AD 68, though not a particularly constructive year for Nero, was to prove fertile ground for senators "on the make". Not that they were to have the time to build anything much other than to carve out a niche for themselves in the annals of history. It was not until the dust finally settled, leaving Vespasian as the last contender standing, that any major building projects were to be initiated under Imperial auspices. However, that does not mean that there is nothing in this period that is of interest to this study. Though Galba, Otho and Vitellius may have had little opportunity to indulge in any significant building activity, and probably given the length and nature of their reigns even less opportunity to consider the possibility of building for their future glory, they did however at the very least use the existing imperial buildings to their own ends, in their own ways continuing what were by now the deeply rooted traditions of the principate.

Galba installed himself in what Suetonius terms the palatium (Suet. Galba. 18), which may not necessarily have been the Golden House of Nero, but was part at least of the by now agglomerated sprawl of Imperial residences in Rome that stretched from the summit of the Palatine hill across the valley where now stands the Colosseum to the slopes of the Oppian, and included the Golden House. Vitellius too is said to have used the palatium as his base in Rome (Suet. Vit. 16),
and is shown by Suetonius to have actively allied himself with Nero's obviously still popular memory (Suet. Vit. 11. 2). In the case of Otho we find an even more overt attempt to ally his public image with the memory of Nero, and more explicitly, using public funds to obtain the wherewithal to continue work on the domus aurea (Suet. Otho. 7. 1). All three of Nero's successors, then, felt no need to actively dissociate themselves from a building that had done so much to define the form of the principate as it had been conceived and developed under the last of the Julio-Claudians. In fact two of the successors actively encouraged the idea that they were, at least in spirit, the true successor to Nero.

To be a successor to Nero though had finally proven itself to be of highly dubious utility. It is hardly surprising that it was with the final victory of the Flavian cause that a more conservative functioning of the principate was able to resume, and able to resume in the atmosphere of greater stability that this victory could produce. Alternatively it may be more the case that a wide-ranging stability, an empire-wide and population-deep tranquillity, or even just a resistance to flux, a deep distrust of change, allowed the Flavian party to usurp so easily then retain the most powerful position in the empire. Notice the use of the words "most powerful", it need not necessarily imply the most prized position on the empire. After all, there seems to have been a minimum of effort expended by the
victors in capturing their prize, and very little uncertainty as to the security of their new position¹. This situation was unlike that at the time of Octavian’s rise to supreme ascendancy, when the victor had been able to assert his sole power due in large part to what may be likened to a scorched earth policy on his part when it came to dealing with those who sought to rival him. But if Octavian’s secure grasp on power was due largely to the fact that out of all the possible contenders for domination of the empire he was the last one standing, a young and energetic colossus among a sea of exhausted pygmies, Vespasian’s position was very different².

For a start the empire had not been subjected to the long drawn out civil strife that had preceded Octavian’s hegemonic accession. The empire at the time of Vespasian’s victory had in its majority enjoyed nigh on a century of passivity and prosperity. It was used to and pacified by the peace and the fruits thereof, and had long been subjected to the message that this peace was the result of the form of government that it was fortunate enough to have been given under Augustus. Time there had been for both the empire and the power structure of its governance to be consolidated, to be systemised, and both were all the healthier and stronger as a result.

Following the defeat and death of Marc Antony there had been no-

¹This though may have more to do with with perceptions due to history favouring victors than with the actualities of the times.
one left in a position able to consider even rivalling Octavian in terms of the actual power he wielded, through control of military forces, but also and maybe no less importantly, through the less tangible power he wielded by means of his personal and familial auctoritas.

At the time of his force's victory in Italy Vespasian was strategically in much the same position as Octavian had been after the final defeat of Marc Antony. The majority of the empire's armed forces had already sworn allegiance to Vespasian prior to the engagement of the Vitellian and Flavian forces at Cremona. Also worth noting is the geographical position of the person of Vespasian. By remaining in Egypt while the forces loyal to his cause advanced on Italy and were finally victorious in their objective, Vespasian was able not only to remain in the militarily strong position that Egypt afforded, it also allowed him continued access to the riches of the Eastern Empire along with control over the main source of the capital's grain supply. Whether this initial bid for power was successful or not, Vespasian could retain a strategically strong position.

Octavian had had the benefit of a lineage that was unquestionably of a level of prestige that it could quell any doubts as to his right to at least participate in the very highest levels of government at Rome. Furthermore, and more specifically, he had been the adopted heir of Caesar, and so held the military auctoritas and popular support that
had belonged to the name Caesar. However with the death of Vitellius in the December of AD 69 the senate was filled with men able, if not to better, then at least to rival the family background of Vespasian. What had Vespasian that that these other senators had not? The answer is simple, and supplied to us by Tacitus: the support of the legions and sons to follow him.

There is another significant difference between the situation faced by Octavian and that faced by Vespasian. Until the success of Octavian there had never been an entirely successful wielding of sole power at Rome since the time of the kings. In fact one of the most popular and tenacious themes of the Republic had been the aristocratic and oligarchic nature of the government at Rome. Good and well known examples of this characteristic of the Roman mentality are the events surrounding the dictatorship of Caesar. It is equally well known what a bloody mess that turned out to be. It could very well be argued that it was this almost pathological resistance to anything even vaguely resembling monarchy that in large part determined the nature and character of the Augustan model of the principate. There was no successful Roman model or precedent for Augustus to follow, rather a series of historical examples more heavily weighted in regard to the ‘don’ts’ than to the ‘does’. In contrast Vespasian had not only a century of precedent, he was able to be elevated to the principate:

Octavian had had slowly and carefully to build the institution.

Furthermore the world of Vespasian's elevation to the principate was one in which there were few, apart from archaizing sophists, who let alone question the existence of the principate, could not possibly conceive that their world could continue to function normally without it. Not only this, but the empire came with a bureaucratic system that had been strong enough to withstand the vicissitudes of the likes of Caligula, the experimentation of Nero, and the destabilising uncertainties generated by the rapid succession of principes such had just occurred under Galba, Otho and Vitellius. Also, a century of Julio-Claudian monarchy had provided, along with a few definite 'don'ts', quite a few proven 'does'. Vespasian could have the benefit of hindsight if he chose to use it. So when modern historians talk about the similarity between the accession of Octavian and that of Vespasian, one wonders just what those similarities could be. Can fourteen months of political flux confined in the main to the very top echelons of the political and military institutions after a century of prosperous stability in any way be paralleled with a century of political, military and civil strife? The assumption of the top job in a well defined, structured and smoothly operating system is a world apart from the dangerous transition period from one form of government to another, deeply distrusted form of government.
One advantage that Octavian did have over his otherwise fortunate later successor was in fact this very instability and all the problems that went with it. He was able to present his reign as a refoundation of Rome, a regeneration of the populace, a resuscitation of their political and civil institutions, a restoration of the greatness of Rome and the accompanying universal peace under the aegis of the gods and himself. If calamity is bad (and by definition it should be) then anything that can be shown to be a remedy to, or a prevention of, that calamity can quite easily and legitimately be presented as good. Accordingly it should find acceptance all the more readily, and is likely to prove more popular than it otherwise may have been. Octavian had seized an empire that seemed to be drowning in calamity, and successfully presented himself and his form of government as the saviour. The success of this strategy was everywhere evident in the legacies of the Augustan reign. On the other hand three of Nero’s successors had gone at least some way to identifying themselves as a continuation of his legacy, and their level of success was unenviable to say the least. The Flavians needed a calamitous past in order to be able to present themselves as the agents of a welcome future. The uncertainties of A. D. 68-69, and probably more importantly the excesses of the Neronian principate had to be, or at least could be, marshalled and presented towards this end\(^4\).

---

The Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus

Certain events also favoured the new masters of Rome. On what was to be the penultimate night of Vitellius' life a group of Flavian supporters including both Flavius Sabinus and Domitian, respectively the brother and the son of the soon to be uncontested emperor Vespasian, sought refuge or protection in the precinct of the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, or Iuppiter Capitolinus if one prefers. Attacked there during the course of the next day by the Vitellian forces, the Flavians lost the battle. Domitian managed to escape but Sabinus was captured, and then killed. Rome lost too; in the course of the fighting the Temple of Capitoline Jupiter caught fire and was destroyed. It was an event that could truly be thought to be calamitous, as is made evident in the account by Tacitus of its destruction (Tac. Hist. 3. 72). The jewel in Rome's heavily bedecked crown of gods had been destroyed by the very ones who were fighting for the right to control the destiny and well being of the empire.

Whoever was ultimately responsible for the firing of the Capitoline, the event was to prove propitious for Vespasian. The battle for the Capitoline may have been lost but the war for the hearts

---

5There is discrepancy between the various accounts of the firing of the Capitoline precinct with Suetonius and Josephus and the Elder Pliny all placing blame on the Vitellian forces, but Tacitus leaves the question of ultimate blame in doubt, preferring to castigate both sides for their behaviour (Suet. Vit. 15. 3; Josephus. BJ. 4. 645-649; Pliny. HN. 24. 38).
and minds of the Roman people, the campaign of dynastic justification and promotion had yet to begin. What more welcome disaster could there have been than the destruction by fire of the Temple of Capitoline Jupiter, *Iuppiter Capitolinus*, the great god of the Roman Pantheon. The symbolism was superb. The pride and joy of the Roman people, the great protective patron of the city that ruled the greatest empire yet known to the western world, destroyed due to the selfish and violent actions of the Vitellian forces as they attacked the Flavian forces who sought refuge in this sacred precinct (Suet. Vit. 15. 3; Josephus. BJ 6. 645-649). To the victor went the spoils, in this case one of which was the means to present themselves in the most redeeming light in relation to this calamitous event.

Of more immediate utility than the ability to influence the writing of history, was that the destruction of the Capitol provided the welcome opportunity for the new masters of the Roman world to restore this most important citadel in Rome. It was fortuitous that such a disaster could provide such scope for self-serving metaphor, and fortuitous also in that hardly anyone was seriously inconvenienced by the temple’s destruction, except of course Flavius Sabinus and the reputation of the Vitellian forces. Just how important the reconstruction of the temple was to the new regime is made

---

6 For a wider discussion of this Flavian bias in the histories available to us see Darwall-Smith, R. H.,*Emperors and Architecture, A Study of Flavian Rome*, Brussels, 1996, pp. 41-43, hereafter Darwall-Smith, 1996.

7 For an indication as to just how important this reconstruction was thought to be more
evident by what may have been a delay of anywhere up to a year before work proper was begun on the citadel. Rebuilding work started in earnest only after the return of Vespasian to Rome, allowing him to personally take part and credit in and for the work. Further evidence as to the importance of this project to the new regime is provided by the number of coin issues that depicted the temple. Issues are known from the years AD 71, 72, 73, 74, 76, 77/8, and 79 as dupondii, sestertii and asses, under the auspices of Vespasian, Titus and Domitian, and from the mints at both Lugdunum and Rome.

Little is known or can be retrieved as to what design the new Vespasianic version of Rome's premier shrine may have been. Its later destruction during the fire of AD 80 has meant that what meagre remains of the Capitoline shrine have survived into the modern era belong to the Domitianic rebuilding. However this should not be of issue here. The fact of the temple's rebuilding being undertaken under Imperial auspices against at least one wish to the contrary (Tac. *Hist.* 4. 9), the delay in the start of reconstruction to allow Vespasian's presence and show of pious labour as a mark of respect for the gods (Suet. *Ves.* 8. 5), his undertaking to restore the

generally see Tac. *Hist.* 4. 4, wherein thr impetus to restore the temple is second on the Senate's agenda after dealing with business arising from the immediate political events. Tacitean approbation in evidence again.

8Darwall-Smith, 1996, pp. 43-45.

9BMC numbers for the coins are 850, 870 for the asses; 695+, 721, 722, 734, 741, 741A, 746+ for the sestertii; 614, 647, 672/ / 690A for the dupondii.
bronze tablets previously affixed to the temple over generations and now lost in the fire (ibid.), the fact that it was the first building undertaken by Vespasian to have its restoration declared on coins\(^\text{10}\), can tell us enough for our purposes here. It seems that Vespasian was anxious to align himself with, and present himself as, an emperor in the tradition of Augustus. There is the piety in regard to the most Roman of the gods. There is concern for the well-being of the community in wanting to address a substantial flaw in the pax deorum, but only through the intervention of the princeps, not the senate. There is the maintenance of the tradition that major building works, particularly those of religious structures are the responsibility of the princeps. Finally, there is the concern to conserve and maintain the dignity and the presence of the venerable past.

The Temple of Peace.

At least some desire to tap this august memory of the Augustan precedent is to be found also in the construction of the Temple of Peace, the templum Pacis, also often referred to as the Forum of Peace\(^\text{11}\). Firstly and most simply the name of the building itself evokes the Augustan past. The restoration and then the maintenance

\(^{10}\) Darwall-Smith, 1996, p. 47.

\(^{11}\) For the Temple of Peace see generally Castagnoli, F., Cozza, L., 'L’angolo meridionale del Foro dell’Pace.', RCar 76, 1956-8, pp. 119-42; Anderson Jr., J. C.,“Domitian, the Argiletum and the Temple of Peace.’, AJA 86, 1992, pp. 101-18; Richardson, 1992, p. 286 f.; Coarelli, F., LTUR 4, 1999, pp. 67-70. For a plan of the site and a proposed reconstruction see Plate 10.
of an empire-wide peace had been one of the major boasts of the Augustan regime. Initially serving as a major justification for the assumption of sole power, the theme had been evolved through time to gain support for the status quo. The celebration of this theme had even found architectural expression in the relatively small, but topographically and programmatically vitally significant, *Ara Pacis*. It was now to find expression again. Topographically and programmatically it too was to be a vitally significant statement by the ruling regime.

The temple was begun by Vespasian after the successful conclusion of the Judaean War. This had been a major and protracted campaign, begun in AD 67 under the auspices of Nero and the command of T. Flavius Vespasianus. It was completed with the fall of Jerusalem in August of AD 70 under the command of Vespasian’s son, the future emperor Titus, but under the auspices of the now new *imperator* Vespasian. According to Josephus the Temple was begun following the triumph held in Rome on the return of Titus (*Jos. B.j. 7. 5. 7*). Upon its completion the temple was to house and display some of the rich spoils won in Judaea, especially those taken from the temple in Jerusalem. These most probably included the shew-bread table and the menorah as depicted on one of the relief panels of the Arch of Titus being carried in triumphal procession. Thus the temple was

---

12Josephus, *B.j. 7. 5. 7*, does not specifically name these two objects. However, in his previous listing of the spoils taken from the temple in Jerusalem he does mention them (*B.j. 7. 5. 5*), along with
at least in part a celebration of the returning to a state of peace the provinces of the empire of the Romans, an empire-wide peace won back under the auspices and generalship of the Flavian dynasty.

In this aspect of the Temple of Peace we can perceive something of the Augustan theme of peace as expressed in the *Ara Pacis*. With the *Ara Pacis* the concept of peace as it was expressed in the relief sculptures involved a smooth social harmony brought about by an inclusive yet hierarchical system of government and social rank, pious towards the gods and respectful of the past, and all under the tutelage of Augustus. It was however a concept delineated entirely within the hierarchy of the city of Rome. In the Vespasianic version of the theme the peace has been widened to include the entire empire, not just the ruling elite at Rome. Now there is an understanding that the well-being of the centre is reliant on peace at the peripheries of empire. It is a broader view.

This broader view is fitting perhaps when one considers the relative sizes of the Temple of Peace and the Altar of Peace. At 11.625 by 10.55 m\(^1\) the altar is tiny by comparison with the precinct of the temple, the *area* of the temple having dimensions of approximately 110 by 135 m\(^2\). In part what we have with the *templum Pacis* is a

---

\(^1\)The measurements are from Platner and Ashby, pp. 386-8.
monumental amplification of the Augustan-related concept of Pax, an amplification strengthened by the Vespasianic version being a temple rather than merely an altar, an ara, to a demi-god. A temple on the other hand had a different function. It was the actual house of the deity. What Vespasian has done symbolically is to earth the goddess by providing housing for her right in the middle of Rome. He has anchored the presence of peace in the heart of that most militaristic of societies.

It is highly unlikely that Vespasian conceived of his temple in direct relation to the altar. Quite simply the topographical positioning of the two would count against this. However, it is likely that there was an intended relationship between the templum Pacis and another of the highly significant Augustan monuments, the Forum of Augustus. Topographically their positioning either side of the Argiletum set up an immediate relationship between the two. Then there is the similarity between the materials used, namely marble paving in pavonazetto and giallo antico\textsuperscript{15}. There is the basic form of the two structures, large oblong open spaces surrounded and delineated by colonnaded porticos and incorporating a temple. There is a similarity of scale, though at 110 x 135m the Temple of Peace had a substantially


\textsuperscript{15}Platner and Ashby cite to the archeological report. However the lack of extant material evidence from the temple makes any broader comparisons on materials, decorative programmes etc impossible.
larger area than the Augustan Forum at 125 x 90 m.

So a relationship yes, but a rivalry no. The temple and its area were not intended as a forum\textsuperscript{16}, it was not a place of business, especially not of governmental business. It was provided with what may have been gardens, or trees, or maybe even pools, it had a library incorporated into it, and an extensive art collection displayed within its confines. In this way it more closely resembled the pleasure porticos of the Campus Martius than the fora of the Caesars. The way in which the actual temple was incorporated into the structure showed a departure from the fora as well. In the cases of the fora the temples pushed out into the space of the fora, semi-detached from their surrounding colonnades. Combined with the height of the temples this feature gave a dominating effect to the temple in the enclosed space of the forum. The Temple of Peace however eschewed this dominating posture. Its front columns were erected flush with the columns of its surrounding portico. The columns of the temple may have been taller than the columns of the portico to allow recognition of its presence, still the architectonic effect would have been far less dramatic, less emphatic, and also less aggressive as a presence. The Temple of Peace became through design a place of peace as well, providing an oasis of calm, tranquillity and pleasurable

\textsuperscript{16}It was not termed a forum in literary sources until Late Antiquity, when it had been rebuilt and had probably had additional functions incorporated into it. It should also be noted that the representation of the Templum Pacis known to us from the Severan Marble Plan, \textit{FUR} fragments 15 a-c, 16 a-d = pl. 20, \textit{La pianta marmorea di Roma antica}, possibly represents the Severan rebuild of the complex.
diversion in this part of the city. As such it complemented its august Augustan neighbour, it stressed peace whilst the forum stressed war, it stressed harmony whilst the other stressed vengeance. In place of a focus on might through the militarism of the past there was a highlighting of the tranquillity of the present.

