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During his reign from 193-211, Septimius Severus was responsible for a significant building programme in the city of Rome. This involved both new buildings and the restoration of existing structures. Previous scholarship, however, has tended to consider specific buildings of the period in isolation instead of analysing Severus’ building programme as a whole. The purpose of the present study is to redress this by examining the overall programme in the historical context of Severus’ reign through archaeological investigations, studies of art and architectural history, epigraphy, numismatics, and the literary record.

A framework for the motivation behind Severus’ building programme may be established by relating the types of buildings constructed anew or restored to what is known of his reign through other sources. Severus wished to portray himself as the rightful heir of the Antonines who had been chosen by divine providence to establish a renewed period of peace and prosperity. Through his building activity he exploited important institutions to underline this position and to legitimize his rule. By his concern for the physical fabric of the capital he at the same time reinforced the message that he had restored the prestige of the Empire. The importance attached to this restoration is attested by the numerous inscriptions placed throughout the city on the restored buildings and other structures proudly announcing the attentions of the new emperor.

Much of the Severan enhancement and restoration seems to have been geared toward the celebration of the Secular Games in the capital, an event that heralded a new
age of renewal and restoration. Severus’ intention of establishing a new dynasty was also implicit in the creation of an architectural presence within the heritage of the imperial city.

The use of a building programme within the capital to reinforce the policies of the emperor originated with the first emperor, Augustus. While not on the same scale as the Augustan redevelopment of the city, Severus’ building activity followed this imperial tradition with a deliberate and concerted building programme that reflected his propagandistic aims.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Septimius Severus, emperor 193-211, was responsible for a significant building programme in the city of Rome, involving both new buildings and much reconstruction and restoration.¹ During his reign new monuments were set up in the Forum Romanum, the symbolic centre of the Roman Empire. The imperial palace was extended on the Palatine and the impressive addition of the Septizodium, a monumental nymphaeum, defined the urban layout of the area. He was responsible for rebuilding at least two temple complexes - the Templum Pacis and Porticus Octaviae - as well as for restoring the Temples of Vesta and Vespasian, and the Pantheon. He also erected a new temple to his own patron gods Hercules and Bacchus. In addition, utilitarian structures were not overlooked. At least one new public bath complex was constructed and several aqueducts restored. A new barracks was also built to accommodate the expanded *equites singulares*. He also seems to have promoted commercial building activity in the Forum Boarium and Transtiberina. After the limited building activity of the Antonine emperors, the constructions undertaken by Severus had a substantial impact upon the city of Rome.

Although the extraordinary architectural activity undertaken in Rome during this reign has long been noted, the programme as a whole has not received much attention or analysis.² Previous scholarship has concentrated on specific buildings of this period or problems considered in isolation, and often the considerable Severan restorations are recorded merely as footnotes to the general history of the structure under discussion. H. Benario, using inscriptions and citations in Platner-Ashby and Lugli, has undertaken the
only inventory of the buildings attributed to the Severans, but his list contains only very brief annotations and no analysis. Indeed, he tends to minimize the Severan contributions to Rome's building history, for while he acknowledges that they were the last dynasty to undertake extensive changes to the city, he states that their accomplishments did not constitute a conscious building programme comparable to Augustus.

The purpose of this study is to go beyond Benario's collection and to survey the topography of Rome at the time of Severus, the changes made to the city by him, and the overall effect that any of his building activities had on the city, by consulting archaeological investigations, studies of art and architectural history, epigraphy, numismatics, and the literary record. Such a synthesis and interpretation of the available evidence for this period of Rome's development has not been previously attempted.

From an examination of literary, epigraphical, and numismatic sources, I shall attempt to show how Severus wished to portray himself to the Roman public. Severus' building activity in general will thus be related to the general themes that arise from these sources. A discussion of the individual constructions grouped topographically will then follow. My intention is not to provide only an art historical examination of the major new constructions of the emperor, but to view his building activity overall in its historical context. With this purpose in mind, the restorations and rebuilding carried out by the emperor, even of utilitarian structures, will have significance. Relating the types of structures constructed anew and restored by Severus to what is known of his reign through other sources may provide a framework through which the motivation behind Severus' building programme may be discovered. An understanding of this element of his
imperial policy may thus add to our knowledge of Severus’ reign in general and of the image that he attempted to represent both to his contemporaries and to future ages in particular. From this it will become apparent that while the Severan building programme was not comparable in scale to the Augustan redevelopment of the city, there was a deliberate and concerted building programme that reflected Severus' propagandistic aims.

Most of the previous research on Severus’ building in Rome tends to treat the subject in a fragmented way, with the emphasis on a few major structures, although sufficient information is available on minor and less well documented buildings to compose a comprehensive account of Severus’ building activities. Brief discussions of the individual buildings are included in the early topographical studies by R. Lanciani, H. Jordan and C. Hülsen, as well as the later studies of G. Lugli and F. Coarelli. References to the individual buildings of Severus are also included in the topographical dictionaries of S.B. Platner and T. Ashby, E. Nash, and L. Richardson Jr., and, most recently, the Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae edited by M. Steinby. The major architectural developments of the Severan period in Rome and through the provinces have also been discussed briefly in the general works of L. Crema and J.B. Ward-Perkins. The studies of E.B. Van Deman and G. Lugli are important for the construction techniques of the Severan period. Also fundamental is the work of H. Bloch and M. Steinby on the stamped bricks of Rome and its surroundings.

Excavation reports of individual structures and areas of the city going back to the earliest investigations are contained in various publications, especially theBullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma, Monumenti Antichi, Notizie degli
Scavi di Antichità, Studi Romani, Archäologischer Anzeiger, Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung and Mélanges d’archéologie et d’histoire de l’Ecole française de Rome. Important new information, especially about the arch in the Forum, has been obtained from the recent restoration work and the re-examinations of areas of the city carried out by the Soprintendenza Archeologica di Roma and the various foreign schools and published in BullCom and other publications.

The more important monuments of Severus from an art historical perspective have received individual monographs: R. Brilliant on the triumphal arch in the Forum, and D.E.L. Haynes and P.E.D. Hirst and M. Pallottino on the Arch of the Argentarii. The depictions of buildings on the coinage of Severus have been examined by P.V. Hill, and A.G. McKay, but only in a summary fashion and not within the context of Severus’ building programme.

As for literary accounts of Severus’ building programme in Rome there is no continuous narrative. We must rely on incidental references in the principal contemporary ancient sources, Dio Cassius and Herodian. Information is also contained in the later Historia Augusta, although its value is affected by its reliability for the topography of the Rome, first questioned by A. von Domaszewski. His view that the topography of the Historia Augusta should be rejected as completely untrustworthy, however, has been convincingly refuted in detail by D.M. Robathan and specifically for the Severan period by H. Benario. The sources utilized in the Historia Augusta for the discussions of Severus’ buildings seem for the most part to be dependable, although the elaborations of the author are at times suspicious.
Severus’ building was not restricted to the capital. He also undertook projects in other parts of the Empire. The *Historia Augusta* records that there were significant works of his in many cities.\(^\text{16}\) Tertullian praises Severus and his sons for the great number of cities which they have created, amplified and restored.\(^\text{17}\) Archaeological excavations have also revealed one of the most significant building projects undertaken by Severus at his native city of Lepcis Magna. Other cities in Africa were also favoured with constructions, especially during the imperial visit in 202-203.\(^\text{18}\) During Severus’ reign extensive repairs were also carried out on the roads in most of the provinces of the Empire.\(^\text{19}\) While these buildings constructed in Severus’ name throughout the Empire also provide evidence of the nature of his reign and the imperial image he desired, their analysis is beyond the scope of the present discussion. Attention here has been concentrated on the developments in Rome, which, as the capital city and official seat of the emperor, was the fount of the imperial identity and authority.
Caracalla joined his father as joint emperor in 198, but since Severus was obviously the senior partner, for our purposes the building programme is referred to under the name of Severus.

Middleton (1885), 250-251 placed the Severan activity as second only to that of Augustus, although he conceded that the results could not rival the artistic beauty of the “more polished and Hellenised age of Augustus.” See also Jordan-Hülsen (1871-1907) I:1, 20 and Homo (1951), 46.

