spalla è indubbiamente gesto di saluto paterno e affettuoso. Chi si irrigidisse in una posizione che si direbbe <<attenti>>, senza slancio filiale, senza calore d'affetto, in un atteggiamento che vuole essere studiatamente di freddo ossequio è lui, il figlio, sicché a ben guardare è proprio la sua figura che finisce, senza parere, per assumere la massima importanza nell'intera composizione: è il personaggio che raccolta in se stesso, fra tutti gli altri che fanno qualcosa o fanno coppia o gruppo, non fa niente, non ha niente, non si muove, ma sta solo, con mal celato orgoglio sulle labbra e sicura coscienza di sé nello sguardo.

Finisce così che è quasi il padre a rendergli omaggio, di maniera che la situazione si capovolge, e questo omaggio egli lo riceve in presenza di Roma e delle Vestali, del Senato e del Popolo, della Vittoria e dei littori. Ecco dunque una, e certo la più importante, delle ragioni politiche di questo rilievo. Mettersi in tale rapporto col padre, col fondatore della dinastia flavia al suo ingresso imperiale nell'Urbe, da prevalere sul fratello maggiore d'età ma assente, scavalcandolo quasi, mediante una presunta diretta successione, come già aveva tentato di fare alla morte del padre impugnanone il testamento e reclamando per sé immediatamente il trono [with n. 1, quoting: "Suet. *Domit.* 2,3"]. Ciò non gli riuscì d'ottenere, com'è noto, e con mal animo dovette sopportare i due anni di regno del fratello [*i.e.*, of Titus] [with n. 2, providing references]".

Koeppel (1969, 172) wrote under the headline: "Das Relief B von der Cancellaria mit dem *Adventus* des Vespasian", "... Die Hauptfigur des Reliefs ist nicht Vespasian, sondern Domitian [with n. 157, quoted *verbatim supra*, n. 173, at I.1.]. Cf. p. 174: "Domitian, der die Stadt [*i.e.*, Rome] für seinen Vater [*i.e.*, Vespasian] gehütet hat, übergibt Vespasian bei seiner Ankunft das Imperium [with n. 164]". Cf. his n. 164: "Suet. Domitian 13,1; Mart. IX 101, 13ff.; Bianchi Bandinelli, BullCom, 72, 1946-48, 259; Simon ... [1960], 153. - Man darf nicht so weit gehen, hier die Darstellung des staatsrechtlichen Aktes der Einsetzung des Domitian als Nachfolger Vespasians zu sehen (so G.M.A. Hanfmann ... [1964] 108). Die Ikonographie des *Adventus* ist

⁴⁶³ F. MAGI 1945, 111; cf. *supra*, n. 194, for further quotations from MAGI, that relate to Vespasian's *adventus* in 70 AD.

klar. Hauptthema der Darstellung muß deshalb der Adventus sein. Inwiefern hinter dieser Adventus-Darstellung andere Gedanken stecken, ist eine zweite Frage. Wenn die Adventus-Ikonographie auch den Regierungsantritt verdeutlichen kann, so ist hier der des Vespasian gemeint, nicht der Domitians, denn der Sohn des Kaisers steht an der Spitze der Empfangenden".

Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli (1946-48, 259) wrote: "Anche sul soggetto del rilievo B l'accordo è quasi completo: l'unico *adventus* di Vespasiano da imperatore è quello del 70; ma mi par giusto vedere come scopo principale del rilievo, più che la celebrazione di quel ritorno, l'incontro con il giovane Cesare [*i.e.*, Domitian] e dare a questo incontro il significato di una designazione alle successione. Sappiamo che, storicamente, l'incontro fra Vespasiano e Domiziano avvenne a Benevento; mentre il rilievo trasporta l'avvenimento a Roma, come è mostrato dalla presenza delle cinque Vestali (la sesta non poteva esserci, perché il culto non poteva essere abbandonato) e dall'immagine di Roma seduta e appoggiata alla lancia. Ma non siamo di fronte a una cronaca illustrata, bensì come sempre nella scultura storica romana, di fronte alla trasfigurazione di un avvenimento storico entro una determinata tradizione iconografica, che l'artista usa come un canovaccio sul quale innestare le proprie variazioni, e in vista di una contingente situazione politica che andava manifestata".

McCann (1972, 275), concerning the meaning of this gesture, made by the emperor on Frieze B with his right hand, had suggested exactly the same as Hanfmann [1964], only that she identified the two protagonists on Frieze B not as Vespasian and Domitian, as Bianchi Bandinelli [1946-48], Hanfmann [1964], and Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli and Mario Torelli [1976, quoted *verbatim infra*] had done, and Rita Paris (1994b), Stefan Pfeiffer (2009; for both see below), Spinola and I myself still do, but as Trajan and Hadrian instead: "While a missing link in the reconstruction of the original iconography of Frieze B remains the identification of the emperor ... in the light of the historical and numismatic evidence discussed is it not probable that Frieze B commemorated to the world Hadrian's right to the imperial office through his adoption by Trajan? The original of the head of Vespasian would therefore have been Trajan who is shown with his hand upon his selected successor".

For more scholars, who have followed Magi's relevant opinion that Vespasian on Frieze B with the gesture of his right hand legitimizes the young togate youth Domitian's reign as emperor, cf. Langer and Pfanner (2018, 62 with n. 59; quoted in more detail *verbatim infra*, at V.1.h)). Of those scholars, whom they list in their footnote 59, I had so far overlooked the following: "J. Béranger ... [*i.e.*, here J. BÉRANGER 1964] 81; B. Andreae, *Römische Kunst* (Freiburg i. Breisgau 1973³) 193 ... W. Kuhoff ... [*i.e.*, here W. KUHOFF 1993] 77f. Anm. 103, quoted *verbatim infra*; LIMC V (1990) 500 Nr. 21. 502 s. v. Honos (C. Lochin); and N. H. Ramage ... [*i.e.*, here N.H. RAMAGE and A. RAMAGE 1996] 144".

Langer and Pfanner (2018, 25) quote in their bibliography Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli and Mario Torelli (1976 ARTE ROMANA scheda 105, quoted in part *verbatim infra*), but they do not mention this account in their list of scholars who follow Magi's interpretation of Frieze B of the Cancellaria Reliefs (here **Fig. 2**): as a matter of fact, Bianchi Bandinelli and Torelli, in their interpretation, went even further than Magi did.

Thanks to Franz Xaver Schütz, I have finally been able to consult the work of Bianchi Bandinelli and Torelli (1976) - but only after I had finished writing this entire book.

And although Langer and Pfanner (2016, 26) quote in their bibliography Rita Paris (1994b, 80-83, Figs. 6; 7a-c, quoted *verbatim infra*, at V.1.i.3.a)), and on p. 27 Stefan Pfeiffer (2009, 62), in their just-quoted list of scholars, who follow Magi's interpretation of Frieze B, they too leave out the work of Paris (1994b) and Pfeiffer (2009).

Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli and Mario Torelli (1976 ARTE ROMANA scheda 105) wrote:

"Nel secondo rilievo (B [= here **Fig. 2**]) ... è raffigurata una scena incentrata sul giovane Domiziano e su Vespasiano. All'estremità sinistra presso **una statua seduta della dea Roma**, è un gruppo di cinque Vestali

accompagnate dal littore che spettava a queste sacerdotesse; all'estremità destra si colloca invece Vespasiano vestito di ampia toga ma a capo scoperto, incoronato da una Vittoria volante e seguito da un littore e da un *apparitor* con rotolo, mentre al centro Domiziano giovane, anch'egli in toga e sovrastato dal *Genius Senatus* e dal *Genius Populi Romani*, è **accompagnato da un littore e da due altre figure che si dirigono verso il gruppo delle Vestali (littori oppure *apparitores*)**. L'interpretazione di entrambe le scene è controversa. Nel rilievo B è forse da vedere l'*adventus* di Vespasiano, accolto dal figlio Domiziano **in veste di *praetor urbanus* e di *servator Urbis* (dove i littori alle sue spalle e Roma con le vestali): il suo gesto è di ossequio filiale, come quello delle Vestali, giuridicamente *filiae del pontifex maximus* Vespasiano. L'allusione sarebbe in tal modo chiara: Domiziano salvata Roma, la riconsegnerebbe al padre, prefigurando così i propri meriti per la successione e di vero fondatore della dinastia [my emphasis]". - I have highlighted those passages which differ not only from Magi's hypotheses, but also from those of most other scholars.**

Some of these 'highlighted ideas' go back to Jocelyn M.C. Toynbee (1957), whom Bianchi Bandinelli and Torelli (1976) themselves did not quote, but even Toynbee had copied those ideas from Hugh Last (1948), without quoting *him*.

I, therefore, repeat here what was quoted in more detail above, at I.1.1.:

Jocelyn M.C. Toynbee (1957, 5-6) wrote about Frieze B (cf. here **Fig. 2**):

"Finally, in the foreground [on Frieze B] ... we see the young Domitian, togate and slightly whiskered, turned three-quarters towards his father [*i.e.*, Vespasian] ... it would seem that Domitian was publicizing here his own version ... of his situation as Caesar in Rome at the time of his father's accession, as the recipient of congratulations on the 'vice-regency' exercised by him in the capital while Vespasian was still absent in the East. Thus the scene portrays the first public occasion on which Domitian, as a youth of nineteen, played a significant part in the crucial hour of the founding of the Flavian dynasty. It is almost an illustration of the saying which Suetonius attributes to him: '*patri se et fratri imperium dedisse, illos sibi reddidisse*' (note 1) [with my note 208]".

'In my **note 208**, I write: "J.M.C. TOYNBEE 1957, 5-6. In her n. 1 on p. 6, she quotes: "Suetonius, *Domit.* 13". TOYNBEE, *op.cit.*, does not say that already H. LAST 1948, 12, had suggested the latter: "There is much that might be added about this panel [*i.e.*, Frieze B], for instance it invites consideration of the passage in which Suetonius (*Dom.* 13,1) asserts of Domitian that '*principatum ... adeptus, neque in senatu iactare dubitavit et patri se et fratri imperium dedisse, illos sibi reddidisse ...*'. This was also discussed by M. BERGMANN 1981, 19-20; and by H. MEYER 2000, 136: "Die alte Deutung des Frieses B ist gewiß zutreffend, sagt doch Sueton: >>Als [Domitian] dann zur Herrschaft gelangt war, hatte er die Stirn, vor dem Senat zu prahlen, er sei es gewesen, der seinem Vater wie seinem Bruder den Thron gegeben, sie hätten ihm diesen nur zurückgegeben<< [with n. 431: "Suet. *Dom.* 13.]" - For that very influential idea, cf. also *infra*, at **n. 456**, at III.".

Pfeiffer (2009, 62; already quoted *verbatim supra*, at II.3.1.c)) is the most recent scholar, who has followed Magi's (1939; *id.* 1945) opinion that Vespasian on Frieze B with the gesture of his right hand legitimizes the young togate youth Domitian's reign as emperor:

"Eines der beiden Reliefs [*i.e.*, Frieze B of the Cancellaria Reliefs] zeigt auf jeden Fall Domitian mit Vespasian. Vater und Sohn werden von Minerva, Rom und den Genien von Senat und Volk Roms begleitet. Auf diese Weise ist nicht nur die Legitimation der Herrschaft des Domitian durch seinen Vater verkündet ...".

The most recent scholar, who has followed Magi's interpretation (1939; *id.* 1945) of frieze B in a publication, is to my knowledge Pollini (2017b). He identifies on pp. 116, 118, the emperor on Frieze B with Vespasian, and on p. 118 n. 96 the togate youth on Frieze B with Domitian, "who greets his father [Vespasian]".

A comparison of Frieze B of the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here Fig. 2) with the hieroglyphic texts of Domitian's obelisk (cf. here Fig. 28) shows that both propagate the same message

Now, if Spinola is right with his hypothesis that Frieze B from the very beginning has been conceived of as showing Vespasian and Domitian, the message, this frieze contains - according to Spinola, the "legittimazione" of Domitian as emperor by his father Vespasian, indicated by the gesture Vespasian makes with his right hand - seems to have striking similarities with the political message of another monument, likewise commissioned by Domitian: the Obeliscus Pamphilius/ Domitian's obelisk, which is mounted on top of Gianlorenzo Bernini's famous 'Fountain of the Four Rivers' on Piazza Navona at Rome⁴⁶⁴ (cf. here Fig. 28).

Fig. 28. The Obeliscus Pamphilius/ Domitian's obelisk on top of Gianlorenzo Bernini's 'Fountain of the Four Rivers' on Piazza Navona at Rome. From: C. Häuber (2017, 156, Fig. 5.5.2). Photos: F.X. Schütz. Courtesy F.X. Schütz. Photo: Cesare D'Onofrio (1921-2003). From: G. Simonetta, L. Gigli and G. Marchetti [2004] 122, Fig. 8. The caption reads: "La fontana dei Quattro fiumi, ripresa zenitale dall'alto della chiesa di Sant'Agnese". Courtesy: L. Gigli. Photo: L. Gigli (December 2003). Courtesy: L. Gigli.

In the hieroglyphic inscriptions of his obelisk, the "legitimacy"⁴⁶⁵ of Domitian's reign is stressed. Jean-Claude Grenier⁴⁶⁶, commented on these inscriptions as follows: 'The first three sides [of Domitian's obelisk] glorify only Domitian *dominus et deus*: the proclamation of his divine birth and thus his predestination to exercise the supreme power like the great pharaohs of the past, an attestation of his legitimacy to be the heir to Vespasian at the head of the Empire'.

After I finished writing this section, I had the chance to read the accounts by the scholars, who contributed to the Proceedings of the Iseum Campense Conference in Rome of May 2016, of whose findings I will quote in the following the passages that relate to Domitian's here discussed obelisk. All of these authors discuss this obelisk in context with the Iseum Campense, which Domitian had just restored after the great fire of AD 80, and for which, in my opinion, the emperor had commissioned this obelisk (probably shortly after his accession to the throne in AD 81; cf. *supra*, n. 466). For the recent controversy concerning the original location of this obelisk; cf. *infra*, at IV.1.1.a) - IV.1.1.h).

Katja Lembke (2018, 32) writes:

"It is a much discussed and unfortunately unprovable hypothesis that the obelisk Pamphilj, placed today on Piazza Navona, stood at its centre. However, like a majority of recent scholars, I am still in favour of this

⁴⁶⁴ cf. C. HÄUBER 2017, Fig. 5.5.2 on p. 156, pp. 153-168.

⁴⁶⁵ cf. C. HÄUBER 2017, 163.

⁴⁶⁶ cf. C. HÄUBER 2017, 159, 160-161, 164, where scholars are quoted, who discuss this passage of the hieroglyphic inscription on Domitian's Obelisk. The here quoted line is my own translation of J.-C. GRENIER 2009, 238, a passage, in which he commented on the hieroglyphic texts, written on Domitian's Obelisk (for those texts, cf. *infra*, n. 467): "I primi tre lati sono per la sola gloria di Domiziano *dominus et deus*: proclamazione della sua nascita divina e dunque della sua predestinazione a esercitare il potere supremo come i grandi faraoni del tempo passato, attestazione della sua legittimità a essere l'erede di Vespasiano alla testa dell'impero ...".

Cf. C. HÄUBER 2017, 21: "In one of the inscriptions on his Obelisk, written in hieroglyphs, Domitian formulates his hope that his contemporaries as well as posterity will always remember the achievements of his family, the Flavian dynasty, especially their benefactions for the Roman People. Domitian stresses that his family managed to consolidate the state, which had severely suffered from those 'who reigned before' (i.e., the Julio-Claudian dynasty)".

Cf. pp. 159, 163-164 (certain details in the contents of the hieroglyphic inscriptions of Domitian's obelisk allow the assumption that it was erected at the beginning of his reign, that is to say, shortly after AD 81).

Cf. pp. 20, 134, 142, 164-168, 171, 174-177 (for the building *Divorum*, erected by Domitian and dedicated to the two *Divi*, his father and brother, *Divus Vespasianus* and *Divus Titus*, for the difficulty to reconstruct its ground-plan, and for its meaning).

Cf. pp. 165-169 (for the benefactions of the emperors of the Flavian dynasty for the Roman People, as mentioned in the hieroglyphic texts of Domitian's obelisks, as well as for those buildings, which they erected all over the City of Rome); cf. p. 165 for the translation of the passage of one of these hieroglyphic texts, in which is explicitly stated, that Domitian's family members (i.e., Vespasian and Titus) had managed to consolidate the state, which had severely suffered from those, 'who reigned before'.

view (fig. 6) [with n. 18, providing references in favour of this view]. It was imported from Egypt carrying hieroglyphic inscriptions that contain the titles of Domitian".

Laurent Bricault and Richard Veymiers (2018, 151-152) write:

"À Rome, l'obélisque aujourd'hui visible sur la Piazza Navona, dont le programme iconographique et hymnique met principalement en scène Domitien et Isis, avait dû être dressé à l'intérieur, sinon à proximité du sanctuaire isiaque du Champ de Mars [with n. 161], sensiblement à la même époque, pour en célébrer la refondation [with n. 162, providing references]".

In their **n. 161**, they write: "On le situe le plus souvent au centre de la cour d'entrée du sanctuaire (... [i.e., here K. LEMBKE 1994b], 25 e 29)". - For that assumption, which in my opinion is true, cf. *infra*, at IV.1.1.c).

Eric M. Moormann (2018, 171-172) writes:

"As we know, the Flavians had a positive relationship with Egypt in general. Domitian might have stressed his bonds through the hieroglyphic inscription on the so-called *Obeliscus Pamphilius*, found in the Circus of Maxentius along the Via Appia and currently erected on Piazza Navona. On this needle, he is hailed as a pharaoh in what J.-C. Grenier has called a >>hymne à Domitien et à la dynastie flavienne<<, something that Domitien apparently did not object to [with n. 65]. However, this Egyptian text will not have played a great role in conveying [page 172] specific messages to the citizens of Rome, since no Roman could read it. Consequently, it was for that reason, that the obelisk remained untouched after A.D. 96 and did not fall prey to *damnatio memoriae* [with n. 66, providing references]. The monument does not give us reason to detect a specific *aegyptophilia* of the emperor, but it rather is, again, a form of imitating Augustus [with n. 67]. The interpretation of things Egyptian is, as had been demonstrated various times by Miguel John Versluys, rather tricky, and in our context it seems more appropriate to see the Iseum Campense and the obelisk in the context of 'things Roman', as two of many tesserae in the mosaic of Flavian buildings on the Campus Martius".

In his **note 65**, Moormann writes: "J.-C. Grenier, *LTUR* III (1996) 356-57, esp. 356. See on this obelisk as a monument from the *Iseum* [Campense], i.a. ... [i.e., here K. LEMBKE 1994b], 69-70 ... [i.e., here S. PFEIFFER 2010a], 281-83 ... Albers 2013, 154; ... [i.e., here F. COARELLI 2009b], 94; ... [i.e., here J.-C. GRENIER 2009] 234-39 and Coarelli 2014, 205-7: they see it as an element from the Temple of the *Gens Flavia*, which might be likely on the basis of the inscription, but not as to its shape and signification [my emphasis] ... The sobriquet *Obeliscus Pamphilius* was coined in the title of the homonymous publication by Athanasius Kircher (Rome 1650)".

Moormann's (2018, 172) just-quoted judgement concerning Domitian's obelisk as belonging to 'things Roman' is quite the opposite of what Emanuele Ciampini writes, who in our discussions on the subject has corrected my calling Domitian's obelisk 'Egyptianizing' (because manufactured in the Roman period), since in his opinion it is Egyptian; I myself follow now Ciampini's judgement (cf. *infra*, at VI.3).

To the controversy concerning the question, for which context Domitian had commissioned his obelisk, the Iseum Campense or the *templum gentis Flaviae*, I will come back below; cf. *infra*, at IV.1.1.

Stefan Pfeiffer (2018, 181, in his section "1. Domitian, an Isiac") writes:

"This section examines researchers' main arguments for suggesting a special relationship between Domitian and the Egyptian cults ... [in the following providing a list of these arguments by other scholars] ...

6. Hence, we arrive at the most important lines of reasoning:

a) Domitian restored the *Iseum* and *Serapeum* on the *Campus Martius*, which became one of the largest precincts of the area [with n. 15] ...

c) Inside the Isis precinct, Domitian was represented as pharaoh in the form of a statue. Furthermore, the well-known Pamphili obelisk, which probably belonged to the Iseum Campense, shows that he deliberately wanted to be regarded as pharaoh [with n. 19].

Having collected these main scholarly arguments, I do not intend to prove them wrong. Instead, I attempt to approach the same material from another perspective". In his **notes**, Pfeiffer provides references.

Pfeiffer (2018, 188), in his section "1.6. The Iseum Campense", in which he describes his own opinion, writes:

"Last but not least, the most important object connected with Domitian's affinity to Egyptian religion is the Pamphili obelisk, which was eventually erected in front of the temple of Isis [with n. 76]. Its inscriptions and depictions present Domitian as Egyptian pharaoh, beloved and elected by Isis and other Egyptian gods [with n. 77, with references]. Even the dynasty itself is mentioned [78, with references]. It is possible that Domitian knew the meaning of the inscriptions and was informed about the pictorial representations on the pyramidion, which only could be seen from a bird's eye view [with n. 79, with a reference]. **However, it would be premature to conclude that Domitian had a religious policy in mind to make himself pharaoh in Rome, based only on this singular representation.** Furthermore, neither Egyptians nor Romans could read these hieroglyphic inscriptions [with n. 80, with a reference]. More conclusive evidence is needed to demonstrate that Domitian really wanted to be pharaoh; and if this is not possible, one could interpret the obelisk's inscriptions as a representation of Domitian as expressed by Egyptian priests, who attributed Domitian the power of a pharaoh [my emphasis]".

In his **note 76**, Pfeiffer writes: "... [i.e., here K. LEMBKE 1994b], 40; attribution to the *templum gentis Flaviae*: e.g. Grenier 1999, 229 (does not appear in the bibliography [?]); ... [i.e., here F. COARELLI 2009b], 94 (does not appear in the bibliography [?])".

Concerning the question of who might have been the *spiritus rector* of Domitian's Obelisk, I myself, contrary to Pfeiffer (2018, 188), quoted above, follow Emanuele M. Ciampini (cf. *The first Contribution by Emanuele M. Ciampini* in this volume: *La regalità domiziana: una nota egittologica*), who suggests that the hieroglyphic texts of Domitian's obelisk were composed by Egyptian specialists, at the order of, and in close cooperation with, Domitian.

There are two prerequisites for my relevant assumption, *a*) contrary to J.-C. Grenier (1996; 1999; 2009) and F. Coarelli (2009b; 2014; discussed *infra*, at IV.1.1.), I am convinced that Domitian commissioned the Pamphili Obelisk for the Iseum Campense, which he restored after the great fire of AD 80; *b*) I suggest in this study, that one passage of one of the hieroglyphic inscriptions of Domitian's obelisk says *expressis verbis*, what in my opinion Domitian has ordered his artists to express on Frieze B of the Cancellaria Reliefs: I follow in this respect the relevant interpretation by Magi (1939; 1945), who suggested that the Emperor Vespasian on Frieze B, with the gesture of his right, expresses the legitimation of his younger son Domitian to reign as emperor, who is standing in front of him (cf. *infra*, at V.1.h.1.); V.1.i.3.); VI.3.). - As we have seen above, not only Paris (1994b, 82, quoted *verbatim infra*, at V.1.i.3.a), but also Pfeiffer himself (cf. *id.* 2009, 62, quoted *verbatim supra*) follow this interpretation of Frieze B, suggested by Magi.

To the remark by Pfeiffer (2018, 188): "However, it would be premature to conclude that Domitian had a religious policy in mind to make himself pharaoh in Rome, based only on this singular representation [i.e., Domitian's obelisk; my emphasis]", I should like to add an observation.

Tacitus (*Hist.* 3,74) describes the cult-statue of Jupiter in his temple of Iuppiter Custos. This temple was dedicated by Domitian on the *Capitolium*, and possibly even in the *area Capitolina*, that is to say, within the *temenos* of the (fourth) Temple of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus Capitolinus (built anew by Domitian; cf. *infra*, at Appendix I.g.4.)), as a thanksgiving for his escape from the *Capitolium* on 19th December AD 69, during the civil war. Interestingly, the cult-statue of this Jupiter temple was represented seated, with a portrait statue of

Domitian on his lap. Domitian was thus interpreted as the son of the supreme Roman god Jupiter, and that in a statue group that was certainly ordered by himself. Of course all Roman emperors since Augustus had claimed to be the son of Jupiter, but Domitian's here mentioned iconography was something completely new (for a discussion, cf. *infra*, at *Appendix I.d*)).

It is impossible not to understand this iconography as Domitian's claim of the 'doppelte Sohnschaft' 'double sonship', as the pharaohs of Egypt had done, as well as Alexander the Great and Augustus, all of whom had thus legitimized their reigns as kings of Egypt. For Alexander and Augustus, Pfeiffer (2010b, 45-50, 60-61) has himself studied this phenomenon and its meaning (cf. *infra*, at *IV.1.1.a*)). See also Giuseppina Capriotti Vittozzi (2013, 39 with n. 71; cf. *infra*, at *Appendix III*)).

In the hieroglyphic inscriptions of Domitian's obelisk, basically the same claim is formulated, here Domitian states to be the son of the supreme Egyptian god, Re-Harakhte. The underlying religious beliefs, that are thus expressed in these inscriptions, were acted out in sacred performances, the 'royal rituals' (some of which took place at the structures called *mammisis* in Egypt), which had the function to visualize the legitimation of the (new) king (cf. *infra*, at *IV.1.1.d*); *IV.1.1.e*)).

I therefore do not agree with Pfeiffer (2018, 188), that Domitian's obelisk is the only monument at Rome known to us which documents Domitian's relevant thoughts. At the same time, the iconography of Domitian's cult-statue in his Temple of Iuppiter Custos, with himself, sitting on Jupiter's lap, refers also to a legend, told about the later Augustus, when he was a child. The iconography, chosen by Domitian for the cult-statue of his Temple of Iuppiter Custos had therefore again a political meaning, which has great similarities with the contents of the hieroglyphic inscriptions of Domitian's obelisk. Cf. Suetonius (*Aug.* 94,8, quoted *verbatim infra*, at *Appendix I.d*)).

Besides, Domitian was the first Roman emperor to be represented as wearing a cuirass decorated with the she-wolf, suckling Romulus and Remus. As Claudio Parisi Presicce (2000, 28, 29, 39, cat. no. 13 [= here **Fig. 6, left**]) has shown, 'the *lupa* and the twins on those cuirasses symbolize the claim of Rome to eternal power and divine mission, and that it was the task of the Roman emperor to fulfill this obligation' (cf. *infra*, at *Appendix IV.c.2*)).

As is well known, this was precisely the foremost obligation, the fulfillment of which was also expected of an Egyptian pharaoh (for that; cf. *infra*, at *Appendix II.c*)).

And Trevor Luke (2018, 207) writes:

"Thanks to Domitian's restoration and building projects on the Campus Martius, the presence of *aegyptiaca* in 88 was more pronounced than ever before. The pyramidion of the Pamphili Obelisk provides a stunning example of how far this Egyptian expression of Domitianic imperial ideology could reach in its portrayal of Domitian as a pharaoh receiving the crowns of Upper and Lower Egypt from goddesses [with n. 77, quoting: Bülow Clausen 2015, 147]".

Cf. Luke (2018, 209): "The fire that ravaged Rome in A.D. 80 gave Domitian the opportunity to indulge his love of *aegyptiaca* by restoring and rebuilding the Iseum Campense. Particularly through the Pamphili obelisk Domitian expressed a distinctly Egyptian theological vision of his imperial ideology in the depiction of him in a close relationship with the gods of Egypt, being crowned as pharaoh by them [with n. 94, providing references, quoting *inter alia* E.M. CIAMPINI 2004; E.M. CIAMPINI 2005]. It is likely the case that these efforts coincided with Domitianic cultivation of the stories of Vespasian's Serapis miracles, which similarly depicted the usurper-emperor [*i.e.*, Vespasian] receiving royal tokens and interacting with the god Serapis [with n. 95, providing a reference]. Viewed synoptically, these structures, images, and narratives represent the crystallization of a memory - the memory of the momentous, and divinely mandated, connection between Egypt and the founding of the Flavian dynasty - at the Campus Martius".

For "Vespasian's Serapis miracles", cf. *supra*, n. 455 in section III., and *infra*, at Appendix II.a).

Like Trevor Luke (2018, 209), I have studied the publication by Emanuele Marcello Ciampini (2004)⁴⁶⁷ on the hieroglyphic texts of Domitian's Obelisk, and especially the inscription on its east side. In the following quotation, I have left out Ciampini's drawing of the relevant hieroglyphic inscription and his transliteration of this Egyptian text, but quote only his Italian translation of it:

"Lato verso Corso Rinascimento (est)

Pyramidion - Domiziano di fronte [corr.: fronte] a Mut, seguito da un'altra figura

H. 22 Horo: Quello per il quale dei e uomini fanno lode;

H. 23. quando riceve la regalità da suo padre **Vespasiano il dio**,

H. 24. dal fratello maggiore **Tito il dio**, mentre il suo ba si muove verso la volta celeste;

H. 25. le Due Signore: il forte, il campione, il muro efficace della terra intera;

H. 26 Falco d'oro: grande di forza che compie atti utili, signore delle feste giubilari come Ptah-Tatenen, sovrano come Ra;

H. 27. re dell'Alto e Basso Egitto, signore delle Due Terre, erede efficace, amato degli dei dell'Egitto
Autokrator,

H. 28. figlio di Ra, signore delle Corone **Cesare Domiziano Augusto**, amato di Ptah e Iside, viva come Ra!"
(the passages in bold have been highlighted like this by the author himself).

This section of one of the hieroglyphic inscriptions of Domitian's obelisk thus means, as already mentioned in the introductory section of this study (cf. *supra*, at *Introductory remarks and acknowledgements*): the *Autokrator* [emperor] *Caesar Domitianus Augustus* has received his reign from his father, *Divus Vespasianus* and from his brother, *Divus Titus*.

The meaning of Frieze B of the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here Fig. 2) - if at all correctly interpreted by Spinola (cf. *supra* at III.; IV.1.) and here by myself - and the meaning of the above quoted passages of the hieroglyphic inscriptions on Domitian's obelisk (cf. here Fig. 28) have so far not been compared with each other, but this short note hopefully marks the beginning of an inquiry into this direction.

But also with this assumption I was wrong: after this section was written, I had the chance to read Wolfgang Kuhoff's account (1993). In his interpretation of Frieze B of the Cancellaria Reliefs, he follows Magi and in the pertaining footnote, he refers to the hieroglyphic texts of Domitian's obelisk (!).

Kuhoff (1993, 77 with n. 103) writes:

"Der seinem Bruder im Prinzipat gefolgte Domitian war von seinem Vater als *Caesar* ins Herrscherkollegium aufgenommen worden und blieb nach Titus Thronbesteigung unbestrittener Nachfolgekandidat [with n. 102, providing references for Domitian as *Caesar*]. Im Nachhinein stilisierte er sich zwar schon für das Jahr 69 als verkannter Anwärter für das Kaisertum, doch war dies nur Ausdruck eines Wunschdenkens [with n. 103]".

In his n. 103, Kuhoff writes: "Das hierfür bedeutungsvolle *Adventus-Relief* vom römischen Palazzo della Cancellaria ... [summarizing in the following some of its controversial interpretations]. Mir selbst erscheint immer noch die bisherige Interpretation als die überzeugendste. Daß sich Domitians Vorstellungen von seiner Rolle als wahrer Nachfolger Vespasians auch in ungewöhnlicher Form artikulieren konnten, zeigt Jean-Claude Grenier, *Les inscriptions hiéroglyphiques de l'obélisque Pamphili. Un témoignage méconnu sur l'avènement de Domitien*, MEFRA 88, 1987, 937-961 [my emphasis]".

⁴⁶⁷ E.M. CIAMPINI 2004, 162-165.

Note that "l'avènement" means 'to ascend to the throne'.

I had come to my own conclusions concerning this point, as summarized above, when Emanuele Marcello Ciampini was so kind as to send me the text that he has dedicated to the subject discussed here. See *The first Contribution by Emanuele M. Ciampini* in this volume: *La regalità domiziana: una nota egittologica*.

IV.1.1. The Obeliscus Pamphilius/ Domitian's obelisk - that was commissioned for the Iseum Campense, not for the Templum Gentis Flaviae

As already said above, especially fruitful for this study has turned out the fact that the organizers of the Iseum Campense Conference at Rome in May 2016, Miguel John Versluys, Kristine Bülow Clausen and Giuseppina Capriotti Vittozzi, had invited me to attend, since without the help of the scholars, I met there, I would definitely have been unable to solve many of the problems discussed here.