Inasmuch as the Temple of Peace reached back to the start of the principate for at least part of its inspiration, and insofar as it provided a forum enabling the new regime to declare its achievements in providing a stability of empire, it also provided Vespasian with a means whereby to express another aspect of his programme of self promotion. It has been mentioned above that the temple provided an exhibition space for an extensive collection of famous works of art. What is significant here is where that art came from. It is from Pliny the Elder that we gain our knowledge as to its provenance. He writes,

\[ atque \ ex \ omnibus, \ quae \ rettuli, \ clarissima \ quaeque \ in \ urbem \ iam \ sunt \ dicata \ a \ Vespasiano \ principe \ in \ templo \ Pacis \ aliisque \ eius \ operibus, \ violentia \ Neronis \ in \ urbem \ convecta \ et \ in \ sellariis \ domus \ aurea \ disposta. \]

And among the list of works I have referred to all the most celebrated have now been dedicated by the emperor Vespasian in the Temple of Peace and his other public buildings: they had been
looted by Nero, who conveyed them to Rome and arranged them in
the sitting-rooms of his Golden House.

(HN. 34, 84)\textsuperscript{17}

Vespasian may have wished to align himself with the traditions of
the principate, but only with selected traditions\textsuperscript{18}. More importantly
he needed to distance himself and his regime from the immediately
preceding regimes. We have seen how this was at least partially
effected in regard to Vitellius in the writing of the history of the
destruction of the \textit{area Capitolina}. Now with the art collection
installed in the Temple of Peace there is a rejection of the principate
style as fostered under Nero. What had been for private indulgence
and/or self magnificence has been transformed into public
munificence. The treasures of the \textit{princeps} transferred to the people
of the empire (even if it was only those who could make it to Rome),
whereas before the treasures of the empire had been transferred to the
\textit{sellaria} of the \textit{princeps}. However, what had become Imperial
property through the looting of Nero remained Imperial property, the
pieces of the art collection were not restored to their original owners.

\textsuperscript{17}Text and translation Loeb Classical Library
\textsuperscript{16}A strong example of the Flavian desire to identify themselves with the commendable aspects of
the principate as demonstrated under the previous dynasty is evidenced by the document known as
the \textit{lex de imperio Vespasiani}, \textit{CIL} 6, 930 with its references to the precedents of only selected
imperial predecessors.
The Temple of the Deified Claudius.

A giving over of a previously privately owned and displayed art collection was a grand and heavily symbolic gesture. It was not however as complex an undertaking as another Vespasianic action that sheds light on his notion as to how he wished his principate to be perceived and understood in relation to the previous dynasty.

Temples to deified previous incumbents could have a significant role to play in the presentation of the tone of a principate, and were not to be despised by Vespasian. The Temple of the Deified Claudius could provide an excellent opportunity to demonstrate Vespasian’s intentions in relation to how he wished his reign to be perceived

The templum divi Claudii had been vowed and even begun during the early reign of Nero, at the time when he was still to some degree under the control of both his mother and his tutors. With his increasing independence, however, a truer indication of the Neronian feelings for his predecessor and adoptive father had revealed

themselves, and work on the temple stalled. Still later much of the
work that had been completed was deconstructed or demolished;
...sed a Nerone prope funditus destructum. (Suet. Vesp. 9), but not
in its entirety. The temple itself seems to have been demolished but
the enormous platform that had been built on the Caelian Mount in
order to provide an extensive area for the temple survived, most
probably being incorporated into the extensive embrace of the Domus
Aurea20.

With Vespasian wishing to reject the Neronian style of rule, what
clearer indication to the populace at Rome could there be than a
reversal of part of Nero's imperial building policy? Accordingly the
enormous platform was reconverted, its originally intended purpose
restored, and work on the Temple of the Deified Claudius begun. The
resuscitation of the memory of the Deified Claudius could benefit
Vespasian in a number of different ways. For a start it made for a
favourable comparison with what had been the Neronian behaviour
towards his adopted father. Secondly it expressed pietas in a very
traditional and therefore acceptable way. It displayed a responsibility
to and a respect of a predecessor who had been thought worthy of
deification. It helped add further lustre to the Julio-Claudian dynasty,
the dynasty to which Vespasian was claiming he was the worthy and
legitimate successor. The only other two instances of building a

20 There is some evidence that the east flank of the platform was redesigned as maybe some sort of
nymphaeum but the evidence seems to be inconclusive. Whilst often supposed that the nymphaeum was
constructed as part of the Domus Aurea, see Colini, 1944, pp. 143-7 who casts doubt on this.
temple to a deified predecessor, those of the temples of *divus Iulius* and *divus Augustus* had been constructed under the auspices of the legitimate heir. One must also remember that Claudius was one of the only two deified emperors, so in resuscitating the memory of Claudius Vespasian was also in a sense resuscitating the reputation of the principate. On balance there had been rather more 'bad' than 'good' emperors. The emphatic reintegration of the memory of Claudius into the fabric of the city emphasised that the principate could have 'good' incumbents.

So as Vespasian had work on the Temple restarted so too the memory of Claudius was renovated, a major new precinct was returned from private to public ownership and the style of rulership developed or adopted by Nero was rejected. It is interesting to note however that that which was Neronian was not simply rejected because of its association with that emperor. It seems likely that the Neronian nympheae and fountains that had been constructed on and around the platform were left *in situ*\(^\text{21}\). So not just a temple and its precinct were given over to the public of Rome, but also a richly ornamented landscape for their recreation and pleasure. Far from removing the memory of Nero from the topography of Rome, Vespasian maintained or retained the excesses, though he lends them a different tone. Only by retaining the legacy of Nero, yet changing the

\(^{21}\) At any rate the west facade of the platform was not rebuilt to match the other facades of the platform.
ownership of and access to that legacy, can the contrast between the 
two regimes be so dramatically contrasted. Far from attempting a 
damnatio memoriae Vespasian retains the memory of the Neronian 
principate in order to provide a contrast to his own regime.

So far the works of Vespasian that we have looked at have all been 
securely ensconced within the conservative traditions of the 
principate. The rebuilding of the Temple of Jupiter Optimus 
Maximus had reiterated that ultimate responsibility for the housing of 
Rome's most important deities rested within the responsibilities of 
the emperor, well within the precedents set by Augustus. The Temple 
of Peace responded to the Forum of Augustus in a mode that recalled, 
complemented and extended the ideology of the original creator of the 
principate. Finally the Temple of the Deified Claudius helped to 
strengthen the past reputation of the principate whilst presenting 
Vespasian as the legitimate heir, in spirit if not by blood, of the best 
and most honourable aspects of the principate, whilst simultaneously 
retaining the memory of the worst that that office could do.

The only remaining major building project of Vespasian's in Rome 
does something a little different. Instead of simply entrenching the 
tradition of the principate further into the traditions of Rome, it had 
the effect of cementing a long-standing tradition of Rome further into 
the tradition of the principate.
The Flavian Amphitheatre.

The gladiatorial combats of the Roman world were the result of ancient traditions. Originally they had been part of the funeral services of the Roman elite, but their sacred nature had gradually given way in the face of their increasing popularity as a form of entertainment. Whilst losing in large part their sacred nature they remained a unique expression of Rome's cultural heritage, a product of the psyche of Roman society, and a handy distraction to the Roman populace. However, the increased popularity of the gladiatorial games had meant that the traditional site of their performance, the Forum, had long been an inappropriate venue for their staging. Temporary wooden amphitheatres had for many years been erected to provide more suitable accommodation, but these wooden structures had very definite drawbacks. Having to provide the venue as well as the games would have greatly increased the cost of such occasions. This could lead to cost cutting which may in some circumstances result in

---

22 First recorded in a specifically Roman context in connection with the funeral of D. Junius Pera in 264 BC, Livy, Epit. 16; Val. Max. 2. 4. 7; Auson. *Griphus ternarii numeri* 36-7, the actual origin of gladiatorial combat seems to have evolved elsewhere. For an admittedly brief but recent discussion of the origins of the gladiatorial concept see Kyle, D., *Spectacles of Death in Ancient Rome.*, London, 1998., pp. 44-46.

23 As for example the wooden structure erected by Nero on the Campus Martius to house *spectacula*, and mentioned by Tacitus (*Ann. 13. 31*).
short-cuts that could undermine the structural integrity of such projects. Such was the case with the amphitheatre erected by a certain Atilius at Fidenae in A.D. 27. Tacitus is quite sure as to the cause of the disaster;

\[\text{neque fundamenta per solidum subdidit, neque firmis nexibus ligneam compagem superstruxit}\]

due to the whole event being staged not for reasons of generosity or display,

\[\text{sed in sordiam mercedem id negotium quaesivisset.}\]

(Tac. Ann. 4, 62).

However, even at imperially sponsored games there could arise audience concerns as to their own safety (Suet. Aug. 43)\(^{24}\). The Roman population may have been only too willing to lap up the spilling of blood as a form of entertainment, but they were not nearly so impressed when there was the possibility that the blood being spilt might be their own. Vespasian determined to provide Rome with what other lesser cities of the empire such as Pompeii already possessed, a purpose built amphitheatre, built for permanence and stability of stone and concrete, and of a size suitable to Rome’s

\(^{24}\) Tac. Ann. 4.62; Suet. Tib. 40, and for an example of an audience’s fears for their own safety see Suet. Aug. 43, though here it is unclear whether the theatre mentioned was a temporary wooden structure.
In terms of propaganda and symbolism the amphitheatre was to prove to be something of a gold mine for Vespasian, and also his dynastic successors. For a start it was something completely new for Rome. Another market or forum or temple may have been all very nice but at the same time it would be simply just more of the same, just another temple or forum or market. But the amphitheatre was a first, and therefore would make all the more of an impression in the increasingly crowded environment of monuments in inner-city Rome. Also, the amphitheatre was massive, an element of its design that not only allowed the structure to accommodate a large crowd, but also to dominate its environs. The amphitheatre was to be a generously proportioned building provided by a generous emperor. This overwhelming size coupled with the unique and self-contained appearance of the building in relation to the vast majority of the buildings of the city, both monumental and domestic, would have

---


given the amphitheatre an unparalleled distinctiveness\textsuperscript{27}.

The positioning of the amphitheatre could also play an important role in the promotion of the Flavian dynasty. The valley bottom had been the site under Nero for an ornamental lake in the gardens that added so greatly to the villa atmosphere of the Domus Aurea. It had been the indulgence in the luxury of space that seems to have been one of the major criticisms of that residence. Now the lake was drained and the resulting space used to accommodate a structure wholly dedicated to the entertainment of the entire population. Where once had been given over to provide delight for one, had now been given back to provide delight for all. Even the very appearance of the exterior of the amphitheatre suggests this all inclusive intention of the building. Its entire façade is made permeable by the series of arches that provide entrance and exit, a design only needed if large audience numbers were to find easy entrance and egress. Unlike such public buildings as the Imperial fora with restricted means of access and high excluding walls, here the entrances and walls are open.

Here arises another of the advantages that may have occurred to Vespasian when he chose to construct such a building as this. It is from the work of Martial that we gain a contemporary insight into

\textsuperscript{27} The Colosseum is to this day quite unmistakable. There may be no sure way of recovering just how great an impact the building may have had on the ancient inhabitants of Rome, but it would seem absurd to think it would have been less striking than it still is.
this other potential benefit:-

Quae tam seposita est, quae gens tam barbara, Caesar,
ex qua spectator non sit in urbe tua?
venit ab Orphee cultor Rhodopeius Haemo,
venit et epoto Samata pastus equo,
et qui prima bibit deprensi flumina Nili,
et quem supremae Tethyos unda ferit;
festinavit Arabs, festinavere Sabaei,
et Cilices nimbis hic maduere suis.
crinibus in nodum tortis venere Sugambri,
atque aliter tortis crinibus Aethiopes.
vox diversa sonat populorum, tum tamen una est,
cum verus patriae diceris esse pater.

What race is set so far, what race so barbarous, Caesar,
wherefrom a spectator is not in thy city? There has come the farmer
of Rhodope from Orphic Haemus, there has come too the
Sarmatian fed on draughts of horses' blood, and he who quaffs at its
spring the stream of first found Nile, and he whose shore the wave
of farthest Tethys beats; the Arab has sped, Sabeans have sped, and
Cicilians have here been drenched in their own saffron dew. With
hair twined in a knot have come Sygambrians, and, with locks
entwined elsewise, Aethiopians. Diverse sounds the speech of the
peoples, yet then is it one when thou art acclaimed thy country's
father true.

(Martial, Spec. 3)

All the peoples of the world have their representatives in Rome, and all the people in Rome can enjoy the facility of the amphitheatre. Martial here stresses the diversity and exoticism of the crowd it was possible to find in the amphitheatre, even though one must of course allow for poetic excesses. It highlights also another of the social functions that the amphitheatre facilitated, a face to face relationship between the crowd and the emperor, a function that was to develop throughout the history of the empire from this time forward. However, something even more may have been happening to the crowd as they watched the shows, something more than simply being entertained.

Rome's conquests had brought within its sway an enormous diversity of peoples and ethnicities, a potentially fractured and fractious social mix with all the cultural diversity and divided loyalties this could incorporate. The city however, and especially those at the head of the city's administration, could have found very welcome a method by which to forge a cohesive and inclusive identity, may have found very useful an educative tool by which the population of the city could learn what it meant to be Roman. They may have felt need of a way by which the population could recognise who they were, what
they were expected to be, and what their place in the social structure was, what the social structure itself was, and to have all these concepts continually reinforced and inculcated. The amphitheatre could go a long way to accommodating all these needs, desires or functions.

It may seem somewhat perverse that one of the primary methods by which a sense of unity could be encouraged was by division. This was, however, the case. At its most basic level the amphitheatre embodied and expressed a fundamental division, the division between the watched and the watchers. The arena wall sharply demarcated the two groups present in the amphitheatre, society on one side and those that had either put themselves or been put outside of that society. In the main those who appeared in the arena were, as described by Edmonson, "socially dead or, at best, déclassé." Those who appeared in the cavea were neither socially dead nor déclassé, in fact quite the opposite. Social distinctions and strata were not only very much in evidence in the cavea, the controlled seating arrangements could allow a great deal of complexity as to the separateness of all the various social groups, arranged in a hierarchical order. The amphitheatre revealed the strata of society, displaying

---

28 For an illustration of one way in which the structure of the Amphitheatre facilitated this division of the audience see Plate 12.


30 There is ample literature on this subject outlining both the arrangements themselves and the
the Roman populace to itself *en masse*, and in a context of participating in a uniquely Roman pastime. Stratified, segregated and delineated as the amphitheatre's audience may have been it remained a whole, united as a single entity by two elements present in the physical form of the amphitheatre itself. Firstly there was the element already mentioned of the arena wall, the most elemental division in the amphitheatre. This elemental divide would have created a strong sense of 'them' and 'us', always a highly effective means by which to create a sense of common unity and cohesion. Then there was also the all-enclosing form of the amphitheatre. The encircling nature of the cavea allowed the audience to see and hear itself, and to see and hear itself as a single entity. All or any distractions outside the walls of the amphitheatre were denied, with even the *velabrum* adding to the sense of disjunction with the world outside the cavea. The audience had only itself and the activities in the arena upon which to focus, adding to the starkness of the division.

breadth and depth of the potential users of this facility, a discriminated cross section of Rome's social categories and ethnicities, everyone from the richest senator to a provincial ambassador, were among the potential audience, as were members of the oldest patrician families to the many ethnic groups that were encompassed by Rome's far flung territories, all of these comprised the potential beneficiaries of Vespasian's gift\textsuperscript{31}, not forgetting of course the women of Rome, a segment of the population who had no direct benefit from many of the secular buildings of the city. This aspect of the amphitheatre, not as a social leveller, rather as a microcosm of Roman society accommodated in the cavea, would have aided and abetted the display of social unity. The social unity of the microcosm of Roman society present in the cavea was enhanced by its relationship in opposition to those present at the games in the arena.

The amphitheatre could also show the wealth and the breadth of Rome's vast dominion, for instance the wide variety of animals marshalled for the various entertainments. The animals were obtained from both within the borders of the empire and from without, revealing the power of Rome in a geographic and political sense, in a symbolic sense in its mastery over the wild beasts of the natural world, and in the organisational capacity of the Romans to capture and supply these animals in the vast quantities which are

\textsuperscript{31}Provided \textit{ex manubiis} so the restored dedicatory inscriptions proclaim, Alfoldy, G., "Eine Bauinschrift aus dem Colosseum.", \textit{ZPE} 109, 1995, pp. 195-226.
It did all this under the tutelage of the emperor, who not only provided many of the games, but the venue itself. Thus not only the wealth and power of the emperor could be displayed and demonstrated in an easily comprehensible form, but it also demonstrated society's reliance on the emperor as patron for its well being, just as the empire likewise did.