Benario (1958), 712-722. Severus’ building in Rome is also briefly listed by Calderini (1949), 453-455.

Benario’s evaluation of Severus’ programme is repeated by Robinson (1992), 22.

Many of the events and trends of the history of the reign have been established in the general works by Platnauer (1918), Hasebroek (1921), and more recently by Birley (1988). Specific problems and events are also discussed in various publications. A collection of important inscriptions is found in Murphy (1945). The art of the period has only relatively recently received much attention with the fundamental study of Franchi (1964). Hannestad (1986), 249-410 includes a good discussion of the major sculptural works of the reign and explores their propagandistic value. See also Kleiner (1992), 317-353. The portraiture has been examined by McCann (1968) who also includes an extensive bibliography on the subject.

Recently M. Taliaferro Boatwright has published a detailed topographical examination of Hadrianic Rome, Hadrian and the City of Rome (Princeton 1987). This study is an attempt to bring together and discuss Hadrian’s constructions in their urban and historical context, both new and renovated structures, and his administrative changes in Rome. A similar approach is adopted for my treatment of Rome in the reign of Severus. The need for such a study of Severan Rome has been expressed by J. VanderLeest, Phoenix 42 (1988), 278 and J.C. Anderson, AJA 94 (1990), 360 in their reviews of Boatwright’s work. The criticisms of Boatwright’s approach contained in the review of S. Walker, JRA 2 (1989), 219-222 have been taken into account. See also J. Delaine, JRA 79 (1989), 219-220.

Lanciani (1897), Jordan-Hülsen (1871-1907), Hülsen (1905), Lugli (1930-38), (1946), (1975) and Coarelli (1980). M.E. Blake’s survey of construction in the city of Rome and Italy, completed by D.T. Taylor and J.D. Bishop, does not include the Severan period, but concludes with the Antonines. See Blake (1947), (1959), and Blake and Bishop (1973).


14. Domaszewski (1916), 1-15. His theory that the author of the work lived at the end of the sixth century at Nimes and had no personal knowledge of Rome has now been rejected.


17. *De pallio* 1.1; 2.7. During the civil war large grants of money were made for the reconstruction of cities devastated by Niger’s armies (Herodian 3.6.9). Cities punished by Severus’ own armies for siding with the enemy were also later restored. Baths and a Septizodium were built at Antioch at Severus’ order (Hieronymus, *a. Abr.* 2216 [ed. Helm, 1913]). At Byzantium baths, a hippodrome, and a temple to Jupiter were constructed (Suidas, 2.699). For the Hippodrome at Byzantium, see Guilland (1970) 182-188. For a list of Severan constructions outside Rome, see also Calderini (1949), 455-456.


19. For the milestones from throughout the Empire, see Murphy (1945), 80-100. The majority of these repairs took place between 198-201. See also De Ceuleneer (1874), 254-258.
II. BACKGROUND TO SEVERAN PROPAGANDA

Before investigating Severus’ building programme, a survey of his propaganda message as revealed in the literary, numismatic, and epigraphic sources is in order, to provide a context within which his use of public architecture as propaganda, in particular, may be understood. Because of the nature of his accession (he was the first emperor since Vespasian to obtain the throne through civil war), it was necessary for him to establish the legitimacy of his claim and to secure his authority by promoting a number of themes in his propaganda, including a positive portrayal of his military successes and other exploits, the divine sanction of his rule, the authenticity of his succession through links with the imperial heritage, the founding of a new dynasty promising a period of stability, and the restoration and renewal of the Roman state. This was accomplished through various media. Religious celebrations, such as the Secular Games, public festivals and imperial anniversaries were used to highlight these themes. Public orations and proclamations must also have disseminated the official account. Literary activity encouraged by Severus and the issues of coinage also reinforced the message.¹

Severus seems to have fostered an official version of events which was promoted in part through the encouragement of literary activity.² The emperor himself is said to have written an autobiography.³ According to Herodian, many historians and poets of the day featured the life of Severus in their work, giving detailed accounts of his military campaigns, his speeches at each city, and the frequent manifestations and signs of divine providence. Herodian condemns many of these authors for exaggerating in order to flatter
the emperor.\textsuperscript{4} Herodian’s remark seems to indicate that there was a body of works that presented Severus’ rule in a positive light, but unfortunately our evidence of contemporary writers other than Dio is rather limited.

Aelius Antipater of Hierapolis, the tutor of Severus’ sons and his \textit{ab epistulis Graecis}, is recorded as having written a \textit{Res Gestae (Erga)} of the emperor.\textsuperscript{5} Due to Antipater’s official position this work may well have been composed with Severus’ stamp of approval.\textsuperscript{6} Marius Maximus, another contemporary, wrote biographies of the Caesars from Nerva to Elagabalus. Since little of Maximus’ work survives intact it is difficult to determine if his life of Severus was a favourable account.\textsuperscript{7}

Dio also reports that his own literary career began when he published a couple of approving monographs, which he sent to Severus. The first of these consisted of a pamphlet concerning the dreams and portents that foreshadowed the emperor’s rise to imperial power, which was acknowledged by a complimentary letter from the emperor. The second work was an account of the wars and civil strife, which was also favourably received by Severus.\textsuperscript{8} Parts of both of these works were later incorporated by Dio into a more critical account of Severus’ reign included in his major composition about the history of Rome.\textsuperscript{9}

In Herodian’s work there are also indications that he made use of a pro-Severan account.\textsuperscript{10} His glorification of Severus’ military exploits seems to have been based upon a source or sources influenced by the official version of events. He compares Severus’ victories to the battles of Sulla against Marius, Caesar against Pompey, and Augustus against Anthony. These conflicts, however, did not match Severus’ defeat of three
reigning emperors.\textsuperscript{11} He also concludes that none of these well-known examples surpassed Severus in bravery, endurance or military organization and no one had ever before been so successful in civil wars against rivals or in foreign wars against barbarians.\textsuperscript{12}

The evidence suggests that Dio was also aware of such an official history. He recounts that after Severus crossed the Euphrates and captured Nisibis the emperor prided himself on this accomplishment as if he surpassed all men in intelligence and bravery.\textsuperscript{13} Severus also boasted that his Parthian campaign was a great victory which added a vast territory to the Empire and made it a bulwark against Syria, while Dio on the contrary considered this conquest to be a constant source of war and great expense.\textsuperscript{14}

After his victory over the Parthians Severus himself is said to have dispatched reports to Rome that made much of his achievements and also ordered his victories to be painted and publicly exhibited.\textsuperscript{15} It was perhaps official versions such as these reports, as well as rumours and writings such as Severus’ autobiography, that influenced the flattering accounts written by the historians and poets recorded by Herodian. Severus also seems to have discreetly encouraged the publication of such works, as demonstrated by his favourable responses to Dio.\textsuperscript{16} There also seems to have been a certain amount of literary activity associated with the imperial court. The empress Julia Domna was interested in philosophy and she is known to have encouraged Philostratus to compose the \textit{Life of Apollonius of Tyana}.\textsuperscript{17} It is possible that she had contact with many of the leading writers of the day, some of whom may have participated in writing about the reign of Severus.\textsuperscript{18}
Divine Sanction

The promotion of the belief that Severus was called by divine providence to realize the restoration of the Roman state was part of this official version. By highlighting supernatural events that foretold his rise to the throne, his claim to supreme power could be clothed in legitimacy. These stories of divine favour, although reputed to have been received by Severus before he became emperor, seem to have been disseminated *ex post facto* through official means. The autobiography written by Severus seems to have dealt at least in part with his *omina imperii*. Some of these dreams and portents were also commemorated in public monuments. Literary activity concerning these manifestations also seems to have been encouraged. Herodian states that many authors of the day wrote about the signs of Severus' divine election.