Generating *measured* maps takes a long time, and because I needed the maps, drawn for my talk at this Conference, for the book on the *Campus Martius*, which Franz Xaver Schütz and I wished to dedicate to Eugenio La Rocca, I have published my paper already in this study (2017), instead of in the Proceedings of that Conference (2018).

(Cf. C. HÄUBER 2017, 153-174, Fig. 5.5.2. [= here **Fig. 28**] and the maps Fig. 3.7. on p. 69 [= here **Fig. 59**]; Fig. 3.7.1 on p. 71 [= here **Fig. 60**], and Fig. 3.7.1.1 on p. 73. See also Häuber (forthcoming: the paper read at the Iseum Campense Conference).

Fig. 59. Map of the *Campus Martius*. C. Häuber & F.X. Schütz, "AIS ROMA". From: C. HÄUBER 2017, 69, Fig. 3.7.

For an explanation of the cartographic details of this map; cf. Häuber (2017, 68).

Fig. 60. Map of the Iseum Campense. C. Häuber & F.X. Schütz, "AIS ROMA". From: C. HÄUBER 2017, 71, Fig. 3.7.1 (detail of the map here Fig. 59)

For an explanation of the cartographic details of this map; cf. Häuber (2017, 70).

IV.1.1.a) A summary of the hypotheses of Jean-Claude Grenier and Filippo Coarelli, according to whom Domitian's obelisk (cf. here Fig. 28) was not commissioned for the Iseum Campense, but instead for the Templum Gentis Flaviae. With a discussion of the contents of the reliefs on the pyramidion of Domitian's obelisk and of the contents of its hieroglyphic inscriptions

After my talk at the Conference on the Iseum Campense on 25th May 2016, I was fortunate to make the acquaintance of the Egyptologist Alessandro Roccati, with whom I started an E-mail-correspondence. Roccati then helped me in my attempt to solve a great problem that I came across again the following year, namely the controversy concerning the question of whether or not Domitian had commissioned the Obeliscus Pamphilius/ Domitian's obelisk for the Iseum Campense. - This obelisk is today mounted on top of Gianlorenzo Bernini's famous 'Fountain of the Four Rivers' on Piazza Navona at Rome (cf. here **Fig. 28**). Already for my publication of 2017, I had tried to solve this problem, since Jean-Claude Grenier and Filippo Coarelli had suggested that Domitian's obelisk was instead originally created and erected at the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* on the Quirinal.

Cf. Jean-Claude Grenier (1996, 357; *id.* 2009, 234-239 [cf. *id.* 1987, 937-961, for the hieroglyphic inscriptions of Domitian's Obelisk]; F. COARELLI 1996, 108; *id.*, in: F. COARELLI 2009a, 451, cat. no.: "43 frammento della *Forma Urbis Romae* [*i.e.*, the Severan Marble Plan] con l'Iseo e il Serapeo"; COARELLI 2009b, 94; *id.* 2014, 194-207).

In his last relevant publication, Grenier (2009, 237-238) provided a summary of his earlier observations, but, as we shall see below, he had also changed his mind in many respects, when compared with his publication of 1987:

"È ben radicato nell'opinione corrente che questo obelisco [*i.e.*, Domitian's obelisk, here **Fig. 28**] non poté essere eretto che in un contesto egittizzante. Perciò lo si attribuisce ai più significativi edifici >>egizi<< di Roma: l'*Iseum* e il *Serapeum* del [page 238] Campo Marzio che, senza dubbio, furono risistemati sotto Domiziano per cancellare i danni subiti nell'incendio dell'80 che aveva devastato tutta la zona (D.C. LXVI 24,2). **Questa ipotesi è rafforzata dal fatto che un frammento della *Forma Urbis* [*i.e.*, the Severan Marble Plan] mostra che, molto probabilmente, un obelisco si innalzava effettivamente nello spazio che separa il *Serapeum* dall'*Iseum*: se ne riconosce la posizione nel piccolo quadrato inciso al di sopra della seconda A della parola SERAPAEVM. E c'è un generale accordo nell'ammettere che quest'obelisco non può essere altro se non quello di Domiziano, tenendo conto del suo carattere >>isiaco<<.**

Questo punto di vista mi sembra difficilmente condivisibile.

Tralasciamo il fatto che un altro obelisco poteva essere eretto in questo luogo ...

Insistiamo sul presunto carattere >>isiaco<< del nostro obelisco che è in genere chiamato in causa per giustificare la sua collocazione nell'ambito dell'*Iseum* e del *Serapeum*. **Non capisco dove esso si trovi. Iside è più che discreta nelle scene del *pyramidion* e, obiettivamente, ci si può chiedere se essa vi compaia davvero, a meno di non pensare che essa faccia sistematicamente propri, in questo caso, attributi di altre dee (Oadjet, Nekhbet, Hathor) o della regina-madre. Per quel che riguarda i testi, certamente per due volte Domiziano è chiamato >>amato di Iside<<. Raro qui e usuale altrove, questo epiteto non basterà, secondo me, a fare di questo obelisco un monumento >>isiaco<<.** Basterà ricordare che Domiziano poteva a buon diritto definirsi >>amato di Iside<< e ricordare questo legame per una ragione personale precisa: bloccato sul Campidoglio in fiamme durante l'assalto dei partigiani di Vitellio, riuscì a sfuggire >>travestito<< da sacerdote della dea (salvato certamente più dalla testa rasata per l'occasione che dal indossare una veste di lino) (Svet. *Dom.* 1; Tac. *Hist.* III,74,1). Ma se si fosse davvero voluto ricordare e celebrare questo episodio per consacrare l'obelisco a Iside, il redattore di questi testi sarebbe stato obbligato certamente a comporre e farvi comparire un inno alla dea, che proclamasse con insistenza le sue virtù protettrici e salvifiche.

Ora, obiettivamente, i testi dell'obelisco non potrebbero essere più chiari: sono, nel loro insieme, privi di qualunque preoccupazione >>isiaca<<. I primi tre lati sono per la sola gloria di Domiziano *dominus et deus*: proclamazione della sua nascita divina e dunque della sua predestinazione a esercitare il potere supremo come i grandi faraoni del tempo passato, attestazione della sua legittimità a essere l'erede di Vespasiano alla testa dell'impero. Il quarto lato precisa il carattere esclusivamente solare del monumento dedicato a Ra-Harakhte e canta la gloria della *gens Flavia*.

Più che qualsiasi altro, un contesto monumentale a forte destinazione ideologica sembrerebbe essere stato particolarmente indicato ad accogliere questo obelisco: **il complesso del *Templum Gentis Flaviae*** eretto sul Quirinale alla fine del regno di Domiziano. Innalzato sul luogo della casa natale di Domiziano (Suet. *Dom.* 1), **era certamente circolare in quanto immagine del cielo e dell'eternità ciclica** (Mart. IX,1,8; 3,12; 34,2 e Stat. *Silv.* IV.3.18-19): come indicava il suo nome, esso era dedicato al culto della *gens Flavia* in quanto tomba dinastica: le ceneri di Vespasiano e di Tito vi erano state deposte (Mart. IX,34,7 e Stat. *Silv.* V,1,240-241) ed esso ospitava quelle di Domiziano che qui furono mischiate a quelle della beneamata Giulia, la figlia di Tito (Suet. *Dom.* 17 e 22). **Ci sono qui tanti elementi quanti se ne ritrovano riflessi nella natura stessa dell'obelisco, monumento solare simbolo dell'eternità ciclica, e nel contenuto dei suoi testi, che glorificano da una parte la nascita e la dignità imperiale di Domiziano, dall'altra il ricordo dei sovrani della *gens Flavia*.**

Questa proposta di collocare l'obelisco nell'ambito del *Templum Gentis Flaviae* sembra supportata dal fatto che sia stato scelto proprio questo obelisco da Massenzio per decorare la *spina* del circo della sua villa sulla via Appia. Nella sua nuova collocazione, esso continuò a rivestire il ruolo che Domiziano gli aveva assegnato nell'ambito del *Templum Gentis Flaviae*: conservare una dimensione cosmica in un complesso monumentale che voleva essere, l'affermazione e la glorificazione di una nuova dinastia [my emphasis; to the relevant passages I will come back below]".

The hypotheses, published by Grenier (2009). With discussions of the contents of the reliefs on the pyramidion of Domitian's obelisk and of the contents of its hieroglyphic inscriptions (cf. here Fig. 28)

To the small square, which is incised on the Severan Marble Plan on the piazza between the *Iseum* and the *Serapeum* (cf. here Fig. 78), I will likewise come back below. As Grenier (2009, 238) observed in the just quoted passage, many scholars have so far identified this square with the socle of Domitian's obelisk. - I hope to demonstrate in this section, that their assumption is actually true. Grenier (*op.cit.*) was right: on the Severan Marble Plan the lettering is indeed: SERAPAEUM; cf. *LTUR* I (1993, Figs. 122; 122a); Giuseppina Capriotti Vittozzi (2013, 178, Fig. 5). On Guglielmo Gatti's plan of the area (cf. *infra*, at IV.1.1.c) and here Fig. 78), the lettering has been 'turned around' in order to be legible, and reads: ISEVM ET SERAPEVM.

To Grenier's statement (2009, 238): "Iside è più che discreta nelle scene del *pyramidion* e, obiettivamente, ci si può chiedere se essa vi compaia davvero, a meno di non pensare che essa faccia sistematicamente propri, in questo caso, attributi di altre dee (Oadjet, Nekhbet, Hathor) o della regina-madre" - two objections can be made.

1.) Grenier's assertion, according to which: '[the presence of] Isis is more than moderate' in the scenes of the *pyramidion* of Domitian's obelisk, is not true. On the contrary, she is even herself represented, as we shall see below. Therefore it is not necessary to ask ourselves, as Grenier did, whether -

2.) Isis could possibly be equated in these scenes on the *pyramidion* of Domitian's obelisk with the goddesses, whom Grenier mentions: Wadjet, Nekhbet and Hathor, or with Grenier's "regina-madre".

With the latter remark, Grenier hinted obviously at scholars like Michel Malaise (1972a, 204-205), whose relevant opinion, as we shall see below, Grenier had in his earlier article rejected; cf. Grenier (1987, 957-958, with n. 40, quoted *verbatim infra*); or for example Katja Lembke (1994b, 212, quoted *verbatim infra*, at IV.1.1.c)), who is also of the opinion that on all four scenes of this *pyramidion*, Isis turns to Domitian, thus equating these goddesses with Isis; or to Emanuele Ciampini (2005, 399, quoted *verbatim infra*, at IV.1.1.d)), who calls these goddesses the 'divine mothers of Domitian'. Besides, as we shall see below, according to some scholars, Grenier's "regina-madre" actually was likewise Isis.

For good photographs of the four sides of the *pyramidion* of Domitian's obelisk, cf. Grenier (2009, 236, Fig. "2. I quattro lati del *pyramidion* che coronava l'obelisco di Domiziano. Città del Vaticano, Musei Vaticani". - On top left: south side, on top right: west side, on bottom left: east side, on bottom right: north side). This large fragment of the *pyramidion* was later found than the shaft of the obelisk that in 1648 was re-erected on Bernini's fountain in Piazza Navona. Some more fragments of this *pyramidion*, comprising also some hieroglyphs, were found in the excavation of 1960, conducted on the *spina* of the *Circus* of Maxentius at his *Villa* on the Via Appia.

Giuseppina Pisani Sartorio (2006, 58, in her description of the sculptures and monuments that were found on the *spina* of the *Circus* of Maxentius at his *Villa* on the Via Appia), writes about the various parts of Domitian's obelisk (cf. here Fig. 28):

"6) obelisco in granito rosa, d'epoca romana, fatto trasportare da Massenzio dall'Iseo e Serapeo Campense domiziano dell'anno 81 o da altro luogo: il Grenier ha recentemente avanzato l'ipotesi di una provenienza

dalla *domus* ["et le *templum*", so J.-C. GRENIER 1996, 357] *Gentis Flaviae* sul Quirinale (Grenier, 'L'obelisco' [i.e., here J.-C. GRENIER 1999] 225-234). L'obelisco, caduto probabilmente a causa del terremoto del 365 descritto da Ammiano Marcellino (26.10.15-19) o di quello del 443, venne trasportato a piazza Navona nel 1648 sotto Innocenzo X. Il *pyramidion* dell'obelisco, rinvenuto più tardi e acquistato dal card.[inale] Borgia alla fine del Settecento, dopo la dispersione della collezione Borgia nel 1814 venne venduto al Vaticano, dove ancora si conserva (Calza [i.e., here R. CALZA 1976] 168-170, nn. 12, 13a-b); alcuni frammenti, recuperati negli scavi del 1960, anche con geroglifici, sono conservati presso l'Antiquarium Comunale (cassa 307/236, nn. 3-10) (Ioppolo [i.e., here G. IOPPOLO 1988] 126-130, figs. 21-25). La platea dell'obelisco era larga m 4,73 x 6,21, in posizione centrale sulla spina tra le due mete. L'altezza totale dell'obelisco, a seguito di nuove misurazioni effettuate nel 1995, è di m 16,38 m".

The 'royal rituals' represented on Domitian's obelisk

The goddesses Wadjet, Nekhbet and Hathor (but not the "regina-madre"), all mentioned by Grenier (2009, 238), who are represented in the scenes on the *pyramidion* of Domitian's obelisk, have been studied in detail by Emanuele M. Ciampini (2005). These goddesses appear in the scenes on the *pyramidion* of the obelisk and are explicitly mentioned in one section of its hieroglyphic texts, and refer to the sacred dramas, performed at the structures called *mammisis* ('the houses of birth' [of the pharaoh]) in Egypt.

Ciampini (2005, 399) writes that the *raison d'être* of *mammisis* was the demonstration of the "legitimization of the king", which is why the appearance of these goddesses on Domitian's obelisk fulfills the same function. Jean-Claude Goyon (1988) calls the sacred dramas, performed at the *mammisis* and elsewhere the 'royal rituals'. In their entirety, these rituals could last from the end of March until mid-July. They began with the enactment of 'the birth of the divine child', the (new) king of Egypt, and ended with his coronation as pharaoh, which occurred at the festival of Egyptian New Year. Those rituals were performed every year; in those years, in which a new pharaoh was not crowned, they served the reigning king as "the repeated confirmation of his royal power"; cf. Jean-Claude Goyon (1988, 33; cf. *infra*, at IV.1.1.e)). Emanuele M. Ciampini refers to such a ceremony as "rituale di conferma del potere regale alla Festa del Nuovo Anno"; cf. *The first Contribution by Emanuele M. Ciampini* in this volume: *La regalità domiziana: una nota egittologica*.

Both subjects, the birth of the divine child Domitian and his coronation as pharaoh, appear therefore not by chance likewise in the hieroglyphic texts of Domitian's obelisk (*infra*, at IV.1.1.d)), as well as in the scenes on the *pyramidion* of this obelisk (cf. *supra*, and *infra*, at IV.1.1.c)).

Because Grenier (2009, 234, 237, 238) mentions in his descriptions of the scenes on the four sides of the *pyramidion* of Domitian's obelisk (cf. here Fig. 28) the following points a)-c), which are all related to the 'royal rituals', these facts made me at first wonder, why Grenier did not himself arrive at the obvious conclusion that Isis is actually *very much* present on Domitian's obelisk.

The difference between his interpretation, as compared to that of those scholars, who I am myself following here, is clear, when we look at point *b*). But let's first of all look at all three points:

a) these specific goddesses (Wadjet, Nekhbet and Hathor; but not Grenier's "regina-madre"), whom Grenier (2009, 238) mentions in the above quoted passage, in which he summarizes his descriptions of the four scenes, represented on the *pyramidion* of Domitian's obelisk, were all important actors in the 'royal rituals', performed at the *mammisis* in Egypt;

b) Grenier (2009, 234), in his description of the scene on the *pyramidion* on the west side of the obelisk, mentions in the centre the enthroned Domitian. Behind him stands in his opinion the god Amun: "progenitore dei faraoni a partire dal Nuovo Regno, che, secondo il dogma della trasmissione della dignità regale prendeva il posto del sovrano regnante nel momento dell'unione con la regina. Nella logica di questo dogma avremmo qui dunque un Vespasiano-Ammon e una Flavia Domitilla-regina che trasmettono al

figlio la dignità regale rappresentata dalla doppia corona che ella gli offre. Ammone presenta il viso di Maat, simbolo dell'Armonia Universale, e mostra così che il frutto della loro unione si inserisce nell'ordine cosmico".

c), in the scene of the *pyramidion* on the north side of the obelisk appears the god Thot, about whom Grenier (2009, 237) writes: "uno degli attori divini fondamentali nei riti legati alla trasmissione del potere regale" (quoted in more *detail infra*), that is to say, one of the 'fundamental divine actors' in the 'royal rituals', as Grenier himself says.

Grenier (2009, 234), in the above-quoted point **b**), refers to the ritual of 'the birth of the divine child', performed at the structures called *mammisis*, with which the 'royal rituals' began that culminated in the coronation of this new king. By applying this to Domitian, Grenier thus follows what we know about the dogma of the 'doppelte Sohnschaft' ('double sonship', by other scholars referred to as theogamy; cf. *infra*). This was not only claimed by the kings of Egypt of the pharaonic period, but also by Alexander the Great and by Augustus and served the function of legitimizing their reigns as rulers.

In the following, I allow myself a digression on the dogma of the 'doppelte Sohnschaft' ('double sonship'.

Tonio Hölscher (2009b, 59-60) writes about Alexander the Great:

"In Ägypten hatte der Gott Ammon ihn [Alexander] bei seinem Besuch des Orakels in der Oase Siw als seinen Sohn anerkannt. Damit trat Alexander in die ägyptische Tradition des Herrschers als eines unmittelbaren Gottessohnes ein. Der Pharao war Sohn des Sonnengottes, gezeugt von Amun Re in Gestalt des regierenden Königs mit dessen Gemahlin. Daraus resultierte die Ebenbildlichkeit zwischen dem Gott und dem von ihm gezeugten neuen Herrscher. Die Theologie der Herrschaft hatte die Identität von Gott und Herrscher zur Grundlage, aus der das göttliche Wesen des neugeborenen Nachfolgers erwuchs. Gleichzeitig aber wurde an der Vaterschaft des regierenden Königs festgehalten. Damit kam es zu dem Phänomen der doppelten göttlich-menschlichen Herkunft, die dem königlichen Nachfolger die unverbrüchliche Legitimität verlieh".

For the dogma of the 'doppelte Sohnschaft' ('double sonship'), cf. Häuber (2014a, 717, 733 with n. 53, providing references); for "Maat, simbolo dell'Armonia Universale", as Grenier (2009, 234), referred to this Egyptian all-embracing ethic doctrine; cf. Häuber (2017, 166, 376-377, 418-423). According to Egyptian theology, the establishment and maintenance of Ma'at was the most important obligation of the king, it not only guaranteed the life and welfare of the king's subjects, but even the survival of the entire cosmos; for Alexander the Great's and Augustus' 'double sonship', cf. Häuber (2017, 570, 572-578), where I have discussed the relevant studies by Stefan Pfeiffer (2010b, 45-50, 60-61).

According to this dogma of the 'doppelte Sohnschaft', the (new) king of Egypt had mortal parents, the reigning king of Egypt and his queen. But in the moment of the conception of the new king, the god Amun [or Re-Harakhte] took the place of his mortal father. According to Grenier (2009, 234), therefore: "Vespasiano-Ammone e ... Flavia Domitilla-regina" transferred the 'dignity of kingship' on their son Domitian.

I myself follow instead scholars like Goyon (1988; cf. *infra*, at IV.1.1.e) and Ciampini (2004 and 2005; cf. *infra*, at IV.1.1.d)), who interpret the 'royal rituals' at the structure called *mammisis* differently than Grenier (*op.cit.*). Goyon (1988, 34) mentions the fact that in reality the queen of the reigning king (*i.e.*, Grenier's "regina-madre") conceives the 'divine child' and gives birth to it. Cf. Goyon's Fig. 9 (= here **Fig. 79**): "The birth of the

child-god Harpre ("Horus-the-Son") before Amun-Re, the goddess Nekhbet, and Cleopatra VII ... [*i.e.*, the second figure from right]". - To this I will come back below.

But Goyon (1988, 34) quotes also the texts which accompany the relevant scenes, representing the birth of the divine child (the future king): "Although we cannot state the precise dates assigned to the festivities, due to the lack of documents, they followed one another in a logical order, from 28 Pharmouthi to the fateful date of the coronation: the first day of the month of Thot (mid-July). When Re himself had announced the coming to the world of the heir by saying "Isis has brought into the world her Horus ...", the renewed king regained his efficacy, and Ma'at, momentarily menaced, continued to rule the universe". - With the latter remark, Goyon referred to the fact that these ceremonies were celebrated every year; in those years, in which not a new pharaoh was crowned, they served the reigning king as "the repeated confirmation of his royal power"; cf. Goyon (1988, 33; cf. *infra*, at IV.1.1.e)). And Emanuele M. Ciampini refers to such a ceremony as "rituale di conferma del potere regale alla Festa del Nuovo Anno"; cf. *The first Contribution by Emanuele M. Ciampini in this volume: La regalità domiziana: una nota egittologica*).

Ciampini (2005, 399) writes that Horus (*i.e.*, the king) is the son of Osiris, and that the new king is born as the son of the divine couple (Isis and Osiris). On p. 400, Ciampini, by explaining the gradual development of the various 'royal rituals' over time, mentions the fact that: "(Amon-Rê decides to have a son, his incarnation as human father of [the] king, conception and birth of pharaoh)", but does not mention the queen of the reigning king at all in this context. Ciampini speaks only of Isis as the mother of the king, and of his 'divine mothers' (cf. pp. 399-400). The reason being that according to the hieroglyphic texts accompanying the relevant representations in the structures called *mammisi*, which Ciampini refers to (which differ from Goyon's examples, his Figs. 8-10, here illustrated as Fig. 79), the king's mother, who gives birth to him and raises him, is identified as the goddess Isis herself.

Capriotti Vittozzi provides an interesting example for the 'application' of the old dogma of the 'double sonship', called theogamy by her, that caused the famous scandal under Tiberius in AD 32 and the destruction of the Temple of Isis, where that scandal had occurred. Some scholars, including Capriotti Vittozzi (2013) herself, believe (in my opinion erroneously) that the temple in question was the Iseum Campense. For a detailed discussion; cf. *infra*, at Appendix III).

Capriotti Vittozzi (2013, 38-39) writes:

"A incentivare l'avversione imperiale [*i.e.*, of Tiberius] per quella che veniva considerata una pernicioso superstizione, intervenne un pubblico scandalo che ci viene narrato da Flavio Giuseppe [with n. 70]: un cavaliere romano che si era proposto di sedurre una virtuosissima nobildonna, dopo inutili tentativi vi era riuscito lasciandole credere che si stesse intrattenendo con il dio Anubi. Scoperto l'inganno, il marito di lei era ricorso all'imperatore. [page 39] È interessante notare che l'intrigo fosse stato ordito sulla trama di un antica tradizione egizia, quella della teogamia, per la quale un dio visitava la regina dando vita al futuro sovrano".

In her **note 70**, Capriotti Vittozzi writes: "*Ant. Iud.* XVIII, 3,4".

Let's now return to the hypotheses, published by Grenier (2009). With discussions of the contents of the reliefs on the pyramidion of Domitian's obelisk (cf. here Fig. 28) and of the contents of its hieroglyphic inscriptions

I have mentioned above this point **b**), because from this passage, Grenier (2009, 234), is clear, why the author (2009, 238) could assert that Isis is not present neither in the four scenes of the *pyramidion* of Domitian's Obelisk, nor in the hieroglyphic texts on the four sides of this obelisk. Grenier mentioned "il dogma della

trasmissione della dignità regale" in this context at all, because he identified the figure behind Domitian as Amun, who appears in the scene on the *pyramidion* of the west side of Domitian's obelisk; so also Katja Lembke (1994b, 40, quoted *verbatim infra*, at IV.1.1.c)). Given the fact that the scenes on the *pyramidion* of Domitian's obelisk are badly preserved, other scholars are of the, as I believe, correct opinion that this figure is not identifiable at all. - To this "dogma della trasmissione della dignità regale", enacted in the 'royal rituals', I will come back below (cf. *infra*, at IV.1.1.d); IV.1.1.e)).

Ciampini (2004, 165) writes:

"Lato verso la chiesa di S. Agnese [*i.e.*, west]

Pyramidion / Domiziano di fronte a Nekhbet e seguito da un'altra figura [this is the figure that according to Grenier 2009, 234, represents Amun]".

Also still another subject of the hieroglyphic inscriptions on Domitian's obelisk, that Grenier mentions elsewhere in the above quoted passage, turns out to be a theme that was enacted in the 'royal rituals', *inter alia* at the structures called *mammisis*. Grenier (2009, 238) writes: "I primi tre lati [of the hieroglyphic inscriptions on Domitian's obelisk] sono per la sola gloria di Domiziano *dominus et deus*: proclamazione della sua nascita divina e dunque della sua predestinazione a esercitare il potere supremo come i grandi faraoni del tempo passato, attestazione della sua legittimità a essere l'erede di Vespasiano alla testa dell'impero. **Il quarto lato precisa il carattere esclusivamente solare del monumento dedicato a Ra-Harakhte** [my emphasis]". Add to this Grenier's translation (2009, 237) of a section of the hieroglyphic inscription on the fourth side of Domitian's Obelisk: "IV - lato nord verso il Tevere ... **Egli ha eretto questo obelisco** in granito son le sue mani (?) **per suo padre Ra-Harakhte** ... [my emphasis]".

The claim of the king of Egypt to be the son of Re-Harakhte was also enacted in those 'royal rituals' that were connected *inter alia* with the structures called *mammisis* in Egypt (cf. *infra*, at IV.1.1.d)).

Ad 2.) These parallels to *mammisis* in Egypt in the scenes on the *pyramidion* of Domitian's Obelisk and in the relevant section of the hieroglyphic texts of the obelisk (cf. E.M. CIAMPINI 2005) prove that Isis is - already indirectly - present here: despite the assertions to the contrary by Grenier (2009, 238). - Apart from the fact that Isis is also 'herself' represented in one of these scenes (cf. *infra*).

And that because of the following reasons: the "regina-madre" and the 'divine child Domitian', whom Grenier (2009, 238) mentioned separately in the above quoted passage, belong together: in the rituals at the *mammisis* in Egypt, in which 'the birth of the divine child' was enacted in sacred dramas, it was *not* the real "regina-madre", who gave birth to the 'divine child', the new king - having been impregnated by her husband, the reigning king of Egypt - but instead the goddess Isis herself, who was believed to have been impregnated by the god Re-Harakhte. - To all this I will come back in detail below (cf. *infra*, at IV.1.1.d)).

Ad 1.) As already mentioned, contrary to Grenier's assertion, Isis is in the opinion of other scholars also 'herself' present in one of the four scenes on the *pyramidion* of Domitian's obelisk. Cf. Grenier's translation (2009, 237) of the hieroglyphic text on the north side of the obelisk:

"IV - lato nord (verso il Tevere)

Scena del *pyramidion*. Domiziano al centro è rivolto verso sinistra (senso di lettura del testo), la testa adorna dello *pschent*, le mani, chiuse, sono alzate e la sinistra tiene uno scettro. Davanti a lui, una dea acconciata con il *basileion*, nella gestualità della protezione (mano levata aperta). Dietro di lui, il dio Thot con testa di ibis (uno degli attori divini fondamentali nei riti legati alla trasmissione del potere regale) sembra fare lo stesso gesto".

For the *basileion*, one of the most typical attributes of Isis, cf. Gemma Sena Chiesa (1997, 152; C. HÄUBER 2014a, 156 with ns. 53, 56, Fig. 7).

But see Alfred Grimm (1997) 128: "... Domiziano arredò il santuario di Iside e Serapide [*i.e.*, the Iseum Campense] con numerosi monumenti egizi ed egittizzanti, tra i quali anche l'obelisco che oggi si trova in piazza Navona e che raffigura l'incoronazione del principe **da parte della dea Iside** [my emphasis]".

Ciampini (2004, 159) writes: "Lato verso il Tevere (nord)
Pyramidion / Domiziano mentre **offre a Iside**: dietro l'imperatore è Thot [my emphasis]".

Capriotti Vittozzi (2013, 127, in her Chapter: "I luoghi 'egizi' di Roma") writes:

"Altre interessanti considerazioni riguardano il ruolo di Iside nell'obelisco di Domiziano, la quale appare come elargitrice di regalità e, in tal senso, in relazione con Ptah [with n. 11]: ciò lascia intravedere una precisa citazione dell'ambiente menfita, che peraltro era l'antica capitale dove avveniva tradizionalmente l'incoronazione [my emphasis]".

In her **note 11**, Capriotti Vittozzi writes: Ciampini 2004, 165".

See also Capriotti Vittozzi (2014, 243-246, quoted *verbatim infra*, at IV.1.1.d)), where she likewise discusses the "ruolo di Iside nell'obelisco di Domiziano".

Also Laurent Bricault and Richard Veymiers (2018, 151) write:

"À Rome, l'obélisque aujourd'hui visible sur la Piazza Navona, dont le programme iconographique et hymnique met principalement en scène Domitien **et Isis** ... [my emphasis]".

To conclude. The analysis of the above-quoted passages from Grenier (2009, 238, 234) has shown, why, in the author's opinion, Domitian's obelisk (cf. here Fig. 28) was not commissioned for the Iseum Campense, but rather for the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*. He did this by (in my opinion erroneously) asserting, that Isis is not present either in the scenes on the *pyramidion* of Domitian's obelisk, or in its hieroglyphic texts.

Grenier mentioned his relevant opinion in his discussions of the following two figures that appear in the scenes on the *pyramidion*, **a)** the "regina-madre", whose function in the 'royal rituals' he explained by applying the meaning of those sacred performances to Domitian, but note that Grenier did not say, in which scene of the *pyramidion* in his opinion the "regina-madre" is represented (to this I will come back below); and **b)** the figure of Amun, whom Grenier recognized in the scene of the *pyramidion* on the west side of Domitian's obelisk. But note also that none of the other here discussed scholars identify Grenier's alleged "regina-madre" as such.

As already mentioned, Grenier's interpretation (2009) of the 'royal rituals', performed *inter alia* at the *mammisis* in Egypt, differed greatly from those of Goyon (1988) and Ciampini (2004; 2005), whom I am following here (cf. *infra*, at V.1.1.d); V.1.1.e)).

Let's now turn to Coarelli (2014, 204-207, with Figs. 50-52), who discusses the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* and explains, why he follows Grenier in attributing Domitian's obelisk (cf. here Fig. 28) to this building.

Cf. Coarelli (2014, 204: "L'edificio così ricostruito ci restituisce un'immagine plausibile del *templum gentis Flaviae*: una struttura che riuniva in sé, per la prima volta, le caratteristiche e le funzioni di tipi edilizi in precedenza distinti: il sepolcro e il tempio dinastico.

Resta da chiarire il motivo per cui esso viene ancora citato nei Cataloghi Regionari di età costantiniana, quando ormai doveva essere scomparso per far luogo alle Terme di Diocleziano (Anch'esse menzionate nello stesso documento) [my emphasis]".

Cf. Coarelli (2014, 204-207): "**Va tenuto conto, a questo proposito, di un detta-** [page 205] **glio emerso dalle esplorazioni recenti** [with n. 474], **di cui non si è tenuto alcun conto: il fatto cioè che i resti dell'edificio spiccano a un livello più alto rispetto a quello delle successive terme. Questo dato ammette un'unica soluzione, che infatti è stata proposta, con prudenza, dai responsabili dello scavo: mentre la grande platea porticata venne certamente soppressa dall'edificio successivo, che ne prese il posto, la costruzione centrale, e cioè il nucleo essenziale del complesso, venne risparmiato, poiché veniva a cadere in un'area libera entro il recinto delle terme.** L'ovvia conclusione è che il complesso domiziano sopravvisse anche in seguito, ciò che consente di spiegare la sua menzione, insieme alle terme, nei Cataloghi Regionari. Una sua distruzione totale infatti sarebbe difficile da spiegare, in un'epoca in cui la memoria dei Flavi (escluso ovviamente Domiziano) continuò a vivere, e questo almeno fino all'età di Costantino. Non va dimenticato, che quest'ultimo apparteneva alla *gens Flavia*, e d'altra parte sarebbe difficile immaginare che la costruzione a *Hispellum* di un *templum Flaviae gentis* non abbia tenuto conto dell'omonimo modello domiziano [with n. 475].