For Vespasian the amphitheatre also had the added symbolism, though this would have faded with time, of being a reversal of Neronian policy. The Domus Aurea had caused consternation among the upper echelons of Roman society as we have already seen, though it must be remembered that this was not necessarily the case among the masses. The amphitheatre returned to public use a large area of land in the centre of Rome that had been used under Nero for a show of despotism. So while retaining the loyalty of the masses through the pomp, ceremony, display both in the amphitheatre and through the extravagant gesture of such an enormous building, Vespasian was

32Although great quantities of animals would have been used throughout the functioning life of the amphitheatre (see such works as Kyle 1998) a particularly appropriate but maybe extreme example is the number of beasts recorded to have been displayed and destroyed during the dedicatory ludi held under Titus. Dio tells us that 9000 animals were killed during the 100 days of games (Dio, 66.25) whilst Suetonius recounts that 5000 were killed in a single day's events (Suet. Tit. 7). From Martial's De Spectaculis we get an idea as to the exotic diversity of the beasts displayed, including lions (Sp. 10. 15. 23), a tigress (Sp. 18), a rhinoceros (Sp. 9), elephants (Sp. 17) and a Caledonian bear (Sp. 7).
also able to reassure the top echelons of society by making it a public
building there for the recreation of all. The huge undertaking could
be seen as being for the benefit of Rome as a whole, not for the
emperor alone. All these aspects of the amphitheatre provided it with
a far broader appeal than another temple complex or some other such
Imperial cliche could have commanded. Along with the
neutralisation of the colossal statue of Nero that stood before it33,
not a destruction of the Neronian vanity but a more sophisticated
removal of his presence, the amphitheatre provided a highly useful
facility for everyone involved.

Thus far all the major building works of Vespasian have been
discussed. Work was however carried out on a number of lesser
projects during his principate. There was a restoration of the _aqua
Claudia_ in 7134, and a restoration of the _scaena_ of the theatre of
Marcellus (Suet. _Ves._ 19. 1), both buildings with linkages to _principes_
of the past the reputations of whom were fostered by Vespasian, the
theatre with Augustus and the aqueduct of course with Claudius.
There was also the advantage of demonstrating that Vespasian was in
general caring for the well-being of the city, not merely glory seeking.

---

33Pliny, _HN_ 34. 45 is our source for this neutralisation of the colossal statue of Nero, but what
this neutralisation involved is not at all clear. He writes that the original statue was intended to
represent Nero but is now (at the time of writing) dedicated to Sol, _qui dicatus Soli venerationi est._
Suetonius writes of Vespasian’s rewarding of the _colossi refectorem_, translated in the Loeb as
restorer of the colossus (Suet. _Ves._ 18), though by rights this could also mean the refashioner of the
colossus. There is also, though, _S. H. A. Hadr._ 19. 12 which describes both the repositioning of the
colossus and its reconfiguration as a statue of Sol by Hadrian.
34_CIL_ 6. 1257 gives us both the information that the aqueduct was restored by Vespasian and the
date.
In this category also we should place the Vespasianic restoration of the aedes of Honos et Virtus (Pliny, *HN*. 35. 120), maybe after damage or destruction during the fire of Nero, though this need not necessarily be the case\textsuperscript{35}. It was a very old and venerable site, old and venerable enough to be probably used as the site of the Augustan era altar to Fortuna Redux in 19 BC (*RG*. 11). So maybe Vespasian was here once again trying to strengthen the linkages between his own principate and that of Augustus.

There were also an uncertain number of arches erected under the principate of Vespasian. It is from Dio that the most certain evidence for these arches is to be gained. He writes at 66. 7. 2;

\begin{quote}
φκαι ἐπὶ αὐτοῖς τὸ μὲν τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος ὄνομα ἀμφότεροι ἔλαβον, τὸ δὲ δὴ τοῦ Ἰουδαικοῦ οὐδὲτερος ἔσχε· καὶ τα τὲ ἄλλα αὐτοῖς, ὅσα ἐπὶ τηλικαύτη νίκη εἰκὸς ἦν, καὶ ἀψίδες τρωπαίοφόροι ἐψηφίσθησαν.
\end{quote}

In consequence of this success both generals received the title of *imperator*, but neither got that of Judaicus, although all the other honours that were fitting on the occasion of so magnificent a victory, including triumphal arches, were voted to them.

Using this as the starting point for his article, Kleiner\textsuperscript{36} then goes on

\textsuperscript{35}As suggested by Richardson, 1992, p. 190.

to make a case for there being three arches erected in Rome under Vespasian, one being the arch portrayed on the triumphal relief sculpture on the Arch of Titus, another being the *arcus ad Isis* portrayed on the Haterii relief, and finally a third arch identified from a rare series of *sestertii*. Whilst Dio states that the arches were voted by the Senate it does not necessarily follow that they were built. However elements in the argument put forward by Kleiner suggest that at least two of them probably were.

This then may be a further indication of the practice of Vespasian in following for the most part in the well accepted traditions of the principate and of Rome itself. There is nothing unusual in this behaviour at all. It is interesting to note, however, that both depictions of those arches most likely to have been built during the principate of Vespasian indicate by their imagery that Vespasian was

---

37 BMC Roman Empire II, 57, 124 no. 576

38 For the Arch of Titus Relief: ”Only on the arch in the Spoils of Jerusalem panel is Vespasian celebrated as Titus’s equal, indicating a Vespasianic date.” For the Haterii Relief arch: ”That this is another of the arches decreed by the Senate in A.D. 70 and erected during Vespasian’s lifetime is confirmed by the three crowns featured on the facade. One is larger and separate from the other two.” (Kleiner, F. S., ‘The Arches of Vespasian in Rome’ 1990, pp 130 and 132-3). However the attribution by Kleiner of the third arch mentioned above and known from the *sestertii* as one of the triumphal arches voted by the Senate to Vespasian and Titus, seems to be undercut by his own statement that, ”it does not support triumphal chariots, trophies, or captives, ... it does not even include a portrait of the emperor...” (p. 136). At most one could claim that the coin commemorates the voting of an arch by the Senate, not a depiction of an actual arch. This could go some way to explaining the uniqueness of the attic statuary identified by Kleiner as the Genius Senatus and the Genius Populi Romani if the depiction is symbolic rather than based on any actual object. The arch is then one voted to the Augustus from the Senate and the Roman People.
concerned to promote himself as the founder of a dynasty. Both representations include reference to the sons of Vespasian, on the *arcus ad Isis* there are the three crowns represented symbolizing the dynastic trio, and on the arch depicted on the relief sculpture on the Arch of Titus there are dual triumphal chariots depicted with a horserider between them as the attic statuary, perhaps the dual triumphators of Vespasian and Titus flanking Domitian on a horse. The depiction of a dual triumph in the attic statuary is without precedent on Roman arches, not surprising given the rarity of joint triumphs 39. Inasmuch as this would have allayed fears as to the stability of the empire upon the occasion of his death, Vespasian promoted his sons as being the natural successors to his principate. This subject will be more fully discussed in the chapter devoted to Titus. Here again, though, we find a connection with the two favoured *principes* of the preceding dynasty. Of all the Julio-Claudians it was Augustus and Claudius who seem to have been the most likely, if not the only, ones to have any interest at all in who should succeed them, rather than an unhealthy interest in who might wish to take their place.

In the building programme of Vespasian a curious if not wholly unexpected blend of influences, themes and desired impressions became evident, along with a subtle mixing of both respectful

---

39 For the lack of precedence, Kleiner, 1990, p. 130. On the rarity of joint triumphs I have been able to find but two, the Flavian and one shared by Caius Marius and Q. Lutuiatius Catulus in 101 B.C.
emulation of, but also a rivalry with, the preceding incumbents of the principate. Firstly there was the concern to be seen to be the salvation of the Roman world in a time of ferment and trouble. This theme is amply demonstrated with regard to the destruction of the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus and the importance given to its speedy, and very definitely imperially sponsored, reconstruction. There are signs here also of Augustanism in the desire to be seen as the primary source of responsibility in maintaining the relationship between the Roman people and their primary god.

The desire to present his reign as a salvation of the Roman world was expressed also in the Temple of Peace. Here too there is the presence of the memory of Augustus, a referencing back to the themes of the Augustan principate. It is the direct references to the Augustan monuments of the Forum of Augustus and the theme of Pax that also allowed the emergence of a degree of rivalry with the overwhelming figure of Augustus. Perhaps rivalry is too strong a word, but it would seem that there is a desire on the part of Vespasian to be positively compared with his illustrious predecessor.

The need for illustrious predecessors most probably explains the rehabilitation of the memory of Claudius during the reign of Vespasian with the result that the second only deified princeps finally got to have his temple and precinct built. Massive in size,
unavoidable thanks to the prominence provided by its topographical positioning, the Temple of the Deified Claudius allowed Vespasian a display of piety towards his predecessor whilst simultaneously strengthening the idea that the principate was a venerable and worthwhile institution. Moreover a venerable and worthwhile institution of whose past worthy incumbents Vespasian was the true heir, in spirit if not in direct chronological fact. It was a concept strengthened by maintaining much of the private indulgences that had been built under Nero but changing their function to public usage.

The concern to provide public amenities for the widest possible cross section of the population of the city and the empire is also evident in the amphitheatre mainly constructed under the reign of Vespasian. Though on one level simply a recreational facility for the people, the amphitheatre was also in a sense didactic, strengthening the status quo of society and thus as a consequence strengthening the position of the principate within that society.
June 23 or 24, 79 (Suet. Ves. 24; Dio, 64. 17.) saw the rather sudden passing away of Vespasian at Aquae Cutiliae following an attack of diarrhoea (Suet. Ves. 24). He was succeeded by his eldest son Titus, in what would seem to have been a seamless transition of power. This problem-free inheritance of power was no accident of fate, but the result of a detailed and consistent programme by Vespasian to provide on the occasion of his demise a successor, and a successor that was to be one of his sons (Suet. Ves. 25; Dio, 65. 12).  

Vespasian’s planning for the provision of an heir dates from the very beginnings of his reign. It was decided within a few days of the return of Titus to Rome in June of 70 that the triumphs voted individually to both Vespasian and Titus should be held as a single dual triumph (Jos. BJ. 7. 121). The dual nature of the triumph is also attested by the depiction

---


of the arch through which the triumphal procession is progressing on the
relief panel in the Arch of Titus *in summa sacra via*, mentioned in the
preceding chapter. A dual triumph was an uncommon event made
more uncommon in that no-one other than the emperor of the day had
been permitted the honour of sharing in a triumph since Blaesus had
been granted the privilege in AD 22 (Tac. *Ann.* 3. 74. 4)\(^4\) The holding
of a dual triumph would have held certain advantages for Vespasian.
For a start it meant one, not two processions, which would have meant a
saving in time and resources. It also allowed the staging of a show of
familial and therefore dynastic solidarity. According to Josephus the
dress, sacrifices, prayers and marks of honour were identical for the two
*imperatores* (*Jos. BJ.* 7. 124 ff.). It singled Titus out from both the crowd
and his brother and closely aligned him with his father. Moreover, it set
a precedent that was now to be followed scrupulously. According to
Jones "from this time on, all imperial acclamations were jointly credited
to them, and from July they shared the tribunician power"\(^5\).

However it should be noted that there was a distinction in the hierarchy
even on this occasion. At *Jos. BJ.* 7. 127-130 it is Vespasian who
acknowledges the acclamations. Josephus keeps the focus on Vespasian
by having him rise to recite the prayers, with Titus mentioned almost as

---

\(^4\)Jones, 1984, p. 78

\(^5\)For the quote, Jones, 1984, p. 78. For the sharing of salutations; Chambalu, A., *De Magistratibus
Flavorum*, Bonn, 1882, pp. 28-31; also coin evidence, *B. M. C. II*, pls. 24-25.
an afterthought. Then it is Vespasian who addresses those assembled, and it is he who dismisses the troops. There may have been a semblance of equality between the joint triumphatores, but it was all too obvious who was to be considered senior.

It is a distinction which was maintained throughout the reign of Vespasian in regard to the titulature of the Imperial pair. Titus' assumption of tribunicia potestas has already been mentioned above. However the numbering of the assumptions of tribunicia potestas that Titus held was consistently two less than those held by his father\textsuperscript{6}. A similar system of ranking can be seen in the numbering of imperial salutations, for example ILS 246 and 254 where it seems as if there was maintained a difference of six salutations to Vespasian's advantage. Dessau mentions this at ILS 248 n. 2, '... nummi titulique demonstrant Vespianum Tito plerumque sex imperatoriiis acclamationibus fuisse superiorem, ...'. The same holds true for the consulships held by each, though here the margin is once again two. And whereas Vespasian is pontifex maximus, Titus is merely pontifex, Vespasian is augustus where Titus is Augusti filius. Vespasian has the honour of being titled pater patriae but there seems to have been no way of attributing a similar but lesser title to Titus. So Titus was about as closely associated with the reign of his father as it was possible to be, though always kept at

\textsuperscript{6}For the inscriptionsal evidence compare ILS 246 (AD 72) Vespasian trib. pot. IIII, Titus trib. pot. II, ILS 248 (AD 74/75) Vespasian trib. pot. VI Titus trib. pot. IV, ILS 254 (AD 79) Vespasian trib. pot. X Titus trib. pot. VIII.
a lesser rank. It is unsurprising then that the succession proved to be so seamless, when the accession of Titus to sole power was in effect simply a continuation of the already ruling regime.

If the reign of Vespasian can be seen to be characterised by cautious emulation of those predecessors deemed by him to be suitable role-models, then the reign of Titus is most easily characterised by the unavoidable feature of it, its brevity. The time allowed him by the Fates to demonstrate his capacity in his role as sole head of the empire was short indeed, twenty-six months and twenty days is perhaps the best estimate as to the length of his reign. One might wonder how long Titus may have continued so much in the shadow of his father’s reign after Vespasian’s death. There is always the possibility that he would have wished to stamp his own character on his time in office, much as every other successor to dynastic founders seems to have done. This is of course mere speculation, and achieves nothing. Titus had not the time to even begin to significantly differentiate his principate from that of his father’s, to define a separate character for it before fate overtook him, and the Roman world was left with the mixed blessings of Domitian’s idea of emperorship.

Insofar as his building works are concerned, the very limited time he had

---

7 At any rate the majority of the sources agree on this length; Suet. Tit. 11; Dio, 66. 26. 4; Epitome de Caesaribus 11. However Aurelius Victor De Caesaribus 10. 5 gives a duration of 32 months, 20 days. There is an inconsistency in Suetonius in that he states at Tit. 1 that Titus was born in 41 yet he states at Tit.11 that he was in his forty second year when he passed away. See here Jones, 1984, Ch. 4, n. 236.
proves to be quite detrimental to what his reputation as a builder might otherwise have been. He continued work on the Flavian amphitheatre, work that possibly entailed an expansion of the seating capacity. According to the Chronographer of 354, under Vespasian the amphitheatre had been completed to the top of the second arcade and the maenianum secundum, the second bank of seats in the cavea, and was dedicated by Vespasian before his death (Chron. 146). To Domitian is credited the addition of clipea (Chron. 146), so one would presume that the third and fourth storeys of the amphitheatre and the resulting completion of the cavea were largely accomplished during the short principate of Titus. However, given the strong emphasis on the dynastic nature of the Flavian principates it is probably of little real consequence here as to just how much of the amphitheatre was directly attributable to the reign of Titus. It was he to whom the public relations coup of providing 100 days of dedicatory games fell. This provided the

---

8 There seems to be something of a consensus on the issue of which of the Flavians built which parts of the amphitheatre, but not total agreement. Richardson, 1992, p. 7 simply states that Vespasian carried out the work to the top of the second arcade and second tier of seating, Titus finished all of the rest except for some decorative ornament provided by Domitian. Sear, F., *Roman Architecture*, London, 1982, pp. 134 ff, working from the analysis of the amphitheatre and a theory developed by Cozzo, G., *Ingegneria Romana*, Rome, 1928, suggests something similar, though he ascribes the fourth storey to Domitian as well as the ornamentation ad clipea. Blake suggests that Titus' contribution may have been tiers of seats constructed of wood, and subsequently destroyed by fire (Blake, 1959, p. 98). In Platner and Ashby the standard; Vespasian two storeys, Titus one and Domitian the rest is reported. All of these have had as their raison d'être the report of the Chronographer of 354. It is J. B. Ward-Perkins who in many ways seems to best address the question by stating that, "Exactly which parts are the work of Vespasian, and which of Titus and Domitian, are questions of little importance." Ward-Perkins, J. B., *Roman Imperial Architecture*, Harmondsworth, 1981. It is a view shared by Darwall-Smith, 1996 p. 79. Interesting to note a coin of the time of Titus that shows the Colosseum as it was originally completed, see Plate 14.
new emperor with an unparalleled opportunity to display enormous public largesse.

This largesse also incorporated the erection of a public bath complex just next door to the amphitheatre which was dedicated at the same time as the amphitheatre\textsuperscript{9}. Both Suetonius and Dio explicitly connect the dedication games in the amphitheatre with the dedication of the nearby thermae (Suet. Tit. 7. 3; Dio. 66. 25.1). This bath complex was quite small, a modest building when compared to later imperial examples. This may go some way to explaining the swiftness of their construction mentioned by both Suetonius and Martial, celeriter extractis (Suet. Tit. 7. 3) and velocia munera (Mart. SP. 2. 7).

**The Baths of Titus.**

If indeed the thermae were entirely constructed within the reign of Titus work on them must have been swift indeed. Vespasian died on either the 23rd or 24th of June AD 79. The baths and the amphitheatre are known to have been dedicated sometime in AD 80. Our evidence for this dating is from Dio;

After he had finished these exhibitions (the inaugural games) and had wept so bitterly on the last day that all of the people saw him, he performed no other deeds of importance: but the next year, in the consulship of Flavius and Pollio (AD 81)\(^{10}\), after the dedication of the buildings mentioned, he passed away at the same watering-place that had been the scene of his father's death.