A list of the dreams and portents which encouraged Severus to hope for imperial power is contained in Dio's history, incorporated from the pamphlet which was so favourably received by the emperor. Severus was said to have dreamed that he was suckled by a she-wolf and once while he was sleeping water gushed from his hand. In another dream Severus was taken up by a horse which had thrown Pertinax, an omen also reported by Herodian. Dio also records that when Severus was still governor at Lugdunum the whole Roman Empire approached him in a dream and saluted him. On another occasion he was taken up to a summit from which he gazed down upon all the land and all the sea. When he laid hold of them they all sounded together like an all-harmonious instrument. A similar dream, which is said to have taken place in Spain, is recorded by the *Historia Augusta*. In this version Severus was also directed to repair the
temple of Augustus at Tarraco, then falling into ruin.\textsuperscript{25} A number of other omens concerning Severus' divine election are also found in the \textit{Historia Augusta}, including the dream in which he was suckled by the wolf.\textsuperscript{26}

\textbf{The Imperial Heritage}

Upon ascending the throne, Severus appears to have moved quickly to solidify his position by establishing a connection to the imperial line and previous rulers. In his first speech to the senate on his arrival in Rome in 193, Severus proclaimed himself the avenger of Pertinax, who had been legally elected by the Senate after the assassination of Commodus. He declared that he would take the name of Pertinax and adopt his outlook.\textsuperscript{27} One of his first official acts was to conduct an elaborate funeral, during which he gave the eulogy, and then to deify Pertinax.\textsuperscript{28} During his first speech before the senate Severus also promised to make the reign of Marcus Aurelius his model.\textsuperscript{29} Later, in 195, desiring a more prestigious affiliation, Severus had himself adopted as the son of Marcus Aurelius and renamed his eldest son Marcus Aurelius Antoninus.\textsuperscript{30} The reign of Marcus was viewed as a Golden Age, one that Severus hoped to re-establish. In order to further consolidate his relationship to the Antonine dynasty Commodus was also rehabilitated, and Severus called him brother.\textsuperscript{31} Other associations with Marcus Aurelius were cultivated. At the same time that Severus proclaimed himself the son of Divus Marcus Severan propaganda sought to ascribe a number of divine interventions in the form of weather miracles in Severus' favour during the war against Niger and the First Parthian War.\textsuperscript{32} Marcus was also said to have received divine favour during his
campaigns that was prominently displayed on the reliefs of the column set up in his honour.\textsuperscript{33}

It is possible that Severus himself may have carried out a final dedication of Marcus Aurelius' column, further reinforcing his connection to the previous dynasty. A request of the curator of the monument to build a house for himself behind the column with a number of planks that were required for scaffolding is recorded on an inscription dated August and September 193.\textsuperscript{34} This inscription provides a \textit{terminus ante quern} for the completion of the monument since the need for scaffolding seems to indicate that work was still being carried out during Severus' reign.\textsuperscript{35} The extent of the finishing work required at this time, however, is difficult to determine.\textsuperscript{36}

Severus' position as the direct heir of Marcus Aurelius was also promoted through the imperial portraiture. The Severan portrait appears to follow very faithfully the style and fashion of the Antonines, including direct allusions to the portraiture of Marcus Aurelius.\textsuperscript{37} In the portraiture of the empress Julia Domna there are also some stylistic and iconographic similarities to the portraits of Marcus Aurelius' wife Faustina.\textsuperscript{38} A resemblance in physiognomy and style between the portraits of Caracalla and Geta as children, and the childhood portraits of Commodus and Annius Verus, has also been noted.\textsuperscript{39}

Severus' reign was portrayed as a direct continuation of the Antonine dynasty and through his adoption he was also able to tie himself to the ancestors of Marcus Aurelius. The cognomen Pius was also taken up by Severus, which was the characteristic name of Antoninus, and Caracalla later came to be called Antoninus Pius.\textsuperscript{40} The legitimacy of
Severus' claim was further reinforced by other associations with the Antonine dynasty. A group of Severus' portraits found both on the coinage and on sculpture in the round refer to Antoninus Pius in their iconography and style. Allusions to the era of Pius, which was looked upon as a time of stability and peace to be emulated, also seem to have been made by Severus in the minting of coins. Grant, in his study of anniversary issues, has noted that Severus struck coinage with the legend APOLLINI AUGUSTO fifty years after Antoninus Pius. This epithet for Apollo had not appeared in the span between these mintings.

The establishment of an Antonine heritage also provided a connection to previous rulers. The ancestry of Severus, and also that of his sons, is proudly extolled on inscriptions which refer to him as the filius of Marcus Aurelius, the frater of Commodus, the nepos of Antoninus Pius, the pronepos of Hadrian, the abnepos of Trajan, and adnepos of Nerva. This intention on the part of Severus to relate himself to earlier emperors can also be seen in other actions. By taking the title of Parthicus Maximus after his Parthian victories, Severus apparently wished to exploit a connection with Trajan, who had first assumed the title Parthicus. To reinforce this association, Trajan is referred to as Parthicus in the Severan inscriptions. Severus' defeat of Parthia was also celebrated on the carefully chosen date of January 28, 198, which was the centenary of Trajan's accession. On this day Caracalla was elevated to Augustus and therefore shared the dies imperii of Trajan. Coin issues of Severus were also minted with the legend S P Q R OPTIMO PRINCIPI, recalling the title of the "good" emperor Trajan. In the Forum of Trajan several inscriptions were set up by Severus and the imperial family.
Domna also restored a building specially constructed for the *matronae* by Sabina in this Forum. Special honours were also paid to another ancestor, Nerva, to commemorate the centenary of his reign. During the period of 196-198 coins were minted reminiscent of the issues of that emperor.

**The Imperial Family and a New Dynasty**

While establishing his imperial pedigree, Severus also embarked upon the foundation of his own dynasty. In 193 an agreement had been reached with the rival claimant Clodius Albinus, who had accepted the role of Caesar, while Severus pursued his other rival Pescennius Niger in the East. In 195 Severus’ self-adoption into the house of Marcus Aurelius and the renaming of his son, who was also declared Caesar, was a clear sign of his break with Albinus. When Albinus was finally defeated in 197 the way was open for Severus to reveal his dynastic intentions. In 198 Caracalla became joint Augustus with his father, and Geta was also declared Caesar. In 202 Caracalla and Plautilla, the daughter of Severus’ influential Praetorian Prefect Plautianus, were married, with the promise of the continuity of the dynasty. In 209 Geta was also promoted to Augustus.

The prominence given to the imperial family, and the dynastic intent behind this is clearly apparent on the coinage. Coins were struck in honour of each member with Severus, Caracalla, Geta, Julia Domna and Plautilla all appearing on the obverses. Members of the family are also often depicted together on the same coin with the legends AETERNITAS IMPERII or FELICITAS SAECULI, declaring the stability and prosperity ensured by the new royal family.
The promise of the new Severan dynasty, however, would appear only as viable as the stability of the imperial family itself and the theme of Concordia was used to reinforce an image of harmony, which in reality was not always present. The literary sources record that Caracalla hated his wife Plautilla, and there was constant disagreement between Severus' sons. The legends CONCORDIA AETERNA, CONCORDIA FELIX, and CONCORDIA AUGUSTORUM appear on the Severan coinage to emphasize four familial relationships: Severus and Julia Domna, Caracalla and Plautilla, Severus and Caracalla, and Caracalla and Geta. An interesting issue of 209, the year Geta also became co-emperor, has the legend FELICITAS PUBLICA and the busts of Severus and Julia Domna on the obverse, and PERPETUA CONCORDIA with Caracalla and Geta on the reverse. Concordia also appears on the reliefs from the Severan arch at Lepcis Magna. This concept had been used during the Antonine period to illustrate the marital harmony of Antoninus Pius and Faustina I, and Marcus Aurelius and Faustina II, as well as the relationship between Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus. There also seems to have been a special association of Concordia with the Antonine empresses, a motif which was carried on during the reign of Severus with issues of Julia Domna and Plautilla.