Un ultimo dato emerge dagli studi di J.-P. [corr.: J.-C.] **Grenier** [with n. 476], **dai quali risulta l'estraneità dell'obelisco panfilio di piazza Navona, opera di Domiziano, all'Iseo del Campo Marzio** (con il quale esso veniva in genere collegato, ma senza argomenti cogenti). **In effetti, nel testo geroglifico è praticamente assente ogni allusione ai culti egiziani, mentre è palese l'insistenza sugli aspetti dinastici della *gens Flavia*, che vengono più volte ribaditi. Per questo, Grenier propone di attribuirlo al *templum gentis Flaviae*.**

Un elemento che sembra confermare l'identificazione è l'apparente disponibilità dell'obelisco subito dopo la distruzione di gran parte del tempio per la realizzazione delle Terme di Diocleziano, e quindi immediatamente prima della sua nuova sistemazione nel Circo di Massenzio. **Ma il fatto più interessante, giustamente sottolineato da Grenier, è che tale collocazione mirava a ricostituire, nella nuova sede, un contesto del tutto analogo a quello originario: l'obelisco veniva infatti a trovarsi in prossimità del sepolcro detto di Romolo che in realtà era, nelle intenzioni, il mausoleo dinastico destinato a Massenzio e alla sua famiglia. Ora, come abbiamo visto, questo costituisce il primo di una serie di sepolcri analoghi, realizzati in età costantiniana. Ma l'archetipo, come sappiamo, è da riconoscere proprio nel *templum gentis Flaviae*, con il quale si era realizzata per la prima volta la sintesi tra tomba e tempio dinastico. Le motivazioni ideologiche di un tale connubio corrispondono in effetti alle esigenze della politica 'monarchica' di Domiziano.**

L'abbandono di questo modello, in seguito alla condanna del suo creatore [*i.e.*, Domitian], renderà improponibile ogni tentativo analogo nel periodo successivo: Nerva infatti sarà sepolto nel Mausoleo di Augusto e i corpi degli imperatori successivi, con la nota eccezione di Traiano, verranno ospitati nel nuovo Mausoleo di Adriano. Solo con Massenzio il tentativo sarà rinnovato, e con un certo successo, come sappiamo. **La voluta conservazione del monumento domiziano all'interno delle terme (realizzate dal padre di Massenzio, Massimiano Ercoleo) e il trasferimento dell'obelisco costituiscono certamente operazioni collegate:** in ogni caso, tali da confermare l'ipotesi che vi riconosce l'avvenuto recupero di un modello già antico in funzione di un nuovo esperimento dinastico [my emphasis]".

In his n. 474, Coarelli writes: "CANDILIO 2000-01, p. 552, nota 32.

In his n. 475, he writes: GASCOU 1967.

In his n. 476, he writes: GRENIER 1999; GRENIER 2009.

As already written elsewhere; cf. Häuber (2017, 158-164, for a summary, cf. *infra*, at IV.1.1.h)), I do not follow the hypotheses presented here of Coarelli and Grenier, which I have discussed on the basis of their following publications (cf. J.-C. GRENIER 1996, 357; *id.* 2009, 234-239; F. COARELLI 1996, 108; *id.*, in: F. COARELLI 2009a, 451, cat. no.: "43 frammento della *Forma Urbis Romae* [*i.e.*, the Severan Marble Plan] con l'Iseo e il

Serapeo"; *id.* 2009b, 94; *id.* 2014, 194-207). And that because of the following reasons (I repeat below the relevant sections of Coarelli's text):

1.) Contrary to Coarelli's assertion (2014, 205) that: "nel testo geroglifico [of Domitian's obelisk] è praticamente assente ogni allusione ai culti egiziani", I follow those scholars, who have documented just the contrary. Their observations are summarized below (cf. *infra*, at IV.1.1.c); and at IV.1.1.d)).

This means that Grenier's and Coarelli's main argument, in which they both do *not* attribute Domitian's obelisk (cf. here Fig. 28) to the Iseum Campense, is actually untrue. - But there are more reasons that speak against their hypotheses (cf. also *infra*, at IV.1.1.h)).

2.) Contrary to Coarelli (2014, 205-207), I cannot see that: "il fatto più interessante, giustamente sottolineato da Grenier, è che tale collocazione [*i.e.*, of Domitian's obelisk] mirava a ricostituire, nella nuova sede [*i.e.*, at the *Villa* of Maxentius on the *Via Appia*], un contesto del tutto analogo a quello originario: l'obelisco veniva infatti a trovarsi in prossimità del sepolcro detto di Romolo".

The display of Domitian's obelisk at the Villa of Maxentius on the Via Appia

Domitian's obelisk at the *Villa* of Maxentius on the *Via Appia* did *not* stand 'close to the sepolcro detto di Romolo', also known as 'Tempio di Romolo', as asserted by Coarelli, who follows, in this respect, Grenier, but was instead on display on the *spina* of the *Circus* of Maxentius, which is far away from this mausoleum. Maxentius had, in my opinion, thus created with Domitian's obelisk on the *spina* of his *Circus* one of several *Architekturtropien* of the obelisk, that Augustus had erected on the *spina* of the *Circus Maximus*, and which at Maxentius' time was still in place (cf. here Fig. 58, label: CIRCUS MAXIMUS). - This was one of the two Egyptian obelisks, which Augustus was first to bring from Egypt to Rome; it is the one now standing on the Piazza del Popolo.

On the *Villa* of Maxentius on the *Via Appia*, Domitian's obelisk, and the hypothesis that attribute it to the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*; cf. Amanda Claridge (1998, 338; cf. p. 337, "Fig. 166. Villa and Circus of Maxentius. Site plan", labels: "MAUSOLEUM; Circus; Spina": cf. pp. 211, 350, Fig. 174, number 15 [with the earlier, wrong location of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* at the site of the *domus* of Domitian's paternal uncle, Flavius Sabinus]; cf. *ead.* 2010, 427; cf. p. 427, "Fig. 203. Villa and Circus of Maxentius. Site plan", labels: "MAUSOLEUM; Circus; Spina"; cf. pp. 237, 392, Fig. 180, number 15 [with the earlier, wrong location of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* at the site of the *domus* of Domitian's paternal uncle, Flavius Sabinus]); and G. Pisani Sartorio (2006, 49-59, esp. p. 58, quoted *verbatim supra*).

For the different locations of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, I have written elsewhere: "cf. Coarelli: "Gens Flavia, Templum", in: *LTUR* II (1995) 368-369. In this entry, Coarelli identified the *domus*, where Domitian was born, and thus the future site of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, with the *domus* of Domitian's paternal uncle, Flavius Sabinus, an opinion, which he would later correct. Cf. *LTUR* V (1999) 262 (for the most recent publications on the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*"); cf. Häuber 2017, 160. For the Caserma dei Corazzieri (next to the Church of S. Susanna), the site of the *domus* of Flavius Sabinus; cf. *infra*, at V.1.i.3.a).

Cf. here Fig. 58, labels: QUIRINAL; Servian city Wall; ALTA SEMITA; S. Susanna; Caserma dei Corazzieri; site of DOMUS: FLAVIUS SABINUS; Baths of Diocletian; site of TEMPLUM GENTIS FLAVIAE.

For the idea that Maxentius' re-use of Domitian's obelisk on the *spina* of his *Circus* may be regarded as an *Architektorkopie* of Augustus' obelisk on the *spina* of the *Circus Maximus*, cf. Häuber (2017, 37, Fig. 1,2, pp. 162, 599. Cf. pp. 19, 113 n. 63, pp. 424-426, for the Egyptian obelisk now on the Piazza del Popolo. Cf. pp. 382-384, for the other comparable *Architektorkopien*).

Only after this section was written, did I read the first publication by Grenier (1987) on the hieroglyphic texts of Domitian's obelisk. I was hoping to find there, which figure in the scenes on its *pyramidion* the author might have referred to in the above quoted passage (cf. J.-C. GRENIER 2009, 238), as the "regina-madre". To my great surprise, Grenier (1987) did not identify any of the female figures in the scenes on the obelisk's *pyramidion* as the "regina-madre", in addition to this, he was of almost exactly the same opinion concerning the interpretations of the iconographic details of these scenes as Ciampini (2005; cf. *infra*, at IV.1.1.d)).

Grenier (1987, 952) wrote about the hieroglyphic texts of Domitian's obelisk and the scenes of its *pyramidion*:

"De même, sur la face I, la séquence bien connue vautant les mérites du pharaon constructeur ne saurait être ici employée fortuitement:

<<Il a relevé ce qui était tombé en ruine et il a rempli ce qu'il a trouvé vide en augmentant e qui existait déjà, attentif à faire pour le mieux>>.

(I,7)

Compte tenu du contexte, il est licite de voir là une allusion aux travaux entrepris par Domitien pour reconstruire les édifices du Champ de Mars détruits par l'incendi de l'an 80 au nombre desquels se trouvait justement l'ensemble de l'Iseum et du Serapeum où se dressait l'obélisque [with n. 33, providing references]".

Cf. Grenier (1987, 955):

"... rien ne vient indiquer que ce monument [*i.e.*, Domitian's obelisk] témoigne d'une dévotion particulière pour les divinités alexandrines en particulier [with n. 38] ... la déesse à qui, on le sait, il [*i.e.*, Domitian] devait la vie (cf. l'épisode fameux du jeune Domitien échappant à ses assassins lors de l'assaut du Capitole en 69, en se réfugiant dans le temple capitolin d'Isis comme le rapportent TACITE, *Hist.*, III, 74, 1 et SUÉTONNE, *Dom.* 1,4 [cf. *infra*, at Appendix I.b-I.d]).

Grenier (1987, 957-958, with n. 40, Figs. 5-8) comments on the scenes represented on the pyramidion of Domitian's obelisk as follows:

"... dans lesquelles on a reconcé à l'iconographie traditionnelle du Pharaon adorant le demiurge solaire pour évoquer la cérémonie même du couronnement royal: remise des couronnes et du symbol royal par excellence, l'emblème de Maât évoquant l'harmonie du monde que le nouveau souverain avait la charge de entretenir [with n. 40]".

In his 40, Grenier wrote:

"Le caractère exceptionnel de ce *pyramidion* a été remarqué par tous mais ici encore on peut se demander si le contenu <<isiacque>> de ces scènes n'a pas été exagérée il s'il convient d'identifier systématiquement à Isis tous les déesses qui y apparaissent (cf. p. ex. [par exemple] MALAISE, *Inventaire* [*i.e.*, here M. MALAISE 1972a], p. 204-205). Il me semble que reconnaître Isis (Fig. 5), Hathor e Quadjet (?) (Fig. 6); Mout (Fig. 7) et Nekhbet (Fig. 8) serait plus vraisemblable et rendrait mieux compte de la nature de ces scènes ... [my emphasis]".

IV.1.1.b) My first attempt to find arguments in support of the hypothesis that Domitian's obelisk (cf. here Fig. 28) was commissioned for the Iseum Campense

I repeat in the following a passage written for section II.3.1.c).

‘In my effort to find proofs for the assumption that Domitian's obelisk was indeed commissioned by the emperor for the restored Iseum Campense, I have compared the claims made in the hieroglyphic inscriptions of this obelisk (cf. here Fig. 28) that concern the benefactions of the Flavian dynasty for the Roman People, as well as the claims made in these texts that concern the benefactions of Domitian himself, especially his provision of the Roman People with bountiful food - with those building, surrounding the obelisk, which Domitian himself had actually commissioned, for example the *Porticus Minucia Frumentaria*’.

For those claims, cf. Grenier (2009, 237: concerning the claims made in the hieroglyphic inscriptions on Domitian's obelisk on behalf of the Flavian dynasty), and Häuber (2017, 165: concerning the claims made in the hieroglyphic inscriptions on Domitian's obelisk on behalf of Domitian)

As a prerequisite of the just described ‘urbanistic comparison’ of Domitian's Obelisk within its real surroundings, I have assumed that this obelisk was indeed standing on the square between the *Iseum* and the *Serapeum*, where it has been located by many scholars (cf. the maps, here Figs. 60; 78). As I hope to demonstrate in this *Chapter* (cf. *infra*, at IV.1.1.h)), Domitian had indeed commissioned the Obeliscus Pamphilius for precisely that location. For my earlier studies concerning this subject (cf. *supra*, n. 466 in section IV.1., and C. HÄUBER 2017, 158-167, Fig. 5.5.2. [= cf. here Fig. 28] and the maps Fig. 3.7. on p. 69 [= here Fig. 59]; Fig. 3.7.1 on p. 71 [= here Fig. 60], and Fig. 3.7.1.1 on p. 73 [= here Fig. 61]).

IV.1.1.c) Further research that was undertaken to clarify the question, whether or not Domitian's obelisk (cf. here Fig. 28) was commissioned for the Iseum Campense and G. Gatti's correct reconstruction of the central Campus Martius (cf. here Fig. 78)

In 2017 the book by Hugo Brandenburg on ‘Constantine's Basilica of Saint Peter at Rome’ appeared. In it he mentions the fact that artworks could not be removed from ‘pagan’ temples until the middle of the 5th century (cf. H. BRANDENBURG, *Die Konstantinische Petersbasilika am Vatikan in Rom. Anmerkungen zu ihrer Chronologie, Architektur und Ausstattung* 2017).

Brandenburg (2017, 70), in his discussion of the question, whether or not ancient *spolia* could possibly have been re-used for the construction of Constantine's new Basilica of Saint Peter, writes:

“Öffentliche Bauten einschließlich der Tempel, denen man Material in den entsprechenden Maßen und vielleicht auch Anzahl als Spolien hätte entnehmen können, standen nicht zur Verfügung, da sie in gutem Bauzustand waren und bis in die Mitte des 5. Jh. als *ornamenta urbis* unter Schutz standen [with n. 203]”.

In his n. 203, Brandenburg writes: "Schutz der öffentlichen Bauten und Tempel z.B. Cod. Theod. IX, 17, 2 von März des Jahres 349; XVI, 10, Ian. 29 vom Jahr 399; zur Bewertung dieser Bauten als *ornamenta urbis* s. A. Geyer, *Ne ruinis urbis deformetur*. Ästhetische Kriterien in der spätantiken Baugesetzgebung: *Boreas* 16, 1993, 63-77; C. J. Goddard, The evolution of pagan sanctuaries in late antique Italy: M. Ghilardi, C. J. Goddard, P. Porena (Hrsg.), *Les cités d'Italie tardo antique (IVE-VIIe siècle)*, Rom 2006, 281-308; Bosman 2013, 77”.

Brandenburg's just-quoted statement opened the following questions:

1.) how could Maxentius have removed Domitian's obelisk from the Iseum Campense? - Provided it stood there at all;

2.) provided this sanctuary was still 'operating' as such at that time;

A 3.) problem lies in the fact that in the hieroglyphic texts of Domitian's obelisk no mention is made - as in such texts on other obelisks - where the obelisk had been erected in antiquity.

To begin with the second question posed above, we do not know precisely, until when the cult at the Iseum Campense survived. Still after the restoration in AD 195/196 or between 198 and 209 by Septimius Severus and Caracalla (cf. C. HÄUBER 2014a, 74 with n. 231 [a comparison of all Egyptian sanctuaries at Rome with each other]; 724), we have further information concerning its existence. Filippo Coarelli (1996, 107) writes: "Ulteriori restauri vennero forse realizzati da Settimio Severo e Caracalla (iscrizione letta, ma non trascritta: *NSc* 1925, 239; quoted *verbatim infra*, at *Appendix I.g.2.*) e da Alessandro Severo (*Hist. Aug. Alex.* 26.8). Il santuario è ancora menzionato in Porph. *Plot.* 10 e in Lyd. *mens.* 4.148". That is to say, the Iseum Campense is still mentioned by: Porphyry, *Vita Plotini* and Lydus, *De mensibus*.

Cf. Andrew Smith ("Porphyry (AD 234-c.[irca] 305), scholar, philosopher, and student of religions. He was born probably at Tyre; originally bore the Syrian name Malchus; studied under Cassius Longinus at Athens; became a devoted disciple of Plotinus with whom he studied in Rome [263-268 AD] ... ", in: *OCD*³ [1996] 1226. Cf. L. M. WHITBY: "Lydus, i.e. John the Lydian, civil servant at Constantinople and Greek author (AD 490-c.[irca] 560) ... *De mensibus* discusses the Roman calendar ...", in: *OCD*³ [1996] 899).

For the fact that the hieroglyphic texts of Domitian's obelisk do not contain, as other such texts, explicit indications to the location where this obelisk was erected, cf. **Katja Lembke** (1994b, 41 with n. 117):

"Keine Gründe für die Aufstellung werden dagegen auf dem römischen Obelisken angegeben [i.e., in the inscriptions, written in hieroglyphs on Domitian's obelisk; my emphasis]. Bei genauer Betrachtung ergeben sich allerdings einige Hinweise:

1. Auf der heutigen Westseite ist die Kindheit des Pharaos [i.e., of Domitian] geschildert, die mit der Inthronisation endet.

2. Mehrmals (Nord- und Ostseite) ist von der Krönung Domitians als Nachfolger Vespasians die Rede.

3. Das Pyramidion trägt auf allen Seiten eine Darstellung der Begegnung Domitians mit Göttern. Anhand der Attribute ist die Vermutung naheliegend, hierin eine Schilderung der Herrschaftsübergabe zu sehen".

Interesting in the context discussed here are also the following observations by Lemke (1994b, 212):

"Der Domitiansobelisk ist aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach zunächst im Iseum Campense aufgestellt worden. Folgende Argumente unterstützen diese Annahme:

1.) **In den Darstellungen auf dem Pyramidion wird jeweils Domitians enge Beziehung zu Isis thematisiert, die dem Princeps auf allen vier Seiten zugewendet ist, so daß die Errichtung in einem Heiligtum der ägyptischen Götter nahe liegt. Außerdem spricht die Inschrift der Nordseite von dem Wiederaufbau und der Erweiterung eines (oder mehrerer) Gebäude. Auch wenn konkrete Hinweise**

fehlen, kann man diese Aussage auf den Wiederaufbau des Iseum Campense nach dem Brand d. J. [des Jahres] 80 beziehen ... [my emphasis]".

Lembke (1994b, 40) has made, in addition to this, more important observations concerning the *pyramidion* of Domitian's obelisk:

"Nähere Aufschlüsse ermöglicht das Pyramidion. Auf den vier Seiten ist jeweils Domitian mit Herrscherinsignien in Begleitung zweier Götter dargestellt. **Vor ihm steht jedes Mal Isis**; weitere Götter sind Thot, Uto (?), Horus und Amun-Re. **Im Zentrum steht also Domitians enge Bindung an Isis. Außerdem aber tragen die Gottheiten Insignien, die auf ein konkretes Ereignis anspielen: die Inthronisation Domitians als ägyptischer Pharao.** Die verschiedenen Gesten und Symbole, die ihm die Götter überreichen (**w3ś**-Szepter, Kronen, Statuetten der Maat, Uräus), sind Teil des ägyptischen Herrscherbildes. Ebenfalls in diesen Kontext gehören die Kronen Domitians (Doppelkrone, Kompositkrone, **hprś**-Krone), die sowohl die Herrschaft von Ober- und Unterägypten als auch den göttlichen Aspekt des Königtums darstellen.

Wichtig ist in diesem Zusammenhang, daß nicht Pharao Domitian agiert und als Träger der Verantwortung für die irdische Gerechtigkeit den Göttern das Symbol der Maat übergibt, sondern als Empfänger göttlicher Gaben in Erscheinung tritt. Damit wird ihm [i.e., Domitian] die Ordnung gleichsam als Attribut verliehen und verliert ihren Aspekt als Leistung des Pharao. In Ägypten dagegen ``kann sich Ma'at aus eigener Kraft nicht halten und bedarf des Königs zu ihrer Fortsetzung. Nicht die Ma'at fundiert den Staat, sondern der Staat fundiert die Ma'at'' [with n. 113; my emphasis]".

In her **note 113**, Lembke writes: "J. Assmann, Ma'at (1990) 201. Ihm verdanke ich ebenfalls den Hinweis auf dieses Phänomen". - Cf. the comments by Häuber (2017, 166).

On the 4th of May 2018, I met again with Alessandro Roccati in Rome. This time we discussed the controversy concerning the context, for which Domitian had commissioned his obelisk, in addition to this I asked him, whether there is a chance to find out, when studying its hieroglyphic texts, for which context Domitian's obelisk had been made. He told me that the hieroglyphic inscriptions on obelisks actually always contain such information, which is why the Pamphili Obelisk, if indeed erected at the Iseum Campense, should contain clear hints at the goddess Isis. - A fact, although J.-C. Grenier (2009, 238), as well as Coarelli (2014, 205, both quoted *verbatim supra*, at IV.1.1.a)) have explicitly denied this, is actually the case, as other scholars have observed (cf. K. LEMBKE 1994b, 40-41, quoted *verbatim supra*. See also E.M. CIAMPINI 2004, 159, 165, H 30; *id.* 2005, 399-402, quoted *verbatim infra*, at IV.1.1.d)).

Roccati mentioned to me the relevant studies of the Egyptologist Emanuele Marcello Ciampini and kindly contacted him for me. Fortunately on 11th May 2018, I had also the chance to meet with Emanuele Ciampini himself in Rome. Personally I am unable to read hieroglyphs, and Ciampini was kind enough to present me with his book, in which he has translated these Egyptian texts of Domitian's Obelisk into Italian (cf. E.M. CIAMPINI 2004).

When I discussed my above-posed three questions (*i.e.*, 1.); 2.); 3.)) with Ciampini on 11th May 2018 in Rome, he was of the opinion that Maxentius, being after all the emperor, could anyway act in this respect as he wished, even provided the cult at the Iseum Campense was still performed at that stage. Also Hugo Brandenburg and Angelika Geyer, with whom I had the chance to discuss these questions on 13th May 2018 in Rome, were likewise of the opinion that Maxentius, who reigned from 306-312, did remove Domitian's obelisk to his *Villa* on the Via Appia. A fact, which, in Brandenburg's and Geyer's opinion does not preclude the assumption that originally this obelisk may have belonged to the Iseum Campense.

Concerning the fact that Maxentius had moved Domitian's obelisk to the *spina* of his *Circus* at his *Villa* on the Via Appia, we have *a*) the reports since the 15th century, that the obelisk was found there, and *b*) the actual proof of this tradition, since fragments of the *pyramidion* of this obelisk have been excavated on the *spina* of this *Circus* in 1960; cf. Pisani Sartorio (2006, 58, quoted *verbatim supra*, at IV.1.1.a)).

Cf. Ciampini (2004, 157: "**Osservazioni:** All'inizio del IV sec. l'obelisco venne rimosso dalla sua collocazione originaria per essere eretto nella Villa di Massenzio sull'Appia Antica; dove andò a decorare la spina del circo; da qui fu poi spostato nella sua attuale collocazione sulla fontana dei Quattro Fiumi per volontà del pontefice Innocenzo X (1648). Il monumento è attualmente privo della parte superiore del *pyramidion*, un suo frammento è conservato nel Museo Gregoriano Egizio. I testi furono redatti e incisi a Roma e costituiscono una notevole testimonianza dell'adozione, da parte di Domiziano, di culti egiziani" (the emphasis is that of the author).

Of a very different opinion was J.-C. Grenier (1996, 357):

"Nos sources ne mentionnent pas cet obélisque. Sa localisation première est problématique. **La tradition historiographique le situe dans l'espace séparant l'Iseum Campense du Sérapeum en le reconnaissant sur la FUR** [*i.e.*, the *Forma Urbis Romae*, meaning the Severan Marble Plan] (recomposition [V.] Lundström [1929]; cf. [G] Gatti [1943-44], 121) **dans le petit carré gravé au-dessus du deuxième A de SERAPAEV[M]**. Cette opinion se heurte à plusieurs objections. **L'ensemble voué par Domitien sur le Quirinal à la sacralisation de sa propre naissance et de sa famille (la *domus* et le *templum gentis Flaviae* ...) conviendrait mieux à la nature de cet obélisque** telle que la révèlent ses inscriptions; cela permettrait aussi de justifier le choix de Maxence qui fit transporter et ériger cet obélisque dans sa *villa* de la *via Appia* dont l'ensemble flavien du Quirinal semble constituer un lointain mais évident archétype idéologique (Grenier à paraître [*i.e.*, here J.-C. GRENIER 1999]) [my emphasis]".

To the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* I will come back below (cf. *infra*, at IV.1.1.h); and at V.1.i.3.a)).

Guglielmo Gatti (1943-1944, tav. 4 = here Fig. 78) has reconstructed the ancient topography of the central Campus Martius by integrating the relevant fragments of the Severan Marble Plan into the then current paper cadastre. On his relevant map appears the ground-plan of the *Iseum* and the *Serapeum* to the south of it (cf. here Fig. 78); between those two sanctuaries, the Severan Marble Plan shows a piazza. As Grenier (1996, 357) writes in the above quoted passage, it has been observed that on the Severan Marble Plan is marked a small square on this piazza, which has tentatively been identified by many scholars as the socle of Domitian's obelisk.

Fig. 78. G. Gatti, reconstruction of the Central Campus Martius, based on the fragments of the Severan Marble plan, with the *Iseum* and the *Serapeum* and the piazza in between them. G. Gatti (1943-1944, 121, tav. 4; after: *LTUR* 3 [1996] Fig. 69). Note that on Gatti's plan the sanctuary is labelled: ISEVM ET SERAPEVM, whereas on the Severan Marble Plan, the sanctuary is labelled: SERAPAEVM (cf. *LTUR* I [1993] Fig. 122a).

For Guglielmo Gatti's reconstruction of the central Campus Martius, comprising the *Iseum* and of the *Serapeum* and the piazza in between them; cf. Gatti (1943-1944, 121, Fig. 12, tav. 4 = here Fig. 78). The correctness of Gatti's entire reconstruction of the central *Campus Martius* has been challenged by Alessandra Ten (2015), whereas I myself have confirmed Gatti's reconstruction; cf. Häuber (2017, 133-134, 141-144, 203-218); this was followed by Alexander Heinemann (2018, 221 with n. 31).

Gatti's reconstruction shows that on the Severan Marble plan there is marked a small square on the piazza between his *Iseum* and his *Serapeum*, which also in my opinion represents the socle of Domitian's obelisk. This assumption has been rejected by Grenier (1996, 357, quoted above, and in *id.* 2009, 238, quoted *verbatim supra*, at IV.1.1.a), and most recently by Filippo Coarelli (2019b, 74 with n. 55):

"Al centro dell'area [*i.e.*, on the piazza of the Iseum Campense] sono indicate due piccole costruzioni, di pianta rispettivamente circolare e quadrata: nella prima si è identificata una fontana (in cui poteva essere collocata la grande pigna bronzea vaticana, che proviene da questa zona); nella seconda la base di un obelisco, correntemente identificato (ma certamente a torto) con quello Panfilio di Piazza Navona [with n. 55; my emphasis]".

In his note 55, Coarelli writes: "Iversen 1968, pp. 78-80. Alcuni autori accettano ancora questa identificazione, ormai definitivamente confutata da J.-C. Grenier (Grenier 1996). È importante anche segnalare a questo proposito che nel breviarium dei Cataloghi regionali (Nordh 1949, pp. 57 s.), dove sono segnalati tutti gli obelischi maggiori (5 nella Notitia, 6 nel Curiosum, evidentemente redatto dopo il 354, data della sistemazione nel Circo Massimo dell'obelisco lateranense [cf. here Fig. 101]) non ne è menzionato nessuno nell'Iseo campense [my emphasis]". - This was already quoted *supra*, at II.3.1.d); VII.

Because the Emperor Maxentius reigned from AD 306-312, and we know that he had ordered the transportation of Domitian's obelisk to his *Villa* on the Via Appia, where it was erected in his lifetime on the *spina* of his *Circus* (cf. *supra*, at IV.1.1.a)), it is quite understandable that no obelisk is mentioned in this list for the Iseum Campense, which was compiled after AD 354', as Coarelli observes. - Besides, as I hope to demonstrate in this chapter IV., contrary to what Coarelli (*op.cit.*) asserts, Domitian had certainly commissioned his obelisk (cf. here Fig. 28) for the Iseum Campense.

Cf. R.P. Davis: "Maxentius (*RE* 1), Marcus Aurelius Valerius (b.[orn] c.[irca] AD 283), son of Maximian ... Constantine ... (312) ... marched on Rome and defeated Maxentius's forces ... at Saxa Rubra; Maxentius was drowned near the Mulvian bridge ...", in: *OCD*³ (1996) 940. Cf. Häuber (2017, 161).

For the history of the Obeliscus Lateranense (cf. here Fig. 101) in Roman times; cf. Häuber (2017, 113 with n. 64, pp. 162, 424, n. 214, pp. 427-428 [on p. 427 is stated that the Lateran Obelisk was brought by Constantius II 'before AD 357 to Rome'; cf. p. 162, quoted *verbatim supra*, at II.3.1.d); VII.], Fig. 5,1). As we have seen above, Filippo Coarelli (2019b, 74 with n. 55) writes that the Lateran Obelisk was erected in the *Circus Maximus* in AD 354.

As already mentioned, others suggest that the Lateran Obelisk (cf. here Fig. 101) was erected in the *Circus Maximus* in AD 357 instead. Cf. *infra*, at A Study on the colossal portrait of Hadrian (now Constantine the Great) in the courtyard of the Palazzo dei Conservatori at Rome (cf. here Fig. 11). With The Contribution by Hans Rupprecht Goette; II. *La Marmorata*. With discussions of the 'Porticus Aemilia' (in reality identifiable as Navalvia) and of the Horrea Aemilia.

I have intentionally not drawn this incised small square, which the Severan Marble Plan marks on the piazza in the Iseum Campense, in my own maps (cf. here Figs. 59; 60), given the fact that we integrate into our maps only features, whose nature, location, and dimensions are precisely known, information, which in the case of this cartographic detail is unfortunately lacking.

In the course of the discussion with Ciampini on 11th May 2018, and by looking at my map of the Iseum Campense (cf. here **Fig. 60**), I mentioned to Ciampini also the 'new' ancient road, that I could integrate into my maps of the area.

Cf. Häuber (2017, 144-145, Chapter: 'A "new" ancient road, the "Via Petrarca"/ Clivus Salutis?, the Sepulcrum of the Sepronii, the villa or horti of Scipio Africanus maior on the Collis Latiaris, and the consular auspices taken there, which preceded the elections at the Saepta'. See also **Fig. 60**, labels: ISEUM; SERAPEUM; Arco di Camilliano; "VIA PETRARCA"/ CLIVUS SALUTIS ?).

Already Ferdinando Castagnoli (1985, 319 n. 22) and Carla Alfano (1992, 11 with ns. 3, 4) had discussed this road, but it had not been mapped so far, although great parts of it have been excavated. It was described by Petrarca (20.7.1304-18.7.1374), which is why I have called it "Via Petrarca" on my maps. This road, as the poet tells us, led from the Quirinal to the Tiber, passing through the Arco di Camilliano to the east of the Iseum Campense, as Petrarca explicitly wrote, and therefore certainly between the areas of the former ancient temples of Isis and Serapis. Alfano (*op.cit.*) has therefore convincingly suggested that this road was older than both temples and that its existence was the reason why these two 'halves' of the same sanctuary are divided by this piazza. If so, it follows, that this piazza was a public square. - To the Arco di Camilliano I will come back below (cf. *infra*, at IV.1.1.g)).

Alfano (1992, 11 with ns. 3, 4) does not discuss the hypothesis of Anne Roulet (1972, 27, Fig. 352), which I find equally convincing. According to Roulet (*op.cit.*), the two 'halves' of the Iseum Campense - Iseum in the north and Serapeum in the south - may not be explained by the pre-existing "Via Petrarca", as I assume here, following Alfano. Roulet (1972, 27) rather argues that the architects of the Iseum Campense followed a typology that was typical of such sanctuaries; she observes for example that the sanctuary at Memphis has a similar hemicycle (as the Serapeum at the Iseum Campense), and that the Serapeum C at Delos has such a "central courtyard"; cf. Roulet (1972, 25 with n. 7, Fig. 350, p. 27). Roulet's relevant observations have been followed by Coarelli (2019b, 76 with n. 58, Fig. 16).

IV.1.1.d) E.M. Ciampini (2005) has observed that the contents of the hieroglyphic inscriptions and of the representations on the pyramidion of Domitian's obelisk (cf. here Fig. 28) are closely related to the structures called *mammisis* in Egypt. The (new) king of Egypt was legitimized by the 'royal rituals', which were performed there and elsewhere. With the article of Emanuele M. Ciampini (2005) and his first Contribution to this volume

Given the fact that the hieroglyphic inscriptions of Domitian's obelisk (cf. *supra*, at IV.1.1.a)) mention, as we have seen above, **a**) the goddess Isis and her close relationship to Domitian, and **b**) the birth of the divine child Domitian and his coronation as pharaoh, I asked Emanuele Ciampini, whether or not that could be compared with the famous rituals connected with buildings called *mammisis* ('birthhouses of the king') in Egypt.