(Dio, 66. 26. 1).\(^{11}\)

Inscriptional and coin evidence cannot be used to date more accurately the inauguration of the amphitheatre and the baths. A sesterce (BMC Emp. II, 262, Nn 190.) showing on its reverse a depiction of the amphitheatre and with an inscription on the obverse reading IMP T [CA]ES VESP AUG P M.TR.P.P.P.COS VIII dates the coin no more precisely than to sometime between January 1, 80 and the end of Titus' reign. CIL 6. 2059: II. 25-35\(^{12}\), from the Acta Fratrum Arvalium adds nothing to this dating. It deals with the assigning of seating in the amphitheatre, and according to its consular dating this must have occurred in March or April of 80\(^{13}\). Neither of these sources can be said

---


\(^{11}\) Text and translation Loeb Classical Library, translated by Cary, E.

\(^{12}\) As published in McCrum and Woodhead, 1960, p. 19.
to add any precision to the dating of the inauguration of the amphitheatre and baths. The coin may be celebrating an upcoming or past event, the allocation of seating preparation for an event that could take place at any time after March/April 80. However the inaugural games are said to have been conducted over 100 days, and to have finished before the end of the year. Therefore the latest they could have started was sometime in September. Therefore there is a period of anything up to five months in which to place the date for the beginning of the inaugural games. However, at the most there can have been something less than 15 months available to Titus in which to have the baths brought to a level of completion to permit their dedication. That is of course if construction of the baths began only after the death of Vespasian. In addition it should be held in mind that even less time would have been available for the work due to the nature of the materials. It is from Frontinus that we learn that the Romans normally limited their construction in concrete to the months between the 1st of April and the end of October (Fron. Aq. 123). This was due to the concrete developing an inferior strength when the cold prevented quick setting\textsuperscript{14}. Time for construction of the baths is getting short indeed.

It has been suggested that the Baths of Titus had indeed been constructed during a preceding principate, that the baths were simply a redevelopment of baths constructed as part of Nero's \textit{domus aurea}\textsuperscript{15}.

\textsuperscript{14}Sear, \textit{Roman Architecture.}, 1982, p. 140.
Sear mentions this hypothesis, though does nothing more than mention it\textsuperscript{16}. The theory relied in the main on there being an exact alignment of the baths with the Esquiline wing of the Golden House, and the sharing of an architectural dynamism that linked it to the innovative architecture that had developed under Nero's sponsorship. However, there were problems with the theory. The layout of the baths is known mainly from plans drawn of them by Palladio in the 1540s\textsuperscript{17}. However as pointed out by Delaine\textsuperscript{18} care should be taken as to the reliability of Palladio's strict adherence to visible remains. It was these plans of Palladio that were used by Lanciani\textsuperscript{19} to identify a few still extant pilasters opposite the Colosseum as remains of the façade of the baths. It is from these pilasters that the supposed orientation of the baths has been taken. This identification has been questioned by both Blake and Coarelli, and in the words of Anderson 'should probably be abandoned'\textsuperscript{20}. Notwithstanding this evidence, there is also the

\textsuperscript{15}Coarelli, F., Guida archeologica di Roma, Verona, 1974, p. 203.

\textsuperscript{16}Sear, 1982, p. 145. Brödner, E., Die römischen Thermen und das antike Badewesen, Darmstadt, 1983; and Heinz, W., Römische Thermen. Badewesen und Badeluxus im römischen Reich, Munich, 1983, both ascribe to the theory. However contra De Fine Licht, K., et al., 'Colle Oppio' in Roma-Archeologia nel Centro, Vol. I: L'Area archeologica centrale (LSA, 6), Rome, 1985, pp. 467-486, figs. 4 and 9, and Richardson, 1992, p. 397, 'but the relationship to the adjacent remains of the Domus Aurea is not persuasive; walls do not really line up, nor are the plans and volumes similar'. On the books of Brödner and Heinz see Delaine, J., 'Recent Research on Roman Baths', JRA 1, 1988, pp. 11-32, who also questions Lanciani's theory as does Anderson Jr., J. C., 'The Date of the Thermae Traianae and the Topography of the Oppius Mons', AJA 89, 1985, pp. 499-509.

\textsuperscript{17}Zorzi, G., I disegni delle Antichità di Andrea Palladio, Venice, 1959, figs. 89-95; Lewis, D., The Drawings of Andrea Palladio, Washington D. C., 1981-2.

\textsuperscript{18}Delaine, 1988, p. 20.


\textsuperscript{20}Lanciani, R., 'Gli Scavi del Colosseo e le Terme de Tito', BCAA 23, 1895; Blake, 1959, pp. 46-54; Coarelli, F., Guida archeologica di Roma, Verona, 1974, p. 203; Anderson Jr., J. C., 'The Date of the
argument put forward by Darwall-Smith to the effect that the language of
the contemporary sources implies a new construction rather than a
renovation of an pre-existing building\textsuperscript{21}. However, the suggestion that
if the baths were a remodelling of a Neronian version then surely this
would have been perfect material for the propagandists of the Flavians,
may be interesting but surely cannot be used as any sort of evidence\textsuperscript{22}.

However all these theories may have been erroneous due to a lack of
direct evidence. Recent evidence brought to light during excavation of
the site may necessitate a reappraisal. The remains of the bath complex
known as the Baths of Titus may actually be of Hadrianic construction, as
evidenced by datable brick stamps in the hypocaust system\textsuperscript{23}.

**Another Nero?**

So where to from here? We know, the sources tell us, that Titus had
*thermae* built, quickly, and close by the amphitheatre. It is possible that
the remains on the slope of the Oppian are a rebuilding of these baths
undertaken by Hadrian, but it is also possible that they are not. However
what may be of greater importance here is what Titus was in such a hurry

\textsuperscript{21}Darwall-Smith, 1996, p. 94.

\textsuperscript{22}Darwall-Smith, 1996, p. 94.

to have built, *thermae*. But one other emperor had seen fit to provide for the bathing needs of the populace at Rome, and that had been Nero. In and of itself one parallel between two principates is of little or no consequence. There are however other Neronian characteristics evident in the behaviour of Titus. It seems that Titus saw fit to inhabit some part or parts of the Domus Aurea, at least for a time (*Pliny, HN*, 36. 4. 37)\(^{24}\). This went against the example of his father who preferred to reside in the Gardens of Sallust (*Dio*, 65. 10. 4). It is possible that the Colossus of Nero had its features reconfigured to represent those of Titus (*Dio*, 66. 15. 1)\(^{25}\).

Then there is the fact that Titus had been educated along with Britannicus at the court of Claudius (*Suet. Tit.* 2), had indeed been inculcated with the very cultural values and perspectives that had produced the likes of Nero. Indeed his behaviour throughout his life shows a tendency to excess, and an excess that could be Neronian at its extreme.

After the fall of Jerusalem Titus stayed in the eastern half of the empire, wintering first at Caesarea Philippi, where he spent at least part of his time providing spectacles for the population (*Jos. BJ*. 7. 23). On the 24th of October he held games of great splendour at Maritime Caesarea for the occasion of his brother's birthday at which in excess of 2,500 Jewish captives were destroyed. Later that same year, on the 17th of November, he held even more lavish games at Berytus in honour of his father's

\(^{24}\) Anderson, 1983, p. 103.

\(^{25}\) Lega, *LTUR* 1, 1993, p. 298.
birthday. Then, according to Josephus he toured the cities of Syria exhibiting costly spectacles in all the major cities of the province (Jos. BJ. 7.96). This of course may be just good dynastic promotion. However it is the excessiveness in both the number of games and the numbers involved in the games as evidenced in the recounting of the spectacles that seems somewhat Neronian. In the words of Jones the seven month sojourn 'must have been an enormously costly exercise. This Neronian style to the behaviour of Titus seems to have continued unabated during the principate of Vespasian, if Suetonius can be taken as an authority on the subject. At Tit. 7.1 he writes,

\[\text{Praeter saevitiam suspecta in eo etiam luxuria erat, quod ad mediam noctem comissiones cum profusissimo quoque familiarium extenderet; nec minus libido propter exoletorum et spandonum greges propterque insignem reginae Berenices amorem, cui etiam nuptias pollicitas, quod constabat in cognitionibus patris nundinari praemiarique solitum; denique propalam alium Neronem et opinabantur et praedicabant.}\]

Besides cruelty, he was also suspected of riotous living, since he protracted his revels until the middle of the night with the most prodigal of his friends; likewise of unchastity because of his troops of catamites and eunuchs, and his notorious passion for queen Berenice, to whom it was even said that he promised marriage. He was

\[26\text{Jones, 1984, p. 57.}\]
suspected of greed as well; for it was well known that in cases that came before his father he put a price on his influence and accepted bribes. In short, people not only thought, but openly declared, that he would be a second Nero.  

Another Nero, not the most promising comparison for a Flavian prince. Even upon Titus' assumption of the principate his behaviour showed signs of this lack of restraint. Though outwardly his behaviour changed (Suet. Tit. 7. 1) it was in the emphasis placed by Titus on unbounded liberality and largesse that there remained the traces of his education, socialisation and of his cultural milieu, his Neronianism. *Et tamen nemine ante se munificentia minor* writes Suetonius at Tit. 7. 3, as has been previously discussed in relation to the games held to dedicate the amphitheatre. This liberality was not confined to costly public shows, but translated also into his behaviour in regard to petitioners, even when he was made aware that he was promising more than could be achieved (Suet. Tit. 8. 1). Maybe it is within this tradition of Neronian display and munificence, of largesse and liberality that the *thermae Titi* should be seen.  

But perhaps this aspect of Titus' character should not be too highly emphasised. The arch of Titus erected in the Circus Maximus in order to

---

Text and translation Loeb Classical Library, translated by Rolfe.

Others who have seen a Neronianism in the behaviour of Titus are Jones, 1984, p. 57; Garzetti, 1974, p. 263.
commemorate the victory over the Jews showed not only this aspect of self promotion but also a tempering consideration of reality. The arch may have been one of those voted to Vespasian and Titus in AD 70 (Dio, 66, 7, 2). However, if this is the case, then the inscription on the arch, known from the Einsiedlen Itinerary, becomes of even more interest here. The inscription reads:

*Senatus populusq. Romanus imp. Tito Caesari divi Vespasiani f.*


(CIL 6.944 = ILS 264)

The *trib. pot. X* dates the inscription to 80/81, whilst the *Senatus populusq. Romanus* sanctions the arch as the result of a properly voted triumphal honour. The inscription is a dynastic boast, both father and son working in unison to achieve a victory no-one else had been able to achieve. It is interesting that Vespasian's position is sublimated to that of Titus, when in reality the positions were reversed. Titus was acting as Vespasian's *legatus* and without proconsular imperium. This is acknowledged in the text, however the inscription still reads as if the victory were that of Titus. The arch was probably that one built into the cavea of the circus in the middle of the hemicycle and illustrated on the

---

29Jones, 1984, p. 59.
Marble Plan, the Piazza Armerina mosaic and in the Foligno Relief (See Plate 13 for Marble Plan Illus.)\textsuperscript{30}.

Of the other building works carried out or started during the principate of Titus little can be said. It is known that repair work was carried out on the \textit{aqua Claudia}, (\textit{CIL} 6. 1258; \textit{CIL} 6. 1246), and that subsequent to another fire that once again devastated large tracts of Rome in 80, restoration work was at least planned to be undertaken on the rebuilding of the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus\textsuperscript{31}. Other reconstruction work would no doubt have followed, and probably much of that which was undertaken during the principate of Domitian would have been completed under Titus had the Fates played differently. It is also possible that Titus had begun either construction or at least the planning for a temple to be consecrated to his deified father\textsuperscript{32}, the same temple that was ultimately to be consecrated to Titus as well.

It would seem that to a large extent Titus was content to continue the work begun by his father. He did however bring to his principate an element not to be found in the principate of Vespasian, and this element

\textsuperscript{30}FUR, pl. 17, 7 a-e, 8 a-h, 9; mosaic and relief illustrated in Humphrey, J. \textit{Roman Circuses. Arenas for Chariot Racing.}, London, 1986, pp. 123, 243, 223, 246. Further on the arch see; Platner and Ashby, p. 45; Cianto Rossetto, P., LTUR 1, 1993, pp. 108-109.

\textsuperscript{31}\textit{CIL} 6. 32363. 11-13, is the text from the \textit{Acta Fratrum Arvalium} which reads; M. Tittio Frugi T. Vinicio Iuliano cos. VII idus Decembr. in Capitolio in aedem Opis / sacerdotes conuenerunt ad sot a nuncupanda ad retitutionem et dedicationem Capi / toli ab imp. Caesare Vespasiano Aug....

\textsuperscript{32}Blake, 1959, p. 97; Ward-Perkins, 1981, pp. 72-73; Richardson, 1992, pp. 92, 412; Darwall-Smith, 1996, pp. 98-98. For the date of the \textit{consecratio} of Vespasian and its importance to the Flavian House see Jones, 1984, pp. 152-154.
can be found principally in the character of, and the cultural and educational background of Titus. However the brevity of his incumbency at the head of empire allows only a hint of this variation from his father's example to show through in the sources available to us. Whether this divergence would have increased over time, whether the reputation of Titus would have been different had he lived longer are lines of inquiry that can only lead to speculations, never answers, and are therefore redundant. Ultimately Titus followed his father's example, dying at the same family villa in which his father had died two years, two months and twenty days previously (Suet. Tit. 11; Dio, 66.26.4.; Epit. De Caes. 11.1). Rome was now to have Domitian to contend with: and Domitian Rome.
Just as Nero had found to his delight the benefits a major conflagration could confer on a ruler, benefits that Caligula had recognised but had not the fortune to enjoy, so too did Domitian find himself the beneficiary of a disastrous fire that destroyed much of the monumental precinct of the Campus Martius in Rome in the year A.D 80. Domitian in fact was even more fortunate than Nero as regards the fire. The conflagration had actually occurred during the reign of his brother, so there was not the danger of the fire being rumoured to be the work of this glory-seeking emperor. Even Titus had been fortunate in that he was in Campania at the time of the fire, in the words of Cassius Dio “attending to the catastrophe that had befallen that region” (66. 24. 1-3), so he had been safe also from rumour-mongering. The fire of 80 burnt for three days and nights, destroying most, if not all the buildings between the Capitoline temples and the Pantheon of Agrippa. It would seem also that the damage inflicted by the fire of 64 had not been completely rectified, if this is a reasonable assumption to be gained from the inscriptions known as the *arae incendiis Neronis* (*CIL* 6. 826, 30837 = *ILS* 4914). All this meant that Domitian was supplied with the opportunity to indulge in an unprecedented programme of urban renewal. This was always a welcome opportunity with its inherent scope for the promotion of regimes and/or dynasties, both in the buildings created, and in the work provided for that part of the populace at Rome that either worked on the
buildings, or profited from such activity\(^1\).

It was not just fire that could provide the impetus for the remodelling of large parts of the city, but also the conception by the incumbent of the constitutional position of the \textit{princeps} within the political structure of the empire that could have a profound effect of the urban landscape. One could take here as an example the Palatine hill. It has been seen previously how Augustus used the traditional if not always historically accurate associations of the Palatine hill to augment the propaganda campaign of his time, and how following members of the Julio-Claudian dynasty had used the Palatine in their own way to express their own idea of the principate in what looks like attempts to either maintain or to change the public perception of just what the \textit{princeps} was. Vespasian had had for some reason no liking for the Palatine as the location for his household, preferring the Gardens of Sallust for his residence whilst in Rome (Dio, 65. 10. 4). Perhaps the Neronian excesses still in evidence on that hill swayed his choice. Titus seems to have contented himself with accommodations comprised of portions remaining from the re-assignment from private to public of the Domus Aurea (Pliny, \textit{HN} 36. 4. 37)\(^2\). Domitian was to show himself to have his own ideas as to what was appropriate accommodation for the most powerful person in the western world. In just this one area of Rome, the Palatine, there is

---


evidenced the diverse concerns of the various *principes*.

In a wider context there was also a continuation of the Flavian concern to promote itself dynastically, a theme upon which Domitian was to place his own personal interpretation. Finally there was the concern to build into the city the conception of Rome's place in the world and Domitian's, or the principate's role in that context. All in all there was an ample sufficiency of stimuli and opportunity to encourage a programme of building at Rome that was to result in the consolidation of the reputation of Domitian as one of the foremost of the Imperial builders of Rome.

Indeed the scale and diversity of Domitian's building programme at Rome is such that it can present problems in trying to determine how best to approach and organise the material to maintain a degree of clarity and attempt to draw at least some meaning from so many and so widely scattered buildings. Darwall-Smith acknowledges this difficulty, rejecting a chronological approach as unworkable due to lack of reliable or available dating of the buildings, and opting for a typological rather than a topographical approach in order to 'provide a clearer means of understanding...'. As useful as this approach may be, it does, for example, fail to highlight what may have been one of the major stimuli of Domitian's behaviour as *princeps*, namely his desire for military

---

3Darwall-Smith, 1996, p. 102.
glory. A typological approach combined with a thematic and also at times topographical approach may provide a deeper understanding of Domitian's building activity, providing as it does other dimensions. Furthermore, in providing greater flexibility it may also seek to avoid some of the artificiality created by the restraint of any system of classification imposed on what may well have been a fairly organic process.

The Obsession with Military Honour.

Even before his accession to the purple Domitian was eager for military experience and kudos. His hopes were dashed early in the reign of Vespasian when he was denied an active role in the suppression of revolt in Gaul and the two Germanies (Suet. Dom. 2. 1), he was eager enough, it would seem, to go to the lengths of bribing eastern potentates in order to gain military experience and glory (Suet. Dom. 2. 2). But it was not to be, and it was not until the death of Titus that Domitian was to have the chance to prove himself at war. Then, he wasted little time achieving his goal\(^4\). This should not be seen as unusual, emperors needed military success, indeed it may be considered an imperative. What sets aside Domitian's behaviour in respect of military honour is, however, his almost obsessive focus on providing within Rome a very

Flavian dominated setting for one of Rome’s premier expressions of militarism and military glory, the triumph.