This special role given to Julia Domna within the domus divina and the promotion of her public image as the heir of the Antonine empresses and the mother of a new dynasty was another feature of the reign. She figured prominently in inscriptions and was always included as part of the imperial family on dedications. Coin issues of the empress with the legend LIBERAL AUG seem to indicate that she distributed imperial largesse with money stamped with her own name, a practice which before this time was
confined to the emperor, and she was also the first imperial consort to be honoured with coins of Fortuna Redux.\textsuperscript{60} The variety and numbers of coin issues struck in Julia Domna’s honour exceed those of any other imperial consort and attests to her immense prestige.\textsuperscript{61}

Julia Domna was the daughter of the priest of Baal at Emesa, and according to the \textit{Historia Augusta} Severus married her because her horoscope predicted that she would marry a king, which was probably another omen created \textit{post eventum} to bolster Severus’ claim of divine favour.\textsuperscript{62} Another portent associated with Severus’ marriage to Julia Domna is recorded by Dio among the \textit{omina imperii} of Severus. Before the wedding Severus is said to have had a dream in which Faustina, the wife of Marcus Aurelius, prepared the \textit{thalamos} for them in the temple of Venus and Rome, which had been built by Hadrian on the slope of the Velia.\textsuperscript{63} Severus’ marriage to Julia Domna was thus given approval by Severus’ divine ancestors. The first coins struck for Julia Domna also celebrate the goddess Venus.\textsuperscript{64} Coinage minted for Caracalla and Geta, the offspring of this divinely sanctioned marriage, depicting the facade of the Temple of Venus and Rome on the reverse, may also allude to this dream.\textsuperscript{65} A further connection to Marcus Aurelius and his wife was established in 195, when in honour of faithful companionship on her husband’s campaigns, Julia Domna received the title Mater Castrorum, which had first been awarded to Faustina II by Marcus Aurelius.\textsuperscript{66} Julia Domna’s coinage also reflected a link to the women of the Antonine dynasty, with reverse types of Hilaritas, Mater Deum, Laetitia, Ceres, Venus Felix, Pudicitia and Pietas, which had also been minted for the Antonine empresses.\textsuperscript{67}
Julia Domna was also presented as the premier matron of the state who would ensure the future stability of the dynasty through her sons. In 198 she received the titles Mater Augusti and Mater Caesars after the elevation of Caracalla and Geta, and later in the reign, when Geta was also made Augustus, she became Mater Augustorum. The title Mater Senatus et Patriae was also conferred on Julia Domna, but the date of its bestowal is disputed and may have taken place after the death of Severus. Much of Julia Domna's coinage also reflects the idea of motherhood. Venus Genetrix, mother of Aeneas and the Julian gens, Fecunditas with two children at her side, Cybele, the Mater Deorum and Vesta Mater appear on the reverses. The Felicitas of the dynasty was also closely associated with the wife and mother of the Augusti.

**Tradition and Religion**

The period of the Severan dynasty has been considered a religious watershed, which saw the deliberate introduction of eastern gods into the Roman pantheon on the part of the imperial family. This orientalizing of Roman religion has been attributed to Severus because of his African descent and the eastern origin of Julia Domna who was the daughter of the priest of Baal. The existence of explicit African and Eastern elements in Severus' religious policy has also been generally recognized on this basis.

This presumption, however, does not withstand analysis. For example, the suggestion by Domaszewski that Severus was responsible for introducing Dea Caelestis, the goddess of Carthage, into the Roman pantheon and that Julia Domna herself was worshipped as this goddess has been convincingly refuted by I. Mundle. While the goddess Dea Caelestis was known in Rome from the time of the Second Punic War, the...
earliest datable dedication comes from the time of Nerva. There does appear to have been some increased worship of Dea Caelestis in Rome outside of an official cult at the beginning of the third century, but this would not be surprising considering the importance of Africans within the capital, a phenomenon already evident under the Antonines. There does not seem to be any evidence, however, of a conscious introduction of this African goddess into the Roman pantheon by the imperial family during the reign of Severus. The formal establishment of the worship of Dea Caelestis and the construction of a temple on the Capitoline in her honour appears to have been undertaken by Elagabalus, who transferred her statue from Carthage to Rome in order to marry the goddess to his god Sol Invictus Elagabalus. An assimilation between the eastern goddess Cybele and Julia Domna has also been proposed, on the basis of the coin issues of the Augusta depicting this goddess with the legend MATER AUGG. The presence of Cybele, however, on the coinage of the imperial women had been already firmly established in the Antonine period. There are also no monumental or epigraphical sources in which Julia Domna is directly represented as Cybele.

Severus is also believed to have been a devotee and promoter of Serapis, another god of African origin, because of his visit to Egypt recorded in the Historia Augusta. This experience was said to have been especially pleasing to the emperor because of the religio of the god Serapis, the antiquity of the place, and the novelty of its animals and places. The account of these events seems to indicate that Severus took part in the worship of this god during his tour, most likely at the Serapeum at Alexandria. This act has often been interpreted as a demonstration of Severus’ particular devotion to this god. As further
proof of Severus' veneration and promotion of Serapis, some scholars have also identified the iconography of Serapis in Severus' portraiture, and contend that the emperor wished to be assimilated with the god.\(^2\)

Severus' personal devotion to Serapis, however, is difficult to assess from this evidence. Despite the pleasure Severus was said to have taken in the worship of the god in the account of the *Historia Augusta*, his visit to the temple of Serapis does not necessarily indicate a particularly extraordinary devotion to the Egyptian cults in general, much less that he wanted to be identified with the god.\(^3\) Other emperors before him had visited the Serapeum at Alexandria, and had shown a more explicit interest in this god. Vespasian in particular had promoted the fact that he had received certain favourable omens from the god during his visit, and one would scarcely accuse him of orientalizing.\(^4\) Severus' desire to be assimilated with Serapis in his portraiture has also not met with complete acceptance. Many scholars have noted that the identification of the iconography of Serapis in the particular rendering of the beard and hair of the emperor in some of Severus' portraiture is tentative at best and could just as easily be seen to reflect Marcus Aurelius or the god Jupiter.\(^5\)

There is also little evidence to support the personal promotion of the god Serapis within the city of Rome by Severus. The image or name of Serapis does not appear explicitly on the reverses of any of Severus' Roman coinage.\(^6\) Severus himself also did not construct a temple of Serapis in the city of Rome.\(^7\) Any increase in the worship of this god which occurred at this time can best be explained by the religious developments
in the period generally rather than as a conscious orientalizing of the state religion and the introduction of another African divinity into the Roman pantheon by Severus.\textsuperscript{88}

The worship of the Syrian god Sol Invictus Elagabalus in Rome during the reign of Severus should perhaps also be seen in the context of the influx of eastern religions that had already begun during the second century A.D.\textsuperscript{89} The iconography of the sun had already been used by earlier emperors.\textsuperscript{90} Severus continued the depiction of the sun god on the imperial coinage. An interesting \textit{aureus} of 200-202 depicts either Geta or Caracalla as the young Sol with his right hand raised in blessing with the legend SEVERI INVICTI AUG PII FIL.\textsuperscript{91} On other issues as well the emperor and his sons are depicted radiate.\textsuperscript{92} The god Sol himself appears on various reverses as Pacator or Rector Orbis.\textsuperscript{93} Severus also may have been responsible for returning the Colossus to its appearance as Sol after Commodus is said to have substituted his own portrait on the statue and to have given it a club, the attribute of Hercules, and placed a bronze lion at its feet. Although Severus seems to have promoted Hercules, it may have seemed advisable, in the earlier part of his reign at least, to return this monument to its traditional form.\textsuperscript{94}

It has been suggested that the use of \textit{invictus} as a title of Severus on the coinage was intended to connect the emperor directly to the eastern god Sol Invictus Elagabalus.\textsuperscript{95} Victory issues of Severus from 193-194 depict trophies on the reverse and the legend \textit{INVICTO IMP(ERATORI)}.\textsuperscript{96} The legend IOVI INVICTO appears on a reverse of a \textit{denarius} of 196-197 portraying the seated figure of Jupiter holding a Victory.\textsuperscript{97} J.R. Fears, however, has shown that the use of this title does not necessarily indicate an eastern connection.\textsuperscript{98} He suggests that the title \textit{invictus}, rather than being a borrowing
from oriental solar imagery, was actually an adoption by the emperors of an unofficial title long in use and connected to the imperial cult of victory. While *invictus* was used unofficially as an imperial title from the very beginning of the principate, the earliest reference to *invictus* as an epithet of Sol dates to 158 A.D. It is possible that this epithet came to Sol through the imperial application. *Invictus* first appeared as part of the official imperial title at the time of Commodus, and the use of this title by Severus may be more a desire to connect himself to his adopted brother and the legacy of imperial victory, which justified his royal power and provided proof of his legitimacy.