The only publication on ">>the house of birth<< (*mammisi*)" (so J.-C. GOYON 1988, 33), known to me, that made me ask Ciampini this question, is that by Jean-Claude Goyon (1988, 32-37) which will be quoted below (cf. *infra*, at IV.1.1.e)).

"Certo", Ciampini replied, adding to this that he himself had made this observation long ago, and that he has also published it (cf. E.M. CIAMPINI 2005), namely that the scenes on the *pyramidion* of Domitian's Obelisk, as well as sections of its hieroglyphic texts contain contents that clearly relate to the ceremonies performed at *mammisis* and elsewhere (*i.e.*, the 'royal rituals') and thus to the legitimation of the (new) king. After our discussion, Ciampini has sent me this article.

Emanuele M. Ciampini (2005, 399-402, in his article "The Pamphili Obelisk: Two Notes on Pharaonic Elements in Domitian Ideology") writes:

"Religious elements are clear evidence of relations between Rome and Egypt; in the first century B. C., the Iseum Campense became the greatest temple dedicated to Isis outside the land of the Nile, decorated with statues and material brought from ancient towns such as Heliopolis and Sais. In addition to genuine Egyptian materials, we find also a monument like the obelisk Pamphili or Pamphilius [with n. 1], whose texts have been composed in Rome from Egyptians who were still able to express the forms of pharaonic semantic [with n. 2].

Divine mothers of Domitian

Like pharaonic ones, the Pamphili Obelisk celebrates Domitian as the legitimate pharaoh, son of deities to whom the monument was dedicated. The inscriptions show the Emperor as son of the solar deities, such as Rê-Harakhti, while a female role is played by goddesses like Isis, Hathor, Wadjet, Mut, and Nekhbet. The same we find on the pyramidion [with n. 3], the power and the divine nature of the pharaoh as child-god was embodied in it, showing in this way the deep relation between Roman and Ptolemaic ideology.

The role of the goddesses is pointed out by an inscription which states: "The two Ladies (Uadjet and Nekhbet, patronesses of Lower and Upper Egypt) give their breast to his (Domitian's) mouth, the two Nurses are on his bands, and the Hathors play the tambourine around him. It is given to him the great duty (the kingship) that the Lady of mankind (Hathor) has created, while her ureus is on her head [with n. 4]. Here are stressed some key-figures for kingship: at first Isis as actress in the myth of Osiris, whose death is a topic in the growth of royal models and for the unity of the country, as shown by Graeco-Roman tradition in which the relics of the god are buried in the 42 Egyptian districts [with n. 5]; then her role can be related with the transmission of father's power to his son Horus. In the text it can be noted that a group of goddesses are related to the legitimation of the king: Hathor, Mut and above all Nekhbet and Uadjet are expression[s] of kingship which is the focus of *mammisis*, the structure where, since the Late Period, the king [was] born as a son of the divine couple, or as the son of the great goddess.

This role of some goddesses as mothers of the king is a late theology elaboration, whose growth can be dated to the Ptolemaic period, even if its origin is surely earlier (see below); some texts of *mammisis* show such a situation, the structure of the birth in Dendera, where the dynastic deities Nekhbet and Uadjet are at both sides of Isis nursing the king. Here the divine mother [*i.e.*, Isis] says: "I suckle my baby, in order that he would vindicate his father; I nourish him as king, son of the king of Lower and Upper Egypt" [with n. 6]; Uadjet answers to her, [page 400] "I am the beautiful nurse of the fair baby, the nurse of the august child; I am behind you (Isis), embracing your body", while Nekhbet states, "I am the beautiful nurse who suckles her son without being tired, day and night" [with n. 7].

This scene is flanked by the solar god, Rê-Harakhti who gives a palm-branch to the child suckled by Hathor, saying, "I establish to you (Hathor?) endless jubilees, for hundreds of thousands of cycle of solar disc", and Hathor answers, "Oh Rê-Harakhti, I have nursed your heir as beautiful child, I renew him as your majesty" [with n. 8].

Here we find the same actors of the Domitian[ic] text, and we have to note the figure of Rê-Harakhti who plays a central role in the legitimation of the Emperor.

Graeco-Roman tradition about divine mothers can be traced back to the New Kingdom, when the mature state was able to create a complex model of legitimization. **During the Eighteenth Dynasty a mythological elaboration was composed about the Divine Birth of the Pharaoh:** in the funerary temple of queen Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari (west Thebes) and in the temple of Luqsor, dated to Amenhotep III, scenes and texts describe the divine origin of the king who is son of the Theban god Amon-Rê, lord of the Karnak temple and chief of the gods.

This myth is an elaboration of Theban theologians who created a narration in which, through different episodes (Amon-Rê decides to have a son, his incarnation as human father of [the] king, conception and birth of pharaoh), the ideology stresses the legitimization of the living ruler. With Amon-Rê, many gods act in the choral narration elaborated by the Theban clergy; among them we note **the couple**

Uadjet and Nekhbet, dynastic patronesses and mothers of the king who confirm his power by means of milk: with it they suckle the young king, giving to him the divine nature of ruler; at the same time their milk is a topic in the resurrection of the dead pharaoh since the Pyramids Texts (third millenium B.C.) [with n. 9]. Thus suckling is an expression of the royalty of the triumphant king [with n. 10].

In the Amenhotep III version of the Divine Birth (Luq̄sor temple) the king is nursed by two cows that say: "We nourish you as king of Upper and Lower Egypt, you being alive and your heart happy on the throne of Horus; may you conduct the livings and rule over the two lands in triumph, like Rê for ever" [with note 11]. **In the southern rooms of the same temple, Amenhotep III is followed by two goddesses, the first is Mut, while the name of the second, now destroyed, can be reconstructed by a fragmentary epithet as Wadjet** [with n. 12]; according to the text, they give to him access in the temple of father Amon and endless years. **Thus, it is confirmed the divine nature of kingship, related with the deities who symbolize here the two halves of the country.**

The "ka" called Flavii

Kingship's legitimization is a topic in the Pamphili Obelisk, becoming part of the propaganda relating to the predestination of the Emperor. This aspect, whose echo seems [to be] recognizable in the coronation ritual just exposed, is joint with patterns of an ancient royal tradition; in it the power of the king comes from the divine father and from that element which embodies the abstract concept of kingship. The texts call this personification "royal ka", [the] expression of pharaoh's legitimization since his birth. This doctrine can be traced back at least to the XVIII [th] dynasty, when Theban kings stressed the relationship with their father Amon-Rê, as shown in the Divine Birth [*i.e.*, the *mammisi*] just noted. This conception is the core of the decoration of [the] Luq̄sor temple, which can be considered a kingship's shrine. The renewal and legitimization of royal power was described in the decoration of the temple dated to Amenhotep III; during the ritual the union of the king with his "royal ka" who ties the living ruler with his ancestors; in them the Egyptian tradition saw the royal past of the present king, as shown in the funerary ritual performed [page 401] in honour of ancient pharaohs. **Past and present of kingship are identified with Osiris, which is the dead king, and Rê-Harakhti, the solar deity as expression of living power grown up by ancestors. With the accession to the throne, the human pharaoh becomes the temporary incarnation of an eternal concept; owning the "royal ka", he is legitimated as king of Lower and Upper Egypt, son of the Creator god** [with n. 13].

Echoes of these conceptions seem to be heard on the monument of Domitian [*i.e.*, Domitian's Obelisk], on which we read: "he has raised up this obelisk in true granit [!] for his father Rê-Harakhti, so that mankind can see the monument made, and the names of kings of Lower and Upper Egypt who were on the throne of Horus could be established, and the world could be healthy at the time of that dynasty whose name is Flavi" [with n. 14], while another text evidences the relations of Domitian with his ancestors: "he takes the kingship from his father Vespasian the god and from his brother Titus the god" [with n. 15]. Both sentences tie the living ruler with the ancient kings of Lower and Upper Egypt, and with the father and brother who had taken the imperial power before him; in this doctrine the sun god Rê-Harakhti plays the role of the kingship's source, the same we have just noted in one scene of the *mammisis* in Dendera (see above).

All these elements are grouped on an obelisk, that is a monument which since the third millenium B.C. celebrates the bond of pharaoh with the solar god; thus the obelisk confirms the power of Domitian as pharaoh and ruler of the whole Empire. In the first century propaganda, Egyptian patterns can be used in imperial ideology, becoming part of a wider program in which old elements are transformed according to the necessities of specific forms of kingship.

Such a situation makes the Egyptianizing tendencies of the Emperor a coherent expression of pharaonic ideology in the inscriptions of the obelisk: Domitian uses a classical phraseology with some lexicographical nuances, which stress this attitude, such as the pharaonic titulary. Indeed, he [*i.e.*, Domitian] is one of the few Roman emperors to have the complete series of five names; but it is striking that his whole pharaonic titulary is attested only on Italian obelisks (Rome and Benevent) [with n. 16].

One of the texts just noted makes a clear connection among monuments, ancient kings of Lower and Upper Egypt, and the Flavii dynasty; thus the obelisk is conceived as something which renders the names of

the Emperor everlasting, creating a strong connection between past and present, which is the pharaonic model of divine rule and the Domitian[ic] power which is extended over the world. Also noteworthy is the particular use of the word "ka", which has been noted to play a central role in the royal doctrine; according to the late use of the Egyptian language, it can be considered a synonym for "name" [with n. 17], and the text of Domitian shows clearly its correspondence with "gens", a concept in which the relation of a single with his family group is expressed.

This particular use of the word covers two different semantic fields: on the one hand it is related to the family's name, and more generally, with the ancestors of the living ruler; on the other hand, it can denote the same family, that is the "gens", in which it may be reflected the Egyptian concept of kingship. The mention of Vespasian and Titus in the last text [*i.e.*, on the fourth side of Domitian's obelisk] may offer an element of Roman interpretation of the Egyptian royalty; the origin of Domitian's power, according to this inscription, is the kingship of the imperial ancestors who were the owners of a divine authority before him. The superhuman nature of the Emperor is stressed by the epithet "the god" which follows the names of Vespasian and Titus; the divine kingship, embodied by the living pharaoh, makes him after the death a form of solar god [with n. 18].

The legitimization in Domitian's inscriptions uses an imperial interpretation of pharaonic elements; we have just seen the use of the term "ka" which expresses the core of the divine kingship, but the same can be said for another Egyptian pattern. In the royal funerary belief of the New Kingdom the ka of the father is shown introducing the dead king to the deities: in the tomb of Amenhotep III (valley of the kings, Thebes west) the "royal ka" of the king's father Thutmose IV is depicted with the son, greeted by the sky-goddess Nut [with n. 19] [page 402]; in this situation we find the elements noted in the ideology of Domitian, that is the ruler and the ancestor who gives him the power and the legitimization as heir [with n. 20].

The attitude of Domitian toward Egyptian traditions may reflect the diffusion of Isiac cult in the Empire; at the same time, his legitimization uses phraseology partially coherent with ancient forms, as shown by the central role of Isis and other divine mothers [with n. 21]. The use of Egyptian models could be related with the growth of a pharaonic titulary of the Roman rulers, as shown since Augustus, when the royal Egyptian names used to be considered a way to express the role of the Emperor as manifestation of the supreme power (see the use of Autokrator in the so-called coronation name) [with n. 22]. **The divine nature of the Emperor is celebrated in the Egyptian temples where he is an image of the gods [with n. 23]; however, we have to note that the imperial ideology in Egypt has particular forms; evidence of this can be recognized in the chapel of the imperial insignia installed in the Luqсор temple, the same which we have just seen as kingship shrine of the New Kingdom [with n. 24]. In the roman interpretation which stresses the divine nature of the ruler, we note the ideological elaboration of Domitian: in using ancient forms of legitimization, the Emperor chose to raise up a single obelisk, celebrating in this way his divine nature according to pharaonic patterns [with n. 25; my emphasis].**

In his **notes**, Ciampini writes:

- 1 K. Lembke, *Das Iseum Campense. Studien über den Isiskult unter Domitian. Archäologie und Geschichte*, Band 3 (Heidelberg 1994) 20-21.
- 2 Texts: J.-Cl. Grenier, *Les Inscriptions hiéroglyphiques de l'Obélisque Pamphili, Un témoignage méconnu sur l'avènement de Domitien. Mélanges de l'École Française de Rome - Antiquité. Tome 99.2, 1987, 93-961. - Lembke (note 1) 210-215 (55) Taf.15-17. - E.M. Ciampini, *Gli obelischi iscritti di Roma. (Rome 2004).**
- 3 Grenier (note 2) 958 n.40.
- 4 Grenier (note 2) 945; Ciampini (note 2) 167.
- 5 H. Beinlich, *Die Osirisreliquien. Zum Motiv der Körperzergliederung in der altägyptischen Religion. Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 42 (Wiesbaden 1984).*
- 6 Fr. Daumas, *Les Mammisis de Dendera (Le Caire 1959) 128 (10-11) pl. LX, II.*
- 7 Daumas (note 6) 128 (12-13; 14-15).
- 8 Daumas (note 6) 128 (3-4; 7-8) pl. LX, I.
- 9 For the royal suckling see W. Seipel, *Säugen*. In: W. Helck/W. Westendorf (Hrsg.), *Lexikon der Ägyptologie V (Wiesbaden 1987) 340.*

- 10 J. Leclant, Sur un contrepoids de menat au nom de Taharqa. Allaitement et 'apparition' royale. In: *Mélanges Mariette. Bibliothèque d'Étude* 32 (Le Caire 1961) 263–266.
- 11 H. Brunner, Die Geburt des Gottkönigs. Studien zur Überlieferung eines altägyptischen Mythos. *Ägyptologische Abhandlungen* 10 (Wiesbaden 1964) 30 (text XII Lc; scene 12) and note (a). A similar scene can be recognized in Graeco-roman mammisis: Daumas (note 6) 6 (12–13; 14–15); the cows are here identified with Hesat and Sekhather.
- 12 H. Brunner, Die südlichen Räume des Tempels von Luxor. Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Abteilung Kairo – Archäologische Veröffentlichungen 18 (Mainz am Rhein 1977) 44 Taf. 74 (scene XVIII, 37).
- 13 On [the] meaning of [the] «royal ka» in the Egyptian doctrine of the New Kingdom see L. Bell, The New Kingdom «Divine» Temple: the example of Luxor. In: B.E. Schafer (Hrsg.), *Temples of Ancient Egypt* (London, New York 1997) 137–144.
- 14 Grenier (note 2) 939.
- 15 Grenier (note 2) 943.
- 16 J.-Cl. Grenier, Le protocole pharaonique des empereurs romains. Analyse formelle et signification historique. In: *Revue d'Égyptologie* 38, 1987, 82 note 2.
- 17 P. Wilson, A Ptolemaic Lexicon. A Lexicographical Study of the Texts in the Temple of Edfu. *Orientalia Lovanensia Analecta* 78 (Leuven 1997) 1079; it is to note here that the «ka» is related with the royal name since the New Kingdom texts; the ambivalence seems to be often conscious in ptolemaic period.
- 18 Bell (note 13) 144.
- 19 E. Hornung, *Tal der Könige. Die Ruhestätte der Pharaonen* (Zürich, München 1982) 14.
- 20 It is to note that legitimation and condition of heir are the focus even in the Osirian succession, see above.
- 21 L. Kákosy, Probleme der Religion im römerzeitlichen Ägypten. In: W. Haase/H. Temporini (Hrsg.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt. Teil II: Principat. Band 18 Religion - 5. Teilband* (Berlin, New York 1995) 1915–1916. - G. Hölbl, *Altägypten in Römischen Reich. Der Römische Pharao und seine Tempel I. Römische Politik und altägyptische Ideologie von Augustus bis Diocletian, Tempelbau im Oberägypten* (Mainz am Rhein 2000) 35.
- 22 J.-Cl. Grenier, Traditions pharaoniques et réalités impériales: le nom de couronnement du Pharaon à l'époque romaine. In: L. Criscuolo/G. Geraci (Hrsg.), *Egitto e Storia antica dall'ellenismo all'età araba. Bilancio di un confronto. Atti del Colloquio Internazionale. Bologna 31 agosto - 2 settembre 1987* (Bologna 1989) 403-420.
- 23 See his connection with apotropaic deities such as Tutu: D. Frankfurter, *Religion in Roman Egypt. Assimilation and Resistance* (Princeton 1998) 120.
- 24 M. el-Saghir/Cl. Galvin/M. Reddé/H. el-Sayed/G. Wegner, Le champ romain de Louqsor (avec une étude des graffites gréco-romains du Temple d'Amon). *Mémoires de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 83 (Le Caire 1986) 31.
- 25 For the original position of [the] obelisk in the temple see Lembke (note 1) 25 (plan). On the theological implications of a single obelisk see now L. Bell, *Divine Kingship and the Theology of the Obelisk Cult in the Temples of Thebes*. In: H. Beinlich/Arno Egberts/R. Gundlach/D. Kurth/St. Wenig (Hrsg.), *5. Ägyptologische Tempeltagung. Würzburg, 23.–26. September 1999. Ägypten und Altes Testament* 33.3 (Wiesbaden 2002) 17–46.

Emanuele Ciampini

Università Cà Foscari, Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità e del Vicino Oriente,
Sezione di Archeologia, Palazzo Bernardo, S. Polo 1977, I-30125 – Venezia.

To the following passage of Ciampini's (2005, 400) above-quoted text, I should like to add a comment:

"The "ka" called Flavii

Kingship's legitimization is a topic in the Pamphili Obelisk, becoming part of the propaganda relating to the predestination of the Emperor. This aspect, whose echo seems [to be] recognizable in the coronation ritual just exposed ...".

Since I had not understood, why the text immediately preceding this section could possibly refer to a "coronation ritual", I asked Ciampini for advice. He kindly explained to me that in the just-quoted passage, he referred back to the paragraphs before, in which the goddesses are suckling the king: *this* is the allusion to the coronation ritual.

The relevant passages in Ciampini (2005, 400 with ns. 9, 11) read: "During the Eighteenth Dynasty a mythological elaboration was composed about the Divine Birth of the Pharaoh ... This myth is an elaboration of Theban theologians who created a narration in which ... (Amon-Rê decides to have a son, his incarnation as human father of [the] king, conception and birth of pharaoh), the ideology stresses the legitimization of the living ruler. With Amon-Rê, many gods act in the choral narration elaborated by the Theban clergy; among them we note the couple Uadjet and Nekhbet, dynastic patronesses and mothers of the king who confirm his power by means of milk: with it they suckle the young king, giving to him the divine nature of ruler ... In the Amenhotep III version of the Divine Birth (Luqsor temple) the king is nursed by two cows that say, "We nourish you as king of Upper and Lower Egypt, you being alive and your heart happy on the throne of Horus; may you conduct the livings and rule over the two lands in triumph, like Rê for ever".

Only after having written this section, did I find that also the Egyptologist Giuseppina Capriotti Vittozzi (2013, 101, in her Chapter: "Aspetti egizi dell'immagine imperiale") has addressed this specific feature in the hieroglyphic texts of Domitian's obelisk (cf. here Fig. 28):

"Particolare interesse riveste un frammento, oggi al Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Firenze [with n. 3], ritrovato nell'area dell'Iseo Campense, raffigurante il sovrano allattato dalla vacca divina (fig. 47): questa immagine, tradizionale in Egitto, introdusse a Roma un aspetto peculiare della regalità divina faraonica, riecheggiando rituali tipici dell'incoronazione, come appunto l'allattamento da parte della dea a segnare la nascita del sovrano alla nuova vita regale: questo tema trova corrispondenza nell'obelisco di Domiziano [with n. 4] (fig. 48) ".

In her **note 3**, Capriotti Vittozzi writes: "Inv. 5419. Lembke 1994a [*i.e.*, here K. LEMBKE 1994b], 227-228 [Kat. E "18. Hathorhuh mit säugendem Haremhab (Taf. 36) ... Datierung: Neues Reich, 18. Dynastie, Haremhab (1333-1306 v. Chr.)]".

In her **note 4**, she writes: "Cap. 15.3".

Capriotti Vittozzi (2013, 162 in her Chapter: "15.3. L'obelisco di Domiziano") writes:

"Inoltre, come sottolineato da E.M. Ciampini [with n. 24], l'identità faraonica di Domiziano è espressa attraverso le scene del *pyramidion*, dove si definisce la sua nascita divina, grazie alla presenza di divinità femminili, mentre il testo parla dell'allattamento divino, un passaggio ben conosciuto nei riti di incoronazione [with n. 25]".

In her **note 24**, Capriotti Vittozzi writes: Ciampini 2005".

In her **note 25**, she writes: Leclant 1959 e Leclant 1960".

Cf. Capriotti Vittozzi (2013, 127, in her Chapter: "I luoghi `egizi` di Roma"):

"Altre interessanti considerazioni riguardano il ruolo di Iside nell'obelisco di Domiziano, la quale appare come elargitrice di regalità e, in tal senso, in relazione con Ptah [with n. 11]: ciò lascia intravedere una precisa

citazione dell'ambiente menfita, che peraltro era l'antica capitale dove avveniva tradizionalmente l'incoronazione".

In her **note 11**, Capriotti Vittozzi writes: "Ciampini 2004, 165".

Capriotti Vittozzi (2013) discusses Domitian's obelisk also on pp. 41, 86, 87, 93-94, 99, 112, 113, 161-162, 167.

See also Capriotti Vittozzi (2014, 243-246, with ns. 26-36, Fig. 10.2), where she *inter alia* summarizes Ciampini's above quoted article of 2005.

Capriotti Vittozzi (2014, 245) writes:

"... The divine descent of the Pharaoh [*i.e.*, of Domitian] is identified in connection to (the royal status of) Vespasian and Titus [with n. 26]. In addition, the divine birth of Domitian is expressed by the presence of maternal divinities (including Isis) in both the text and the images of the *pyramidion*. In his turn E. Ciampini has noted the relationships between the role of the goddesses on the obelisk of Domitian and Ptolemaic texts, in particular those from the *mammisi* at Dendera [with n. 27]. The scene of divine breastfeeding, described in the text on the obelisk [with n. 28], is closely associated with royalty, not only in regard to the divine birth, but also in regard to its role in the coronation rites [with n. 29]. The attention paid on the obelisk to the royal status of Domitian and his predecessors, expressed according to tradition but in a rather unusual way, can also be noted in the particular choice to designate the *gens* of the Emperor with the Egyptian term *ka* [with n. 30]".

In her **note 26**, Capriotti Vittozzi writes: "Grenier ... [*i.e.*, here J.-C. GRENIER 1987], 949. The scholar recognises [!] an explicit mention of specific dynastic events".

In her **note 27**, she writes: "Ciampini ... [*i.e.*, here E.M. CIAMPINI 2005] 399-400".

In her **note 28**, she writes: "Grenier ... [*i.e.*, here J.-C. GRENIER 1987], 945, Ciampini ... [*i.e.*, here E.M. CIAMPINI 2004], 167 (H.32)".

In her **note 29**, she writes: "J. Leclant ... [*i.e.*, here J. LECLANT 1951] 123-127; id. ... [*i.e.*, here J. LECLANT 1959], 69-71, Id. ... [*i.e.*, here J. LECLANT 1960] 135-145, Id. ... [*i.e.*, here J. LECLANT 1961] 251-284".

In her **note 30**, she writes: "Grenier ... [*i.e.*, here J.-C. GRENIER 1987], 939, "Ciampini ... [*i.e.*, here E.M. CIAMPINI 2005] 400-402".

In his first Contribution to this volume ("La regalità domiziana: una nota egittologica"), Ciampini deals in more detail with the subject 'legitimation of the (new) king', which is discussed in three passages of the hieroglyphic texts of Domitian's obelisk that are already mentioned in his above quoted article of 2005.

The 'royal rituals', described by Ciampini (2005), which the priests began in the structures called *mammisis* by the enactment of the birth of the divine child (*i.e.*, the new king), culminated in the coronation of the (new) pharaoh that occurred at the festival of Egyptian New Year. Those rituals were performed every year; in those years, in which not a new pharaoh was crowned, they served the reigning king as "the repeated confirmation of his royal power"; cf. Jean-Claude Goyon (1988, 33; cf. *infra*, at IV.1.1.e). And Emanuele M. Ciampini refers to such a ceremony as "rituale di conferma del potere regale alla Festa del Nuovo Anno"; cf. *The first Contribution by Emanuele M. Ciampini* in this volume: *La regalità domiziana: una nota egittologica*.

For the 'royal rituals', cf. also *infra*, at IV.1.1.e), and at *Appendix II. Again on the Egyptianizing marble relief allegedly from Ariccia at the Museo Nazionale Romano, Palazzo Altemps* (Fig. 111) - a representation of the Egyptian festival of New Year?

IV.1.1.e) J.-C. Goyon (1988) on the 'royal rituals', performed at the structures called *mammisis*, and P.G.P. Meyboom (2016) on the festivals connected with the Nile flood and on the 'royal rituals' at the festival of New Year

Fig. 79. Drawings after scenes in structures called *mammisis* ('house of birth') in Egypt. From: J.-C. Goyon (1988, 34-35, Figs. 8-10; drawings).

The caption of his Fig. 8 in J.-C. Goyon (1988, 34) reads: "A scene from the *mammisi* at Philae. Here the divine child is nursed, modeled by the god Khnum, given years of life by the god Thoth, and, at the right, offered a pectoral by Augustus in his role as pharaoh. (Adapted from Champollion 1935: pl. LXXVI, 1)".

The caption of his Fig. 9 in J.-C. Goyon (1988, 35) reads: "The birth of the child-god Harpre ('Horus-the-Son') before Amun-Re, the goddess Nekhbet, and Cleopatra VII. The winged scarab above the child is identified as the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, the solar god Khepri, who appears each morning and is identified with Harpre, the son of Amun. The scene is from the destroyed *mammisi* of Armant. (Adapted from Lepsius 1849-59, pt. IV: pl. 60, a)".

The caption of his Fig. 10 in J.-C. Goyon (1988, 35) reads: "Divine nurses from the destroyed *mammisi* of Armant. (Adapted from Lepsius 1849-59, pt. IV: pl. 59, c)".

The caption of his Fig. 12 in J.-C. Goyon (1988, 37) reads: "Procession from the Temple of Horus at Edfu. The train of priests, led by the pharaoh, carries divine images of the Living Falcon and the falcon-headed Horakhty ("Horus-of-the-Two-Horizons"). (Adapted from Chassinat 1960b: pl. CLIV)".

Jean Claude Goyon (1988, 32-33) writes:

"Horus-King and the Triumph of the Falcon King"

The adaptation of the sacerdotal functions that had already been germinating, as we have just seen, toward the end of the first millennium at Thebes, was to become the rule in Ptolemaic temples. Thus it is that at Edfu, for example, at the time of the great annual ceremonies, where the titular royal person (a Ptolemy whose throne name we know and whose effigy we may have on coins, but who never ventured, so deep into the south) would traditionally have presided and conducted the holy office, a sacerdotal delegate, often the local high priest, took the place of the sovereign and assumed the rank and function of "Priest of the King". This indicates even more clearly the transformation that had taken place in the theological expression of the royal function, although formal appearances were scrupulously kept up in the temple reliefs. There the only names mentioned or images depicted are those of the ruling king, of divine pedigree, who had been crowned King of Egypt in Memphis. We have seen above that the pharaoh-Horus, embodying the principle of the maintenance of Ma'at, was recognized and universally accepted, whatever his name, not because of who he was but for the sake of the fundamental principle of social harmony. By stressing this idea and making use of the imagery of Horus, a vehicle at once of the divine (son of Osiris) and the royal (pharaoh, "Horus of the Living", Horus of Gold"), the priests of the third century B. C. concentrated in the representation of the Falcon of Horus and its Living Image, the Sacred Falcon, all the properties inherent in the concept of pharaonic royalty; that is, **the intrinsic association described above between Power and the Sacred**. While the Delta was becoming Hellenized, the South was revitalizing the royal elements of the Heliopolitan doctrine in order to give them a liturgical vigor never before attained.

The walls of the Ptolemaic temples of Edfu and Philae have preserved almost completely the reliefs and texts of the great royal liturgies celebrated in honour of the Living Image, the Living Falcon or the "Animal Sacred to Horakhty". The Living Raptor, whom the vital energy of the great solar king Horus

animated, was chosen from among all those of his species housed in the aviary of the temple, and during his lifetime was the incarnate Horus and the earthly royal principle. All the solemn liturgies of the annual royal cycle, celebrated on the day forecast by the calendar of festival (based on an ancient Heliopolitan model), associated the living Sacred Falcon with the statue of the god-king in the temple.

Thus, around the second century B.C., when the construction of the royal temples of the South was practically finished - and in a region completely cut off from the turbulent political world of the distant Ptolemies of Alexandria the ceremonies of the royal cult, the annual highpoints of the exaltation of the monarchic principle, unrolled in their entirety within the walls of the temple, away from impure contact with the profane world. Only the final phase of the great festivities of the cycle of renewal of royal power at the New Year brought to the people the glorious sight of their god-king.

The cycle harmonized with the astral year; the rites were integrated with the cosmic rhythms and their symbolism was inspired by those rhythms. Weaving their way to the calendar, the rites celebrated the essential acts and events of the endlessly renewed life of the king of the world. The liturgical dramas devoted to the divine birth of Horus-king, to his coronation, his accession, then to the repeated confirmation of his royal power (assuring the perennial nature of the reign) made up the central episodes of the religious year. The clergy based their work on the ancient rituals that came from Heliopolis, where they had been codified well before the time of the pyramids and piously preserved in the sacred archives; the clergy then drew up new copies, completed them and brought them to light to form the *ordo* of the ceremonies. And, under the guidance of the *priest of the king*, the priesthood carried out, with faith and the greatest possible pomp, the celebration of the rituals [my emphasis]."

For "the intrinsic association described above between Power and the Sacred", mentioned by Goyon (1988, 33), see his section: "The Creation of the World and the Royal Function"; cf. Goyon (1988, 29-30; *id.* 1989, 33-34. The English version of his text is quoted *verbatim* in C. HÄUBER 2014a, 733-734 with n. 56).

Immediately after that, Goyon (1988, 33-34) continues:

"The Royal Rites

The liturgies of Horus-king (some of whose celebrations are described below) most often began, at Edfu at least, **at the end of the fourth month of that long Egyptian spring, the season of *Peret* (28 Pharmouthi in the Coptic calendar, or about the end of March). In the >house of birth<< (*mammisi*), a special building in the forecourt of the temple, was celebrated the mystery of the divine birth of Horus the heir, legitimate king of the universe, successor to Osiris, the paradigm for all kings. Since Dynasty XVIII a myth of the miraculous birth of the earthly king had been known. In this myth, the creator-god Amun magically took the place of the bodily father, the reigning king, in order to impregnate the queen, a mother sanctified by the divine contact, who would bring the royal child into the world when her time was come. It was this same myth, adapted to fit the legend of Osiris, that was an underlying theme of Ptolemaic times. The mother is Isis: queen, wife of Osiris, rendered pregnant by him after his temporary resurrection; and the longed-for son is Horus, but a Horus perceived as the symbol of the universal king (CATS. 100, 101).**

[p. 34] It is he whose coming birth is announced by the priestly actors of the liturgy when playing the roles of the divinities involved in the sacred drama; divinities present in the form of their small, portable statues. **While the theogamy and the conception of the god-son (denoted modestly by the image of the potter-god Khnum fashioning the body of the child on his wheel [cf. his Fig. 8 = here Fig. 79]) were recalled in secret, the announcement was solemnly made to Isis that she would bring forth into the world the king of Egypt. After being brought to childbed, the mother of the savior-god, under the protection of the genies of birth (Bes, Hytyt) and of the Seven Hathors, the good fairies of universal happiness, gave birth to the divine offspring. The wondrous child, recognized by his father the god, began his life, then, as a royal infant suckled by divine wet nurses (Figs. 8-10 [= here Fig. 79]).**

The entire ritual play was recast with reference to the old myth of the birth of Horus in the papyrus thickets of the Delta, in the secrecy of the swamps of Khemmis near Buto (CAT. 13). Because of this, the focal point of these ceremonies was the presentation, against the backdrop evocative of the Delta marshland, of the effigy of the falcon-god wearing the Crown of Upper and Lower Egypt (Fig. 11). The

symbolism of the scene, moreover, was twofold: if it effectively evoked the presentation to the universe of the newly appeared king, it was also intended to recall the mode of the appearance of the king of the universe at Creation. The falcon was also the first living incarnation of Re-Horakhty taking possession of the world that his divine Word had just caused to surge forth from the watery chaos. **Once again, Light had been revealed and was guaranteeing life.**

Birth and the creation of the world, these were the *idée-forces* behind the celebration of the main mystery of the royal plays of the year. It was then necessary to move on to the acts of the reign. Although we cannot state the precise dates assigned to the festivities, due to the lack of documents, they followed one another in a logical order, **from 28 Pharmouthi to the fateful date of the coronation: the first day of the month of Thot (mid-July).**

When Re himself had announced the coming to the world of the heir by saying "Isis has brought into the world her Horus ...", the renewed king regained his efficacy, and Ma'at, momentarily menaced, continued to rule the universe [my emphasis]".