Whilst contemporary sources for the route taken by triumphs are very scant indeed, especially so given the importance of this procession in the ritual life of Rome, there is the evidence provided by Josephus for at least part of the triumphal procession taken by Vespasian and Titus when they held their joint Judaic triumph in A. D. 70 (Jos. BJ., 7, 123-157). This is as complete a contemporary account as we have for any route of triumphal procession that may have occurred during the reign of Domitian. Moreover, as pointed out by Laurence, the strength of tradition at Rome being such, and especially in the case of religious matters, it is unlikely that there was much in the way of innovation concerning the route of the triumph. Vespasian and Titus had spent the night in the Temple of Isis, near to the Villa Publica, the traditional resting place for triumphing generals waiting to enter the city. Their armies were moved into position around this area during the night, ready for the beginning of the ceremonies at dawn. The imperatores and their armies then moved off to the Porticus Octaviae where the senators, the magistrates, and the equestrians awaited. Thence to the Porta Triumphalis, from where the triumphal procession proper began, moving off through the theatres. The procession would then have

---


6 Which are not specified. It may well be that the three theatres in the district are meant, the theatres of Pompey, Marcellus and Balbus, but one cannot be certain. Any of these would have
made its way through the Forum Holitorium, along the vicus Iugarius, perhaps entering the Forum before heading south-west down the vicus Tuscus, through the Velabrum and the Forum Boarium to the Circus Maximus. Having passed through the Circus, exiting via an arch in the sphendome, the procession would have turned towards the north-east, taking a street that came to be known as the Via Triumphalis that ran between the Palatine and the Caelian hills. Turning into the Sacra Via the triumphal procession then made its way into and through the Forum, up the Clivus Capitolinus to where the triumphators finally arrived at the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus.

The fire of 80 had destroyed much if not all of the built environment that contained the initial stages of the triumphal route and ritual, as well as the ultimate destination of all triumphal processions, the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus. In the absence of any way of chronologically ordering the erection of buildings by Domitian along the route of triumphal processions, the route itself will serve to give an ordering and form to the following description of the Flavian presence interposed on required the triumphal procession double back on itself, which would strike one as being unlikely.

that route by the end on the reign of Domitian.

The Villa Publica had served a number of functions since its inception by the censors C. Furius Paculus and M. Geganius Macerinus in 435 B.C. for the purpose of holding a census of the Roman populace (Livy, 4, 22, 7). One of its purposes had been to often house returned generals awaiting senatorial approval to hold a triumph (Livy, 30, 21, 12; 33, 24, 5; Jos., BJ. 7, 5, 4). Destroyed by the fire of 80, it was replaced after a fashion by Domitian, by what was to become known as the Divorum. Contemporary literary sources do not mention the building. It is however assigned to Domitian by Jerome and the Chronographer of 354. Represented on the Marble Plan (FUR pl. 31; Rodriguez - Almeida pl. 26) the Divorum, or more properly the Templum Divorum (Degrassi, Inscriptiones Italiae 13. 1. 203, 233; CIL 10234 = ILS 7213) seems to have been a monumentalisation of what may have previously been a rather ill-defined and somewhat informal precinct. The Templum Divorum seems to have comprised a fairly narrow rectangular portico, entered through its short north side via a triple arched gateway, just inside of which two tetrastyle prostyle temples faced each other, flanking the entrance-way, and dedicated one to Vespasian and the other to Titus.

---

8 According to the argument of Richardson Jr., L., 'The Villa Publica and the Divorum.', in In memoriam Otto J. Brendal: Essays in Archaeology and the Humanities, Bonafante, J., von Heintze, H., eds., Mainz, 1976, pp. 159-63, though this is not beyond dispute; see Darwall-Smith, 1996, p. 158, n. 164 for the reported view of Steinby, who remains sceptical of such an identification.


10 Evidence for the dedication of the twin temples comes from an inscription of the collegium Aesculapi et Hygieae (CIL 6. 10234) which reads "decretum...quod gestum est in templo Divorum in
The Marble Plan depicts in the open area enclosed by the porticos regularly arranged dots, which have been interpreted as depicting trees. At the southern end on axis with the central fornix of the arched entrance-way, is what appears to be an altar. Just outside the entrance was erected the small temple of Minerva Chalcidica, which appears to be a tholus given its depiction on the marble plan (FUR pl. 31; Rodriguez-Almeida pl. 26, see Plate 18). This temple too has also been assigned to Domitian (Chron. 146; Hieron. a Abr. 2105).

It would seem then from the evidence that what Domitian built here was a structure that formalised or monumentalised an area previously connected with both censorial and triumphal activities, promoting at the same time his dynastic heritage, meshing his deified father and brother into the starting point of triumphal processions, and all of this guarded by the presence of Minerva at the gate.

In the testimony of Josephus, the triumphators spent the night in the Temple of Isis. This structure was situated next to where the Templum Divorum was to rise, and therefore at this time possibly beside the Villa Publica. The Eastern character of this triumph, and perhaps the gratitude of Vespasian and Titus for the assistance forthcoming from the Egyptian deities, may explain this peculiarity. In more regular circumstances it is likely that it would have been the Templum Divorum (in earlier times the Villa Publica) in or around which the troops would have been drawn aede divi Titi". This designates one of the temples, the other is assumed to be to Vespasian.
up in the early hours of the morning. The triumphators would, with the troops, then have made their way towards the Porticus Octaviae, through an area that was to become dense with Domitianic rebuilds and repairs.

The Temples of Isis and Serapis (Eutropius, 7. 23. 5; Chron. 146) stood directly to the west and north-west of the Temple of Minerva Chalcidica, and communicated with the square containing the Temple of Minerva and the entrance to the Templum Divorum via the triple fornix arch\textsuperscript{11}. The temples are depicted on the Marble Plan (\textit{FUR} pl. 31; Rodriguez-Almeida pl. 27), and whilst these fragments show a great deal of that part of the complex that was the Serapaeum, very little remains of the Iseum. However, what can be determined is that on egressing the Templum Divorum one would have been at least in visual contact with these temples, temples that held associations with Flavian dynastic victory and now bore the presence of Domitian as their rebuilder\textsuperscript{12}. Upon leaving the Templum Divorum, it is unknown by which route, triumphators may have made their way to the Porticus Octaviae, although it is possible

\textsuperscript{11}Known as the Arco di Camigliano it survived in part until it was finally demolished in the early 17th century. Excavations in 1969 rediscovered the north central pier. See further Coarelli, F., 'I monumenti dei Culti orientali in Roma - Questioni topografiche e cronologiche.', in \textit{La Soteriologia dei Culti orientali nell'Impero romano}, ed. Bianchi, U., Vermaseren, M. J., Leiden, 1982, p. 64; Castagnoli, F., 'Gli Edifici rappresentati in un Rilievo del Sepolcro degli Haterii.', BCAR 69, 1941, pp. 65-66 argued that this may have been the arch labelled \textit{Arcus ad Isis} and represented on the Haterii Relief. Malaise, M., \textit{Inventaire préliminaire des documents égyptiens découverts en Italie.}, Leiden, 1972, p. 191 agreed with this identification. However, Roullet, A., \textit{The Egyptian and Egyptianising Monuments of Imperial Rome.}, Leiden, 1972, p. 25, disputes this identification.

\textsuperscript{12}It should be remembered with all of the temples discussed in this chapter that Domitian had his name as restorer alone inscribed on the architraves. Due to this behaviour his written presence would have been all the greater.
that the Saepta Julia\textsuperscript{13}, the Diribitorium\textsuperscript{14}, Porticoes Minucia Frumentaria or Minucia Vetus\textsuperscript{15}, the theatre of Balbus with its adjacent portico\textsuperscript{16} would all have had to have been passed or passed through on the way.

In the description we have of the dual triumph celebrated by Vespasian and Titus it was in the Porticus Octaviae that the senatorial and equestrian orders were present to witness, and one would thereby assume grant official state sanction to, the acclamation by the troops of the triumphators. The portico burned in the fire of 80 (Dio, 66, 24, 2) and was restored, presumably by Domitian. Depicted on the Marble Plan (\textit{FUR} pl. 29; Rodriguez - Almeida pl. 23) it is shown as being


architecturally open to the Circus Flaminius, the traditional staging point of triumphal processions. Josephus testifies that the triumphators then moved on to the Porta Triumphalis. The Porta Triumphalis was an essential element in the topography of the triumph. Only triumphing generals seem to have been permitted to enter Rome through this gate, and in the description of the dual triumph of Vespasian and Titus it is here that the triumphators changed their attire, donning the triumphal robes in which they would remain for the remainder of the ceremony. From the account of Josephus it would appear that it was from this point that the triumphal procession proper began, and in the case of the triumph he describes, the procession moved off from here through the theatres, one presumes these were those of Marcellus, Balbus and Pompey, though there is no definite indication that these were the theatres meant. The first had had its *scaena* restored and re-dedicated.

---


During the principate of Vespasian (Suet., Ves. 19.1), the theatres of Balbus and Pompey were at least partially restored during the reign of Domitian following damage incurred in the fire of 80 (Dio, 66. 24, 2). From these the procession must have made its way back towards the Porta Triumphalis. Where this gate was has yet to be identified with complete certainty, however we do know that Domitian had this structure either restored or completely rebuilt, and crowned its decorative programme with a statue group consisting of himself as *triumphator* in a *biga* drawn by elephants. The elephants are important, being as they were an indication of divinity in the semiotics of Roman artistic representation.\textsuperscript{19}

Passing through the Forum Holitorium and the triumphal gate, turning left, perhaps within view of the Temple of Fortuna Redux built by Domitian (Martial, 8, 65), a triumphal procession would have proceeded up the *vicus iugarius* past the temples identified as those of Fortuna and Mater Matuta, *aedes* whose *area* was repaved, possibly at the time of Domitian. There is some uncertainty here concerning the temples of Fortuna. That Domitian had a temple to Fortuna Redux erected is attested to by Martial, 8. 65\textsuperscript{20}, and also its position seems to be made clear


\textsuperscript{20}Hic ubi Fortunae Reducis fulgentia late / templata nitent, felix area nupre erat: / hic stetit Arctoi formosus pulvere belli / purpureum fundens Caesar ab ore iubar: / hic laurum redivita comas et
by its juxtaposition with an arch, a 'porta triumphis', quite possibly the
porta triumphalis, but this is not beyond doubt. Therein lies part of the
problem, if indeed the porta triumphalis is meant, we still do not know
for certain just where the porta triumphalis was. However, it is not the
whole of the problem. Martial writes of the site of the temple 'felix area
nuper erat'. The word area has to signify some sort of open space, clear
of buildings. Therefore the suggestion by Coarelli, that Domitian's
temple was a rebuilding of the previously existing temples lying beside
the present Vico Jugario and under the chiesa S. Omobono runs into
problems, given that the site has traces of occupation from the Iron Age
onwards.

After moving along the vicus Iugarius the procession then possibly
moved through the Forum Romanum before returning towards the

Here, where far-gleaming shines the fane of Fortune that gives return, was of late, happy in its lot,
an open space; here, graced by the dust of a Northern war, stood Caesar, shedding from his face
effulgent light; here, her locks wreathed with bay, and white of vesture, Rome with voice and hand
greeted her Chief. A second gift, too, attests to the high merit of the spot: a consecrated arch stands
in triumph over the conquered nations; here stand two chariots and many an elephant; he himself
in gold is master of the mighty cars. This gate, Germanicus, is worthy of your triumphs: such an
approach it beseems the City of Mars to possess.

21 Coarelli, F., 'L'ara di Domizio Enobarbo e la cultura artistica in Roma nel II secolo A. C.',
DArch2, 1968, pp. 302-68.

22 For the evidence on these temples see Coarelli, F., Foro Boario, 1988, pp. 205-44; Pisani
155, 246. Darwall-Smith, 1996, p. 131 for the incompatibility between Martial's description and
Coarelli's suggestion.
Forum Boarium by way of the *vicus Tuscus*. Most probably it was somewhere within this circumscribed area that the temple of the Deified Augustus had been erected, probably as close as possible to the Forum proper. The temple and its attendant libraries had been burnt sometime during the 70's and were reconstructed by Domitian (Pliny, *HN*. 12. 94; Martial, 12. 3. 7-8)\(^{23}\). Issuing out of the *vicus Tuscus* the procession passed through the Forum Boarium and entered the Circus Maximus, passing along its length under the imposing façade of the Domus Augustana rising up the south-west slopes and across the summit of the Palatine in majesterial splendour. The parade then passed through the arch built into the sphendome of the circus by Titus to commemorate his Judaic victory\(^{24}\), and moved up the street that lay where the present day *Via S. Gregorio* lies, still in sight of the Domitianic Palatine buildings, under the arches of the Aqua Claudia\(^{25}\) and in sight of the massive presence of the *templum Divi Claudii* towards the imposing bulk of the Flavian Amphitheatre which Domitian had completed and decorated ad *clipea* (Chron. 146). In the vicinity was evidence of further Domitianic largesse. The Ludus Magnus had been erected to the east of the Flavian Amphitheatre by Domitian (Chron. 146) as the largest, as perhaps one should presume from the name, of four *ludi*; the Magnus,

---


\(^{24}\)See preceding chapter.

the Dacus, the Gallicus and the Matutinus, all it would seem built in the vicinity of the Amphitheatre (Curiosum, Notitia)\textsuperscript{26}

Here the procession turned at the Meta Sudans, another of Domitian's additions to the area surrounding the Flavian Amphitheatre, and all of which perhaps should also be interpreted as a further erasing of of the legacy of Nero\textsuperscript{27}. The triumphal procession would then have made its way along the street that led up out of the valley towards the Arch of Titus and the Sacra Via. Passing under the Arch of Titus\textsuperscript{28}, the view from here stretching out over the roofs of the Forum in the valley below. Thence the procession would have wound its way past the reconfigured Colossus of Nero, down the Sacra Via flanked by the Horrea Piperateria and Vespasian and into the Forum. The horrea re-converted the porticos built by Nero to provide a monumental approach to the Domus


\textsuperscript{27}For the excavation of 1986-94 see Panella, C., ed., Meta Sudans I. Un'area sacra in Palatio e la valle del Colosseo prima e dopo Nerone., Rome, 1996. See further Nash, vol 2., pp. 61-3; Richardson, 1992, p. 253. Munoz, A., Via dei Trionfi., Rome, 1933, has photographs of the remains of the Meta Sudans before its demolition. For further visual representation BMC Imp. 2.262, 190-91, 356 after no. 270

Aurea from the direction of the forum. Previously this section of the Sacra Via had been flanked by shops and houses, so the Domitianic horrea could be seen as a partial reinstatement of the pre-Neronian situation, and a Domitianic continuation of the Flavian desire to distance themselves from the style of the last of the Julio-Claudians.

The presence of Domitian was no less in evidence in the Forum than it was in any other location along the route of the triumphal procession. Additions to the Imperial residences on the Palatine defied the natural geography of the hill and with the aid of engineering prowess encroached on the precinct of the Forum, and in a partial resurrection of a scheme of Caligula's provided the Palatine palaces with a direct entrance from the Forum. In the Forum also sat the colossal equestrian statue of Domitian and the newly renovated Curia. From


the Forum the procession made its way up the *clivus capitolinus*, past the Temple of the Deified Vespasian and Titus, past the Portico of the *Dei Consentes* to the *area* of the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, within which stood the Temple of Jupiter Conservator, the *tribunal divi Vespasiani, Titi, Domitiani*, and ended finally with the triumphators dedicating their crowns and a portion of the spoils of their victory at the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus\(^{32}\).

By the time that they had reached the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus any triumphator in the post-Domitianic era had to pass along a route dominated by at least thirty-three Flavianic constructions, most of which had had at least some work carried out on them under the aegis of Domitian, many completely built or re-built under his principate\(^{33}\).

Whatever may have been the intent of Domitian by the end of his principate the presence of both himself and the dynasty to which he belonged permeated the route of probably the most defining tradition accommodated in the ritual landscape of Rome, the triumph.

---

\(^{32}\) All of these buildings were built or re-built by Domitian. For the Portico of the *Dei Consentes* see Platon-Ashby, 1929, p. 421 ff; Blake, 1959, p. 97; Nash, vol. 2, 241-3; Richardson, 1992, p. 313; Nieddu, G., *LTUR* 2, pp. 9-10. For the remaining, see below.

\(^{33}\) For an illustration of the buildings associated with both Domitian and the triumphal route see Plate 24.
A New Augustus.

This conservatism of Domitian in wishing to ally so closely his presence with one of the most venerable and characteristically Roman traditions found many other avenues for expression in other areas of tradition as well, including that which seems to be a conscious attempt to model his principate on some of the more conservative characteristics of the Augustan model. In the words of Jones Domitian was to be "the new Augustus, in money, morals and religion... as well as in building and entertainment."34.

A few months after his accession to the principate Domitian effected a revaluation of his coinage, restoring the silver content of the denarii to the Augustan standard. The restoration in the silver content paralleled an increase in the artistic standard on the coin types as well35. In the field of morality there was a reactivation of the moral legislation that had been introduced or more thoroughly enforced by Augustus, including renewed emphasis on the lex Julia de adulteriis coercendis, the lex Voconia, and the lex Scantinia. There was also the issuing of an edict reported by Suetonius (Dom. 7. 2) restricting the expansion of vineyards in Italy and their reduction by half in the provinces. While many a practical consideration may be adduced as the spur for such

---
34 Jones, 1992, p. 72.
legislation, the reason given by Suetonius, Statius and Philostratus and accepted by Wallace-Hadrill and Jones at least in part, is a desire to increase community morality\textsuperscript{36}. This looks to be pure Augustanism.