While sun imagery is used by Severus, the Syrian god Sol Elagabalus does not appear to have been given any prominence in official circles. Julia Domna, as the daughter of the priest of Baal Elagabalus, is usually assumed to have promoted this god within the city of Rome, but there is no evidence that the worship of Sol Elagabalus was especially encouraged. On the coinage Sol appears in his classical form, and is never represented as the black sacred stone, or betyl, which symbolized the eastern god. Inscriptions from the reign of Severus indicate the presence of a college of priests of the cult of Sol Elagabalus at Rome, but the cult remained outside the pomerium and was not made official. It was not until the reign of Elagabalus that there was overt worship of this god by the imperial family and a temple constructed within the pomerium of the city.

In contrast to his successor Elagabalus, who showed little regard for convention, and desired to set up his god at the head of the Roman pantheon, there was no such overt introduction of eastern gods into the city of Rome during Severus' reign. Elagabalus
brought the black stone from Emesa and married his god to Dea Caelestis. He also transferred the palladium from the Aedes Vestae to the Elagabalium on the Palatine, and he himself also took a Vestal Virgin as his wife.\textsuperscript{105} Severus does not seem to have personally promoted the worship of oriental deities, nor is there any evidence for the orientalization of the formal state cults during his reign. This is also consistent with the Roman coinage, where no clearly oriental types are represented.\textsuperscript{106} African themes as well are not prominent in Severus’ coinage.\textsuperscript{107}

Severus, however, may have been more obviously advancing a personal religious interest in his attention to Hercules and Bacchus/Liber, the patron gods of his native city Lepcis Magna. From early in the reign these divinities were represented on Severus’ coinage, and they appear especially on the issues connected to the Secular Games. The emperor also built a temple in their honour.\textsuperscript{108} The worship of these two deities, however, was fully established in the city of Rome, and in the course of the second century Hadrian and the Antonine emperors had already advanced their role within the imperial iconography. In promoting the imperial patronage of Hercules and Bacchus therefore Severus was not acting extraordinarily.\textsuperscript{109} These gods were also not presented as the African divinities Melqart and Shadrapa, but in their conventional Greco-Roman form.\textsuperscript{110}

Severus also sought a connection with Jupiter. Since Severus came to power through civil war it was important for him to establish his legitimacy by presenting the traditional imperial god as giving divine approval to his rule.\textsuperscript{111} Throughout the reign Jupiter appears exclusively on Severus’ coinage, represented in the act either of conferring military victory on the emperor or endowing him with his rule.\textsuperscript{112} Allusions to
Jupiter in Severus’ portraiture have also been noted.\textsuperscript{113} The traditional Roman pantheon and hierarchy of the gods were also utilized in Severus’ dynastic conception. The emperor’s home town gods, Hercules and Bacchus, who were the offspring of Jupiter, were associated with his two sons. Hercules became the tutelary god of Caracalla and Bacchus that of Geta.\textsuperscript{114}

The emperor’s special relationship with Jupiter was also reinforced by Julia Domna’s association with the divine consort Juno.\textsuperscript{115} Several of her coin issues depict the goddess as the queen of heaven, Juno Regina.\textsuperscript{116} In Africa dedications were made to the empress in the name of Dea luna Orbis Terrae and a Cilician inscription refers to her as the new Hera.\textsuperscript{117} In the so-called Capitoline Triad relief on the arch at Lepcis the figure of Juno standing next to Jupiter has the distinctive hairstyle and features of Julia Domna. In the sacrifice scene also on this arch a direct connection with this goddess is made by placing her directly above Julia Domna.\textsuperscript{118} A close association was also developed between Julia Domna and another important goddess of the Roman pantheon, Vesta, the guardian of the Roman state.\textsuperscript{119} These conventional goddesses were probably intentionally chosen to over-shadow Julia Domna’s eastern origins.\textsuperscript{120}

The divinities which Severus in fact seems to have promoted had already been established within the imperial ideology, and he was able to expand further their significance in order to establish his legitimacy and his dynastic ambitions. Severus’ religious policy may in some way be a reaction to the recent reign of Commodus. Although Severus affiliated himself with this emperor after 195 as part of his adoption into the Antonine family, he seems to have toned down the portrayal of the emperor as
the incarnation of a living god on earth adopted by Commodus and returned to the more subtle aspects of divine representation established by the earlier Antonine emperors. The absence of overt promotion of the eastern cults may be attributable to Severus’s reaction to Commodus’ explicit interest in them. As was noted above, Serapis does not appear on Severus’ coinage, in contrast to the unprecedented honours paid to this god on Commodus’ issues. Both Serapis and Isis appear with this emperor and Serapis receives the title CONSERV(ATOR) AUG(USTI). Commodus is also said to have openly participated in the rites of Isis. It was not until the reign of Caracalla that Isis and Serapis would be again openly promoted.

Severus’ religious policy therefore was rather conventional and included a concern for the traditional observances of the Roman state. Further proof of Severus’ interest in the traditional aspects of Roman religion can perhaps be seen in the commemoration in his coinage of a whole series of Republican temple anniversaries. Severus seems to have been intent in honouring the traditional Roman pantheon in his religious policy, rather than intentionally seeking to orientalize the state cults. This respect for the traditional observances of the Roman state religion was exemplified by the celebration of the Secular Games.

The Secular Games

The Secular Games were celebrated by Severus in the year 204. These Games had an obscure origin going back to the early Republic. The ceremony seems to have been at first associated with the subterranean altar of Dis and Proserpina located near the Tiber in the area called Tarentum in the Campus Martius. These rites were expiatory in nature
and consisted of *ludi scaenici* and sacrifices held to commemorate the end of one *saeculum* and the beginning of another. The celebration was ordered by the Sibylline Books and was under the direction of the *quindecimviris sacris faciundis*. In imperial times Augustus celebrated his Secular Games, which he called the fifth in the series, in the year 17 B.C., using his own calculations from a *saeculum* of one hundred and ten years. Claudius seems to have returned to the original cycle of one hundred years from 146 B.C., and held the Games in 47 A.D. on the eight hundredth anniversary of the city of Rome. Domitian, ignoring the Claudian calculations, observed the sixth Secular Games in the 88, six years early in the *saeculum* from the Augustan date.  

Severus’ celebration of the Secular Games provided an opportunity for the new emperor to share in the legacy of previous emperors and offered further proof of his connection to the long sequence of imperial dynasties. An association with Augustus seems especially to have been desired. Instead of holding the Games in 198, one hundred and ten years after those of Domitian, Severus’ were celebrated in 204, two hundred and twenty years, or two *saecula*, from 17 B.C. Antoninus Pius, Severus’ adopted ancestor, following the one hundred year cycle of Claudius, had also celebrated special games just over fifty years before in 148 to commemorate the nine hundredth year of the city of Rome. The Severan Games were the seventh in the series, auspiciously connected to Septimius’ name. The *Acta Ludorum* discovered on a number of fragments of a large marble commemorative *cippus* excavated on the banks of the Tiber in 1890-91 and 1930, preserve a few details of the event.
Preparations for the celebration began in 203 when at a meeting of the senate the *quindecimviri* announced that the Sibylline oracles had disclosed that the time for the Secular Games had come and a motion was put forth that Severus, his co-emperor Caracalla, and the Caesar Geta should hold them. Because such Games were held only once in a *saeculum* their celebration must have been a very significant event. According to Herodian heralds were sent out in Rome and Italy to summon all to come to see what they had never seen before and would never see again.129 Visitors even travelled to Rome from outside Italy.130 Towards the end of May in 204 the *quindecimviri* distributed incense for purification and received the symbolic offerings of first fruits from the people. On May 31 the ancient site of Tarentum in the Campus Martius was purified. The Secular rites, which consisted of three nights and three successive days of sacrifices and solemn archaic scenic games, officially began after midnight on the Kalends of June. On each night participants in the Campus Martius prayed and sacrificed in turn to the Moerae, the Ilithyiae and Terra Mater. On the first day sacrifices were carried out on the Capitoline to Jupiter, on the second to Juno Regina, and on the third day offerings were made to Apollo and Diana on the Palatine. Also on the third day the *Carmen Saeculare* was sung first on the Palatine and then on the Capitoline. *Ludi scaenici* in the Campus Martius and the *sellisternia* to Juno and Diana on the Capitoline continued night and day. After the three days of sacrifices and prayers there were seven supplementary days of games, including circus races, *venationes, pompae*, concluding with the *Lusus Troiae* on the final day.131