With the latter remark, Goyon (1988, 34) referred to the ceremony in those cases, when the already reigning king was the subject of those 'royal rituals'. Immediately after that, Goyon (1988, 34-37) continues:

"Nevertheless, it was still necessary to confirm the divine decisions about the future of the reign, and to do so at the occasion of the New Year. With the rising of Sothis (Sirius), harbinger of the approach of the Nile flood, the ritualists would prepare for the most important of the ceremonies of the annual *ordo*: the confirmation of Horus' inheritance and the festivals of coronation, coinciding with the New Year (1 Thot, around July 20). The astrologer-priest having announced the arrival of the new water, the people impatiently waited for [p. 35] the miracle of Egyptian agriculture to renew itself, while from the first hint of dawn on New Year's Day an intense activity animated the temples devoted to Horus throughout the South. The liturgy that was beginning would involve the presence of the two holy symbols of royalty: the divine statue of Horus and his Living Image, the Sacred Raptor (Fig. 12 = here **Fig. 79**). All the rites, concurrently or consecutively, through the twenty days of the festivities would concern them. Early in the morning of the Egyptian New Year's Day, a procession was organized to bring the actors, adorned and anointed for the festival, to the places of celebration. First it would cross the threshold of the Holy of Holiest; then it traversed the vestibule, the hypostyle, and the pronaos to reach the court. In the greatest [p. 36] purity the procession would make its way to the site of the "Pavilion of Bestowing the Inheritance". There, after the sacrament of anointing and the performance of prophylactic acts against "the dangers of the year", Horus-king and his Living Image would watch each other being presented with the emblems of the confirmation of the inheritance, while the lector-priest and choir chanted the verses of the great hymn "The Adoration of Horus Whose Inheritance Is Confirmed".

When the officiating priest had anointed the image of the royal falcon and the head of the Living Falcon, he pronounced the solumn salutation:

Hail to thee, Horus son of Osiris!
May thou be protected! May thou be protected!
Though art the eldest son of Onnophris,
Adoration to thee, Horus Triumphant! - four times - [with n. 1].

Then the acolytes would proceed to release the first set of messenger birds, who would fly forth to announce to the whole world that the king lived and reigned under the ultimate guarantee of the Creator.

Immediately afterward began the coronation ceremonies. Solemly, a priest playing the role of Thot proclaimed Horus king by intoning the powerful words of the "Royal Decree Spoken by Re-Horakhty", conferring on the son of Osiris the government of the earth. Sometimes Isis and Nephthys (personified by female members of the clergy, as at Philae) took up in turn the essential words of the decree, proclaiming them very loudly so that the world of man on the outside could not be in ignorance of their significance. The people, excluded from the secrecy of these rites, were never ignorant of their meaning and were living through the drama of waiting. Inside the sacred precinct, the divine stolist

(priests charged with anointments and with dressing the divine statues) would now bring the Crown, the Red of the North and the White of the South; the scepters and weapons; and would consecrate them for the statue of Horus and for his Living Image who accompanied him. All this time a choir had been chanting the litanies for the protection of the Year, while the sacrament of anointing the statue of Horus was being carried out using a scented chrism called "the greatest rejoicing" (*hekenu*).

Simultaneously, the Living Falcon was also receiving a similar anointment and was being offered the consecrated jewelry, the scepters, and the solar bouquets of Heliopolis, all symbols of the universal life of which he was to become the guarantor.

"Thy Ma'at is with thee, O Living Image, Living Falcon, and thou art its lord ... [with n. 2]".

When these sacramental words had been pronounced, the principal date of 19 Thot had arrived, a date which had to coincide with the announcement to the world of men of the consummation of the supreme act for the safeguarding of life. Then, from the aviaries of the temple were brought the messenger birds who would carry the message of salvation to the four cardinal points of the universe. After having received the anointment that sanctified their mission, a falcon (embodying a replica of the Living Falcon of the Year), an ibis, a vulture, and finally another falcon (incarnating Horus son of Osiris), successively took wing. Accompanying their departure the liturgical choir chanted once again the verse of the "Decree of Re", giving to Horus dominion over the Egyptian world and its people. **This was made necessary by the fact that the *actual* king, guarantor of Ma'at, was, from this instant on, the Living Image, the Sacred Raptor of [p. 37] the Year. It mattered little that, at the appropriate points in the sacramental phrases, the name of the Ptolemy reigning in Alexandria was inserted; it was only pronounced following the evocation of the Sacred Animal of Horakhty. This animal alone played a real role and was, as far as the people of Egypt were concerned, the godking living on earth. And that is why this sacred hawk, in the company of the processional of Horus of Edfu or Philae, would be shown to the people amid a great concourse of joy and of chants invoking grace [cf. his Fig. 12 = here Fig. 79].**

In later days at Edfu and Philae (around the first century B.C.), when the pylons had been built, **the procession would form in the Court of Festivals to proceed to the Balcony of Appearances of the Falcon.** Formerly constructed for the festival in the front area of the temple, it was now simply a balcony built in the passage over the central door between the two wings of the pylon on the south face of the building (Fig. 1), the side that opened to the world of men. The pylon itself was a symbolic representation of the ancient Egyptian conception of the horizon: a cross-section of the two cliffs bordering the Nile on the east and west. At the center of the pylon, the top of the axial gateway formed a special terrace where the divine effigy and its living counterpart could make their appearance. This appearance was the equivalent of showing the sun inscribing its course over the land of Egypt and of confirming to the assembled through the renewal of this priceless gift of the light of life. Such a transmission, through such a liturgy, proved beyond a doubt to even the least aware peasants of Upper Egypt gathered for the festival that their world could endure, that it was constantly being protected and recreated because, as had happened since the very beginning of their memories, the king and the god (closely united in the veneration of Egypt), were working together to give Egypt life [my emphasis]".

In his **note 1**, Goyon wrote: "Brooklyn Papyrus 47.218.50, XVI, 4-5".

In his **note 2**, he wrote: "Alliot 1954, vol. 2: 661".

At the end of his article, Goyon (1988, 39) provided a:

"SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Temples and Clergy

H. Stirlin and S. Sauneron, *Les plus beaux temples égyptiens*. Pully, Switzerland, 1980 (reissue of *Derniers temples d'Égypte: Edfou et Philae*. Paris, 1975).

S. Sauneron, *The Priests of Ancient Egypt*, Trans. A. Morrisett. London 1960.

Theology and Religious Thought

J.-C. Goyon, *Les dieux-gardiens et la genèse des temples d'après les textes de l'époque gréco-romaine*. BdE vols. CIII/1-2. 1985.

Dendera

F. Daumas, *Dendera et le temple d'Hathor*. IFAO RAPH 29, 1969.

Edfu

A. Alliot, *Le Culte d'Horus à Edfou au temps des Ptolémées*. BdE vols. XX/1-2. 1948-1954.

S. Cauville, *Edfou*. Guides Archéologiques de l'IFAO, Bibliothèque générale VI. 1984.

S. Cauville, *Essai sur la théologie du temple d'Horus à Edfou*. BdE vols. CII/1-2. 1987.

Esna

S. Sauneron, *Les Fêtes religieuses d'Esna aux derniers siècles du paganisme* (= *Esna V*. Cairo, 1952).

Let's now return to the discussion of Domitian's obelisk (cf. here Fig. 28).

Now, since the hieroglyphic texts of Domitian's obelisk, refer to Domitian's birth as the divine child and to his coronation as pharaoh (cf. K. LEMBKE 1994b, 41, quoted *verbatim supra*, at IV.1.1.c); J.-C. GRENIER 2009, 238, quoted *verbatim supra*, at IV.1.1.a); E.M. CIAMPINI 2005, 399-402, quoted *verbatim supra*, at IV.1.1.d)), it is indeed obvious that Domitian and his Egyptian consultants thus hinted at the rituals performed at the structures called *mammisis* in Egypt, where the birth of the king of Egypt by his divine mother, the goddess Isis, was enacted by priests. The hieroglyphic texts of Domitian's obelisk refer also to the other 'royal rites', described by Goyon (1988, 33-34) in the passages quoted above, which culminated in the coronation ceremony of the pharaoh that occurred on the festival of Egyptian New Year.

The latter ceremonies are also discussed by Paul G.P. Meyboom, whose relevant observations are quoted in the following, as well as *infra*, at Appendix. II. *Again on the Egyptianizing marble relief allegedly from Ariccia at the Museo Nazionale Romano, Palazzo Altemps - a representation of the Egyptian festival of New Year?*

IV.1.1.e) P.G.P. Meyboom (2016) on the festivals connected with the Nile flood and on the 'royal rituals' at the festival of New Year

Paul G.P. Meyboom (2016, 57-58) writes about a ritual, with which the beginning of the Nile flood was celebrated, as follows:

"Some other interesting examples of a chest being carried in a procession may be found in the Graeco-Roman period. Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride*, 39, describes a procession in which a chest plays an important part; 'On the night of the nineteenth day (of the month Athyr) they go down to the sea and the stolistes and priests take out the sacred box, which has a golden casket inside it. Into this they pour some drinking water which they have brought with them, and the people present shout: "Osiris has been found!"

The meaning of this rite was that the finding of fresh water indicated that the Nile flood, which was considered to be the [page 58] efflux of Osiris' body, had begun [with n. 94, providing references] ...

Osiris, a mythical Pharaoh, was killed by his brother Seth. Isis, his wife, searches in mourning for his remains. This stage of the myth represents the period in which the Nile has become dry, Egypt is

suffering from the summer heat and drought, and the vegetation is dead. Isis finds Osiris' remains floating in the water. This symbolises the arrival of the new Nile water in June. Isis has Osiris's limbs attended to, embalmed and mummified (see fig. 81). **In the course of this procedure she unites herself with him and from their union Horus, the new Pharaoh, will be born.** In the Graeco-Roman period the union of Isis and Osiris symbolises the fertilisation of the land of Egypt by the water of the Nile during August and September, as is explained in a famous passage by Plutarch *De Iside et Osiride*, 38: ...

Just as they view the Nile as the efflux of Osiris, thus they hold the earth to be the body of Isis, not the whole earth, but as much as the Nile goes over, fructifying it and uniting with it; and from this union they assume Horus to be procreated.

The mummification of Osiris effects his resurrection and his mummy is placed in a funerary chapel where he becomes king of the realm of the dead. **This symbolises the revival of the vegetation in November and December, as a result of the inundation** [with n. 96, providing references; my emphasis].

Concerning one detail of the above-mentioned rituals, Giuseppina Capriotti Vittozzi (2013, 56, in her Chapter: "II: Iside e la su cerchia; 2.2.4. Il Nilo") writes:

"Nel mito, il cofano contenente il corpo di Osiride, era stato gettato nel fiume [*i.e.*, the Nile] e questo stesso venne riconosciuto come derivante dagli umori cadaverici del dio".

Cf. Meyboom (2016, 68): "Because of the relationship between Isis and Osiris with the inundation, the Pharaohs, who were representatives of the gods, traditionally played an important role in the ceremonies connected with the inundation. This role was taken over by the Ptolemies and their queens [with n. 155]. Their presence at these ceremonies is well attested. In a relief at Dendera they are taking part in the procession of the feast on the first day of the germination season which immediately follows the Khoiak festival (see fig. 93) [with n. 156]. The Ptolemaic king and queen became equated with Osiris and Isis by their Egyptian subjects and with Dionysus and Aphrodite by their Greek subjects. Dionysus was equated by the Greeks in Egypt with Osiris-Sarapis, both being gods of the rebirth of nature [with n. 157]". - In his **notes 155-157**, Meyboom provides references.

Cf. Meyboom (2016, 72-74):

"The Khoiak festival, however, was not the only festival connected with the inundation. The course of the flood was marked by several other festivities [with n. 177]. In the first place **the beginning of the flood, which ideally coincided with the rise of Sothis and the beginning of the new year on the 19th of July, was marked by important ceremonies in which the sovereigns (or their representatives) also participated** (see figs. 71, 73, 93) [with n. 178]. **Another feast took place when the flood had reached a height sufficient to offer the prospect of a successful crop. This height, sixteen cubits,** was indicated on the Nilometers by a mark called the *semeion*, and one of the names given to the feast, **at least in the Roman period, was the Semasia.** Depending on the speed and the volume of the flood, the mark was reached at the end of August at Assuan, and [page 73] ten days later in the Delta. **When the mark was reached the signal was given to cut the dikes which had blocked the irrigation canals and the inundation could spread over the countryside.** This signal was rapidly spread throughout the country, a process which, in the Roman period was symbolically represented by the figure of the Semasia, a young woman on a galloping horse, holding a palm-branch (fig. 94). **The occasion was celebrated with ceremonies and festivities in which the sovereigns again participated** [with n. 179]. **Everyone had a holiday and all along the Nile, especially near the temples of Isis and Osiris, there were banquets and revels, eating and drinking, dancing and boating** (see figs. 47, 96). **The lotus, which had germinated in the soil when the Nile started to rise, began to blossom.**

This was the first sign of the rebirth of the vegetation and consequently became a symbol for it [with n. 180] ...

Moreover, besides the feasts for the beginning of the inundation and celebrating the high flood, there was yet another important feast which in the later Ptolemaic period [when the Nile mosaic at Praeneste was created, the main focus of Meyboom's book] fell in the inundation period. The beginning of the new year, the first day of the month of Thot, originally fell on the 19th of July, the day when Sothis rose and ideally the Nile flood began. In the course of more than a thousand years this date had rotated through the [page 74] year and around the middle of the second century B.C. it fell in September. At the time of the calendar reform of Augustus it fell on the 29th of August, and the beginning of the new year remained fixed on that day from then on. The 29th of August happened to be roughly the date when the necessary height of the flood was reached at Assuan and therefore actually coincided with the Semasia ... Thus in the course of time the connection which traditionally existed between the Nile flood and the beginning of the new year was more or less reestablished [with n. 183].

The sovereigns had traditionally played the main part in the ritual connected with the beginning of the new year. Like Horus, the Pharaoh triumphed over Seth, avenging his father Osiris (cf. fig. 93), and succeeded to his throne and sailed triumphantly down the flooded Nile. Because of this mythological and ritual background the feast of the new year was the ideal occasion for coronations and coronation jubilees. The same idea of the triumphant sovereign was associated with the Khoiak festival, at the conclusion of which the Djed pillar was erected, which again symbolised the triumph of Horus and the rebirth of Osiris (see fig. 81, above centre). For this reason the feast of the Djed pillar was even considered to be an alternative beginning for the new year [with n. 184]. In all events we find the Pharaoh closely associated with both the beginning of the new year, the coronation jubilee of the Pharaoh, the inundation and the rebirth of the vegetation [my emphasis]". - In his notes 177-180, 183 and 184, Meyboom provides references.

IV.1.1.f) What consequences has the fact, that the contents of Domitian's obelisk (cf. here Fig. 28) refer to mammisis, in regard to our question, for which location this obelisk was commissioned?

In the course of our discussion on 11th May 2018, by looking at the assumed location of Domitian's obelisk on this public square between the Iseum Campense and the Serapeum (cf. here **Figs. 60; 78**), Emanuele M. Ciampini mentioned to me that in Egypt the structures called *mammisis* are always to be found *outside* the temple - as also stated in the above quoted passage by Jean-Claude Goyon (1988, 33; cf. *supra*, at IV.1.1.e)), who refers to it as: "a special building in the forecourt of the temple" (a text, which, of course, I had not with me, when Ciampini and I discussed the matter).

Ciampini and I have therefore come on 11th May 2018 to the following conclusions:

a) Already the facts that Isis appears in the scenes on the *pyramidion* of Domitian's obelisk (cf. E.M. CIAMPINI 2004, 159, and here **Fig. 28**), and that Domitian is explicitly called "amato di Iside" in the hieroglyphic texts of the Obeliscus Pamphilius (cf. J.-C. GRENIER 2009, 238; E.M. CIAMPINI 2004, 165, H 30), is enough to attribute this obelisk rather to the Iseum Campense than to the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* - in the iconography of which Isis is conspicuously absent;

b) The scenes on the *pyramidion* and one section in the hieroglyphic texts of Domitian's obelisk (cf. here **Fig. 28**) refer to the rituals performed at the structures called *mammisis* in Egypt, in which, among other ceremonies, the birth of the divine child, the future king of Egypt by his divine mother Isis was enacted; these rituals culminated in the coronation of the new pharaoh at the festival of New Year. On the *pyramidion* of Domitian's obelisk his coronation as pharaoh is actually represented, apart from the fact that it is

described in the hieroglyphic texts of this obelisk. This additional information, which the scenes and the hieroglyphic inscriptions on Domitian's obelisk contain, may be regarded as another support of this idea.

Our conclusions thus support the idea of identifying the small square, which is marked on the Severan marble plan on the piazza between the *Iseum* and the *Serapeum* (cf. here **Fig. 78**), as a representation of the socle of Domitian's Obelisk at its original position.

As mentioned above, many previous scholars had assumed that Domitian's obelisk was commissioned for the Iseum Campense, and precisely for the just mentioned location (cf. here **Fig. 78**). Also several contributors to the Proceedings of the Iseum Campense Conference at Rome in May 2016 are of this opinion (quoted *verbatim supra*, at IV.1.), and, most recently, Eric M. Moormann (2021, 46 with n. 18).

So also Emanuele Ciampini (cf. E.M. CIAMPINI 2004, 157): "**Provenienza:** area compresa tra l'Iseo e il Serapeo di Campo Marzio [the emphasis is that of the author]"; and at *The first Contribution by Emanuele M. Ciampini* in this volume: *La regalità domiziana: una nota egittologica*. - To this I will come back below at IV.1.1.h).

IV.1.1.g) The controversy concerning the "ARCUS AD ISIS" that is visible on a relief from the Tomb of the Haterii (cf. here Figs. 89; 90): it cannot be identified with the Arco di Camilliano to the east of the Iseum Campense, but stood instead near the Temple of Isis et Serapis in Regio III

The "ARCUS AD ISIS", which is visible on the relief from the Tomb of the Haterii depicting six buildings in Rome (cf. here **Figs. 89; 90**), is identified by many scholars with the Arco di Camilliano (also called 'Arco di Camigliano') to the east of the Iseum Campense. So first Heinrich Brunn (*AdI* 1849, 363-410; *MonInst* 5, tavv. 6-8, quoted after F. COARELLI: "Arcus ad Isis", in: *LTUR* I [1993] 97, Fig. 52; cf. F. CASTAGNOLI 1941, 59; R. TURCAN 1983, 24 (cf. L. BRICAULT and R. VEYMIERS 2018, n. 139, quoted *verbatim infra*, at *Appendix I.g*)); K. LEMBKE 1994b, 20-21, 178-179, cat. C. 3, pl. 3,3; and M.C. LAURENTI: "Iseum: Arco di Camigliano", in: *LTUR* III [1996] 110, Figs. 70; 71. Cf. C. HÄUBER 2014a, 783 n. 1 [with ample bibliography]).

Cf. here **Figs. 59-61**, labels: CAMPUS MARTIUS; ISEUM; Arco di Camilliano; SERAPEUM.

Other scholars locate the "ARCUS AD ISIS" near the sanctuary *Isis et Serapis* in *Regio III*. So for example Gösta Säflund (1932, 202), who was first to locate it at the site of the former archaic city gate *Porta Querquetulana* within the Servian city Wall. I have followed him, but assume the *Porta Querquetulana* at a different site than Säflund.

Cf. here **Fig. 72**, labels: Servian city Wall; PORTA QUERQUETULANA/ ARCUS AD ISIS.

Cf. Häuber (1998, 111 n. 158; C. HÄUBER and F.X. SCHÜTZ 2004, 97; C. HÄUBER and F.X. SCHÜTZ 2010, Fig. 1, label: PORTA QUERQUETULANA/ ARCUS AD ISIS?; C. HÄUBER 2014a, 153, 167, 170, 181, 228, 274 ns. 218, 219; Appendix VIII: pp. 415-417; p. 415 n. 6 [here the important observations concerning the reliefs from the tomb of the Haterii by G. SPINOLA 2012 are mentioned]; p. 480, Figs. 116; 117a; 117b, p. 511; chapter **B 19.**): pp. 634, 642; chapter **B 31.**): p. 783 with n. 1 (bibliography); pp. 784-787, p. 788 with n. 70; pp. 789-791; chapter **B 32.**): pp. 792-796, 798. E.M. MOORMANN 2015a, 261, and P. GROS 2016, 351-352, have followed my suggestion to locate the "ARCUS AD ISIS" at the site of the *Porta Querquetulana* within the Servian city Wall.

For the Arco di Camilliano (also `Arco di Camigliano'), which is often (erroneously) identified with the "ARCUS AD ISIS" (here **Figs. 89; 90**), and for the "ARCUS AD ISIS" itself; cf. Häuber (2017, 20, 28, 54, 62, 68, 70; pp. 72-73, Fig. 3.7.1.1; pp. 128, 132, 133, 134, 138; p. 139, Fig. 5,4 = here **Fig. 89**, pp. 142-144, 145, 153; pp. 171-172: "The Arco di Camilliano and G. Gatti's mosaico"; pp. 173, 174, 324, 325, 327. 328). - For the "Haterii Mausoleum"; cf. also Barbara E. Borg (2019, 253-255), suggested date: second quarter of the II. century AD.

To the tomb of the Haterii, and especially to the relief (here **Figs. 89; 90**), I will come back below (cf. *infra*, at IV.1.1.h), and at *Appendix I.g*).

Fig. 89. Marble relief from the tomb of the Haterii, with representations of six buildings in Rome. Città del Vaticano, Musei Vaticani, Museo Gregoriano Profano (inv. no. 9997). From: C. Häuber (2014a, 480, Fig. 116). Suggested date: between the late Flavian period and 120 AD; cf. Häuber (2014a, 315, 170 with n. 178).

Fig. 90. Same as Fig. 89. Detail with the "ARCUS AD ISIS". From: C. Häuber (2014a, 480, Fig. 117a).

Because the "ARCUS AD ISIS" - on architectural grounds - cannot possibly be identified with the Arco di Camilliano, nor with any of the other arches in the vicinity of the Iseum Campense, I myself take it for a replacement of the archaic *Porta Querquetulana* within the Servian city Wall, and thus as an entrance gate both to the sanctuary *Isis et Serapis* in *Regio III* (as its name implies), and to the `Colosseum city'. As Fred S. Kleiner (1990, 129, n. 12; cf. C. HÄUBER 2014a, 786 with n. 40) has convincingly suggested, the Roman Senate had erected the "ARCUS AD ISIS" in honour of Vespasian.

Domitian restored also the huge substructure that flanked this former city gate *Porta Querquetulana/ Arcus ad Isis* on its outside to the north, and built a second one to the south. The multistorey substructure to the north of the city gate was called by the antiquarians of past centuries "Terme di Filippo", on its roof terrace stood in my opinion the Temple of Minerva Medica, built, together with this substructure, by Maecenas, but it functioned at the same time as an elaborate staircase that gave not only access to this temple, but also to the (later) sanctuary of *Isis et Serapis* in *Regio III*; in addition to this, it (possibly) accommodated shops for luxury goods.

For this substructure and the Temple of Minerva Medica, built by Maecenas within his *Horti*; which stands now in Via Pasquale Villari; cf. Häuber (forthcoming, Laocoon, Chapter IV.2.8.).

The city gate *Porta Querquetulana/ Arcus ad Isis* had in part survived in the buildings of the former old Church of SS. Pietro e Marcellino, which were documented on Giambattista Nolli's map of 1748, from where we have copied them into our maps. To the south of this city gate Domitian built anew a huge structure, by which he extended the plateau of the Caelian. Only recently excavated, it has been interpreted as accommodating *Horrea* (?).

This important part of the Flavian `nuova urbs' (a name for it suggested to me my Richard Neudecker many years ago), was begun by Vespasian (who also finished the Temple for *Divus Claudius* on the Caelian; cf. Suet., *Vesp.* 9), and completed by Domitian. I have written elsewhere:

"Already Stefania Adamo Muscettola [with n. 25] had observed: ``... e se Gerusalemme è stato l'Azio dei Flavi, Iside ha svolto un ruolo analogo a quello di Apollo''. The treasure of the temple at Jerusalem, which is mentioned here between the lines, and Vespasian's own drastic financial laws can explain how the Flavian emperors managed to spend so much money on building". - Cf. Häuber (2014a, 153 with n. 25). In my **note 25**, I wrote: "Adamo Muscettola 1994, p. 87; cf. Häuber 2009, p. 312 with n. 36".

To this I will come back below (cf. *infra*, at *Appendix IV.c.1.*); *Appendix IV.d.3.*). See also *Appendix IV.d.4.a*) *Domitian's building project 'Colosseum City'*.

Only after this section was written so far, did I learn from Laurent Bricault and Richard Veymiers (2018, 141, with n. 87) that Vespasien issued coins with the legend: *Roma resurge(n)s* (cf. *infra*, at *IV.1.1.h*, and at *Appendix II.a*)).

The here-discussed part of Rome covered those areas of Nero's *Domus Aurea* that were built on the *Mons Oppius* and on the Caelian and the valley in between them, where today the modern Via Labicana runs, and extended for almost 1 kilometre from the Colosseum eastwards towards this gate in the Servian city Wall. By building the aforementioned huge substructures on either side of the city gate *Porta Querquetulana/ Arcus ad Isis*, Domitian certainly added to the grandiose appearance of the entrance to this entirely new city quarter.

Fig. 72. The 'Colosseum city' between the Colosseum and the *Porta Querquetulana/ Arcus ad Isis* within the Servian city Wall, one part of the 'Flavian *nuova urbs*', begun by Vespasian and completed by Domitian. C. Häuber and F.X. Schütz, "AIS ROMA". From: C. Häuber 2014a, map 3 (= here Fig. 71, detail).

For an explanation of the cartographic details of this map; cf. Häuber (2014a, 873-874), and *infra*, at *Appendix IV.c.2.*).

For a discussion of the topography of this entire area, 'The Colosseum city'; cf. Häuber (1998, 111 n. 158; *ead.* 2009, 312-314 with n. 32, Fig. 2; *ead.* 2014a, 105 [for the old and the new Church of SS. Pietro e Marcellino]; cf. 153 with n. 26 [the east-west extension of the 'Colosseum city', measured with the "AIS ROMA" from the west side of the Colosseum to the *Porta Querquetulana/Arcus ad Isis*, is circa 920 m]; cf. pp. 153, 383, 552, 553-554 [for the Temple of Divus Claudius and two of its possible cult-statues (?), that of Messalina (?)/Agrippina *minor* and of Claudius' son Britannicus (?)]; cf. pp. 154, 166 [for Maecenas's Temple of Minerva Medica on the roof terrace of the "Terme di Filippo"], cf. pp. 180-181, 347, 350; and pp. 401-414: **Appendix VII The finds recorded by Pirro Ligorio (1513/14-1583) in this area**, in esp. pp. 412-414 (on the *Summum Choragium, Castra Misenatium; Ludus Magnus, Armamentaria*; p. 413 with n. 96, for the most recent location of the *Ludus Dacicus* to the west of the *Castra Misenatium* (*i.e.*, both to the north of the modern Via Labicana); chapter **B 31.**): p. 783 with n. 1 [bibliography]). - I myself have not mapped the *ludus Gallicus*, because apart from the fact that it is listed in one of the Constantinian Regionary Catalogues within the Augustan *Regio II*, its precise location is unknown. Carlo Pavolini ("Ludus Gallicus", in: *LTUR* III [1996] 196) tentatively suggests that it stood in the vicinity of the *ludus Matutinus*.

Cf. Häuber (2014a, **maps 3** [= here **Figs. 71; 72**]; **17**, labels: MONS OPPIUS; COLOSSEUM; MONS CAELIUS; TEMPLUM: DIVUS CLAUDIUS; modern Via Labicana; site of LUDUS MATUTINUS; LUDUS MAGNUS; site of LUDUS DACICUS; site of CASTRA MISENATIUM; ARMAMENTARIA?; SUMMUM CHORAGIUM?; MONETA/ HORREA?/ S. Clemente; ISIS ET SERAPIS REGIO III; "Terme di Filippo"; Temple: MINERVA MEDICA; Servian city Wall; PORTA QUERQUETULANA/ ARCUS AD ISIS; SS. Pietro e Marcellino [the ground-plan of the old church and its adjacent convent, copied after Nolli's map of 1748, are drawn as red areas, being ancient structures, built into the ancient city gate, the ground-plan of the modern church, to the east of the old church, is drawn with thin black lines]; HORREA?; cf. C. HÄUBER 2017, 166-167, 324, 337); and *infra*, at *Appendix IV.d.4.a*) *Domitian's building project 'Colosseum City'*.

For the transformation of Nero's *Domus Aurea* into the here-so-called Flavian 'Colosseum city'; cf. Eric M. Moormann (2018, 163-166, Section: "From Golden House to Public Space"); cf. p. 165 (on the Temple of *Divus*

Claudius); and pp. 165-166 (on Domitian's *Meta Sudans*. For that; cf. also *infra*, at *Appendix V.*; Section V.). See now also Moormann (2021, 44).

For the four *ludi*, which belonged to the 'Colosseum City'; cf. now Werner Eck ("Zur Entstehung der kaiserlichen Gladiatorenschulen in Rom: Der *Ludus Dacicus*", 2020). My thanks are due to Hans Rupprecht Goette for providing me with this article.

Eck (2020) does not address the recent topographical discussion of the entire area comprising those *ludi*, which is why he has overlooked that the *ludus Dacicus* is not any more located at the site, where he suggests (*i.e.*, to the south of the *Amphitheatrum Flavium*/ the Colosseum, and thus to the south of modern Via Labicana); cf. Eck (2020, 64-65 with n. 33; cf. p. 60 n. 18). Currently, the *ludus Dacicus* is located to the north of the modern Via Labicana instead; cf. most recently Häuber (2014a, 413 with n. 96, summarized above), and here **Figs. 71; 72**.

Eck (2020, 59), after an analysis of the relevant ancient sources, comes to the convincing conclusion that of those four *ludi*, two, the *ludus Magnus* and the *ludus Matutinus*, had existed as an institution already under Nero. In the following, Eck (2020, 59) discusses also the assertion of the Chronographer of AD 354, according to whom Domitian had built all four *ludi*.

Cf. Eck (2020, 59):

"In der wissenschaftlichen Diskussion haben dabei Aussagen des Chronographen von 354 die wesentliche Rolle gespielt. Denn dort wird unter dem Jahr 94 von der kaiserlichen Bautätigkeit unter Domitian folgende lange Liste vorgelegt [with n. 17]:

multae operae publicae fabricatae sunt: atria vii, horrea piperataria ubi modo est basilica Constantiniana et horrea Vespasiani, templum Castorum et Minervae, portam Capenam, gentem Flaviam, Divorum (sc. porticus), Iseum et Serapeum, Minervam Chalcidicam, Odium, Minuciam veterem, stadium, et thermas Titianas et Traianas, amphitheatrum usque ad clypea, templum Vespasiani et Titi, Capitolium, senatum, ludos IIII, Palatium, metam sudantem et Panteum.

Interessant ist in unserem Zusammenhang nur die Angabe *ludos IIII*. Vier *ludi*, Gladiatorenschulen, werden hier mit Domitian verbunden. Die einzelnen Namen werden an dieser Stelle nicht angegeben".

In his **note 17**, Eck writes: "*Chronographus anni CCCLIII, in Chronica minora saec. IV. V. VI. VII, hg. TH. MOMMSEN (= M.G.H. Auctores Antiquissimi 9), Berlin 1892, 14*".

See for the Chronographer of AD 354 more recently: Michele Renée Salzman (*On Roman Time. The codex-calendar of 354 and the rhythms of urban life in late antiquity*, 1990).

For the (erroneous) assertion of the Chronographer of AD 354 that Domitian restored the "senatum" (*i.e.*, the *Curia Iulia*); cf. *infra*, at *Appendix IV.c*), and for his (correct) assertion that Domitian built "*thermas Titianas et Traianas*" (*i.e.*, the Baths of Trajan); cf. *infra*, at *Appendix IV.d.4.c*).

In the following, Eck (2020, 60-67) summarizes the scholarly discussion on the *ludus Dacicus* and explains why he believes that only Trajan could have built this *ludus*.