The Domitianic desire for private propriety was mirrored by actions designed to increase public probity. Suetonius provides us with the list of Domitian's virtues in regard to the public life of the city. Justice was administered diligently, judicial bribery curbed, corruption prosecuted, officials tightly controlled (Suet. \textit{Dom.} 8. 1-2). The social hierarchy in theatre seating was reinforced, the upper ranks of society protected from demeaning publications, disreputable women denied the privileges of ranked society, senatorial and equestrian propriety reinforced, and the unchastity of Vestal Virgins punished with increasing adherence to rigid traditions (Suet. \textit{Dom.} 8. 3-4). Propriety linked with piety meant a tomb built of masonry originally intended for the reconstruction of the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus being demolished, with the unhoused remains thrown into the sea (Suet. \textit{Dom.} 8. 5). It may be in association with this increase in public piety that the \textit{arae incendii Neronis} were set up, a series of altars vowed under Nero but only fulfilled during the reign of Domitian (\textit{CIL} 6. 826 30837 = \textit{ILS} 4914). Probity and piety,

\textsuperscript{36}Suetonius' report of the edict is part of a list of innovations concerning common practises, "\textit{multa etiam in communi rerum usu nostrit}" and follows mention of the restrictions imposed on actors and the imperial intervention in the making and marketing of eunuchs. It is likely therefore that Suetonius considered the edict to be moral in its intent, at least in part. Statius is more specific, "\textit{qui castae Cereri diu negata reddit iugera sobriasque terras}" (\textit{Silvae}, 4. 3. 11-12), the language here being purely of a moral bent. Philostratus' explanation for the edict is also a moral one (\textit{Vit. Soph.} 520) Wallace-Hadrill, A., \textit{Suetonius}, London, 1983. p. 134; Jones, 1992, p. 77-78.
correct form and correct action, in these alone the Augustanism of Domitian is evident. However it is evident also in the Domitianic concern for the recreation of Rome’s residents, there is a marked increase in officially sanctioned entertainment venues; the *ludii* in the vicinity of the Flavian amphitheatre, the Stadium and Odeum in the Campus Martius, and also in the Naumachia built under Domitian (Suet. *Dom.* 4. 2; Dio, 67. 8. 2) and at least partially demolished under Trajan (Suet. *Dom.* 5), and now lost to us. Augustus too had had a Naumachia constructed. There is further evidence of a certain Augustanism in Domitian’s concern for the monuments of his predecessors, for example the renovation carried out in order to re-align the horologium of Augustus in the northern reaches of the Campus, and perhaps in his renovation of Agrippa’s Pantheon (Chron. 146, Hieron. *a. Abr.* 2105).

The Augustan example is further evident also in the way in which piety results in the physical renovation of the temples of the city.

The slogan of ‘nothing is too good for the gods’ that has been applied to the building programme of Augustus would seem to have been adopted by Domitian as well, at least insofar as they were those gods who had found particular favour with this princeps. As has been shown, the Augustan programme of temple renewal, while not wholly inclusive, had at least been relatively broad in its constituency. The natural disaster

---


38 Zanker, 1988, pp. 103, 106.
of the fire of A.D. 80, and other lesser disasters and damage due to the
march of time, would most probably have required the building
programme of Domitian to expend some resources on simple
restorations. It is probably into this category that we should place such
restorations that have been assigned some Domitianic phase; those such
as the temples of Neptune, Cybele, Venus Genetrix, Apollo, the Dioscuri,
Juno, Deified Augustus, Vesta and the Pantheon. These were temples
whose renovation would have been considered simply a necessary and
completely usual undertaking for any princeps. However, there is
probably more of utility to the subject at hand in the temples of those
gods or deities in whom Domitian seems to have taken a particular
interest, or to have felt a particular debt.

At least four temples were constructed and/or completed during the
principate of Domitian that were expressly connected with his family and
dynasty. These were the Temple of the Deified Vespasian and Titus, the
Temple of the Flavian gens, and the temples to the Deified Vespasian
and the Deified Titus in the precinct of the Templum Divorum.

**The Temple of the Deified Vespasian and Titus.**

Construction of, or at least planning for, the Temple of the Deified
Vespasian and Titus had probably begun soon after the deification of
Vespasian in 80 during the reign of Titus. Titus' death within eighteen

39 For a discussion on these temples and their ascription to Domitian see Darwall-Smith, 1996,
pp. 136-139, and the literature there cited.
months of his elevation to the purple would have meant that any work on the temple already undertaken would have remained incomplete. Thus fell to Domitian the task of seeing the work completed. This he did, incorporating also his newly deified brother into the equation (Chron. 354). The temple to the Deified Vespasian thus became the Temple of the Deified Vespasian and Titus, an expansion of its dynastic character though only Vespasian's name appeared on the architrave (CIL 6.938 = ILS 255).

Space surrounding the Forum being by this time so limited, the porticus deorum consentium had to be rebuilt in different size and shape from the previously existing portico to enable the insertion of the Temple of the Deified Vespasian on the side of the Capitoline hill on the upper side of the clivus capitolinus⁴⁰. The seeming necessity to have the temple both physically and visually accessible from and as an element of the forum affected not only the size and shape of the portico, but the temple itself. The cella was almost square, but broader than it was deep, and the stairs that gave access to the cella had to continue beyond the façade of columns. In effect the site required the temple be compressed from front to back in comparison with more regular Roman temple proportions. In what may have been a conscious effort to avoid a sense of clumsiness or deformity in the building, its Corinthian columns were of extremely slender and elongated proportions, 1.57m in diameter at the base, and

⁴⁰Richardson, 1992, p. 313.
13.20m in height\textsuperscript{41}. The result was that the second dynasty of Imperial Rome had now acquired an elegant divinised presence in the Forum.

\textbf{The Templum Divorum.}

The building that, at least by the time of the engraving of the Severan marble map of Rome, had become known as the Templum Divorum consisted of an extensive portico enclosing three physically independent structures. Upon entering through the triple fornix of the arched entrance way which pierced the short, northern edge of the portico, the visitor was flanked by facing shrines dedicated to the two previously deified Flavian emperors who had preceded Domitian. At the far southern end of the enclosure in direct axial alignment with the entrance stood what appears to have been another altar or shrine, smaller than the two temples to the Flavian deities, but given architectonic importance by virtue of its positioning within the complex. It has been suggested that this structure might reasonably be interpreted as being the Domitianic reconstruction of an altar to Mars\textsuperscript{42}.

If this was the case it would appear that Domitian was again firmly entrenching his dynastic presence into the urban landscape, that


\textsuperscript{42}Richardson Jnr., 1976, p. 162. However reasonable this suggestion may be, there is in all actuality no proof that this is an altar, be it an altar to Mars or to whomever. It remains a matter of interpretation.
monumentalised landscape in which the traditions and rituals so important to the life of Rome were enacted. In one complex he would then have united his deified father and brother with the god who so symbolised the ancient and glorified martial traditions of Rome, and may even have found a way in which his own presence could be incorporated.

It has been suggested that the monumental arched entrance on the north side of the Templum Divorum may have been the original locus for what are known as the Cancelleria Reliefs. Whether or not Domitian found the restraint to omit his own presence from a building that according to its name was of or to the gods, his other dynastic temple was designed to be more fully inclusive.

**The Temple of the Flavian gens.**

There were precedents for the birth-places of emperors to become places of special public interest, even pilgrimage. Suetonius provides us with three examples. At Tit. 1 he mentions the birth-place of Titus, which he calls a mean little room, and mentions that it is open for public viewing. At Aug. 5-6 two places are mentioned as being singled out as the birth-place of Octavian, one at a country villa near Velletri that had been

---

43 Darwall-Smith, 1996, p. 159. However, this is as speculative if not more so than the suggestion concerning the interpretation of what may have been the altar to Mars.
known to manifest supernatural forces, and the other in Rome, at a part of the Palatine region named Capita Bubula or Ox-heads, where Suetonius reports there was in his day a shrine to the deified princeps that had been built after his death. Though a tradition of short standing in the context of Roman history, this showcasing of the birth-places of emperors was a tradition into which Domitian seems to have been eager to stake a claim.

Domitian chose the site of, or the actual house where he had been born to be transformed into a temple dedicated to his family, the temple of the gens Flavia (Suet. Dom. 1. 1; Martial 9. 20. 1-5)\(^{44}\). No actual remains of the temple have so far been found and securely identified, though its location is fairly certain. It was on the Quirinal, near to where the present day chiesa di S. Andrea al Quirinale is situated on the Via XX Settembre\(^ {45} \). Nor can we be sure as to the appearance of the temple, though various identifications as to its representation on coins and in relief sculpture have been suggested\(^ {46} \). What we can be fairly certain of though is that the temple would have been very richly realised in form and materials, and probably also in size. Through accident of birth the temple was sited away from the monumental centres of Rome.

\(^{44}\)The accounts differ somewhat. Suetonius seems to imply that the house itself remained, being converted ‘convertit’ to become the temple, whereas Martial talks of open ground, ‘haec quae tota patet’ where the house once stood, ‘hie steterat veneranda domus’.

\(^{45}\)Platner-Ashby, 1929, p. 247; Richardson, 1992, p. 181; Coarelli, LTUR 2, pp. 368-9; Darwall-Smith, 1996, pp. 159-60.

\(^{46}\)For a summary of these see Darwall-Smith, 1996, pp. 160-1.
However, what was lost in importance in topographical positioning could be remedied by other means.

The temple incorporated three main functions. It monumentalised Domitian's birthplace, provided a venue for the cult of the divinised family of Rome's second imperial dynasty, and was also a mausoleum for the members of this same family. Vespasian and Titus had been deified after their deaths. This was to be expected as they were both succeeded by a member of their family whose own prestige was heightened by this enshrinement of their memory. Titus had gone one step further and had deified his sister Flavia Domitilla (Statius, *Silv.* 1. 1. 97-8)⁴⁷. Domitian also deified other members of the family, Julia, Titus' daughter and his niece, and also his own son who had died in early childhood (Martial, 6. 13; 4 3). With a growing number of deified family members being worshipped in a temple that was also their mausoleum, Domitian was not only increasing his dynasty's prestige in relation to the Julio-Claudians, but also setting the Flavian dynasty apart. Whereas we have seen that Vespasian was at pains to present himself as the true continuation of the best of the Julio-Claudian traditions and emperors, Domitian seems to have desired that his family be seen not so much as the successors to the Julio-Claudians, but rather as an improvement on that family. Amidst the rest of the monuments glorifying that family, there had never been a temple constructed to the Julio-Claudian gens.

The temple of the Flavian gens increased Domitian's prestige by promoting the dynasty, by its array of divinities associated with himself, and by creating as a sanctified area the point on the earth where he had first drawn breath. Other deities associated with important events in Domitian's life were also to receive splendid new abodes during his principate. Prestige must have been an issue with these temples as well, but there would seem also to be something of an almost superstitious gratitude at work in the thinking of Domitian.

**Buildings for Jupiter**

The temple of the Capitoline Triad, otherwise termed the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus or Jupiter Capitolinus, that Vespasian had had restored after its destruction during the siege of the Capitoline lasted only until the fire of 80 when its once again burned as a victim to the incendiary nature of Rome (Dio, 66.24). Once again a Flavian had by chance the honour of reconstructing Rome's premier religious site and as the Acta Arvalium for December 7, in the year 80 records,

*M. Tittio Frugi T. Vinicio Iuliano cos. VII idus Decembr. in Capitolio in aedem Opis / sacerdotes convenerunt ad vota nuncupanda ad restitutionem et dedicationem Capi / toli*
However, Titus was to live too short a time for any substantive work to be accomplished during his principate, and so a third Flavian by chance of events inherited the honour of rebuilding the Capitoline shrine.

It would only have been expected that Domitian would continue reconstruction on Rome's most important religious shrine, it would only have been expected that he should desire to have a most impressive building on which to have his name inscribed. What may not have been so expected was the amount of the empire's resources that Domitian was prepared to spend on a single building. Columns of the Corinthian order, made of Pentelic marble, were imported from Athens to grace its façade (Plutarch, *Publ.* 15. 4), behind which the doors to the *cellae* gleamed in their plating of gold (Zozimus, 5. 38. 5), the richness of which was matched, if not exceeded, by the gilt bronze tiles of the roof (Procopius, *BellVand.* 15. 4). The gilding alone was said to have cost 12,000 talents, or HS 288,000,000, a vast sum\(^48\). This may seem to be an excessive amount of resources to expend on a single temple in a single city of a vast empire. However, of the contemporary writers who mention Domitian's reconstructed temple only one seems to find fault

\(^{48}\)The figure comes from Plutarch (*Publ.* 15. 3-5), the conversion is that of Rogers, P. M., 'Domitian and the finances of State', *Historia* 33, 1984, p. 68 and n. 36. The sum would be somewhere near to one third of the total annual revenue from the empire based on the figures proposed by Hopkins, K., *Taxes and Trade in the Roman Empire (200 B. C. -A. D. 400)*, *JRS* 70, 1980, 101-25.
with this perceived extravagance. Plutarch (Publ. 15. 3-4) seems to take exception to two aspects of the temple as reconstructed by Domitian, the enormous expense of the decoration, and the diminution of the aesthetic qualities of the pillars due to re-polishing and re-sizing at Rome. He was aware that there had been a tradition of extravagant expenses incurred in the previous incarnations of the building, he claims forty thousand pounds of silver was spent on the foundations alone by Tarquin. Plutarch's fundamental criticism of the Domitianic temple is however based not on the quantities of gold, nor on aesthetics, but lies rather in the motivations of the princeps;

However, if anyone who is amazed at the costliness of the Capitol had seen a single colonnade in the palace of Domitian, or a basilica, or a bath, or the apartments for his concubines, then, as Epicharmus says to the spendthrift,
"'Tis not beneficent thou art; thou art
diseased; thy mania is to give,"

so he would have been moved to say to Domitian:

"'Tis not pious, nor nobly ambitious that thou art; thou art diseased;
thy mania is to build; like the famous Midas, thou desirèst that every
thing become gold and stone at thy touch."

(Plutarch. Publ. 15, 5)\textsuperscript{49}

Plutarch's criticism, whilst having its genesis in a particular, is in fact
general. In truth the overwhelming largesse directed by Domitian
towards the gods is for Plutarch not pious in nature, but is the result of a
personality flaw. He rightly recognises that Domitian's desire for
splendour did not contain itself to the realm of religion, but manifested
itself throughout the building programme undertaken throughout his
principate.

However extravagant the rebuilding of the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus
was, it was not the only temple for Jupiter that Domitian was to have
built. During the siege that marked the end of the reign of Vitellius,
Domitian had been caught with the Flavian forces on the Capitoline. In
order to protect his life he had sought refuge in the residence of the
 guardian of the temple of Jupiter (Tac. Hist. 3. 74; Suet. Dom. 1. 2) In
order to show his due gratitude to the god whose sanctuary had helped to

\textsuperscript{49} Text and translation Loeb classical Library, translation B. Perrin.
protect him he had raised during the principate of his father a shrine to Jupiter Conservator. During his own principate Domitian amplified his thank-offering to the god, building somewhere in the area Capitolina a Temple to Jupiter Custos\textsuperscript{50}, the cult statue of which held an image of Domitian (Tac. Hist. 3.74).

Other temples to Jupiter have been ascribed to Domitian. These include a temple to Jupiter Propugnator, one to Jupiter Victor, and another to Jupiter. However, as Darwall-Smith shows, the evidence for these temples having a Domitianic link is scanty to say the least\textsuperscript{51}. There were however other non-temple buildings erected in Rome by Domitian that had a direct connection with Jupiter.

In A. D. 86 Domitian instigated the Capitoline games. Greek in concept and form, the games were given an unmistakably Roman name, being named for and dedicated to Jupiter Capitolinus. Roman in name they may have been, but it is a sign of their non-Roman nature that there were no permanent buildings in Rome in which to accommodate such games. In the Roman mind-set it was considered good for one to exercise, but the watching of others exercising could lead to degeneracy.

\textsuperscript{50}The exact site of the temple is disputable. Platner and Ashby, 1929, p. 292; Blake, 1959, p. 101; Nash vol. I, p. 518 who all place the temple at the site of a large concrete podium core excavated on the Capitoline, studied then destroyed at the end of the nineteenth century. Coarelli, F., \textit{Guida Archeologica di Roma.}, Verona, 1974, p. 45 disagreed. He is supported by Richardson, 1992, pp. 218, 226-7

\textsuperscript{51}Darwall-Smith, 1996, pp. 112-13.
(Tac. Ann. 14. 20; Pliny, Pan. 33. 1). Resistant to that which they considered to be effete, the conservative powers that were at Rome had neither desired nor deigned to build the presence of Greek style games into the city.\(^{52}\) Domitian desired or dared to, and did so in spectacular fashion. A stadium was built on the Campus Martius, to the north of the Theatre of Pompey, and to the west of the Baths of Nero (Suet. Dom. 5; Eutropius, 7. 23. 5; Chron. 146; Hieron. a. Abr. 2105). It stood, and in part still stands, on the site of the present day Piazza Navona, whose own shape is a product of the stadium.\(^{53}\) Probably just to the south of the stadium Domitian had erected the Odeum (Suet. Dom. 5; Chron. 146; Hieron. a. Abr. 2105), in which the less actively strenuous activities of poetical, rhetorical and musical recital were held.\(^{54}\) There were now new additions both to the entertainment options of the Romans and to the recreational precinct on this part of the Campus Martius. Though why Domitian would wish to make such a spectacular departure from his otherwise seemingly conservative approach to the traditions of Rome is a question that demands at least some consideration.

That Domitian greatly honoured Jupiter and associated himself closely with the god in the iconography of his principate is well attested. The

\(^{52}\) For a list of examples of conservative Roman distaste for Greek games see Sherwin-White, A. N., The Letters of Pliny: a Historical and Social Commentary, Oxford, 1985, p. 301. Nero had built a gymnasion, which may have incorporated a stadium of some sort, but it would not have been for the mass public displays of athletic contests. The stadium of Domitian is of a different intention.