The religious rites of the Secular Games were steeped in age-old tradition and had to be observed in strict accordance with ancient and sometimes archaic practices. Severus
closely followed the established rites which had been carried out by Augustus and Domitian before him. The traditional rituals of sacrifice and prayer were performed and the customary formulae followed.\textsuperscript{132} The antiquity of the observance was emphasized. The \textit{Acta} proclaim that the Games of Severus were held 660 years from their ancient origin in the 297\textsuperscript{th} year of the city of Rome.\textsuperscript{133} The beginning of the commentary also underlines the importance of \textit{memoria}.\textsuperscript{134}

Fragments of the marble \textit{cippus} inscribed with the Augustan \textit{Acta Ludorum} have been discovered in the same area as the Severan commemoration.\textsuperscript{135} In contrast with the conciseness of the Augustan commentary, the Severan text includes minute details of the ceremony and the topography as well as the principal elements of the narration, and because of its length required a marble pilaster larger than that set up by Augustus. Such attention to detail may have been intended to show reverence to the ancient rite in all its particulars and respect for the traditional religion of the Roman state.\textsuperscript{136}

In one part of the celebration, however, Severus varied from the known tradition. It seems that although there were a number of obligatory ceremonies, it was possible for the emperor celebrating the Games to honour his own favourite gods in some manner.\textsuperscript{137} Hercules and Bacchus, as the \textit{di patrii} of Severus, apparently received some special honour in the celebration of the Secular Games of 204, although their exact role is unclear. At least one of these gods, Bacchus, was singled out in the \textit{Carmen Saeculare} which was sung first on the Palatine and then on the Capitoline. His name appears in the fragmentary remains of the Severan hymn. In the Augustan Hymn written by Horace there is no reference to this god.\textsuperscript{138} Hercules and Bacchus also figure on coinage issued by
Severus in connection with the Secular Games. Although these gods were in some way closely associated with the Secular Games, the Acta do not record additional sacrifices carried out to Hercules and Bacchus, but indicate that only the traditional religious rites were performed. Severus seems to have been careful not to disturb the conventions of the established state religion.

The dynastic theme, which, as we have seen, was very much a focus of Severus' propaganda, was also prominent during this celebration, a feature not present in the Secular Games of other emperors. In the Acta of the Severan Games, Julia Domna, called Mater Castrorum and Coniunx Augusti, is recorded as taking part in the ceremonies. With the Vestal Virgins and one hundred and nine matrons she led the public prayer to Juno Regina and set the sellisternia to Juno and Diana. From our knowledge of previous celebrations, there is no indication that any other imperial consort took such an active role. Throughout the rites Severus' sons are also present, Caracalla as co-emperor and Geta as Caesar. Severus presided over the sacrifices, Caracalla led the prayer and Geta continued it. The domus divina was an integral part of the celebration and the insurance of the future of the dynasty was on display.

**Restoration and Renewal**

The celebration of the Secular Games in 204 also highlighted another theme promoted by the regime, that of restoration and renewal. The Secular Games commemorated the beginning of a new saeculum. According to the decree of the Sibyl these games were to be conducted in order to give thanks for the prosperity of the Roman state and to ensure that it would continue. Severus was inaugurating a new Golden Age
of stability and prosperity in the company of his sons, who were the promise of its endurance.

From the beginning of his rule Severus seems to have been intent on fostering this perception that he would restore the prestige and harmony of the Roman state, which had been degraded when the throne had been shamefully sold to Didius Julianus. His government would represent a return to the Golden Age of Marcus Aurelius. During his first speech before the senate Severus swore the oath of all “good” emperors that he would not put a senator to death. During this speech, as recorded by Herodian, Severus also promised to provide a time of true prosperity. This theme of renewed public security and happiness is also continually represented on coins issued throughout the reign by the reverse types of FELICITAS TEMPOR, FELICITAS PUBLICA, FELICITAS SAEculI, and FELICITAS IMPERII. Through the coinage Severus was also able to display a number of the imperial virtues in order to highlight the specific features and general overtones of his imperial policy, as well as to affirm traditional values.

During his first ten years Severus had consolidated his rule and defeated Rome’s foreign enemies, the Arabians, Adiabenians and Parthians. The celebration of his decennalia in 202 must have served to underline the stability of the new regime. Spectacular games were held, which lasted seven days, and included the slaughter of seven hundred animals. Literary works extolling the exploits of Severus’ first ten years may also have been published at this time. Around the same time coin issues represent
the emperor as Fundator Pacis and Restitutor Urbis. In the year 202 the marriage of Caracalla and Plautilla was also celebrated, ensuring the continuity of the new age.

Severus attempted to portray himself as the restorer of the Roman state elected by divine providence. An important element of the theme of restoration and renewal was an attention to Roman traditions. In his religious policy Severus seems generally to have been conservative and to have shown a concern for the state religion, as seen in the celebration of the time-honoured Secular Games. The spread of eastern cults during his reign probably reflects trends already developing during the Antonine period, rather than any apparent personal instigation on the emperor's part. A connection to the imperial heritage was attained by his adoption into the Antonine family, as well as by establishing links to earlier dynasties. Severus also had dynastic aspirations of his own. The names of the imperial family were prominently displayed in inscriptions, and all of its members took an active role in public ceremonies.

The success and perhaps the validity of Severus' propaganda message can be seen in the relative security of his reign, which lasted for seventeen years, the longest until the time of Diocletian. According to his dynastic plans his sons also succeeded him, although they enjoyed only a brief joint reign. His direct genetic line ended with Caracalla, but a dynasty from his wife's family based upon the Severan name lasted down to 235 A.D. Severus' stature, promoted by his successful campaign to influence public opinion, would endure until the late Empire. The fourth century poet Ausonius refers to Severus as the saviour of the Empire. He writes that Severus did not seize the imperial title, but rescued
The poet Claudian, writing in the late fourth century, includes Severus in his praise of the Antonine dynasty as a legitimate member of the adoptive line.\(^{155}\)
1 For the various media used by emperors to spread their propaganda message, see Fears (1981c), 910.

2 For the literary activity promoted by the regime, see Rubin (1980), 9-40, especially 38-40.

3 The writing of an autobiography by Severus is mentioned by Herodian 2.9.4, Aurelius Victor, De Caes. 20.22, and HA Severus 3.2. The date of its composition was probably after 205. Rubin suggests that it attempted to show that Severus always put the interests of the Empire first, and that the civil war resulted only from the faults of his opponents. See Rubin (1980), 133-138 and 190 and Birley (1988), 41 and 203.

4 Herodian 2.15.6-7. At 3.7.3 in his account of the battle of Lugdunum, Herodian also differentiates between those historians of the time who wrote to win favour and those who wrote according to the truth.

5 Reported by Philostratus, Vita Soph. 607.

6 Rubin (1980), 25-26 suggests that this work may have been written to coincide with the celebration of Severus’ decennalia.

7 Maximus is quoted in various places in the HA. He is also mentioned by Ammianus Marcellinus, 28.4.14. For his career, which is known from 178-223, see PIR² M 313. Rubin (1980), 192, from an examination of the quotations of Maximus in the HA, suggests that he was a supporter of Severus’ regime, but not completely uncritical of the emperor. See Birley (1988), 205 for a bibliography concerning Marius Maximus.