See Eck (2020, S. 67, the abstract of this article):

"In der Kaiserzeit wurde die Ausbildung von Gladiatoren bald in kaiserliche Regie übernommen. Im 2. Jh. existierten in Rom vier *ludi*: *ludus Magnus*, *ludus Matutinus*, *ludus Dacicus* und *ludus Gallicus*. Umstritten ist aber, wann sie

eingerrichtet wurden. Nach dem Chronographen von 354 soll Domitian ludos III errichtet haben. Obwohl diese Aussage nicht selten von der Wissenschaft übernommen wurde, ist sie unzutreffend. Sicher ist, dass eine spätestens unter Nero bereits zwei kaiserliche Gladiatorenschulen in Rom existierten: der ludus Magnus und der ludus Matutinus. Das hatte man schon bisher partiell auch gesehen, doch die beiden anderen sollen weiterhin auf Domitian zurückgehen. Doch ein cursus honorum eines Claudius Ilus zeigt, dass der ludus Dacicus auf die Zeit Traians zurückgeht [emphasis by the author]".

It would be interesting to create a '3D' model of the sanctuary *Isis et Serapis* in *Regio III* and its surrounding buildings, comprising the 'Colosseum city', in order to better understand their impact on the city scape. Franz Xaver Schütz has made a first attempt into this direction, cf. Franz Xaver Schütz (2014; *id.* 2013, forthcoming in *FORTVNA PAPERS* vol. I, 2021; C. HÄUBER 2014a, **map 4**, cf. pp. 154, 873-874).

IV.1.1.h) The new findings by B. E. Borg (2019) concerning the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* support the hypothesis suggested here that Domitian's obelisk (cf. here Fig. 28) was commissioned for the *Iseum Campense*. With some observations concerning the Temple of Divus Traianus at Italica, and concerning the Marble Forum at the Colonia Augusta Emerita (Mérida) in Spain. With Contributions by John Bodel, Eric M. Moormann, Mario Torelli, and Walter Trillmich

On 2nd May 2018, I had the chance to attend the talk by Barbara E. Borg at the British School at Rome on the subject: "Reviving tradition in Hadrianic Rome: from incineration to inhumation", in which she also discussed the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*. On 3rd May 2018, I met with Borg at the British School at Rome, who was about to finish her book *Roman Tombs and the Art of Commemoration*, which has appeared in the meantime (cf. B. E. BORG 2019), and in which she has published her findings presented in this talk. On 3rd May 2018, Borg was so kind, as to discuss the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* with me and to send me a printout of her text on the "*Templum Gentis Flaviae*".

Domitian built the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* on the Quirinal, at the site of his father Vespasian's *domus*, where he himself was born (Suet., *Dom.* 1; cf. *Dom.* 15), and where later the Baths of Diocletian were erected.

Concerning the date of the construction of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, Filippo Coarelli (2009b, 94 with n. 311) suggests: 'not before AD 94'; cf. Häuber (2017 162).

Cf. here **Fig. 58**, labels: Servian city Wall; Baths of Diocletian; site of **TEMPLUM GENTIS FLAVIAE**.

Of its architecture only scarce remains have been found in excavations, in addition to this, some architectural fragments and some relief fragments, all carved in Pentelic marble. Also the head of its colossal acrolithic cult-stature of *Divus Titus* (cf. here **Fig. 53**), and, as was earlier believed, possibly also the head of its colossal acrolithic cult-stature of *Divus Vespasianus* have been identified; so far the marble quality of those heads has not been described, nor tested; cf. Filippo Coarelli ("Collis Quirinalis", in: *LTUR* IV [1999] 183; COARELLI 2009a, 495, cat. no. 98: "Ritratto colossale di Vespasiano", Napoli, MAN [inv. no. 1889 - but note that this inventory number is based on an error, and that this head of Vespasian was certainly not found near the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*; cf. E. LA ROCCA 2020b, 371, note 16] [E. ROSSO]; cf. pp. 496-497, cat. no. 99: "Ritratto colossale di Tito, Napoli, MAN [inv. no. 11089; 152 cm high] [E. LA ROCCA, who tentatively identifies this head as that of the cult-stature of *Divus Titus* in Domitian's *Templum Gentis Flaviae*]; M.C. CAPANNA 2008; E. LA ROCCA 2009, 225 with ns. 19, 21, p. 230 writes that the portrait of Titus was a colossal acrolithic statue; COARELLI 2009b, 93 with n. 98, p. 94, with n. 322; C. HÄUBER 2014a, 165 n. 144; *ead.* 2017, 163; COARELLI 2014, 200 Fig. 50; E.M. MOORMANN 2018, 169-170; B.E. BORG 2019, 244-251,

Figs. 4.20; 4.21; 4.22, especially p. 245 with n. 197; E.M. MOORMANN 2021, 46 with n. 17, who quotes C. HÄUBER 2021 [*i.e.*, this publication], and follows my view presented here; and *The Contribution by Eric M. Moormann* in this volume: *Can We Reconstruct the Templum Gentis Flaviae?*).

The iconographies of all these sculptures have no relation whatsoever with Isis or any other Egyptian divinity.

We have discussed in the previous *Chapter* (cf. *supra*, at IV.1.1.g)) one of the reliefs from the famous tomb of the Haterii, with representations of six buildings in Rome (cf. here **Figs. 89; 90**). I myself follow those scholars, who date this tomb between the late Flavian period and 120 AD; cf. Häuber (2014a, 315, 170 with n. 178). Barbara E. Borg (2019, 253 with n. 225), suggests instead the following date: "first quarter of the second century".

Barbara E. Borg (2019, 255, Chapter: "4 Straddling Borderlines: Divine Connotations in Funerary Commemoration", Section: "Haterii Mausoleum") suggests the interesting hypothesis that members of the Haterii family may actually have been involved in building the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*:

"He [*i.e.*, the tomb's founder, with n. 227] must have been in the building industry and, as a further relief from the tomb suggests in depicting a number of public buildings [= here Figs. 89; 90], [with n. 228] the Haterii were probably working as *redemptores*, contractors of building projects and construction work, for the emperor and the state. [with n. 229] While the father of the tomb's founder was an ex-slave, he was no imperial freedman but was probably freed by Q. Haterius Antoninus (*cos.* 53), a grandson of the Augustan orator. Antoninus is also known from brick stamps and so was in the building industry himself. The fact that he was closely related to a number of important individuals of his time, and that he was first cousin of both Valeria Messalina and Nero, will certainly have helped his freedmen to enter into important and lucrative businesses. [with n. 230] Having been involved in imperial Flavian building projects, the Haterii would doubtless have been close to the *familia caesaris*, and very aware of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* as well as Priscilla's mausoleum [which Borg discusses as well]. We may even speculate that they were directly involved in the building of the *Templum* [my emphasis]".

For the "Mausoleum of Priscilla"; cf. Borg (2019, 251-253): according to her, this was the first private tomb to copy the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*.

In her **note 227**, Borg writes: "For a different but unconvincing view, see below at n. 255".

In her **note 228**, she writes: "Sometimes called the 'Via Sacra panel' after the inscription on a triumphal arch: Sinn and Freyberger, *Grabdenkmäler* [*i.e.*, here F. SINN and K.S. FREYBERGER 1996] II, 63-76 cat. 8 pls. 20-4. The buildings are normally identified as Flavian, though no agreement has been reached as to their identity. Freyberger and Zitzl ('*Bautenrelief*' [*i.e.*, here K.S. FREYBERGER, C. ZITZL and C. ERTEL 2016a]) recently identified the buildings on the relief with the *Arcus ad Isis* of the *Isium Metellinum* on the *via Labicana*, the amphitheatre of Statilius Taurus, an Augustan triumphal arch at the top end of the *Scalae Caci* in front of the temple of *Magna Mater*, the monumental entrance to the Augustan *Templum Urbis Romae*, the temple of *Jupiter Stator* and the *Fornix Fabianus* - all buildings erected and/ or restored under Augustus and connected with his victory at Actium. Should these identifications be correct, the authors are probably right to read the relief as an allusion to the founder of the Haterii's patron family, Q. Haterius Agrippa, a friend of Augustus and likely involved in his Actian victory, but through historic buildings that were destroyed in the fire of 64 CE and renovated or replaced under the Flavians [my emphasis]"

In her **note 229**, Borg writes: See Martin, *Jurists* [*i.e.*, here S.D. MARTIN 1989], 52-62, esp. 59, on Q. Haterius Tychicus as *redemptor operum publicorum*; Kolb, *Bauverwaltung* [*i.e.*, here A. KOLB 1993], esp. [especially] 130, 316-18; Kolb, *Rom* [*i.e.*, here F. KOLB 1995], 473; Sinn and Freyberger, *Grabdenkmäler* [*i.e.*, here F. SINN and K.S.

FREYBERGER 1996] II, 22-6. For another *redemptor* depicting a crane as indication of his profession, see a relief in Capua: *ibid*, 56 with n. 63".

In her **note 230**, she writes: "As noted by the authors in n. 226". - Cf. her **note 226**: "For a tentative reconstruction [of the tomb of the Haterii], cf. Hesberg, 'Profumo' [*i.e.*, here H. v. HESBERG 2002], 42-4 figs. 12a-c; for the relief, see Sinn and Freyberger, *Grabdenkmäler* [*i.e.*, here F. SINN and K.S. FREYBERGER 1996] II, 51-59 cat. 6 pls. 11-16 [my emphasis]".

To two of her notes; cf. Borg (2019, 255, ns. 228 and 230), I should like to add some comments.

In her **note 228**, Borg mentions the hypotheses, suggested by Freyberger, Zitzl and Ertel (2016a. See also the publication by the same authors, 2016b). I too have discussed the interpretation of these authors of the relief with representations of six buildings in Rome, the 'Bautenrelief' (here **Figs. 89; 90**).

Cf. Häuber (2017, 21, 276-277, 283, 325-337), where I have come to the following results:

1.) Contrary to Freyberger, Zitzl and Ertel (2016a and 2016b), I hope to have shown that all the buildings, visible on the relief here **Figs. 89; 90** were built *anew* in the Flavian period.

2.) I agree with Freyberger, Zitzl and Ertel (2016a and 2016b) that the "ARCUS AD ISIS", the building at the far left of this relief (cf. here **Figs. 89; 90**), stood on the ancient road underneath the modern Via Labicana. But the sanctuary of Isis, to which this arch led, was certainly not the *Isium Metellinum*, which stood on the Caelian, but instead the sanctuary *Isis et Serapis* in *Regio III* on the *Mons Oppius* (for that; cf. *supra*, at *IV.1.1.g*). - For a discussion of Freyberger's, Zitzl's and Ertel's (2016a and 2016b) erroneous hypothesis to locate the *Isium Metellinum* there; cf. Häuber (2017, 337).

3.) The second building from left on the relief here **Fig. 89** is certainly not "the amphitheatre of Statilius Taurus", as Borg writes in her **note 228**, thus reporting on the relevant suggestion by Freyberger, Zitzl and Ertel (2016a and 2016b), but, as was previously always taken for granted, and likewise confirmed by Giandomenico Spinola (2012, 346, at cat. no. "VI.11 Bassorilievo con raffigurazione di edifici (sepolcro degli Haterii)" = here **Fig. 89**), the Colosseum; cf. Häuber (2017, 325-328 [for the Amphitheatre of T. Statilius Taurus and its correct location]; pp. 328-337 [for the identification of the amphitheatre on **Fig. 89** with the Colosseum]).

But because on the relief **Fig. 89** the Colosseum is only 3 storeys high, this is a clear indication of the date of this relief - and by implication of the whole tomb of the Haterii, since only Domitian would add a 4th storey to the Colosseum. Hence my suggestion to date the tomb of the Haterii 'between the late Flavian period and 120 AD'; cf. Häuber (2014a, 170 with n. 178). For Domitian's addition of the 4th storey to the Colosseum; cf. the Chronographer of AD 354. As was already quoted in more detail above (cf. *supra*, at *IV.1.1.g*), Werner Eck mentions the buildings at Rome, which this late antique author has attributed to Domitian.

`Cf. Eck (2020, 59):

"In der wissenschaftlichen Diskussion haben dabei Aussagen des Chronographen von 354 die wesentliche Rolle gespielt. Denn dort wird unter dem Jahr 94 von der kaiserlichen Bautätigkeit unter Domitian folgende lange Liste vorgelegt [with n. 17]:

... *amphitheatrum* [*i.e.*, the *Amphitheatrum Flavium*/ the Colosseum] *usque ad clypea* ...".

In his **note 17**, Eck writes: "*Chronographus anni CCCLIII*, in *Chronica minora saec. IV. V. VI. VII*, hg. TH. MOMMSEN (= *M.G.H. Auctores Antiquissimi* 9), Berlin 1892, 14".

For Domitian's additions to the Colosseum: cf. Rossella Rea ("Amphitheatrum", in: *LTUR* I [1993] 31, with n. 52 = a drawing of here **Fig. 89**).

4.) The relief here **Fig. 89** does certainly not show the monumental entrance to "the Augustan *Templum Urbis Romae*", as Borg writes in her **note 228**, thus reporting on the relevant suggestion by Freyberger, Zitzl and Ertel (2016a and 206b). The authors (erroneously) assume the *Templum Urbis Romae* at the site of the (later) *Templum Pacis*. For a discussion; cf. Häuber (2017, 276-277, 283).

5.) for a detailed discussion of the tomb of the Haterii, and of the various interpretations of its reliefs, which was overlooked by Borg (2019, 255); cf. Häuber (2014a, 153, 167, 170, 181, 228, 274 ns. 218, 219; **Appendix VIII**: pp. 415-417; p. 415 n. 6 [here the important observations concerning the reliefs from the tomb of the Haterii by G. SPINOLA 2012 are mentioned]; p. 480, Figs. 116; 117a; 117b, p. 511; chapter **B 19.**): pp. 634, 642; chapter **B 31.**): p. 783 with n. 1 (bibliography); pp. 784-787, p. 788 with n. 70; pp. 789-791; chapter **B 32.**): pp. 792-796, 798).

In her **note 230**, Borg refers back to her **note 226**. And there she mentions "a tentative reconstruction" of the tomb of the Haterii by Henner von Hesberg (2002).

To this, I should like to add the following. When we consider the new findings related to the reliefs from the tomb of the Haterii, published by Giandomenico Spinola (2012, 345-346, cat. no. "VI.11 Il Sepolcro degli Haterii", and on p. 346, at cat. no. "VI.11 Bassorilievo con raffigurazione di edifici (sepolcro degli Haterii)" = here **Fig. 89**), von Hesberg's (2002) reconstruction of the tomb proves to be impossible; cf. Häuber (2014a, 170, n. 178, p. 415 with ns. 1, 6).

After this *Chapter* had been written up to this point, I received the article by Eugenio La Rocca ("La testa colossale di Tito nel Museo Nazionale di Napoli: uno scandalo agli albori dell'unità d'Italia", 2020b), which is dedicated to the colossal head of Titus (cf. here **Fig. 53**). La Rocca (2020b) confirms his earlier suggestion to identify this head of Titus as that of the cult-statue of *Divus Titus* in the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*. La Rocca (2020b) discusses also the head of Vespasian, which is likewise colossal, but of smaller proportions than the head of Titus, and was certainly not found near the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*. This is the above-mentioned head at the Museo Archeologico Nazionale Napoli with the (alleged) inventory number 1889. As La Rocca (2020b, 371, n. 16) found out, in reality this number refers instead to the year ('1889') when this portrait was described. To La Rocca's (2020b) further findings related to the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* I will come back below.

*I wonder, whether Domitian could have dedicated also colossal cult-statues of his mother
and his sister, Flavia Domitilla maior and minor, in his Templum Gentis Flaviae*

This fact is not explicitly recorded by our literary sources; cf. for those Filippo Coarelli ("Gens Flavia, Templum", in: *LTUR* II [1995] 368-369). Cf. p. 368: "È il *sacrarium* dedicato da Domiziano alla sua *gens* divinizzata, che servì anche da mausoleo: vi furono probabilmente collocate, togliendole dal *mausoleum Augusti*, le ceneri di Vespasiano e di Tito e certamente di Iulia, figlia di Tito (*PIR* F 426), che più tardi vennero mescolate con quelle dello stesso Domiziano (Suet. *Dom.* 17) ...". - For this prudent and faithful act of his nurse Phyllis, who had educated both Domitian and Iulia Titi (Suet., *Dom.* 17; cf. *Dom.* 22); cf. Häuber (2017, 167). For the portrait of Iulia Titi in the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*; cf. Barbara E. Borg (2019, 285 with n. 379).

But also Eugenio La Rocca (2009, 228) suggests that we should suppose that, in addition to the already known members of his family, either Domitian's mother or sister, or both of them, were *buried* in the

Templum Gentis Flaviae as well: "Si deve supporre che ivi fossero anche le urne ... di una o di ambedue le donne con il nome Flavia Domitilla, la moglie († ante 69 d.C.) [with n. 52] e la figlia († ante 69 d.C.) [with n. 53] di Vespasiano, una delle quali divinizzata da Tito più o meno contemporaneamente al padre [with n. 54] ...". In his **notes 52-54**, La Rocca provides references and further discussion. In his **note 54**, he says that scholars tend to believe that of those two ladies rather Flavia Domitilla *minor* had been divinized.

Dietmar Kienast, Werner Eck and Matthäus Heil (2017, 104), on the other hand, state that it is debated whether Domitian's coins, showing *Diva Domitilla Augusta*, represent the emperor's mother or rather his homonymous sister. Cf. p. 102 (on Vespasian): "Eine Tochter FLAVIA DOMITILLA (s.[iehe] unten)". Cf. p. 103: "Flavia Domitilla die Ältere Geburtsdatum unbekannt ... ca. 39 Heirat mit Vespasian; vor 1. Juli 69 Gest.[orben]; 80 Memorialprägung mit Carpentum für Domitilla; nach 90? Consecratio als DIVA DOMITILLA AUGUSTA (?)". Cf. p. 104: "... RIC II 124 Nr. 69 ff. RIC II² 275 f. Nr. 146 u.[nd] 157. (**DIVA DOMITILLA AUGUSTA. Umstritten ist, ob diese Münzen der D.[omitilla] oder ihrer Tochter gehören**) und RIC II Nr. 153 f. RIC II² 214 Nr. 262 f. (Memoriae Domitillae [my emphasis])".

More recently, La Rocca (2014b, 136) has expressed his conviction that Domitian's mother, Flavia Domitilla *maior*, was actually buried in the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*. In his discussion of the tomb next to Mausoleum of Augustus built for the children of Germanicus, he writes:

"In fact, the so-called *ustrinum* of Piazza San Carlo al Corso, often confused with the Strabonian *καύστρα*, has been identified by S. Panciera with a funerary monument annexed to the Mausoleum. It was destined for the children of Germanicus and Agrippina *maior*, who for various reasons did not have the honour of being buried in the great dynastic monument [i.e., the *Mausoleum Augusti*]. **This funerary monument**, perhaps built upon the initiative of Agrippina *minor*, almost certainly between 49 and 59, **hosted for a limited time (and before Domitian built the *templum gentis Flaviae*) his mother's ashes** and those of other relatives of Titus ... [my emphasis]", quoted in more detail and with references in Häuber (2017, 556, Chapter; *THE MAUSOLEUM AUGUSTI* (Figs. 1.9; 3.5; 3.7.; 3.8); Section: *The tomb next to the Mausoleum built for the children of Germanicus* (cf. Figs. 3.5; 3.7; 3.8).

Cf. here **Fig. 59**, labels: CAMPUS MARTIUS; VIA FLAMINIA/ VIA LATA/ Via del Corso; S. Carlo al Corso; Tomb for the children of Germanicus; MAUSOLEUM AUGUSTI.

Domitian's sister, Flavia Domitilla *minor*, has been identified with a portrait-type that is known from several marble portraits; alternatively, this portrait-type has also been identified with Domitian's and Flavia Domitilla *minor*'s homonymous mother, Flavia Domitilla *maior*. Personally, I side with those scholars who identify these marble portraits in the round with Domitian's sister, because they clearly show a young woman. - But the problem remains that those portraits have been identified on the basis of the above-mentioned coins, of which we ignore, whether they show Domitian's mother or his sister. Since both women had died before Vespasian became emperor, we don't have portrait-types of those ladies dating to Vespasian's reign.

The reasons, why I am suggesting that Domitian could have dedicated cult-statues of Flavia Domitilla *maior* and Flavia Domitilla *minor* in his *Templum Gentis Flaviae* are:

a) Only Domitian commissioned the portrait-type discussed here (cf. here **Figs. 54; 55**), which is identifiable because of coins, issued under his reign, that represent *Diva Domitilla Augusta* (but it is debated, whether those coins show Domitian's mother or his sister); it is likewise debated, whether or not both ladies have been divinized at all;

b) because one of the marble replicas of this portrait-type has colossal size (cf. here **Fig. 55**) I wonder, whether Domitian could have made the, in my opinion very obvious, decision to commemorate also his mother who died prematurely, and sister by not only burying both of them in his *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, but also by dedicating cult-statues of both of them there. If so, this temple tomb would not only have comprised cult-statues of two *Divi*, *Divus Vespasianus* and *Divus Titus* (cf. here **Fig. 53**), Domitian's natural father and brother but, in addition to this, also two cult-statues of *Divae*, Flavia Domitilla *maior* and Flavia Domitilla *minor* (cf. here **Figs. 54; 55**) his natural mother and sister respectively.

I have borrowed from Flavia Coraggio the information concerning Flavia Domitilla *minor* and the portrait-type, which has been identified with her, in my above-mentioned points *a*) and *b*); cf. Flavia Coraggio ("9. Ritratto di Flavia Domitilla Minore su busto moderno, detta Messalina", in: Salvatore Settis and Carlo Gasparri 2020, 152, cat. no. 9 = here **Fig. 54**). In this catalogue-entry, Coraggio writes: "Il ritratto coincide con quello apparso su alcune emissioni monetali di aurei e denari conati durante il principato di Domiziano con legenda *Diva Domitilla Augusta*". Of this marble portrait at the Museo Torlonia (inv. no. MT 527) the provenance is unknown. Coraggio (2020) mentions also the colossal replica of this portrait-type in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek at Copenhagen (cf. here **Fig. 55**). For this colossal portrait, which is broken off a statue; cf. also Vagn Poulsen (1974 II, 44-45, cat. no. 9, *Diva Domitilla*, Pl. XVI-XVII). Poulsen (1974) reported that earlier this portrait had been identified with Domitian's mother, but he himself likewise identified the represented woman with Flavia Domitilla *minor*; also of this portrait the provenance is unknown. As also stressed by Coraggio (2020) in her discussion of this portrait-type in general, the left profile of this marble head of Flavia Domitilla *minor* in Copenhagen (cf. here **Fig. 55**) shows striking similarities with portraits of her brother Domitian.

Fig. 53. Colossal head of *Divus Titus*, marble, Napoli, Museo Archeologico Nazionale (inv. no. 110892). Found at Rome "in 1873 in via Pastrengo during the excavations for the construction of the Ministry of Finance" (E. La ROCCA 2020b, 379), close to the north-west corner of the Baths of Diocletian. From: E. La Rocca (2020b, Figs. 4-7), to whom we owe the attribution of this portrait of Titus to the cult-statue of *Divus Titus* in the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*.

Fig. 54: Portrait of Flavia Domitilla *minor* on modern bust, Roma, Museo Torlonia (MT 527). From: S. Settis and C. Gasparri (2020, 152, cat. no. 9, F. CORAGGIO).

Fig. 55: Flavia Domitilla *minor*, Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek (inv. no. 3186). F.S. Johansen (1995, 40-41 Nr. 9). Photos: Courtesy H.R. Goette.

The portrait of Flavia Domitilla *minor* at Copenhagen (cf. here **Fig. 55**) comprises part of the neck, and is only 61 cm high (the head of *Divus Titus* [cf. here **Fig. 53**] from the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, likewise comprising part of its neck, is 152 cm high), which is why this portrait of Flavia Domitilla *minor* did certainly not belong to the here tentatively-assumed cult-statue of *Diva Flavia Domitilla minor* in the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*. But, although I do not know those two heads from autopsy, to judge from the above-quoted illustrations, the renderings of the eyes and of the hair of the head of *Divus Titus* in Naples and of that of Flavia Domitilla *minor* in Copenhagen show great similarities. Perhaps there is also something else which could support the idea that the head of Flavia Domitilla *minor* in Copenhagen was copied after the here assumed cult-statue of *Diva Flavia Domitilla minor* in the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*. Whereas her portrait in the Museo Torlonia shows her facial traits rendered rather unflattering and, therefore, possibly realistically, the portrait in Copenhagen is clearly idealized, as Coraggio suggests: "L'accentuato naturalismo di questa effigie potrebbe dipendere da un prototipo eseguito in vita, mentre la versione idealizzata, che negli esemplari a tutto tondo è in un

caso (Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek) di dimensioni superiori al vero, ne costituirebbe la redazione postuma, celebrativa degli onori conferiti da Domiziano alla congiunta [my emphasis]".

Let's now return to our main subject.

See on the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* most recently, E.M. Moormann (2020, 274); Moormann (2021, 46 with n. 17) and Moormann (forthcoming), quoted *verbatim* in detail *infra*, at *Appendix IV.d.4.b*); and *The Contribution by Eric M. Moormann* in this volume: *Can We Reconstruct the Templum Gentis Flaviae?*

Cf. Daniela Candilio (1990-1991); Candilio (1995); Candilio (1999); Candilio (2000-2001, 552, n. 32); Rita Paris (1994a); Paris (2009. For her reconstructions of two of the marble reliefs of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*; cf. *infra*, at *V.1.i.3.a*), and here **Figs. 33; 34**). Paris (1994b, 26-33, esp. p. 28 with n. 11: "La documentazione iconografica") follows Mario Torelli (1987, 564-567, Fig. 2: "immagine del calco ricostruito nel Museo della Civiltà Romana"), in suggesting that the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* is represented on one of the *sestertii*, issued by Domitian in AD 95/96 (cf. here **Fig. 30**), and on the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano" (cf. *infra*, at *V.1.i.3.a*); *Appendix I.g.3.*); *Appendix IV.c.2.*) and here **Fig. 31**). Of the same opinion like Paris (1994b) concerning Torelli's (1987) above-mentioned hypothesis had at first been also Filippo Coarelli ("Gens Flavia, templum", in: *LTUR* II [1995] 368-369, with Figs. 11 [corr.: 12 = here **Fig. 30**]; 180-182 [here **Fig. 31**], quoted *verbatim infra*, at *The Contribution by Mario Torelli* in this volume). Cf. *LTUR* V (1999) 262 (with further references). For Coarelli's current opinion concerning the *sestertius*, issued by Domitian (here **Fig. 30**); cf. *supra*, at *II.3.1.d*); *II.*; and *II.3.1.d*); *XII*.

For this coin (here **Fig. 30**); cf. Paris (1994b, 26 Fig. 14: "Sesterzio di Domiziano (95/96 d.C) con raffigurazione di edificio decastilo". For the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano" (here **Fig. 31**), which shows in Paris's opinion a procession in front of a 'tempio decastilo'; cf. Paris 1994b, 28, Fig. 16: "Il rilievo del Museo Vaticano e quello del Museo Nazionale ricongiunti in un calco del Museo della Civiltà Romana". Cf. Paris's Figs. 17-19 on p. 29, and Figs. 1-2 on p. 32. Stephanie Langer and Michael Pfanner (2018, 142-157; cf. *infra*, at *Appendix I.g.3.*)) are instead of the convincing opinion that this relief fragment shows a sacrifice in front of this decastyle temple.

Cf. Filippo Coarelli: "Gens Flavia, Templum", in: *LTUR* II (1995) 368-369 (with wrong identification with the *domus* of Domitian's paternal uncle, Flavius Sabinus, an opinion, which he would later correct; cf. *LTUR* V [1999] 262); Coarelli (1999a, 183); Coarelli (2009b, 93-94); Coarelli 2014 (194-207; pp. 204-207 quoted *verbatim supra*, at *IV.1.1.a*)); Jean-Claude Grenier (1996, 357, quoted *verbatim supra*, at *IV.1.1.c*)); Grenier 1999 (225-234); Grenier (2009, 238, quoted *verbatim supra*, at *IV.1.1.a*)), Amanda Claridge (1998, 338; cf. pp. 211, 350, Fig. 174); Claridge 2010 (427; cf. pp. 237, 392, Fig. 180); Kim Hartswick (2004, 143-146); Giuseppina Pisani Sartorio (2006, 58, quoted *verbatim supra*, at *IV.1.1.a*)).

Cf. Eugenio La Rocca (2009; cf. pp. 225-228, for the previous wrong location of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* at the site of the *domus* of Flavius Sabinus; cf. p. 228, for an analysis of Domitian's highly innovative idea to combine for the first time a building dedicated to the imperial cult with the actual tombs of the venerated *Divi* within the same structure, and that within the *pomerium* [!]; cf. p. 230); and Barbara E. Borg (2019, quoted *verbatim infra*).

Especially interesting in the context discussed here are Borg's (2019) observations concerning Coarelli's and Grenier's hypothesis that the temple tomb within the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* had a round ground-plan. Contrary to Coarelli (2014, 194, esp. pp. 204-207) and Grenier (2009, 238, both quoted *verbatim supra*, at *IV.1.1.a*)), Borg (2019, 249) does not reconstruct this temple tomb with a round ground-plan, but assumes a rectangular plan, and because she compares Coarelli's reconstruction of the temple tomb within the

***Templum Gentis Flaviae* with all extant similar structures - that were all inspired by the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* - her conclusions are very convincing.**

To Borg's discussion of Coarelli's reconstruction of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, I will come back below. La Rocca (2020b, 369 with n. 9), who himself does not discuss Borg (2019), is likewise of the opinion that the temple tomb proper within the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* did not have a round ground-plan. La Rocca's relevant findings are discussed in detail below. See also *infra*, at *A Study on Domitian's cult-statue of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus Capitolinus* (cf. here **Fig. 10**).

Borg (2019) herself does not discuss Grenier's idea concerning the Obeliscus Pamphilius. Grenier had actually been first to suggest that the Obeliscus Pamphilius was commissioned for the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*. - So Coarelli (2014, 205 with n. 476, where he quotes J.-C. GRENIER 1999; 2009), but already Coarelli (1996, 108) had referred to Grenier (1996, 357), where the latter had published this idea for the first time.

Whereas Borg (2019) studied especially the temple tomb within this building, I myself have come across Domitian's *Templum Gentis Flaviae* because of its porticoes, since those too have likewise proved to be very influential for later similar projects. See Häuber (2014a, 165 n. 144); Häuber (2017, 159-164) for a discussion of Grenier's and Coarelli's hypotheses concerning the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*; cf. pp. 244-288, section: "The Temple and Precinct of Matidia and the "Tempio di Siepe", the *Templum Pacis*, the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, Hadrian's Library at Athens and Plato's Academy at Athens"; esp. pp. 287-288: "The Precinct of Matidia and its relation to the buildings discussed in this section". I have discussed these institutions in context of Hadrian's *Athenaeum* at Rome; cf. pp. 22, 23, 250, Fig. 5.9 [Hadrian's *adlocutio* relief at the Palazzo dei Conservatori], pp. 505, 515-517, 521, 523). For Hadrian's 'Library' at Athens; cf. Eberhard Thomas (2015). Also Marco Galli (2017, 92-100) has studied Hadrian's *Athenaeum* at Rome and compares (on pp. 104-106) Hadrian's 'Library' at Athens with the *Forum Pacis* at Rome. For the *Templum Pacis*; cf. also Pier Luigi Tucci (2017), and *infra*, at *Appendix IV.d.4.b*).

Eugenio La Rocca (2009, 224) has already mentioned the fact that Hadrian's 'Library' at Athens has great similarities with Hadrian's Temple of *Divus Traianus*, which the emperor built at Italica, where he himself and Trajan were born. Hadrian's 'Library' at Athens, in its turn, is not only based on the gymnasium of Plato's academy at Athens, but also on Vespasian's *Templum Pacis* (also called *Forum Pacis*) at Rome and on Domitian's *Templum Gentis Flaviae*.

I have elsewhere stated: "E. La Rocca (2009, 224), in his discussion of the architectural remains of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, writes: `... **Da questa eclettica congerie di prototipi si sviluppa in età flavia, proprio con il *Templum Pacis*, una pianta con esedre di media grandezza, ma non tutte della medesima misura, comunque regolarmente cadenzate lungo il perimetro della corte porticata** [with n. 17]. **Questo nuovo ruolo delle esedre risulta perfezionato nell'edificio sottostante le terme di Diocleziano** [*i.e.*, the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*], con l'alternanza regolare tra esedre semicircolari ed esedre quadrangolari, anche se tra i due tipi di esedre le misure non coincidono. **Il nuovo ed elegantissimo modello, con qualche ulteriore aggiustamento, sarà adottato qualche decennio dopo in ambiente provinciale, sia nella Biblioteca di Adriano ad Atene** [with n. 18], **sia nel Traiano di Italica** [my emphasis]". In his **ns. 17-18**, La Rocca (2009, 231) provides references. Cf. Häuber 2017, 277.