\(^{53}\) For a full report on the Stadium see Colini, A. M., Lo Stadio di Domiziano, Rome, 1943.

\(^{54}\) It is not known for certain whether or not the remains of a large building discovered in this location in the 1930's are indeed the remains of the Odeum or not. For the relevant literature Darwall-Smith, 1996, and the works cited there.
poets of the time would have him seen as Jupiter on earth (e. g. Statius, *Silv.* 4. 2. 18 ff.). However closer inspection of the official imagery of the reign would point to a different understanding of Domitian’s conception of his relationship *vis à vis* Jupiter. It seems that Domitian preferred to present himself as Jupiter's terrestrial vice-regent rather than as an actual earthly manifestation of the god. This was not a new development in the imagery of the principate but followed a tradition that can be traced back to the reign of Augustus. Also relatively conventional though perhaps a trifle obsessive was Domitian’s devotion to his tutelary goddess Minerva. Domitian seems to have believed he was especially under the protection of this goddess (Suet. *Dom.* 15. 3), one of whose roles was as the protectress of heroes.

Though Hercules had been unpopular in imperial iconography since the time of Augustus following Marc Antony’s identification with him, aristocratic interest in Hercules had been increasing during the later part of the first century A.D. due to philosophical interest in the hero/god as a moral exemplar. This had reached even to the heart of the Imperial court with Senecan interest evident in the tragedy Hercules Furens. There is evidence that Domitian desired to identify himself with the hero/god Hercules. Somewhere near to the eighth milestone from

---

55 Fears, J. R., "Jupiter and Roman Imperial Iconography", *ANRW* 2. 17. 1, 1981, pp. 74-80
56 Ibid, pp. 66-74
57 On Domitian’s relationship with Minerva see Girard, L-L. 'Domitien et Minerve; un prédiliction impériale', *ANRW* 2. 17. 1, 1981, pp. 233-245
58 The identification of himself as Hercules may in part explain Domitian’s attachment to Minerva, and may also shed light on this emperor’s penchant for archery, the only physical...
Rome on the Via Appia, Domitian had erected a temple for Hercules. What is of interest here is that the face of the cult figure of the god was a portrait of Domitian (Martial, Ep. 9. 64; 9. 65; 9. 101). Whilst he may not have dared to portray himself thus within the limits of the city of Rome, eight miles is not at such a distance as to obscure knowledge of the action from the upper social orders at Rome, especially when one considers the highly mobile world of Rome's elite. Nor does Martial seem to believe that this action on the part of Domitian should not be widely published. Furthermore it would seem that there was no precedent for this action on the part of a princeps. Emperors had been worshipped of course, but as themselves. Caligula had dressed as various gods, had stood in person to be worshipped as a god. None however had publicly and permanently identified themselves as one of the gods. Later emperors from Trajan onwards were to use Herculean iconography to express a concept of good and virtuous 'kingship'. Perhaps we have in the identification with Hercules another of the behaviours of Domitian which, though modified, found favour and acceptance under Trajan.

The Olympian games had, according to Pindar, been instigated by Herakles in honour of his father Zeus (Pindar, Oly. 2. 3; 3. 11; 6. 6a; activity he seems to have partaken of, or so reports Suetonius (Dom. 19).

10.25; *Nem.* 10. 33; 11. 27). Were the Capitoline games, primarily in honour of Jupiter, instigated by Domitian as a Herculean act? If this were the case it may go some way to explaining the very permanent introduction of such games into the traditionally resistent environment of Rome by a *princeps* who otherwise seems to have relished his role as protector of Rome's conservative ways.

Having built temples for Jupiter and members of his family, having built a stadium and odeum for games to further honour Jupiter, and ensconced his family's presence along the triumphal route, Domitian brought the two themes of honouring family and deity together in the erection of the tribunal *divi Vespasiani, Titi et Domitiani*. This was possibly a statue base for the Flavian emperors built in the Area Capitolina⁶¹, and known only from a military diploma that was attached to it (*CIL* 16. 28). Suetonius (*Dom.* 13. 2) tells us that Domitian insisted any statues of himself set up in the Area Capitolina had to be of gold or silver and of a fixed weight, so it is probable that all the Flavian likenesses on the tribunal were of this type. Though used by Suetonius and Pliny (*Suet.* *Dom.* 13; *Pliny, Pan.* 52. 3-5) as a sign of the haughtiness of Domitian, this insistence on the type and weight of materials for his likenesses may well have been for Domitian a sign of his piety in wanting only the best for the gods⁶². However, having the name that the tribunal did implies that Domitian is also to be considered

---

⁶¹Richardson, 1992, p. 401.
deified. The tribunal must have been made in the time of Domitian, it would not have been erected before his reign and the deification of his father and brother, and certainly would not have been erected after his death.

Buildings for Minerva.

Though honoured alongside Jupiter and Juno by way of the Capitoline games Minerva held a place apart in the personal piety of Domitian. Minerva was the deity whose protection he most sought, it was a dream of Minerva unable to further protect him that it is reported he felt prefigured his death, it was as the son of Minerva that he wished to be present in prayers to that goddess. There may be a number of reasons for this special attachment of Domitian to Minerva. It may have been as suggested above, that Domitian wished to see himself as some sort of Herculean figure, and it was well known how important Minerva was in the stories of that hero/god. It may have been that Domitian associated Isis with Minerva, and it was disguised as a priest of Isis that he had escaped from the Capitoline after his night of terror there (Tac. Hist. 3. 74; Suet. Dom. 1. 2). Or it may have been that as the Julio-Claudians had in Venus a familial deity, Domitian decided that the Flavian gens needed their own tutelary goddess as well63. Whatever the reason

---

Minerva was to be well served by her imperial adherent.

As has already been mentioned above Domitian included a temple to Minerva as part of his re-working of the Villa Publica into the Templum Divorum. The temple, though small, was significantly sited. Its siting linked it with the Templum Divorum, the Temple of Isis and Serapis, and the nearby buildings of the Augustan and Agrippan building programme such as the Saepta Julia and the Agrippan Baths, both of which almost certainly received Domitianic attention following the fire of 8064.

Likewise a temple known to us only by way of surviving literary sources may have been almost equally significantly sited. The Chronographer of 354 (Chron 146) mentions a templum Castorum et Minervae and the Curiosum lists the building as being in regio VIII. Military diplomata post AD 89 regularly bear as part of their formula the position of their original being posted in muro post templum divi Augusti ad Minervam (CIL 16. 36-156, 60-89). Martial mentions a temple to Minerva which may also be this same temple. He writes;

\[ \text{Hunc, quem saepe vides intra penetralia nostrae} \]
\[ \text{Pallados et templi limina, Cosme, novi} \]

64For their destruction in 80, Dio, 66, 24, 2. Their restoration under Domitian is implied by both Statius (Silv. 4. 6. 2), and Martial (2. 14. 5; 57. 2; 9. 59. 1; 10. 80. 4)
This fellow, whom you often see in the inner precincts of our patron
Pallas and on the threshold, Cosmus, of the New Temple,
(Martial, Ep. 4. 53, 1-2)⁶⁵.

The *templum nouum* has been taken to be the temple of the Deified
Augustus⁶⁶, the exact location of which is not known, though as
mentioned previously it is thought to have been placed close behind the
Temple of Castor and the Basilica Julia. Anderson has suggested that
there were indeed two temples, placed next to each other⁶⁷. Richardson
has proposed that the Temple of Castor perhaps housed a shrine to
Minerva in its back wall in the *loculi* built into its base⁶⁸. Aronen has
proposed even more diverse locations in the immediate vicinity which
may equally well have housed such a shrine or temple⁶⁹. The state of
our knowledge at the present time would seem to leave us at best unsure
as to the exact location of such a building. However, what can be known
from our sources is that some sort of a Minervan presence was built into
the area by Domitian. That is enough for our purposes here. The temple
of Castor was at the time of Domitian a renovation of the Augustan age.

Nearby the Basilica Julia was also an Augustan edifice, linked by both
name and date to the first of the *principes*. Also in the immediate
vicinity was the Temple of the Deified Augustus, the restoration of
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⁶⁶Suet. Tib. 74; Richardson, 1992, p. 46.
⁶⁷Anderson Jr., J. C., 'A Topographical Tradition in Fourth Century Chronicles: Domitian's
Building Program.', Historia 32, 1983, pp. 100-1
⁶⁸Richardson, 1992, p. 255
⁶⁹Aronen, J., LTUR 3, 1996.
which by Domitian had linked the first *princeps* of Rome with the current incumbent. Nearby was the Domitianic complex that served as a Forum level entrance to the Palatine palaces above. Once again we have with the Temple of Castor and Minerva a positioning of Minerva within a nexus of Domitianic and Augustan buildings. It is a wilful adjunction of the Flavian Minerva to an Augustan past that is most fully revealed in the grandest display of Domitianic piety towards his patroness, the Forum Transitorium.

**The Forum Transitorium.**

With the Forum Transitorium some of the problems encountered with the two previous examples of Domitianic structures dedicated to Minerva are not present. Its exact location is very well attested, and there are substantial remains of the forum and its component parts still *in situ*. Though much of these remains may lie beneath the *via dei Fori Imperiali*, at least they remain[^70].

The Forum Transitorium was in effect a monumentalisation of a pre-existing thoroughfare that linked the Forum Romanum with the heavily populated area of the Subura. Its form was restricted, due in part

to this pre-existence of the site as a thoroughfare, and due partly to the structures that bordered it to both its south-east and north-west, the Julian and Augustan forums on the one side, and Vespasian's Temple of Peace on the other. Both restrictions combined to create a site that was both long and narrow. As architecturally difficult as the site may have been it did however contain a possibility of irresistible symbolism. Monumentalisation of the Argiletum allowed Domitian to architecturally link his father's Temple of Peace, Augustus' forum, the Caesarian forum, the Curia and the Forum Romanum. Many of the purpose-built structures that housed the publicly performed governance of Rome and her empire were thus to be united by this single structure. Likewise the legacies of Julius Caesar, Augustus and Vespasian and the Republic were united by the forum built by Domitian.

However Domitian's forum should not be seen simply as some sort of humble vinculum, nor merely a utilitarian rationalisation nor standardisation of space intended to add coherence to this important area of the city. By monumentalising the Argiletum Domitian was interposing his presence both literally and metaphorically amongst some of the most admired legacies of the most honoured of his predecessors; it was a situation that called for display rather than rectitude.

The Forum Transitorium followed to a large extent the form though not necessarily the functions of the other Imperial fora. It consisted of a large paved rectangular space enclosed by walls and colonnade. However, in
the case of the Forum Transitorium limitations on space resulted in the colonnade being semi-engaged rather than the more traditional free-standing colonnades of its predecessors. As with its neighbours this forum contained a temple placed in a visually imposing position. Likewise the materials of its construction and decoration were by and large the same as those that were present in the other Imperial fora, with a display of the Imperially popular polychrome marbles that the provinces could provide. There were however also significant divergences from tradition incorporated within the Domitianic forum.

All the other fora contained a temple to a divinity, but Domitian's forum contained two temples, one to Minerva and one to Janus Quadrifrons. There is much debate concerning this temple to Janus in the Domitianic forum, with seemingly the only indisputable fact being that there was such a temple for this god. Where in the forum it stood, and what form it took, and whether it was a relocation of the archaic shrine from the Forum Romanum to the Domitianic forum are all questions that remain unanswered and are as yet unanswerable. Although some interesting hypotheses have been put forward, they remain merely that, hypotheses 71.

However it would seem appropriate that a transformed thoroughfare, and an area intended to provide a monumental linking between the

---

71 For a summary of the varying theories and arguments see Darwall-Smith, 1996, pp. 120-24 and the literature there cited.
surrounding fora, as well as a symbolic link between the two dynasties responsible for the building of these fora should have contained a shrine to Janus, the god of doorways and passageways. Janus was also the god of passage across water, and it may be no coincidence that a shrine to this god was placed in an area under which the *cloaca maxima* ran.

The other temple that the forum contained was one for Minerva. Placed in a commanding position at the north-east end of the forum the temple served much the same architectonic function as the temples of Venus Genetrix and Mars Ultor in the Caesarian and Augustan forums. It may well have served a similar symbolic function as the temples of Venus Genetrix and Mars as well. The Julian convenience of having a divine ancestor had been used to the full to promote the interests of members of that family, with the temple of Venus Genetrix being perhaps the most explicit, certainly the largest, product of that self and familial promotion. Accordingly a cult image of the goddess had been placed in the Temple of Mars Ultor (Ovid, *Tristia*, 2, 295). The resulting convergence of the two lines of mythological symbolism, and the resonances of the combined divine attributes, served well the Julio-Claudian line in their role as the ruling family at Rome. Notoriously, the Flavians had no such illustrious genesis. However, the *gens Flavia* was connected strongly with the Sabine region, an area with long and strong connections with a cult of Minerva (Varro, *LL.*, 5.74; Dion. Harlic, *AR.*, 1, 14). It has been suggested that Domitian may have wished to provide his family with a
tutelary goddess such as the Julio-Claudians had found in Venus, and chose Minerva for this purpose\textsuperscript{72}. Minerva could have been a particularly suitable choice as a divine patroness for an Imperial family given her dual role as a deity of war and of the arts of peace. That Minerva was used by Domitian to emphasise these arts of peace is demonstrated by the remains of the frieze that once presumably encircled the Forum Transitorium on its entablature\textsuperscript{73}. However, as pointed out by Darwall-Smith\textsuperscript{74}, the very small proportion of the frieze that remains may mislead the unwary, and we should not presume that the remainder of the frieze showed only these more tranquil aspects of the goddess. It may well be that her martial attributes received an equal amount of sculptural illustration, or that other deities were also depicted.

In the one figure Minerva could combine for Domitian the attributes and qualities that Augustus had had to find in separate deities, thus his honouring of Mars and Apollo and Venus. Appropriate then that a temple to Minerva should be positioned between fora that contained temples to Peace, Mars and a familial tutelary goddess. The symbolism of the Domitianic choice of a temple for Minerva with which to grace his forum can be seen to have resonated on a number of different levels,

\textsuperscript{72}Scott, K., 1936, pp. 185-6; Girard, J-L., 1981, pp. 233-45.

\textsuperscript{73}For a recent in depth study of the frieze, D'Ambra, E., Private Lives, Imperial Virtues. The Frieze of the Forum Transitorium in Rome., Princeton, 1993, a study that may now be superceded by a more recent identification of the figure as a personification of a province, see Parisi in Provinciae Fideles: il fregio del Tempio di Adriano in Campo Marzio., ed. Sapelli, M., Milan, 1999. This would then be a programmatic link with the neighboring forum of Augustus.

\textsuperscript{74}Darwall-Smith, 1996, p. 120.
connecting the various symbolic and mythological programmes of the temples of the surrounding fora and uniting them in the one figure.

However much the Domitianic forum may have on many levels functioned as its commonly applied name implied, as a transitional space, there is no doubt that the designers were content to provide simply a utilitarian area that linked the glories of predecessors. Available space may not have allowed for colonnades such as those present in adjacent imperial fora; however, as has been suggested by Darwall-Smith, leaving the side walls of the forum unadorned would have led to a visually brutal result that would be unacceptable in such a prestigious, imperially sponsored project. A resolution was found in the use of free-standing colonnades closely positioned to the wall, a small part of which is still extant, the colloquially named Le Colonnacce. The resulting interplay of light and shadow produced by these colonnades would have had the duel effect of mitigating the disproportionate length of the forum by both breaking up the long lateral walls of the forum into a "rhythmic series of bays" and giving the impression of greater width to the space. Ressauts bracketed out from the entablature extended this architectural effect to the top of the attic.

Creation of the illusion of space was complemented by an actual increase in a different type of space, the surface space of the entablature. It is in

---

Darwall-Smith, 1996, p. 119.
the decoration of this space that once again an indication of an intention to provide more than a simple utilitarian nexus is evidenced. The other fora had colonnades and entablatures. They did not however have entablatures incorporating a didactic frieze. The small fraction of extant relief may not allow us to hazard in any way a reconstruction of the sculptural programme of the entire entablature, though it may be not unreasonable to suppose that its theme was moralizing or edifying, whether it concerned itself exclusively with the exploits of Minerva, or incorporated other deities. Important to the concerns of Domitian as the didactic programme of the relief sculpture may have been, it would not however have had as immediate a presence as the whole of the entablature of which it was a part.

The entablature evidences a luxuriousness of decorative detail characteristic of Flavian, and more especially Domitianic architecture. The rich furnishing of detail is matched by the quality of workmanship, in particular the deep incising of the ornamentation.\textsuperscript{77} However, part of the entablature is missing. On the outward facing ends of the ressauts at attic level the flat, unadorned surfaces reveal bored holes of a regular pattern (See Plate 17). These may well have been to anchor moulded metal plaques. These would have almost certainly have been of gilt bronze. Of gilded bronze too would have been the statuary, the anchoring holes for which remain still on the top of the uppermost cornice.\textsuperscript{78} Rich decorative detail, high quality workmanship and

\textsuperscript{77} Though the quality of the workmanship can be variable, see D'Ambra, 1993, pp. 109-11.
luxurious materials all denote a building designed at least to compete with its larger and more fortunately proportioned neighbours, not merely to link those surrounding monuments of the glorified past.