8 Dio 72.23 and 74.3. Millar (1964), 29 suggests that the first work was presented in 193 when Severus first entered Rome, and the pamphlet on the wars, which covered events only down to the defeat of Albinus, was published in 196-197 when the emperor was again in the city. Rubin (1980), 42-43 proposes that the first pamphlet was given to the emperor in 196-197 and the second work on the wars, which included the Second Parthian campaign, was presented in honour of the decennalia in 202. Rubin’s dates are perhaps the more acceptable, since Millar’s contention that Severus would not want to be reminded of the civil war in 202 is not necessarily convincing, especially since there is a reference to these events in the triumphal arch dedicated in the Forum in 203: ob rem publicam restitutam (CIL 6.1033 = ILS 425).
9. Millar (1964), 139 has detected one such remnant of Dio’s previously enthusiastic account in the positive description of Severus’ entry into Rome at 74.1.3-5, which contrasts with the negative version of both Herodian 2.14.1, and the HA Severus 7.1-3. For more indications of Dio’s original pro-Severan tract contained within his later work, see Rubin (1980), 53-84.


11. 3.7.7-8. Herodian also states that Severus’ battles and victories were incomparable in the size of the contending forces, the resulting upheaval, the number of battles and the distance and speed of the marches.

12. 3.8.8; 3.15.2-3.

13. 75.2.3-4. The senate probably received the official story through letters written by Severus.

14. 75.3.2.


16. For the means of dissemination of Severus’ imperial propaganda, see Rubin (1980), 23-25.

17. Dio at 75.15.6-7 reports that Julia Domna took to philosophy and the company of sophists when she was ousted from her position by Plautianus. She still pursued this interest after Severus’ death in 214-215 when she was in Nicomedia with Caracalla (77.18.2-3). Philostratus, Vita Soph. 2.30; Vita Apoll. 1.3.

18. Philostratus speaks of a literary circle around Julia Domna, although its participants are not known. Bowersock (1969), 101-109 has shown that the coherence of this circle has probably been exaggerated by earlier scholars. See also Ghedini (1984), 10-11 and Birley (1988), 168.

19. Herodian 2.9.4, states that Severus was persuaded to try for the throne by dreams, oracles, and other signs, and that he gave an account of many of these in his autobiography.

20. Herodian 2.9.4 and 6.

21. Herodian 2.15.6.

22. 74.3.

23. 2.9.6. According to Herodian this dream was commemorated by a large bronze statue erected in the Forum.
Herodian 2.14.3-4. *HA Pertinax* 15.2-3; *Severus* 7.9. At 2.10.1 Herodian indicates that he had unofficially assumed the name earlier, in front of the troops in Illyria before the march on Rome, to gather support by reviving the memory of Pertinax. For coinage with the title PERT, see *BMC V*, lxxxiv. The name Pertinax appears on inscriptions of 193 and the following years: *CIL* 3.1374; 8.1170 = *ILS* 413. See Murphy (1945), 102. Pertinax appears to have been dropped in 198 when the name Parthicus Maximus was assumed.

28. Dio 74.4-5; *HA Pertinax* 15.1-2.


31. At 75.7.4 - 8.3 Dio records a speech made in the senate, probably in 197, in which Severus makes an apology for Commodus, which apparently rankled the senate. From 195 Commodus is referred to as the brother of Severus. See Murphy (1945), 102.

32. Rubin (1980), 66-74. Dio reports that a rainstorm turned the tide in the battle at Issus against Niger. This timely outbreak was ascribed by Severus' soldiers to a divine power (74.7.1-8). A thunderstorm also stopped the Scythians from starting a war (75.3.1), and water miraculously appeared in the desert to quench the thirst of Severus' soldiers (75.2.1-3). Rubin suggests that all three stories fit together to suggest an underlying propaganda promoted by Severus to associate himself with the divine favour that was also shown to Marcus. See also Birley (1988), 117.

33. Dio 71.8.1-4 reports a rainstorm sent by a divine power that occurred during Marcus' war against the Quadi, which quenched the thirst of his soldiers and drove back the enemy. *HA Marcus* 24.4 also records that Marcus summoned by his prayers rain to quench his soldiers'
thirst, and also called down a thunderbolt against the war-engines of his enemy. For the depiction of the divine rainstorm and the thunderbolt on the column of Marcus Aurelius, see Guey (1948a) 16-62, (1948b), 105-127 (1949), 93-118, Becatti (1957), 11-12, Jobst (1978), Rubin (1979), 357-380 and Fowden (1987), 85-95.

34 CIL 6.1585 = ILS 5920: ...ad aedificium quod custodiae causa columnae centenariae pecunia sua exstructurus est tignorum vehes decem quanti fisco constiterunt cum pontem necesse fuit compingi petimus dari iubeas. This inscription is reported to have been discovered in 1777 during excavations in Piazza di Montecitorio near the column of Marcus Aurelius.

35. See Hamberg (1945), 149-161.

36. Wegner (1931), 61-174 has determined that the topmost scenes of the column appear to be in a later tradition and may contain some insertions. On the basis of this evidence, Morris (1952), 43-45 suggests that these reliefs in the later tradition may have been added to replace the removal of portraits of Commodus by the senate after his damnatio, which would explain the need for scaffolding. It is possible, however, that work may have been delayed and the column was not completed until the reign of Severus.

37. Kleiner (1992), 320 notes that coins of 196-197 accentuate the resemblance between Severus and the Antonines. McCann (1968), 104-106 and 145-153 identifies allusions to Marcus Aurelius at first on the eastern coinage of Severus of 202 and places the Marcus Aurelius portrait type within the middle years of Severus’ reign. Baharal (1989), 566-580, however, argues that the Severan portraits previously identified as Serapis types by L’Orange (1947), 77-86 and McCann (1968), 109-117 and 155-178, actually display traits of Marcus Aurelius in the arrangement of beard and hair, and also the philosophical expression of the face. Baharal places the earliest Severan portraits reflecting the facial features of Marcus Aurelius on the coinage of 193-194, and continuing to the end of the reign in 210. This earlier reference to Divus Marcus would better correspond with the time of Severus’ adoption and his desire to consolidate this connection during the earlier part of his reign.

38. While Julia Domna sports a very distinct wig-like hairstyle, both portraits follow the Antonine style of surrounding the face by a mass of hair, parted in the middle and cascading in a series of deep waves. See Baharal (1992), 110-120.
39. See Baharal (1992), 112, and n. 5 for an extensive bibliography on this subject.

40. On some coin issues from 201 the legend SEVERUS PIUS AUG occurs on the obverse. *BMC V*, xxxv and cxliv. This cognomen is found as early as 195 on an inscription from Panormus (*CIL* 10.7272. Murphy [1945], 102). On coinage of 201 Caracalla’s title is ANTONINUS PIUS AUG (*BMC V*, cxliv). Caracalla also received the cognomen Pius on inscriptions beginning in 201. Murphy (1945), 104.

41. These portraits occur at the beginning of his reign and continue until his last years. See McCann (1968), 95-99 and 135-143.

42. Grant (1950), 112-115. For the Antonine coinage, see *BMC IV*, 30, no. 186. The Severan coinage was minted in 194-195. *Denarii: BMC V*, 33, no. 78-79, pl. 7.13; *RIC IV*, 96, no. 40; Cohen no. 42. *Dupondius: BMC V*, 125, $t$, pl. 21.9. *Asses: BMC V*, 131, nos. 525-527, pl. 22.9; *RIC IV*, 184, no. 682, 186, no. 699; Cohen nos. 44 and 46. On the reverse Apollo wears a long robe and holds a patera and lyre.

43. For example the inscription that appeared on the Septizodium (*CIL 6.1032*) reads: IMP CAES DIVI M ANTONINI PII GERM SARM FIL DIVI COMMODI FRATER DIVI ANTONINI PII NEP DIVI HADRIANI PRONEP DIVI TRAIANI PARTH ABNEPOS DIVI NERVAE ADNEPOS.