Summarizing the relevant findings of the excavator of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, Daniela Candilio, La Rocca (2009, 224) writes:

"Se collocate a distanza regolare, e ammettendo che su ogni lato ci fossero due esedre semicircolari ed una quadrangolare al centro, si potrebbe stabilire un rapporto tra larghezza e lunghezza di 2:3, presunto, certo, ma convincente. **In tal caso la quadriporticus, i cui lati lunghi sarebbero stati paralleli alla alta Semita,**

avrebbe raggiunto la considerevole misura di 123 x 83 metri circa, complessivamente di poco inferiore alla piazza del *Templum Pacis* (110 x 105 metri).

In quanto al nucleo cementizio in via Vittorio Emanuele Orlando [cf. his Figs. 1 (= here Fig. 57); 2], la sua misura di 47 metri circa da sola non è sufficiente per stabilirne né la reale grandezza né l'orientamento. **Qualora proporzionato al perimetro porticato, si sarebbe trattato in origine di un podio della consistente misura di 70 x 47 metri circa: ed è la proposta avanzata da Daniela Candilio. L'edificio soprastante, verosimilmente un tempio, sarebbe stato gigantesco ... Ma non necessariamente il tempio doveva essere pari di misura al podio ...**

La pianta che si può proporre in base agli scarsi resti, qualora si fosse trattato di un podio unico al centro della *quadriporticus*, **sembra essere simile**, nelle grandi linee, **a quella del cd.** [cosiddetto] **Traiano di Italica** [cf. his Fig. 3] **nel quale, all'interno di un quadriportico simile (120 x 93 metri circa) con esedre sporgenti circolari (diametro esterno 12 metri; diametro interno 8,40 metri, pari a 4,20 metri di raggio) e quadrangolari, ma della medesima lunghezza, emerge su podio un grande tempio ottastilo (42 x 28 metri circa) che domina con la sua mole lo spazio circostante** riempito da file di statue su basi [with n. 9]. La misura dei due porticati sembra coincidere, ma sulla misura e la morfologia del tempio romano, in base a quanto detto, la discussione deve obbligatoriamente restare aperta [my emphasis]". - In his **note 9**, La Rocca provides references.

La Rocca (2009, 228-230, quoted *verbatim supra*, at II.3.1.d); XII.) discusses also the hypothesis, according to which Domitian's *sestertius* (cf. here Fig. 30) represents the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*.

The Temple of Divus Traianus at Italica in Spain

On 2nd July 2018, Oliva Rodríguez Gutiérrez gave a talk at the Archäologisches Institut der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität (LMU) München, with the title: "Italica, die Stadt des Scipio Africanus, Trajan und Hadrian", that I was lucky enough to attend. Rodríguez Gutiérrez has excavated herself at Italica, and on 4th July 2018 she was so kind as to discuss with me in Munich the Temple of *Divus Traianus* at Italica, which she had shown in her talk. This temple was built by Hadrian, together with an entire new city quarter.

This means that scholars, who wish to study the porticoes of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* at Rome, of which only scarce archaeological remains have been found in excavations, can travel to Athens or to Italica, in order to compare those remains with its *Architekturkopien* there.

Rodríguez Gutiérrez was also so kind as to provide me with further information on 20th August 2019 concerning her own work at Italica and concerning its *Traianeum*. For the *Traianeum* at Italica; cf. Pilar León Alonso (1988); and Oliva Rodríguez Gutiérrez, Jesús Rodríguez Medina, Francisco S. Pinto Puerto, and Roque Angulo Fornos (2016). For comparisons of Hadrian's *Traianeum* at Italica with Hadrian's 'Library' at Athens; cf. Aldo Corcella, Maria Chiara Monaco, and Elsa Nuzzo 2013, 121, 137; Maria Chiara Monaco, Aldo Corcella and Elsa Nuzzo (2014, 53-54).

La Rocca (2009, 224) observes that the Temple of *Divus Traianus* at Italica "domina con la sua mole lo spazio circostante [my emphasis]". This is also due to the fact that this temple has been erected at the top of a hill. - We may, therefore, ask ourselves, provided the Temple of *Divus Traianus* at Italica copied the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* at all, whether this was an integral part of this *Architekturkopie*. I am saying this, because Domitian's temple tomb for his dynasty, which has been excavated at the Baths of Diocletian, stood on a higher level than the *quattroporticus* surrounding it.

This has been observed by Filippo Coarelli (cf. *id.* 2014, 204-205 with n. 474, quoted *verbatim supra*, at IV.1.1.a)), and again below. Now, if that were true, this could explain, why Domitian's *sestertius* (cf. here Fig.

30) - in case it represents the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* at all - gives the impression that this temple stands at an elevated site when compared to its surrounding precincts.

Filippo Coarelli (2014) provides an explanation for the irritating fact that both, the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* and the Baths of Diocletian, are mentioned in the Constantinian Regionary Catalogues. This was already quoted above (cf. *supra*, at IV.1.1.a)), but because it has been neglected by a recent commentator, I repeat it here again:

Cf. Coarelli (2014, 204: "L'edificio così ricostruito [*i.e.*, the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*] ci restituisce un'immagine plausibile del *templum gentis Flaviae*: una struttura che riuniva in sé, per la prima volta, le caratteristiche e le funzioni di tipi edilizi in precedenza distinti: il sepolcro e il tempio dinastico.

Resta da chiarire il motivo per cui esso viene ancora citato nei Cataloghi Regionari di età costantiniana, quando ormai doveva essere scomparso per far luogo alle Terme di Diocleziano (Anch'esse menzionate nello stesso documento)".

Cf. Coarelli (2014, 204-205): "**Va tenuto conto, a questo proposito, di un detta-** [page 205] **glio emerso dalle esplorazioni recenti [with n. 474], di cui non si è tenuto alcun conto: il fatto cioè che i resti dell'edificio spiccano a un livello più alto rispetto a quello delle successive terme. Questo dato ammette un'unica soluzione, che infatti è stata proposta, con prudenza, dai responsabili dello scavo: mentre la grande platea porticata venne certamente soppressa dall'edificio successivo, che ne prese il posto, la costruzione centrale, e cioè il nucleo essenziale del complesso, venne risparmiato, poiché veniva a cadere in un'area libera entro il recinto delle terme. L'ovvia conclusione è che il complesso domiziano sopravvisse anche in seguito, ciò che consente di spiegare la sua menzione, insieme alle terme, nei Cataloghi Regionari [my emphasis]**".

For the fact that the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* and the Baths of Diocletian are both mentioned in the Constantinian Regionary Catalogues, see Domenico Polombi: "Fig. 84. *Regiones quattuordecim*. Planimetria generale", label: *Regio VI. Alta Semita* Continet ... 9. Gentem Flabiam. 10. Thermas Diocletianas", in: *LTUR IV* (1999) 518.

For the precise date of the Constantinian Regionary Catalogues; cf. *supra*, at II.3.1.d); VII.

The scholar, who does not address the just quoted explanation by Filippo Coarelli (2014, 204-205) concerning the fact that both the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* and the Baths of Diocletian are mentioned in the Constantinian Regionary Catalogues, is Paolo Liverani (2021, 87-88):

"The body of evidence we have examined up to this point constitutes the most important part of our documentation. Few other examples can be briefly considered, but they are less meaningful because of their fragmentation and lack of precise context. **In 1901, a series of sculptural fragments was found during the building of the northern portico of Piazza della Repubblica in Rome, on the site of the great exedra of the Baths of Diocletian.** They were stolen by the workers and arrived on the antiquarian market, where Paul Hartwig acquired most of the marbles, donating them to the National Museum of Rome (Conlin, fig. 7). Some other fragments ended up in the Kelsey Museum of the University of Michigan. All of them were assigned to the Domitianic period on stylistic grounds and attributed to the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*. Impressive structures - datable to the Domitianic period on the basis of brickstamps were found at various times under the areas occupied by the Planetarium, Via Parigi and Via Vittorio Emanuele Orlando, close to the findspot of the sculpture[s]. **The remains included a precinct and a podium that some scholars identified as the *Templum*.** [with n. 20] **The hypothesis is not without its problems because the Regionary catalogues – a list of monuments of Rome organized by the urban *regiones* (districts) and dating to the**

early fourth century CE – mention both the *Templum* and the Baths of Diocletian, but in this case it is difficult to imagine how the temple could have remained visible inside the area of the baths, which were built much later. Be that as it may, the sculptural fragments suggest that we should reconstruct an enclosure with a series of figures such as caryatids on the outside and with two relief panels, [page 88] one depicting a sacrifice in front of a temple [cf. here Fig. 34], the other the Emperor Vespasian among soldiers and other figures [cf. here Fig. 33; my emphasis]".

In his note 20, Liverani writes: "Candilio 1990-91; Paris 1994 [*i.e.*, here R. PARIS 1994a]; La Rocca 2009; Coarelli 2014, 194-207. See Eric Moormann in this volume".

For "Conlin, fig. 7", mentioned in the Liverani passage quoted above (2021, 87); cf. Diane Atnally Conlin ("Master and God: Domitian's Art and Architecture in Rome", 2021, 157, Fig. 7).

The caption of Conlin's Fig. 7 reads: "Relief fragment from the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* representing a soldier. Rome, Museo Nazionale Romano, Palazzo Massimo alle Terme, inv. 310257 (courtesy of Ministero per i Beni e le Attività Culturali e per il Turismo - Museo Nazionale Romano)". - On this and four other fragments has been based the reconstruction drawing of the panel which represents, in my opinion, Vespasian's *adventus* into Rome of October AD 70; cf. here Fig. 33. For the two relief panels from the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, mentioned by Liverani (2021, 88): "one depicting a sacrifice in front of a temple, the other the emperor Vespasian among soldiers and other figures"; cf. *infra*, at V.1.i.3.a) and here Figs. 34; 33).

Similarly as Liverani (2021, 87-88), Eugenio La Rocca (2020b, 369 with n. 9), although being aware of Coarelli's (2014, 204-205) above-quoted relevant hypothesis, does not believe that the temple tomb proper of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* could have survived within the Baths of Diocletian, arguing that the late antique sources (*inter alia* the Constantinian Regionary Catalogues), which have been interpreted by Coarelli (*op. cit.*) in this way, do not explicitly call the building they refer to as '*templum*'. La Rocca's (2020b) relevant findings are discussed in detail below.

And Diane Atnally Conlin (2021, 158) even suggests that the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* may have been destroyed shortly after Domitian's death:

"The exact date of the destruction of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* is unknown, but it seems likely the structure did not exist for long after the rise of Rome's next great imperial builder, Trajan".

But there are even more buildings that may somehow have been related to Domitian's *Templum Gentis Flaviae*. I cannot study those comparisons here in depth myself, but wish at least to mention them. As was already quoted above (cf. *supra*, at IV.1.1.a)), Coarelli (2014, 204-207) has rightly remarked: "sarebbe difficile immaginare che la costruzione a Hispellum di un *templum Flaviae gentis* non abbia tenuto conto dell'omonimo modello domiziano [with n. 475, quoting: GASCOU 1967]". - Hispellum (modern Spello) is a town located in Umbria in Italy.

The Marble Forum at the Colonia Augusta Emerita (Mérida) in Spain

Much better known than Hispellum in Italy is the so-called Marble Forum at the *Colonia Augusta Emerita* (Mérida) in Spain.

Cf. for example Walter Trillmich (1990; *id.* 1995; *id.* 2002-2003; *id.* 2004 [*non vidi*]; cf. J.L. DE LA BARRERA and W. TRILLMICH 1996), Trinidad Nogales Basarrate (2008), Vibeke Goldbeck (2015), and Antonio Peña (2017).

The chronology of this building is debated. The marble decoration that was applied to an (earlier) building at Mérida, which is therefore now called 'Marble Forum', was according to Trillmich (2004) created in the Neronian period.

Antonio Peña (2017, 206-208) has recently suggested that the Marble Forum is datable in the Flavian period instead, and that this building was dedicated to the imperial cult. It was, in his opinion, either a Temple for *Divus Vespasianus* or a *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, which is why I mention the Marble Forum at Mérida here.

Interesting in the context of this study is the, at least to me so far unknown, fact that at this Marble Forum togate marble statues were excavated, which are missing their heads, and that one of them, which Peña (2017, 206-207 with ns. 56, 57) discusses, looks very much like the togate youth (figure 12) on Frieze B of the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here Fig. 2; Fig. 1 and 2 drawing: figure 12), in my opinion Domitian.

Since Peña refers in a footnote to Trillmich's (2004) dating of the Cancellaria Reliefs to the Neronian period, I repeat in the following, what was already said above (cf. *supra*, at n. 130, in section I.1.):

'Hugo Meyer [with n. 130] is so far the only scholar to have (in my opinion erroneously, cf. *supra*, at II.4.) suggested that also the head of the togate youth on Frieze B was recut in antiquity: in his opinion, this head was first a portrait of king Tiridates of Armenia [with n. 131], that was later recut into the still extant portrait of the young Domitian. According to Hugo Meyer, Tiridates was shown in the moment of receiving his diadem by the Emperor Nero, whose head was later reworked into a portrait of Vespasian [with n. 132]'.

Cf. my **note 130**: "For the assertion that the extant portrait of the young togate Domitian on Frieze B had been recut from the original portrait of Tiridates, cf. H. MEYER 2000, 134-138, Figs. 229; 251; 252; 256-259. This was refuted by M. PENTIRICCI 2009, 59-60 with ns. 417, 419. Cf. *supra*, at II.4.; VI.1.

Hugo Meyer's dating of the (alleged original) togate youth on Frieze B (in my opinion Domitian) in the Neronian period, has been followed by W. TRILLMICH 2004, 334-335, quoted after A. PEÑA 2017, 206-207 with ns. 56, 57. A. PEÑA himself, following E. BAUMER 2007, dates the Cancellaria Reliefs to the Flavian period)".

Cf. **note 131**: "For Tiridates, cf. M.S. DROWER and B.M. LEVICK: "Tiridates (4) (*RE* 6), brother of Vologeses I of Parthia, who set him on the throne of Armenia (AD 54). He fled before the Romans and was temporarily displaced by Tigranes (4) V, but was reinstated by Vologeses. By a compromise with Cn. Domitius Corbulo, Tiridates agreed to journey to Rome and receive the crown of Armenia ceremonially from Nero (AD 66) ...", in: *OCD*³ (1996) 1531. The authors quote Tac. *Ann.* 12ff.; Joseph. *BJ* 7.244-51. It is unfortunately unknown how old Tiridates was in AD 66".

Cf. **note 132**: "H. MEYER 2000, 131-132, with n. 416, Figs. 243; 242".

Since I could not find Walter Trillmich's publication of 2004, I discussed the matter with him in a telephone- and E-mail correspondence and sent him on 15th April 2020 a detailed summary of the results of this study, in which I have followed those scholars, who date the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here **Figs. 1; 2**) to the Flavian period. The relevant hypotheses are explained in the following chapters of this study.

Cf. *supra*, at II.4 (cf. here **Fig. 1.1**), where I hope to have shown that Hugo Meyer's (2000, 131-132, Figs. 243; 242) hypothesis, according to which the emperor on Frieze A (**figure 6**): Domitian (now Nerva; cf. here **Fig. 1; Figs. 1 and 2 drawing: figure 6**) has been reworked from a portrait of Nero, cannot possibly be true. I also summarized my chapters *V.1.h.2.*); *V.1.i.3.*); *V.1.i.3.a.*), in which I hope to have demonstrated that the head of

the emperor on Frieze B (**figure 14**) was from the very beginning Vespasian, as first suggested by Filippo Magi (1939, quoted *verbatim supra*, n. 112, at I.1.; cf. *id.* 1945; cf. here **Fig. 2; Figs. 1 and 2 drawing: figure 14**), not Nero, as likewise (erroneously) asserted by Hugo Meyer (2000, 131-132, with n. 416, Figs. 243; 242; cf. *supra*, n. 132, at I.1.), or for example Domitian, as (erroneously) asserted by Marianne Bergmann (1981, 23-24, Taf. 11; 12; 9, p. 25; cf. *supra*, n. 115, at I.1.; cf. also at I.1.1.; and at V.1.h.2.)).

Finally, I have explained to Walter Trillmich our visualization 'in situ' of the Cancellaria Reliefs, as attached to the opposite and parallel walls in the central bay of an arch (cf. the chapters I.2.1.b); I.3.2.; V.1.d); V.2., and here **Figs. 1 and 2 "in situ"**; and **Figs. 1 and 2 drawing**). In this visualization, the Emperor Domitian (now Nerva) (**figure 6**) on Frieze A stands at the same position as, on the opposite and parallel wall, the togate youth (**figure 12**) on Frieze B. Provided *a*) our assumption is true that the Cancellaria Reliefs actually decorated the opposite, parallel walls in the central bay of an arch, and *b*), provided our visualization is correct, these facts support the hypothesis suggested here that the togate youth on Frieze B has correctly been identified by Magi (1939, quoted *verbatim supra*, n. 112, at I.1.; cf. *id.* 1945) with the young Caesar Domitian, who, in his capacity as *praetor urbanus*, receives Vespasian in an *adventus*-ceremony at Rome that purportedly took place in October of AD 70.

As likewise already suggested by Magi (1939; *id.* 1945) and by many later scholars (all quoted *verbatim supra*, at IV.1.), the gesture, made by Vespasian with his right hand towards his son Domitian, means the "legittimazione" of Domitian's (future) reign as emperor. So Giandomenico Spinola (cf. *supra*, at n. 455, in section III. See also *The Contribution by Giandomenico Spinola* in this volume).

The truth is that Vespasian actually arrived at Rome in October of AD 70, coming back from the Great Jewish War. Our literary sources describe in great detail Vespasian's arrival at the Urbs, but *not* such an *adventus*-ceremony (cf. *infra*, at V.1.i.3.)). Vespasian came back to Rome at that stage for the first time since he was emperor, and is therefore crowned on Frieze B by *Victoria* (cf. here **Figs. 1 and 2 drawing: figure 16**) with a *corona civica* for two reasons: this ceremony means the investiture of Vespasian as the new emperor; cf. Gerhard Koeppel (1969, 193, quoted *verbatim supra*, at n. 200, in section I.1.1.), at the same time Vespasian receives with the *corona civica* the highest possible decoration for a military victory, because, like only Augustus before him, so Pliny (*HN* 16,3, quoted *verbatim infra*, at V.1.i.3.a), and here **Fig. 35**), Vespasian had succeeded to put an end to a civil war; cf. Rita Paris (1994b, 81-82, quoted *verbatim infra*, at V.1.i.3.a)).

Walter Trillmich was kind enough to answer me by E-mail on 25th April 2020, and on 28th April 2020, he has allowed me to publish here the relevant passage of his E-mail.

See *The Contribution by Walter Trillmich* in this volume on the headless marble *togati* found in the so-called Marble Forum at Mérida in Spain, one of which looks like the togate youth on Frieze B of the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here **Fig. 2**), in my opinion Domitian.

In his *Contribution*, Trillmich follows our visualization 'in situ' of the Cancellaria Reliefs, as attached to the opposite and parallel walls in the central bay of an arch (cf. here **Figs. 1 and 2 "in situ"**), and comes to the following conclusions. If indeed the Cancellaria Reliefs (cf. here **Figs. 1; 2**) should be "genuin flavisch" ('genuinely Flavian'), two questions still remain: who at Augusta Emerita (Mérida), in the Flavian period, could have had an interest in commissioning this copy of the program of the Forum of Augustus at Rome? And how can we explain the similarities of the togate statues at Leptis Magna, Cerveteri and Baia, which Trillmich regards as securely dating to the Claudian period, with the togate statues at Mérida?

I have neither been to Italica or Mérida, nor do I know the togate statues at Leptis Magna, Cerveteri and Baia, which Trillmich has mentioned to me in his *Contribution*. But I think it is clear from what I have learned

through the correspondence with him that those sculptures - and of course also the buildings, for which they were commissioned - should all be studied *together*.

Eric M. Moormann, whom I had also asked for advice, was kind enough to send me on 28th April 2020 his review on Vibeke Goldbeck's book (2015), that Trillmich mentions in his *Contribution*, and which provides a good summary of the problems connected with the subject discussed here:

"Chapter C III on the provinces in the Spanish peninsula presents the most rewarding set of cases, since it contains **the stupendous case of Emerita Augusta, modern Mérida ... where sculptural elements of the décor of the Foro de Marmol' were recognized by Maria Floriani Squarciapino in the 1970s as copies of the figures from the Forum Augustum**. Goldbeck makes clear that there are some conspicuous differences between Rome and Mérida, partly due to the placement of the forum within the grid-shaped town (esp.[ecially] absence of absidal exedrae), partly on the basis of other factors, so that this complex is - like most others - an example of 'Umbildung' rather than copying. **A problem is the chronology of these interventions, for which the Julio-Claudian and Flavian era have been proposed. Goldbeck prefers a Claudian or Neronian date and points to the workmanship of artists who also worked at Baiae. Although I agree with her, I am not convinced by her arguments that a complete take over of an Augustan programme as well as precisely copying of elements of the Forum Augustum were not envisaged (p. 79): this cannot be used as a sound argument to reject a Flavian dating [my emphasis]**". Cf. p. 285: "The 'Auswertung' (part D) brings together the results of the many local explorations ... **The questions put in the introduction now return with possible answers: where (western part of the Roman empire), who (local elites, connected with Rome), what (never entire Forum Augustum, but motifs, mainly the Ammon and Medusa *protomi*), when (mainly third quarter of the 1st century AD), and why (relationship with local elites and the central power, not an order of the emperor) [my emphasis]**". - Cf. Moormann (2016, 284, 285).

On 30th April 2020 an E-mail by Hans Rupprecht Goette reached me, whom I had asked for advice concerning the date of the togate statues from the Marble Forum at Mérida. He alerted me to the above-mentioned publications by Walter Trillmich (1990) and Trinidad Nogales Basarrate (2008), and answered my question by writing that also in his opinion the marble *togati* from the Marble Forum at Mérida are datable to the Flavian period.

Let's now return to Barbara Borg's new findings concerning Domitian's *Templum Gentis Flaviae*.

Borg (2019, 245) writes: "Archaeological remains of the complex [*i.e.*, the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*] are difficult to interpret ... New excavations in the area and underneath the western part of the Baths of Diocletian conducted in the 1980s and 1990s have brought to light parts of a **public building that consisted of a rectangular *opus caementicium* podium surrounded by a courtyard and portico with alternating rectangular and semi-circular *exedrae* of about 123 x 83 m, built of travertine blocks and *opus latericium* (Figure 4.22) [with n. 196]. Daniela Candilio has already proposed that the remains must belong to the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*. Their size, Domitianic date (confirmed by brick stamps), location, as well as a colossal, 1.5 m tall head of Titus and a smaller but still colossal head of Vespasian found in the vicinity [with n. 197, providing references], would surely be consistent with such a view [my emphasis]**".

In her n. 196, Borg quotes: "Esp.[ecially] *NSc* (1990-01), 165-83 (D. Candilio); *NSc* (2000-01) 443-53 (D. Candilio); La Rocca [*i.e.*, here La ROCCA 2009].

Coarelli (2014, 194-207, with Fig. 52 on p. 203: "*Templum gentis Flaviae*: ricostruzione dell'ambiente sotterraneo") **reconstructs the temple tomb within the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* with a round ground-plan.**

Concerning Coarelli's relevant proposal, Borg (2019, 249-250) writes:

"The proposal, intriguing as it may be, is riddled with difficulties. Not only is Coarelli's burial chamber strikingly different from the circular corridors of Augustus' mausoleum, it is not entirely clear whether Agrippa's Pantheon featured a roof or was open to the sky [with n. 206], and while it certainly had dynastic connotations and possibly associations of apotheosis, it was clearly not a straightforward temple to the imperial *divi* and *divae*. Moreover, like the late antique circular temple tombs, its overall plan, including the important front porch, requires elongated rather than square foundations. **What is more, not a single curvilinear element has so far been found on site, and even Coarelli's concrete foundations are rectilinear**, while those of the Pantheon *rotunda* as well as those of the late antique mausolea are circular. As some temple tombs and other large brick tombs make clear, semi-interred burial chambers often exist beneath the actual temple structure, and the niche excavated underneath the via Vittorio Emanuele Orlando (Fig. 4.22) could just as well belong to a rectangular interior space [with n. 207].

So far, I cannot see any evidence for a round building. A rectangular podium temple surrounded by a portico would fit with the rectangular features discovered so far, and this would in any case be the most likely shape [with n. 208] ... [page 250]

Despite the uncertainties involved, there can be no doubt that the Flavian complex had many features in common with our temple tombs. Like the *Templum*, temple tombs are often located within a precinct, and they may have shared its podium temple design. At an ideological level, they were intended to honour the deceased members of an entire *gens* - and only this *gens* [with n. 211]. **Moreover, the Templum was erected over the house where Domitian was born (Suetonius, *Dom.* 1.1.9). While private temple tombs could not be erected within the *pomerium* [as is the case of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*], they were often situated at the entrance to, or even very closely integrated into, villa buildings [with n. 212]. Functionally, it is important to note that the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* was the first temple for imperial cult that also served as a tomb, and the first imperial tomb that comprised cult for the *divi* and *divae* [with n. 213]. The erection of the first private temple tombs [also discussed by her] shortly after it [*i.e.*, the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*] was dedicated thus strongly suggests that they were inspired by the imperial model [my emphasis]".**

In her notes 206-208, 211-213, Borg provides references and further discussion.

In her note 208, Borg writes: "For a hypothetical reconstruction [of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*], see Capanna 'Tempio della Gente Flavia' and 'Alta Semita' [*i.e.*, here M.C. CAPANNA 2008; 2012]), who does not, however, explain the shape of the preserved parts of the *caementicium* podium. Some have argued that the appearance of the *Templum* can be gleaned from a relief [cf. here Fig 31] and a coin [cf. here Fig. 30]. The two fragments of the relief show a procession in front of a decastyle temple. Its tympanum depicts Mars and Rhea Silvia as well as the she-wolf with the twins (Torelli, 'Culto imperiale' [*i.e.*, here M. TORELLI 1987], 564 fig. 2; Paris (ed.), *Dono Hartwig* [*i.e.*, here R. PARIS 1994a], 28-30 figs. 16-19, 32-3 figs. 1-2; Davies, *Death and the Emperor* [*i.e.*, here J.P.E. DAVIES 2000]; 157-8; Leithoff, *Vergangenheit* [*i.e.*, here J. LEITHOFF 2014], 190-2 with n. 826 fig. 15). Yet the relief is most likely Trajanic rather than Flavian, as the original portraits in the background and the draping of the togas demonstrate, and the alleged provenance from the Forum of Trajan would further support such a date (Goette, 'Disiecta membra' [*i.e.*, here H-R. GOETTE 1983]). The coin is a Domitianic *sestertius* of 95/96 showing a decastyle temple within a courtyard framed by aedicula niches, either within a surrounding wall or, perhaps more likely, above some terrace walls (Torelli, 'Culto imperiale' [*i.e.*, here M. TORELLI 1987], 566-7; Paris (ed.), *Dono Hartwig* [*i.e.*, here R. PARIS 1994a], 26-8 fig. 14; Gazda *et al.* (eds.), *Images of Empire* [*i.e.*, here E.K. GAZDA, A.E. HAECKL and R. PARIS 1996], 19; Leithoff, *Vergangenheit* [*i.e.*, here J. LEITHOFF 2014], 191 fig. 10). However, the identification largely rests on the observation that there were few if any other decastyle buildings at the time, a relatively weak argument to support such a wide-ranging interpretation, and other suggestions for identification have been made (contra

e.g. Coarelli, 'Flavi' [*i.e.*, here F. COARELLI 2009b], 94; La Rocca, 'Templum' [*i.e.*, here E. La ROCCA 2009], 228-30; Leithoff, *Vergangenheit* [*i.e.*, here J. LEITHOFF 2014], 191-2 fig. 10)".

As we have just seen, also Borg (2019, 249 n. 208) discusses Domitian's coin (cf. here Fig. 30) and the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano" (cf. here Fig. 31), a fact that I had previously overlooked. Mario Torelli (1987) was of the opinion that both represent the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*.

But whereas I myself follow Torelli's (1987) suggestion here, Borg (2019, 249 n. 208) rejects this hypothesis. Although all this will be discussed in detail below, let me anticipate here already a few facts: it is not (quite) true, what Borg (2019, 249 n. 208) writes, that "the identification largely rests on the observation that there were few if any other decastyle buildings at the time".

What Torelli (1987, 564-567, Fig. 2 [= here Fig. 31]) suggested was, that the coin (here Fig. 30) and the relief (here Fig. 31), represent the *same* building; and because of the date 95/96 AD of Domitian's *sestertius* (here Fig. 30), Torelli came to the conclusion that the coin and the relief represent the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*.

Borg (2019, 249 n. 208) follows Hans Rupprecht Goette's (1983) dating of the "Rilievo Vaticano" (here Fig. 31, **below**) in the Trajanic period. Goette (1983, 245 with n. 27, p. 246), in his turn, had based his relevant hypothesis *inter alia* on the alleged findspot of the "Rilievo Vaticano" in the Forum of Trajan. This assumption was not true, as already stated by Torelli (1987, 504 n. 6). For that; cf. *infra*, at Appendix I.g.3.).

Goette (1983) does not discuss Domitian's coin (cf. here Fig. 30), whereas Coarelli (2009b, 94; see also F. COARELLI 2012, 574 with n. 432) and La Rocca (2009, 228-230), to whom Borg likewise refers, discuss Domitian's coin (here Fig. 30) in this context, which in their opinion does not show the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*. But Coarelli (2009b; 2012) and La Rocca (2009) do *not* consider the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano" (here Fig. 31) in their reasonings.

For a detailed discussion of Coarelli's (2012) and La Rocca's (2009) relevant opinions; cf. *supra*, at II.3.1.d).

Borg (2019, 249 n. 208) does not consider the possible meaning of the representation in the tympanon of the depicted temple (cf. here Fig. 31, **above**). I myself follow Stephanie Langer and Michel Pfanner (2018, 142-157) in assuming that, what we witness on the relief Fig. 31, is not a procession, as previously believed (followed by Borg 2019, 249 n. 208), but rather a sacrifice. This means, as has also been stressed by Langer and Pfanner (2018, 154), that the emperor, performing this ritual in front of this shrine, is closely related to the myth represented in the tympanon of this temple: this pediment depicts the foundation myth of Rome, and precisely the birth of Romulus.

We must, therefore, ask ourselves: who *other* than the Flavians, and especially Domitian, could propagate themselves/ himself as the new founders or founder of Rome? - To this I will come back below, when we discuss Eugenio La Rocca's (2020b, 369, n. 9) observations concerning the temple tomb proper within the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*.

To conclude. I myself, therefore, suggest that it is tempting to believe that the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano" (here Fig. 31) originally represented Domitian (whose head was restored by Bertel Thorvaldsen [19.11.1770-24.3.1844] with a portrait of Trajan carved by himself), because it was (erroneously) believed at that stage that the relief had been found in the Forum of Trajan.

See for all that, Langer and Pfanner (2018, 144-145 with n. 20 and Abb. 51, documenting the restorations of the "Rilievo Vaticano", here Fig. 31, **below**), who report some interesting information. The *Commissione Consultativa di Antichità e Belle Arti* of the Vatican had in 1816 decided that the Vatican Museums should only acquire artworks *without* restorations. The Vatican Museums acquired the relief (cf. here Fig. 31, **below**) in

1823, and in the *Registro Generale* is stated that it is *without* restorations. - Ironically, this relief is, in reality heavily restored, by Thorvaldsen, who had himself created those restoration, and was at the time a member of the *Commissione Consultativa di Antichità e Belle Arti* (!).

What we see on this relief is, in my opinion, Domitian, who is sacrificing in front of his newly erected *Templum Gentis Flaviae*. I also believe that this relief was meant to represent a very specific ceremony, namely Domitian's dedication of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*; cf. *infra*, at *Appendix I.g.3.*; *IV*.

For a detailed discussion of Domitian's *sestertius* (here Fig. 30) and the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano" (here Fig. 31); cf. *infra*, at *Appendix I.g.3.*); *I - Appendix I.g.3.*); *V*.

Let's now return to the hypotheses, suggested by Grenier and Coarelli.