Domitian’s plans for the imperial fora did not end with his remodelling of the Argiletum. Work on other parts of the Imperial fora are known. Evidence mainly from brick stamps and architectural ornament has shown that there was a programme in place to completely rebuild the Julian forum under Domitian, including the Temple of Venus Genetrix. There was also the construction of the Basilica Argentaria, an L-shaped arcaded hall built by Domitian, then later extended by Trajan, when it linked the west portico of the Forum Julii and the Forum Traiani. It’s pillars being heavily rusticated in style, this distinction in style gave the building a separate identity to the two fora. This unusual use of the rusticated style so little used in Imperial works may also have been intended as a reference to the works of Claudius, whom we have seen was quite partial to its use. As has been mentioned previously, the Flavian dynasty had reason to be favourably predisposed towards Claudius, and the rustication of the Basilica Argentaria would effect by means of stylistic reference inclusion of the memory of both Claudius and the Vespasianic honouring of a predecessor. The linking
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80 Morselli, LTUR 1, 1993, pp. 169-70, Richardson, 1992, pp. 50-1.
81 Richardson, 1992, p. 51.
and consolidation of the Imperial fora may, as has been indicated above, have not been either the only, nor even the prime design behind these works of Domitian.

It was noted by Blake that there seems to have been Domitianic work in the structures and area that were to be realised at a later date, and are commonly known as the Markets of Trajan\(^{82}\). However, whatever may have been the Domitianic designs for this area they were not, to the best of our knowledge, to be realised. It is possible that the Domitianic plans for the area were, to a greater or lesser extent, brought to actuality during the principate of Trajan, but there is no evidence. If it was the case that Domitian was planning another grand imperial forum where that of Trajan was later to rise we should not be surprised\(^{83}\). It would integrate nicely with what would seem to be some of the major concerns of the Domitianic building programme, the consolidation of past imperial works, the insinuation of a dynastic and personal presence into past traditions, and then an amplification of the Domitianic presence with even greater works than those of his predecessors. Nowhere perhaps are these themes more evident than in the work carried out on the Imperial

---


\(^{83}\)This may explain both the reading of Aurelius Victor (13. 5) supported by Anderson, 'A Topographical Tradition' 1983, p. 55.n. 34 and p. 147, and the attribution by Jerome to Domitian of the Forum of Trajan.
residences on the Palatine.

The Palatine Buildings.

Historically, aristocratic residences at Rome were far more than simply houses in which domestic functions could be suitably accommodated. Houses had public as well as private functions. It is unsurprising therefore that the status and standing of the principal occupant were expressed and conveyed by many different elements. Of these the most important and perhaps the most obvious were size, position and materials.

By the time of Domitian the principal residence of the princeps in Rome had a long and somewhat troubled history. As has been shown, Augustus by a subtle and sophisticated interplaying of conflicting elements had managed to convey an image of semi-divinity whilst ostentatiously living in a very modest way and in a modest abode. Change to this carefully maintained simplicity of Imperial housing had been effected during the principate of Caligula, somewhat unsuccessfully. Again during the principate of Nero imperial accommodation had been re-thought, its concerns re-directed, its symbolic intent re-defined, twice. It had ended in being a public relations disaster. Sensitive to precedent, Vespasian had trodden a conservative path, neutralising Nero's

---

experiment and even abandoning the tradition of Palatine residency. Domitian was moving into sensitive territory in choosing to build an imperial residence in Rome.

Since the beginning of the principate of Augustus the imperial ownership of the Palatine hill had steadily increased, as had the unitary nature of the imperial properties. At *AJ* 19. 103-104; 116-117 Josephus' recounting of the death of Caligula indicates that essentially the imperial residences were still separate entities, some divided by streets and alleyways, some contiguous, but essentially a single edifice. The work of Nero had increased both the area and cohesiveness of the Palatine complex. It is clear that by the time of the principate of Domitian the Palatine was if not entirely, then in the greater majority, imperial property.

Given the public/private nature of aristocratic residences in the Roman world it is unsurprising that the principal official residence of the principal citizen in the principal city of the Roman world should provide ready access, and that points of access should be unmistakable, monumental, impressive. Wiseman has demonstrated both the changing concerns of the various *principes* and the emphasis placed on their various approaches. Domitian was no exception.

---

86 As with so much of Domitian's building activity in Rome it seems virtually impossible to date
The approach to the Palatine on the western corner by way of the *scalae Caci*, Augustus' first choice of approach to his Palatine residence, seems to have lost favour with both the first and then the succeeding *princeps*. There is no evidence that Domitian had any work carried out in this area. Where Domitian did build on the precedence of a former *princeps* was at the northern corner of the Palatine. It had been Caligula who had originally created the direct physical link between the the Palatine complex and the Forum. Domitian now re-emphasised this link.

At the base of the Palatine he had construction begin on what has been interpreted as some sort of monumental vestibule or atrium, a series of three main rooms which may initially have been intended to serve a ceremonial function, or conceivably may have housed some sort of vetting or filtering function of those wishing to visit the imperial complex above, to which this Forum level building was connected by a covered ramp. Whatever the purpose of the building it was significantly sited. In the first instance it amplified the physical presence of the Imperial residence in the Forum. Secondly it most probably was in the various elements of the Palatine complex and thus establish a chronology for the work. Though treated topographically, it should be kept in mind that the Domitianic vision for the Palatine almost certainly evolved over time. What we can know is only the final version of the Domitianic vision.

close proximity to the Temple of the Deified Augustus, a highly prestigious building reconstructed or restored by Domitian. Also in the immediate vicinity was the Temple of Castor and Pollux, with its Domitianic adjunct of some sort of shrine or temple to Minerva. These were the highly significant buildings which now were in a direct association with the Domitianic re-build of the Domus Tiberiana perched high above, connected physically by way of the Domitianic ramp, and visually by way of the height of the vestibule which soared towards the Domus Tiberiana overhead.

However important this way of entry to the Palatine may have been it was not, it would seem, to be the most important way of approach. As demonstrated by Wiseman the principal route of access to the Palatine residences had, since the time of Augustus, been via the clivus Palatinus\textsuperscript{88}. However, the route up from the Forum had been changed substantially since the time of the first princeps. Neronian needs or desires had seen the area between the Temple of Vesta and the ridge that joined the Palatine to the Velia remodelled substantially. It was a project that had probably needed completing by the Flavians\textsuperscript{89}. The result was a direct approach from the edge of the forum proper to the Atrium of the Domus Aurea. The Atrium had provided a point of entrance to the Domus Aurea that spread from this point to the north, the east and the west. Now under Domitian the Domus Aurea was no more, but the

\textsuperscript{88}Wiseman, 1987.

\textsuperscript{89}Castagnoli, F., 'Note sulla topografia del Palatino e del foro romano.', ArchClass16 1964, pp. 195-8.
atrium remained, its purpose to provide the point of entrance to the Palatine.

From this point visitors to the Palatine would have made their way up the slope that led towards the summit of the hill. But where there had been in the time of Augustus the atria of other aristocratic houses lining the way to the princeps' door was now an entirely imperial, and predominately Flavian concern. To the east could be seen the Flavian amphitheatre soaring now to its full four-tiered height, its Domitianic additions of gilt bronze clipea adorning its exterior (Chron. 146). Before it stood the Meta Sudans, while off in the distance loomed the massive bulk of the Temple of the Deified Claudius. Nearer to hand was the Arch celebrating Titus' victory over Judaea, and possibly arches to other Flavians as well. At any rate multiple, probably gilded, statues of Domitian were to be found in the vicinity (Martial, 1. 70. 5-6). To the right was the zone occupied by the pre-Flavian imperial residences, which were to be reconstructed and supplemented by Domitian. This northern flank of the Palatine was now augmented with massive substructures, expanding the usable room on the top of the hill. They also created an imposing presence when seen from below. Here, under where is now laid out the Farnese Gardens, was the Domus Tiberiana. It was the end point for the ramp that connected the vestibule buildings in the forum with the Palatine summit. The Domus Tiberiana was then in turn connected to the Domus Flavia by way of a subterranean passage. 90.
These platforms were duplicated to the left as well, on the south-eastern side of the clivus Palatinus. For what purpose level ground was provided here in the area now known as the Vigna Barberini is not known, though a later temple podium dated to the 170's may be a replacement of an earlier, Domitianic version. Recent archeological work in this area has also brought to light remains that, though still poorly understood, may suggest that here was constructed a building, incorporating in its monumental façade a hemicycle of similar proportions to that still in evidence on the slopes of the opposite side of the hill overlooking the Circus Maximus. Ahead of the Palatine visitor at this stage would have arisen a Domitianic arch, to the right of which was located another temple, perhaps the Domitianic rebuild of the temple for Jupiter Stator, known from Ovid (Trist. 3. 1. 31-4) to have been located somewhere along the line of approach to the Palatine palaces. Beyond these opened out the area Palatina, creating an open vista beyond which soared the magisterial façade of the new Domitianic palace complex. One was now entirely surrounded by Domitianic buildings in depth.

90 For the most up to date study of the Domus Tiberiana see Krause et al, Domus Tiberiana (forthcoming), in the meantime, Krause, LTUR 2, 1995, pp. 173-99, pp. 189-97.
The façade directly facing any visitor arriving in the *area Palatina* seems, both from the axiality of its approach and the rooms contained behind, to have been designed to have been the end goal for the visitor with official business to transact within the Imperial complex. This section of the Domitianic palace, traditionally known as the Domus Flavia, has been interpreted as the official, or if one should prefer, public area of the Imperial residence. However, given what seems to have been the nature of interaction within the *domic* of the Roman aristocracy it should be kept in mind that any area had the potential to be public to some degree, depending on the degree of intimacy accorded to the guest.\(^{94}\)

A number of factors point to this interpretation of the Domus Flavia as a primary focus point for interaction between the *princeps* and his public.\(^{95}\) The first and possibly the strongest element leading to this interpretation is demonstrated by the carefully orchestrated approach of visitors to the Palatine as described above, with the Domus Flavia placed in the strongest and most commanding position possible in relation to the approaching visitor. Position is an important element of course, though by no means the only one. Size too brings weight to bear on the theory.

On approach one would have been met with a commanding façade, the exact form of which remains debatable, though it may in fact be depicted

---

\(^{94}\)Wallace-Hadrill, 1988, p. 94.

\(^{95}\)For example, see the interpretation of the northern porch of the Aula Regia as the position from which the emperor would have conducted the morning *salutatio*, Claridge, 1998, p. 135.
on sestertii of Domitianic date (BMC, p. 406. n. 12, see Plate 15)\(^96\).

However, the extant remains allow for a more concrete if incomplete indication as to the imposing scale of the Domus Flavia\(^97\). Behind the façade the eastern third of the building comprised three main rooms, traditionally titled the Basilica, the Aula Regia and the Lararium. The two largest of these, the Basilica and the Aula Regia, 20.19 by 30.30 and 31.44 by 32.10 metres respectively and of a height in excess of 16 metres, were of impressively imperial proportions\(^98\). Perhaps more interesting than the sheer scale of these rooms is the inclusion in both of an apse, far more pronounced in the Basilica, but evident in the Aula Regia nevertheless. Unusual at this time in a secular context, though not unknown, their use here could perhaps hint at conscious developments towards a divinisation of the person of the princeps\(^99\). Be that as it may, the apses would have determined the focus of attention of those present in the room, most strongly in the Basilica, and it would seem likely that these rooms were envisaged to function as some type of audience or reception halls.

\(^96\) For a summary of the arguments see Darwall-Smith, 1996, pp. 190-3 and the references there cited.

\(^97\) For the plan of the complex that has been used as the basis for the description given below see Plates 16, 17.

\(^98\) Measurements are those of MacDonald, W., *The Architecture of the Roman Empire.* vol. 1, New Haven, 1982, p. 57.

\(^99\) On apsidal rooms see Tamn, B., *Auditorium and Palatium,* Stockholm, 1963, pp. 147-88. Here it may also be interesting to note statuary found in the 18th century buried in the Aula Regia, particularly that known as the Parma Hercules. Palagia, O., ‘Imitation of Heracles in Ruler Portraiture: a Survey from Alexander to Maximinus Daza’, *Boreas* 9, 1986, pp. 137-51, p. 145, claims that the face of the Herculean colossus was a representation of Domitian himself, though as part of the facial features of the statue are a reconstruction this theory is open to controversy.
Behind these rooms was a peristyle courtyard. Again of impressive proportions, it had a colonnade of *giallo antico* surrounding an almost square space largely given over to a substantial water feature consisting of a rectangular pond with a centralised octagonal fountain. To the south-east the peristyle courtyard gave onto another in that part of the complex known as the Domus Augustana, with but a few rooms and their respective colonnades to separate and mark the transition between the two courtyards and complexes. To the north-west of the first peristyle a suite of symmetrically arranged rooms of bold geometric floor plans both screened, though in a highly permeable way, and marked the delineation on this side between the Domus Flavia and the surviving Augustan religio-domestic complex that stretched from this point to the north-western corner of the Palatine hill.

On the south-west side of the peristyle rose the *cenatio* or *triclinium*, the banquet hall, in an exact axial alignment with the Aula Regia and screened off from the peristyle by its colonnade of grey granite. The *cenatio* soared to a height estimated to have been 31.60 m, or 106 Roman feet, its internal walls sheathed in multi-coloured marbles, articulated by three levels of columns, its south-western wall mainly formed by a wide shallow apse, the long flanking walls given permeability by way of large doorways and windows that gave out onto flanking rooms each of which

---

contained fountains of intricate geometry. From three sides of the cenatio then came the sound of the plash of water, the air of the banqueting hall cooled by its presence, the sunlight sent shimmering by its play through the semi-screening of the walls and colonnade to dance across the sculptured surfaces of a rich diversity of gilt and marble; the whole of which was centred on the axially dominant and perhaps divinising presence of the apse. Could one then find fault with a guest, having arrived at the cenatio by way of the above described itinerary from the Forum, for feeling himself to be dining on the gift of supra-human largesse. Statius would not have demurred (Silv. 4, 2. 18-31).

To the south-east of the Domus Flavia is the part of the imperial complex known as the Domus Augustana. Treated by most if not all of the modern literature as a separate entity to the Domus Flavia, there is in fact no clear delineation between the two. As mentioned above, access from the peristyle of the Domus Flavia to the peristyle of the Domus Augustana was in no way restricted or impeded and as pointed out by Claridge\textsuperscript{101}, the intervening suites of rooms provide equal means of access both to and from either courtyard.

This peristyle of the Domus Augustana replicated in size that of the Domus Flavia, and to a certain extent in style also, incorporating as it did a substantial water feature at its centre. To the south-east was arrayed a suite of rooms, differing in arrangement from, but in effect balancing the

\textsuperscript{101}Claridge, 1998, p. 139.
suite to the south-west of the Domus Flavia peristyle. To the north-east of the peristyle of the Domus Augustana was possibly another courtyard incorporating a propylon, or possibly another suite of gargantuan reception rooms; the evidence, or rather lack of it, allows for debate\textsuperscript{102}. To the south-west of the peristyle a symmetrically arranged series of rooms of generally smaller dimension and tighter arrangement than others so far in the Flavian complex finally begins to give the impression of less permeability, less ease of access. It was from one of these rooms in this suite that a single staircase allowed admittance to the level of the Domus Augustana below. Little remains or is known of what the rest of this level of the Domus Augustana consisted, except for a depiction of a part of it on a fragment of the Severan Marble Plan, itself now also lost. From this it would seem that twin suites of what appear to be intricately arrayed rooms made up the majority of the south-western section of this level of the Domus that was itself arranged about what is in effect a massive light well for the peristyle courtyard laid out on the level below.

As has been mentioned it would seem that this lower level of the Domus was only accessible via a single staircase\textsuperscript{103}. This then would have been the most easily secured area of the Domus and thus it seems

\textsuperscript{102}MacDonald, 1982, p. 64 n. 56 and pl. 40 bases his reconstruction on the scant remains and on unpublished drawings from Bartoli’s excavations. However, Claridge, 1998, p. 139, refers to plans drawn in the C16 for the claim of the suite of rooms. Without further evidence it is impossible to evaluate the conflicting claims.

\textsuperscript{103}The present arrangement by which access to this area of the palace is possible from both the exedra facing the Circus Maximus and the stadium garden is the result of modern interventions, Claridge, 1998, p. 140.
likely that it was this area of the complex that accommodated the private household of the princeps.

To the south-west of this end of the Domus Augustana the external façade of the palace was constructed as a giant exhedra. Though diminished by the ravages of centuries the façade remains a towering and imposing sight still when viewed from the site of the Circus Maximus. How much more impressive it must have looked at its full height with pristine finish is perhaps best indicated in the model of ancient Rome in the Museo della civiltà romana.

To the south-east of the Domus Augustana was another peristyle courtyard though of a size and style that belies such a description. Shaped as a stadium or circus, though of a much reduced scale, it was surrounded by a double storied portico, the upper storey of which was at the same elevation as the upper level of the Domus Augustana from which access to this courtyard was gained by way of three entrances. From this courtyard entrance was to be had to a bath complex to the south-east.

It would seem that Domitian was attempting to realise a number of different objectives with his work on the Palatine. Recognising the needs and the nature of the principate, he increased significantly the space available for both the rituals and rites of autocratic governance, as
well as accommodation for the attendant bureaucracy and support staff that this must have necessitated. This expansion was kept within a confined or rather delimited area however, thereby avoiding the mistakes and offences of Nero. By confining the Imperial residence to the traditional site of the Imperial family’s residences, and consolidating and rebuilding those pre-existing structures into the whole, Domitian could present an image of building on and maintaining the traditions of the past whilst simultaneously surpassing them. The political reality of the principate, so carefully obscured in the residence of Augustus, eschewed by Vespasian’s abode, and shockingly laid bare by the designs of Caligula and Nero, finally in the work of Domitian finds form.

Huge, imposing, lavish and divinising, its monumentality visible from all sides of the Palatine, its vastness, its richness of materials and detail bespeaking untold wealth and power, the Imperial residence of Domitian is nonetheless to a degree accessible, permeable, accommodating, and more promising still, consolidated, defined and delimited. Is it unsurprising then that though the memory of Domitian was to be damned, Trajan would be able to live comfortably with the image of himself as principle resident of the Palatine complex.