I myself have elsewhere discussed the relevant hypotheses concerning the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, suggested by Grenier (1996; 2009) and Coarelli (1996; 2009b; cf. HÄUBER 2017, 159-163); this can be summarized as follows.

As we have seen above (cf. *supra*, at *IV.1.1.a*)), both Grenier and Coarelli are of the (in my opinion erroneous) opinion that neither the scenes on the *pyramidion* of Domitian's Obelisk, nor its hieroglyphic texts contain any references to Isis, which could explain its erection at the Iseum Campense. These texts stress instead in the authors' opinion the achievements of the Flavian dynasty - true is that these texts among others also stress the accomplishments of the Flavian dynasty - and this is why their conclusion to attribute this obelisk to the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* sounds from their point of view understandable.

In addition to Grenier's and Coarelli's (2009, 205) first wrong assumption - the alleged lack of references to Isis in the scenes on the *pyramidion* of Domitian's obelisk, as well as in its hieroglyphic texts, Grenier (2009, 238, quoted *verbatim supra*, at *IV.1.1.a*)), and Coarelli (2014, 194-207; the relevant passages from pp. 204-207 are quoted *verbatim supra*, at *IV.1.1.a*)) add the further (wrong) assumption of a round ground-plan for the temple tomb within the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, which in their opinion further supports their attribution of Domitian's Obelisk to the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*. And that because of the following reasons -

a) They argue with the assumption that Maxentius, by building the mausoleum for his son Romulus at his *Villa* on the Via Appia, had chosen as the model for this round mausoleum the alleged round temple tomb of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*; and -

b), Because Maxentius definitely re-erected Domitian's obelisk on the *spina* of his *Circus* at the same *Villa*, Grenier and Coarelli came to the conclusion that Maxentius must also have removed this obelisk from the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*.

Note that the basis of point *b*) are the following assumptions.

Coarelli reminds us of the fact that it was Maximianus Herculeus, the father of Maxentius, who had started building the Baths of Diocletian at the site, where the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* was standing. And because both, the Baths of Diocletian and the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* are still mentioned in the Constantinian Regionary Catalogues, Coarelli (2014, 204-205, 207) convincingly concludes, that the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* survived within these baths. He therefore suggests that only the erection of this huge bath complex 'around' the temple tomb of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* (in the course of which its pertaining porticoes were destroyed) had enabled Maxentius to remove Domitian's obelisk to his own *Villa* - that in Coarelli's opinion had been standing within the building complex of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*.

As already quoted before (cf. *supra*, at IV.1.), Moormann (2018, 171, in his **note 65**) comments on the hypothesis of Coarelli and Grenier to attribute Domitian's obelisk to the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, as follows: "... **Coarelli 2009** [*i.e.*, here F. COARELLI 2009b], 94; **J.-C. Grenier** ... [*i.e.*, here J.-C. GRENIER 2009] 234-39 and **Coarelli 2014**, 205-7: **they see it** [*i.e.*, Domitian's obelisk] **as an element from the Temple of the Gens Flavia, which might be likely on the basis of the inscription, but not as to its shape and signification** ... [my emphasis]". Cf. now Eric M. Moormann (2021, 46 with n. 18. He again rejects the just mentioned view of J.-C. GRENIER 2009, 234-238 and F. COARELLI 2014, 205-207, quoting for his own view also me: C. HÄUBER 2017, 158-164, but without listing this publication in the bibliography of the volume).

I myself have argued elsewhere as follows (cf. C. HÄUBER 2017, 163): if indeed Domitian's obelisk (cf. here **Fig. 28**) had been commissioned for the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, why on earth did the emperor order this 'Egyptian' feature for this building complex, the complete architecture of which, comprising the iconographies of its sculpture and relief decoration (cf. *infra*, at V.1.i.3.a), and here **Figs. 33; 34**), is Roman in style and iconography, considering at the same time that the contents of the *pyramidion* and of the hieroglyphic inscriptions of Domitian's obelisk, especially its praise of the Flavian dynasty, could just as well have been expressed in a Latin inscription, which would be much more appropriate in such a context?

In addition to that, I wrote: "Although Grenier's [2009, 204-238] and Coarelli's [2014, 194-207] hypotheses just-mentioned [and here again summarized] are at first glance very impressive indeed, I would be much more convinced of their reconstructions, had Maxentius placed Domitian's obelisk right in front of the so-called Mausoleum of Romulus (*i.e.*, Maxentius' dynastic tomb) - as Augustus had done in the case of his *Mausoleum* ... The fact that Maxentius did something else opens the chance to wonder, whether the situation may be interpreted differently" (cf. C. HÄUBER 2017, 162).

To conclude. Borg's (2019) new findings concerning the building type of the temple tomb within the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, who was able to prove that it did *not* have a round ground-plan, therefore adds to the critique of the suggestions made by Grenier and Coarelli to attribute Domitian's obelisk (cf. here **Fig. 28) to the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*. Her findings thus support at the same time the hypothesis suggested here that Domitian commissioned the Pamphili Obelisk for the Iseum Campense instead.**

Considering the new findings by Borg (2019) and those mentioned above concerning the *Traianeum*, built by Hadrian at Italica, it is now worth while to reconsider the hypotheses concerning the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, mentioned above. I am referring to Paris (1994b, 26-33, esp. p. 28 with n. 11: "La documentazione iconografica"), who followed in this respect Mario Torelli (1987, 564-567) in suggesting that the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* is represented on one of the *sestertii*, issued by Domitian in AD 95/96 (cf. here **Fig. 30**), and on the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano" (cf. here **Fig. 31**), of which the relief fragment at the Museo Nazionale Romano (here **Fig. 31, above**) shows an "edificio decastilo e frontone"; cf. Paris (1994b, 32, Fig. 1). - Because in both cases the building, identified by Torelli and Paris with Domitian's *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, has a *rectangular* ground-plan.

As I only realized after I had written this, Borg herself (2019, 249 n. 208, quoted *verbatim supra*) does not believe that Domitian's *sestertius* (here **Fig. 30**) and the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano" (here **Fig. 31**) represent the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* at all.

But we should not forget that other scholars do not reconstruct the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* as a decastyle temple, but rather as an octastyle temple. Cf. Eric M. Moormann (2018, 170 with n. 154):

"There are various reconstructions of the complex that consist of a decastyle or an octastyle temple surrounded by a porticus [with n. 54]".

In his **note 54**, Moormann writes: "Capanna 2008 gives the various possibilities and pleas in favour of an octastyle temple".

As we have seen above, also Borg (2019, 249 n. 208) has mentioned Capanna's (2008; 2012) reconstruction of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*.

To some of the subjects, discussed in this Chapter IV. are also dedicated other parts of this study:

Further for the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, Domitian's *sestertius* (cf. here **Fig. 30**) and the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano" (cf. here **Fig. 31, above**); cf. *infra*, at V.1.i.3.a) *The reconstruction by R. Paris (1994b) of two of the marble reliefs of the Templum Gentis Flaviae: 'Vespasian's adventus into Rome in October of AD 70' (cf. here Fig. 33), and 'Sacrifice in front of the Temple of Quirinus on the Quirinal' (cf. here Fig. 34). With some observations concerning Domitian's sestertius, issued in AD 95/96 (cf. here Fig. 30), the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano" (cf. here Fig. 31), and the aureus of Augustus, minted in 12 BC, showing the door of the (real) House of Augustus on the Palatine, decorated with the corona civica and laurel trees (cf. here Fig. 35); cf. infra, at Appendix I.g.3.) A sestertius, issued by Domitian in AD 95/96 (cf. here Fig. 30), and the Flavian date of the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano" (cf. here Fig. 31), both of which possibly represent Domitian's Templum Gentis Flaviae. With The first Contribution by Claudia Valeri; Appendix I.g.3.); V. A marble fragment of a state relief (cf. here **Figs. 32.A-E**), found in the Forum Romanum and published by H.R. Goette (1983), who attributes it to the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano" (cf. here **Fig. 31**); Appendix I.g.4.) Domitian's sacellum of Iuppiter Conservator, his Temple of Iuppiter Custos, and his (fourth) Temple of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus Capitolinus (cf. here **Fig. 83**). With The first Contribution by Peter Herz; and *infra*, at Appendix IV.c.2.) *The Ogulnian monument (a statue group representing the she-wolf suckling Romulus and Remus, standing underneath the sacred fig tree ficus Ruminalis), and the she-wolf suckling Romulus and Remus on two headless cuirassed statues of Flavian emperors (Domitian? and Titus or Vespasian?) in the Vatican Museums (cf. here Figs. 6, left; 6, right) and on Hadrian's cuirassed statue from Hierapydna at Istanbul (cf. here Fig. 29). Exactly like the statue of the ficus Ruminalis on the Anaglypha Hadriani (cf. here **Figs. 21; 22**), the lupa and the twins on those cuirasses symbolize Rome's claim to eternal power and divine mission, and that it was the task of the Roman emperor to fulfill this obligation (cf. C. Parisi Presicce 2000, 28, 29). With a discussion of the meaning of the lupa and the twins on the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano" (cf. here **Fig. 31, above**), and with The second Contribution by Claudia Valeri.**

After they were written, I sent all the text passages of this study, related to Domitian's *sestertius* (cf. here **Fig. 30**), to the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano" (cf. here **Fig. 31**) and to the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* to Mario Torelli, with whom Franz Xaver Schütz and I visited on 29th November 2019 at Perugia to discuss those matters with him.

Mario Torelli was kind enough as to write me by E-mail of 18th July 2020 his comment, which I may publish here with his kind consent. See in this volume: *The Contribution by Mario Torelli on the Templum Gentis Flaviae*.

Eugenio La Rocca's (2020b) new findings concerning the Templum Gentis Flaviae

After having finished writing this Chapter IV.1.1.h) the new article by Eugenio La Rocca on the subject reached me. As already mentioned above, La Rocca (2020b, 367-369 with ns. 8, 9) confirms his earlier

findings concerning this colossal portrait of Titus (here **Fig. 53**) by providing detailed information about where it was found and by attributing it to the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, the location of which within the area of the Baths of Diocletian he maintains as well (cf. his Fig. 10 = here **Fig. 57**).

After discussing the available archival material, La Rocca marks the precise findspot of this head of Titus (here **Fig. 53**) on his plan Fig. 8 [= here **Fig. 56**], label: 2: it was found in 1873, on the pavement of the ancient road that followed the Baths of Diocleian on its north-western side (today: Via Pastrengo). In his note 9, La Rocca (2020b) rejects Filippo Coarelli's (2014) reconstruction of the temple tomb proper within the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, which, according to Coarelli, had a round ground-plan. But note that La Rocca has overlooked the fact that Barbara E. Borg (2019) has already refuted Coarelli's 'round' reconstruction of the temple tomb of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* (for a detailed discussion of Coarelli's and Borg's relevant hypotheses; cf. *supra*).

Then, La Rocca (2020b, 369, n. 9) adds previously not considered information concerning the meaning of the term *templum*, and applies that to the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, concluding that - as I should like to add: under 'normal' circumstances - the temple tomb proper of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* could not possibly be regarded as a *templum*. The reason being, in La Rocca's opinion, that this building was not only a temple for the imperial cult, but served at the same time as a tomb for members of the *gens Flavia*, arguing that, by definition, tombs were not located within an inaugurated space and could, therefore, not be *templa*.

Since I am not an expert in this field myself, I will now ask John Bodel, Barbara E. Borg and Jörg Rüpke for advice. This I have done and John Bodel was kind enough to answer me on 6th September 2021.

See *The Contribution by John Bodel in this volume: A note on the religious status of imperial tombs*. - To this I will come back below.

Also Barbara E. Borg was kind enough to answer my relevant question, on 14th and 20th September 2021. But because Franz Xaver Schütz and I had published the title of this book on 7th September 2021 on our Webserver (in which all *Contributors* to this volume are mentioned), I could unfortunately not ask Borg any more for permission to publish her answer as a *Contribution* to this book, since I received her answer only after the 7th of September. But one thing is clear: when reading Borg's publication discussed here, she has addressed precisely the same complex of problems, which, independently of her, also La Rocca (2020b, 369, n. 9), has observed. See especially Borg (2019, 191-290, Chapter "4 Straddling Borderlines: Divine Connotations in Funerary Commemoration"), which I had not read in its entirety at that point, and that she was kind enough to send me now. -

Barbara Borg was kind enough to write me by E-mail of 20th September 2021 that I may mention here our relevant correspondence.

In addition, La Rocca (2020b, 369, n. 9) doubts (*contra*: F. COARELLI 2014) that the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* could possibly have survived, once the Baths of Diocletian were erected, arguing with the considerable size of this monument, and the fact that neither the Constantinian Regionary Catalogues, nor the Chronographer of AD 354 call it *templum*: "Curiosum, Notitia e Cronografo del 354 citano esclusivamente *gentem Flaviam* (o *Flabiam*) senza il termine *templum*". La Rocca is, of course, aware of the fact that, according to Coarelli, not the surrounding porticoes of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, but only the temple tomb proper, which originally stood on a square within those porticoes, could actually have survived until late antiquity. According to Coarelli's (2014) hypothesis, the Baths of Diocletian, 'surrounding the temple tomb', were planned in such a way that the temple tomb turned out to stand in one of the very large courts of those baths.

In the beginning, I was of the opinion that Coarelli's hypothesis sounds convincing, but we should, of course, now consider also La Rocca's objections to this hypothesis.

Fig. 56. Archaeological plan of the area of the Baths of Diocletian. Cf. C. Pietrangeli 1977, tav. 2 (drawing: C. Buzzetti and E. Gatti). From: E. La Rocca (2020b, Fig. 8): "1. Area dove era ubicato il *templum gentis Flaviae*; 2. Il luogo dove è stata rinvenuta la testa colossale di Tito [cf. here Fig. 53]; 3. Edificio in laterizio dove è stato rinvenuto il mosaico con tiaso marino e le tre Grazie; 4. Il luogo dove sono stati rinvenuti i rilievi Hartwig [for those; cf. *infra*, at V.1.i.3.a), and here Figs. 33; 34]".

Fig. 57. Archaeological plan of the Baths of Diocletian (detail). Cf. C. Pietrangeli 1977, tav. 3, with additions by E. La Rocca. From: E. La Rocca (2020b, Fig. 10: detail of his Fig. 9). The caption of his Fig. 10 reads: "Dettaglio della pianta a fig. 09. Con una linea rossa è segnalato il perimetro della recinzione del *templum gentis Flaviae* (da Pietrangeli 1977, tav. 3, con aggiunte dell'a.[utore])".

La Rocca 2020b, 367-369 with ns. 8, 9) writes about the colossal portrait of Titus (cf. here Fig. 53):

"Dai pochi dati disponibili si evince che la testa [of Titus; cf. here Fig. 53] sia stata rinvenuta sul lastricato della strada che costeggiava il fianco nord-occidentale delle terme di Diocleziano (figg. 2, b; 8 [= here Fig. 56], n.[numero] 2), non lontano da un complesso monumentale in opera laterizia di buona qualità ... databile tra l'età di Traiano e quella dei primi imperatori Antonini ... La testa di Tito (figg. 4-7 [= here here Fig. 53]) che, per la sua colossalità, non è ragionevole che provenga da una sede lontana, come giustamente avevano rilevato già Rosa e Brizio [1873], doveva essere pertinente a una delle principali [page 369] statue di culto del *templum gentis Flaviae*, la cui ubicazione nell'area in seguito occupata dalle terme di Diocleziano (fig. 8 [= here Fig. 56], n. [numero] 1), e nelle cui vicinanze furono trovati i rilievi Hartwig (fig. 8, n. [numero] 4 [= here Fig. 56]), risulta ipotesi ben motivata. Più precisamente, il *templum* doveva essere nel luogo in cui a più riprese, nell'area adiacente alla chiesa di San Bernardo, ai lati di via Vittorio Emanuele Orlando, furono ritrovate le fondazioni di un edificio demolito proprio per far spazio alle terme [with n. 8] (fig. 9). Poco si può dire della sua struttura, sebbene a grandi linee si possa intuire quale fosse il perimetro della sua recinzione [with n. 9] (fig. 10 [= here Fig. 57])".

For the "rilievi Hartwig", mentioned above by La Rocca (2020b, 369), which scholars attribute to the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*; cf. *infra*, at V.1.i.3.a), and here Figs. 33; 34.

In his **note 8**, La Rocca writes: "Candilio 1990-1991, pp. 165-183, spec.[ialmente] p. 175 ss. figg. 9-12; La Rocca 2009c [*i. e.*, here E. LA ROCCA 2009], pp. 224-225, 228-230, figg. 1-2; Coarelli 2014, pp. 197-200, figg. 48-49".

In his **note 9**, he writes: "Che il tempio [*i.e.*, the temple tomb proper of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*] fosse a pianta circolare (come hanno suggerito Jordan, Hülsen 1907, p. 426; Lugli 1938, p. 319; Scott 1936, p. 67; Ward-Perkins 1981, p. 77; e Coarelli 2014, pp. 200-204), è solo una suggestiva ipotesi priva, purtroppo, di un valido sostegno archeologico. Reputo invece poco verosimile che la struttura principale dell'edificio, sebbene priva della sua recinzione, fosse stata inglobata nelle terme. Continua a lasciarmi perplesso l'impatto causato all'interno delle terme da un monumento che, a giudicare dalle fonti superstiti, non era certamente di misura ridotta. Curiosum, Notitia e Cronografo del 354 citano esclusivamente *gentem Flaviam* (o *Flabiam*) senza il termine *templum*, che invece è adottato per altri *templa* della regio VI: il *templum Salutis et Serapis* e il *templum* dei Quirini (c'è una divergenza solo nella citazione del *templum Florae* che nel Curiosum è citato come *Floram*). Rimando ora a Cavallero 2019, pp. 199-220, su una maggiore precisazione del significato di *templum*, la cui incomprendimento da parte mia e di altri, secondo Coarelli, avrebbe prodotto una serie di equivoci a

catena. Il problema è che, malgrado la sicurezza di Coarelli in merito, il vocabolo latino non è così limpido come lui vorrebbe. Varr., *l.l.*, 7, 8, lo definisce come «*locus augurii aut auspicii causa quibusdam conceptis verbis definitus*». In regola generale, gli edifici sacri, salvo rare eccezioni, erano costruiti su un suolo inaugurato, cioè libero da ogni servitù, da ogni diritto di possesso o di proprietà detenuto da entità demoniche o da altre divinità che non fossero quelle alle quali gli edifici stessi, innalzati nei limiti del *templum*, erano consacrati. C'è quindi da dubitare, per quanto si sappia, che l'area di un monumento funerario fosse inaugurata (Marquardt 1892, p. 176). Così, il *templum gentis Flaviae*, in quanto anche sepolcro dei Flavii, non risponde molto bene ai requisiti di un *templum*. Della singolarità del *templum gentis Flaviae*, tempio della *domus divina* e contemporaneamente sepolcro, si era reso conto Jean-Claude Richard (Richard 1966, pp. 133-135), che scorgeva nell'iniziativa di Domiziano un passo avanti nella strategia del culto imperiale, con il passaggio non solo verso la dichiarazione della natura divina di tutti i membri della famiglia, per il solo fatto di essere sepolti a fianco dei parenti che avevano ricevuto l'onore della *consecratio*, ma anche verso l'amplificata funzione dell'edificio, che non è più solo un monumento funerario, ma luogo di culto degli imperatori Flavii divenuti divi e dei loro parenti divinizzati, come non era avvenuto con il mausoleo di Augusto, né sarebbe avvenuto con il mausoleo di Adriano. Ambedue queste strutture erano, infatti, esclusivamente luoghi di sepoltura, non luoghi del loro culto divino, che era altrove. Anche l'opinione di Richard, tuttavia, dovrà essere rettificata in base a una più approfondita analisi di un altro significato del termine *templum*, di cui abbiamo un'eloquente traccia in Virgilio. Didone aveva eretto nella neo-fondata Cartagine un *templum* nel quale erano deposte le ceneri del marito Sicheo (Verg., *Aen.*, IV, 457-458). Nel commento a questo verso, Nonio Marcello (VI, 92, p. 743 L.), annota: *templum et sepulcrum dici potest veterum auctoritate*. C'è quindi un significato del termine *templum*, adottato in base alla *auctoritas veterum*, che non coincide con quello vulgato di luogo inaugurato. Non diversamente, anche se con minore evidenza, nel suo commento al medesimo brano, Servio (*ad Aen.*, IV, 458), adopera sovente il termine *templum* come il più idoneo a identificare il monumento eretto da Didone al marito Sicheo. Non è un esempio isolato. Nella poesia a carattere funerario è frequente il riferimento alle dimore dell'Ade come *templa*. Nell'iscrizione romana di Bassa, morta a dieci anni (CIL, VI, 7898, 8-9), si dice: ... *at saevos Pluto rapuit me ad infera templa*. E in quella del piccolo P. Aelius Pius, anch'essa romana (CIL, VI, 10794, 9): ... *set non hic manis nec templa achirus(i)a visi(t)*. In un'iscrizione funeraria di Ostia (CIL, XIV, 480, ll. 7-8) il monumento funerario è detto *aedes* e *novissima templa* per i Mani e per le ceneri del defunto e dei suoi discendenti: ... *hanc aedem posuit struxitque novissima templa manibus et cineris posterisque meis*. Come si può vedere da questi pur limitati esempi, si deve essere prudenti prima di sostenere che la recente discussione sugli edifici del culto dinastico a Roma si sia arenata per un'incomprensione del reale significato del termine *templum*, che in età imperiale non ha una sola accezione".

Let's now turn to a discussion of La Rocca's statement (2020b, 369, n. 9), according to which Domitian's idea to combine in his *Templum Gentis Flaviae* a temple dedicated to the divinized members of his family, with the family tomb is a concept that would, 'under normal circumstances', have been prohibited by Roman sacred law.

On 6th September 2021 an Email from our good friend John Bodel reached me, since I had asked him for advice concerning this subject. In this E-mail, John Bodel kindly agreed to write a text on this subject.

Cf. *The Contribution by John Bodel* in this volume: *A note on the religious status of imperial tombs*.

Amanda Claridge, with whom I discussed this subject in a telephone conversation on 7th September 2021, had an excellent idea which she kindly shared with John Bodel and me: such 'temple tombs' as the one within Domitian's *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, are by no means without precedent, since founders were usually honoured this way: 'and the Flavians were founders too', Amanda added.

Amanda Claridge was kind enough to write me by E-mail of 25th September 2021 that I may mention here our relevant correspondence.

As an example for such a founder's tomb, Amanda Claridge mentioned to me a tomb in the Triangular Forum at Pompeii which has recently been identified as the tomb of the founder of the city - but which I myself do *not* know. 'That sounds like the tombs of the founders of Greek colonies', I replied. Amanda agreed, adding to this that Pompeii had anyway great similarities with those Greek colonies.

The oldest part of Pompeii is located in the city's 'REGIO VII', immediately adjacent to which in the east was built the Triangular Forum, that belongs to 'REGIO VIII'. For plans that show Pompeii's development over time; cf. Joanne Berry (1998, 14-31, Figs. 11-21), with a summary of the city's history by Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, who mentions on p. 21: "the sanctuary, probably of Minerva and Hercules in the Triangular Forum". See for the Triangular Forum also Wilhelmina F. Jashemski (1993, 224), her cat. no. "460. VIII.vii.30 The Triangular Forum Figs. 255, 256". In this Triangular Forum stands the so-called Doric Temple mentioned by Wallace-Hadrill.

See for a plan of Pompeii in which its 'REGIONES' are marked, Jashemski (1993, 2, Fig. 1), labels: REG. VII; REG. VIII; FORO TRIANGOLARE (the location of the Doric Temple in the Triangular Forum is indicated: it is oriented towards the sea). The caption of Jashemski's Fig. 1 reads: "Plan 1 Pompeii. When Fiorelli became the director of the excavations in 1860 he divided Pompeii into nine regions, and assigned a number to each insula (or block) in each region, as well as to each entrance in each insula".

That a tomb in front of the Doric Temple in the Triangular Forum at Pompeii may be identified as that of the founder of the city is not only understandable because of its location within the oldest part of the city. In addition to this, the oldest architectural finds from the area prove that this oldest part of Pompeii's history is indeed closely connected with the contemporary Greek colonies, as Amanda Claridge had mentioned to me. - Or should we even say: because of this tomb of a founder, the oldest part of Pompeii should be identified *as* a Greek colony?

See for that, Nicholas Purcell ("Pompeii"; in: *OCD*³ [1996] 1214): "The oldest architecture fragments from the Doric Temple ... belong to the Greek milieu around the Campanian *apoikiai* of the 6th cent.[ury] BC (see APOIKIA) ...".

The article '*apoikia*' in the same lexicon leads us then to what I said in my response to Amanda Claridge in our conversation. I myself had referred to the findings of my colleague Roald Docter (2013, 170-171), who, choosing the example of the Greek colony Megara Hyblaia, has described the entire process of founding a Greek colony in the period in question: with the founder Lamis, who after his death was honoured with a *heroon* at Megara Hyblaia. - And, as I should like to add, we may probably assume that his *heroon* had been erected very closely to his tomb.

The other observation of Amanda Claridge, according to which 'the Flavian emperors were founders too', is likewise true.

I, therefore, repeat a passage that was written for a different *Chapter* in this book (cf. *supra*, at II.3.1.d); II.):

'Erika Simon (1963, 727-728) dated the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano" (cf. here **Fig. 31**) to the Flavian period, recognized in the originally represented emperor Domitian (currently restored with a portrait of Trajan), and was of the opinion that this relief, exactly like Domitian's *sestertius* (cf. here **Fig. 30**), shows the '*Domus Tiberiana*' on the Palatine, as rebuilt by Domitian. **Simon therefore believed that the scene in the pediment of this temple (Fig. 31, above [in my opinion the *Templum Gentis Flaviae!*]) fitted very well Domitian's self-presentation, 'who felt [himself] to be the new founder of Rome'** (cf. also *infra*, at V.1.i.3.a) [my emphasis]).

As mentioned above, in my conclusions concerning the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano" (cf. *infra*, at Appendix I.g.3.); IV.), and here Fig. 31), which I regard as a representation of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, I myself stress Domitian's identification with Rome's founder Romulus. If my hypotheses are true, Domitian commissioned this relief, in which he is shown sacrificing in front of his *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, in the tympanon of which, certainly not by chance, is represented Rome's foundation myth: the birth of Romulus. Since the contemporaries knew that Domitian was born in the *domus* of his father Vespasian, at the site of which now stood Domitian's *Templum Gentis Flaviae* (cf. Suet, *Dom.* 1; cf. *Dom.* 15), the tympanon relief of this temple referred directly to Domitian. In addition, I tentatively suggest that what we witness on this relief is the dedicatory ceremony of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*:

Provided *a*) that the Flavian date, suggested here for the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano" (cf. here Fig. 31) is true, and *b*) that this relief and Domitian's *sestertius* (here Fig. 30) represent the same building, Domitian's emulation of Romulus [discussed earlier in Appendix I.g.3.); IV. in context with the tympanon of the Temple of Quirinus, which is visible on one of the reliefs from the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*; cf. here Fig. 34] provides another strong argument in support of Torelli's hypothesis to see in both, the reverse of Domitian's *sestertius*, and the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano", representations of Domitian's *Templum Gentis Flaviae*.

As we have seen above, Stephanie Langer and Michael Pfanner (2018, 151 with Abb. 55) suggest two different reconstructions concerning the sacrifice, which is visible on the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano" (cf. here Fig. 31, below). If we follow Erika Simon (1963, 727, 728) and Langer and Pfanner (2018, 154 with Abb. 55: their reconstruction on the left hand side; cf. their Abb. 53), the emperor is to be identified with their figure 5 on the relief (now with restored head of Trajan), who sacrifices not with *capite velato*.

I also follow Langer and Pfanner (2018, 154) with their following statement:

"Es scheint daher verlockend, die Thematik des Giebfeldes [*i.e.*, of the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano"; cf. here Fig. 31, above] mit der Handlung des Opfernden [cf. here Fig. 31, below] direkt in Verbindung zu bringen". - To this we may add Claudia Valeri's observation, her point 4.) (cf. *The first Contribution by Claudia Valeri* in this volume): "The real protagonist of the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano" is the represented temple [my emphasis]" .

Provided, the hypotheses suggested here are true, *a*) that figure 5 (now with restored head of Trajan) on the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano" (cf. here Fig. 31, below) is the emperor, *b*) that he was shown in the act of sacrificing, *c*) that this emperor was originally Domitian, and *d*) that the represented temple is the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*, it is in my opinion *e*) in addition to this tempting to believe that the "Rilievo Terme Vaticano" showed Domitian in the act of dedicating that temple, in front of which he is shown as sacrificing: namely the *Templum Gentis Flaviae*.

For the importance of 'Rome's foundation story' for the Flavian dynasty in general, and for Domitian in particular, see also Claudio Parisi Presicce (2000, 25-30), quoted *verbatim infra*, at Appendix IV.c.2.)' .

Whereas Domitian styled himself 'only' as the new founder of Rome, Vespasian had done the same, and, in addition to this, proclaimed himself as the founder of a new dynasty.

I, therefore, repeat also another passage that was written for a different section of this *Chapter* (cf. *supra*, at IV.1.1.g):

‘Only after this section was written so far, did I learn from Laurent Bricault and Richard Veymiers (2018, 141, with n. 87) that Vespasien issued coins with the legend: *Roma resurge(n)s* (cf. *infra*, at *Appendix II.a*) [my emphasis].

The following passage from Bricault and Veymiers (2018, 141, with ns. 85-88) is quoted in more detail in *Appendix II.a*:

‘This *sestertius* ([of Vespasian] cf. here **Fig. 113**) was issued "... probablement en mars ou avril 71 ...

Les trois émissions de bronzes, et notamment de sesterces, pour l'année 71 sont les plus importantes du principat [*i.e.*, of Vespasian], tout au moins s'agissant de la variété des types de revers employés [with n. 86]. Si certains revers reprennent des types utilisés précédemment par Galba (*Libertas* ; *Ara Providentiae*), ou s'en inspirent (**La *Roma resurge(n)s* de Vespasien** répondant à la *Roma renasce(n)s* de Galba) [with n. 87], **d'autres intègrent des types totalement neufs (*Roma septicollis* [= here **Fig. 112**] ; *Iseum Campense* [= here **Fig. 113**]). Les thématiques mises en avant dans ce programme numismatique sont claires. Elles traverseront tout le principat. Il est question de victoire (*Mars Victor* ; *Victoria Augusti* ; *Iudaea Capta*), de paix rétablie et de liberté retrouvée en harmonie avec le Sénat (*Pax Augusta* ; *Pax orbis terrarum* ; *Libertas restituta* ; *Fortuna redux* ; *Concordia Senatui* ; *SPQR adsertori libertatis publicae*), **d'une dynastie nouvelle (*Titus et Domitianus Caesares* ; *Principes iuventutis*), de la résurrection de Rome après l'épisode néronien et la guerre civile (*Roma resurge[n]s*), autant de messages annonciateurs d'un nouvel âge d'or** [with n. 88; my emphasis]”.**

I also anticipate another passage, quoted in more detail in *Appendix II.a*):

‘[Alexander] Heinemann (2018, 237) mentions Vespasian's *sestertius*, which shows the *Dea Roma* seated on the Seven Hills of Rome, accompanied by the *lupa* with Romulus and Remus and the Tiber:

"In ideologically appropriating the Tiber flood [of AD 69] as a divine admonishment to re-establish order, Vespasian could rely on a precedent both prominent and convenient. In 27 B.C., on the day after Augustus had taken the name we call him by, the Tiber had flooded the Campus Martius, and at the time seers had hastened to proclaim the incident a great and positive portent blessing the recent political events [with n. 108]. **Some confirmation that a similar appropriation actually took place after A.D. 69 may be gleaned from an issue of *sestertii* coined shortly after Vespasian's arrival at Rome, bearing the unique image of Roma resting on the seven hills and flanked by the Tiber and the *lupa* with Romulus and Remus** [with n. 109] ...

In the mythical past, the rising waters had washed the city's founder onto the slopes of the Palatine; in A.D. 69 - so contemporaries could construe it - they had heralded **the arrival of Vespasian, the founder of a new dynasty, who was to restore the city to its previous grandeur, rebuild the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus and extend the city's pomerium** [my emphasis]”.

See now also the subtitle, chosen for the volume of essays accompanying the exhibition on Domitian, to be held in the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden at Leiden (December 2021 - May 2022, and from June 2022 on in the ‘*Mercati di Traiano*’ at Rome), which was edited by Aurora Raimondi Cominesi, Nathalie de Haan, Eric M. Moormann and Claire Stocks (2021): *God on Earth: Emperor Domitian. The re-invention of Rome at the end of the 1st century AD* [my emphasis].