44. For example *CIL 6.1032* above. See also 6.1259 = *ILS* 424; 6.1031; 6.1247; *AE* (1904), no. 198.

45. The *Feriale Duranum* records the occurrence of Severus’ victory at Ctesiphon on Trajan’s *dies imperii*: 1.14-16: ... *V Kalendae februariae ob victorias arabicam et adiabenicam et parthicam maxi/mam divi Severi et ob imperium divi Traiani, victoriae parthicae / bovem feminam, divo Traiano bovem marem*. See Fink, Hoey, and Snyder (1940), 77-81. See also Brilliant (1967), 99. The coincidence of Severus’ victory and Trajan’s *dies imperii* was probably manufactured. See Rubin (1980), 211.

46. Severus is depicted on horseback on the reverses. The date of the issues is 200-201. *Aureus* with the legend SPQR OPTIMO PRINC on reverse: *BMC V*, 194, no. 208, pl. 32.3; *RIC IV*, 113, no. 169; Cohen, no. 653. See also *BMC V*, cxlii.
CIL 6.1566 (Septimius Severus); CIL 6.977 (Julia Domna); Paribeni (1933), 496, no. 175 (Septimius Severus, Caracalla and Geta). This may also have been in emulation of Marcus Aurelius, who was responsible for a number of dedications in this Forum. Anderson (1984), 170-171 suggests that there may be dynastic associations with the site. The dedications of Marcus Aurelius were almost always recorded jointly either with Lucius Verus or with Commodus, while Severus’ inscriptions feature the emperor and his chosen successor. This interesting concentration of dedications to, or by, pairs of emperors in the Forum of Trajan becomes more pronounced in the fourth century.

CIL 6.997 = ILS 324.

See Grant (1950), 116.

The distribution of the officinae appears to have been as follows: 193-195, Severus probably three officinae, Albinus one, and Julia Domna one; 195-198, Severus three, Caracalla one, and Julia one; 198-201, Severus three, Caracalla one, Julia and Geta one; 202-211, Severus two, Caracalla (and Plautilla) two, Julia and Geta one, with a share in the second. See BMC V, xxv-xxvi.

AETERNITAS IMPERII: (200-201) aureus, Severus on obverse, Caracalla and Geta on reverse, BMC V, 191, no. 184, pl. 31.10; (201) aurei, Severus on obverse, Caracalla and Geta on reverse, BMC V, 202-203, nos. 253-254, pl. 33.5; (201-210) denarius, Severus on obverse, Severus and Caracalla on reverse, BMC V, 213, no. 307, pl. 34.15; (201-210) denarius, Severus on obverse, Caracalla and Geta on reverse, BMC V, 214, no. 308, pl. 34.16; (199-200) denarius, Caracalla on obverse, Severus and Caracalla on reverse, BMC V, 185, no. 158, pl. 30.18; (199-204) denarii, Geta on obverse, Caracalla and Severus on reverse, BMC V, 196, nos. 214-215, pl. 32.6-7; (202-205) denarii, Julia Domna on obverse, Severus and Caracalla on reverse, BMC V, 157, nos. 1-2, pl. 27.2; (202-205) aureus, Julia Domna on obverse, Caracalla and Geta on reverse, BMC V, 157, no. 3, pl. 27.1; denarii same as previous, BMC V, 157-158, nos. 4-6, pl. 27.3. FELICITAS SAECULI: (201) aureus, Severus on obverse, bust of Julia Domna en face flanked by Caracalla and Geta, BMC V, 203, no. 255, pl. 33.6; (202), aureus, same as previous, BMC V, 231, no. 379-380, pl. 37.5-6.

Dio 76.2.5-3.1; 76.7.1-2; 76.11.1. Herodian 3.10.3-4; 3.10.8; 3.13.1-14.1.
CONCORDIA AETERNA: (201) *denarius*, Severus on obverse, Severus and Julia Domna as sun and moon on reverse, BMC V, 298, ‡; (201) *aureus*, Caracalla on obverse, Severus and Julia Domna as sun and moon on reverse, BMC V, 204, no. 260, pl. 33.8; (201-206) *denarius*, same as previous, BMC V, 207, no. 275, pl. 33.17; (202) *aureus*, same as previous, BMC V, 233, no. 389, pl. 37.11; (202-205) *aureus*, Plautilla on obverse, Caracalla and Plautilla clasping hands on reverse, BMC V, 235, no. 400, pl. 37.18; *denarii*, same as previous, BMC V, 235, nos. 401-403, pl. 37.20. CONCORDIA FELIX: (201-206) *aureus*, Caracalla on obverse, Caracalla and Plautilla clasping hands with Concordia in background, BMC V, 206, no. 271, pl. 33.16; *denarius*, Caracalla and Plautilla without Concordia, 206, no. 272-273, pl. 33.20. CONCORDIA AUGUSTORUM: (201-210) *aureus*, Severus on obverse, Caracalla and Geta togate holding Victories on reverse, BMC V, 214, no. 312, pl. 34.20; (205-209) *sestertius*, Geta on obverse, Caracalla and Geta togate sacrificing on reverse, BMC V, 339, no. 839, pl. 50.8; (209-211) *sestertius*, Geta on obverse, Caracalla and Geta in military dress clasping hands each crowned by Victory on reverse, BMC V, 391, no. 178, pl. 57.2. This formula was also used on inscriptions. See CIL 8.17829 = ILS 434.

(Aureus) BMC V, 360, *; RIC IV, 130, no. 312; Cohen (Septimius, Julia, Caracalla, and Geta) no. 7.

See Townsend (1938), 518-521.

BMC IV, lx and lxvii. See also Amit (1962), 152-153. The new form of Concordia Augustorum was also introduced under Marcus Aurelius, as a consequence of the existence of two emperors.

Legend CONCORDIA: (196-202, Eastern Mints) *denarius*, Julia Domna on obverse, Concordia on reverse, BMC V, 276, nos. 593-597, pl. 42.17. Legend CONCORDIAE: (202) *denarius*, Plautilla on obverse, Concordia on reverse, BMC V, 300, nos. 734-736, pl. 46.5; 301, nos. 739-740, pl. 46.7. Legend CONCORDIA AUGG: (202-205) *denarius*, Plautilla on obverse, Concordia on reverse, BMC V, 235, nos. 398-399, pl. 37.17; 236-237, nos. 411-414, pl. 38.4; *aureus*, 237, no. 416, pl. 38.5. A billon medallion was also minted in 207 depicting a bust of Julia Domna on obverse, holding in her right hand a statuette of Concordia and a cornucopia (an attribute of Concordia) on her left arm, Julia Domna with attendants sacrificing at temple of Vesta on reverse (Kent [1978], no. 384; RIC IV, 171, no. 587A; Cohen, no. 240). For the
association of Concordia with the Antonine empresses, see Amit (1962), 154. For the association of Julia Domna and Plautilla with Concordia, see Ghedini (1984), 140-142.

58. Dio 75.15.6 records that during the ascendency of Plautianus, who disliked the empress, Julia Domna retreated into the background, but at least in public policy she was still given a prominent role even before Plautianus’ death in 205. For a study of Julia Domna’s role within Severan propaganda, see Williams (1902), 259-305, Kettenhofen (1979), Ghedini (1984), and Lusnia (1995), 119-139, who particularly notes the use of Julia Domna’s coinage in promoting these themes and the importance of her public image to the interests of the new regime.

59. Murphy (1945), 103. See also Williams (1902), 304-305 who notes the unusual public honours received by this empress throughout the Empire, and especially in Africa. Among the hundred or so public dedications to Julia Domna, thirty appear on public works or on statues erected by towns and municipalities.

60. See Williams (1902), 278-279.

61. See BMC V, cxxxvi and Williams (1902), 304.

62. HA Severus 3.9; Geta 3.1. The source is quoted as Marius Maximus. For the validity of the story, see Syme (1976), 300-301. For a discussion of this episode within Severus’ overall propaganda, see Rubin (1980), 178-180.

63. Dio 74.3.1. It was also in this temple that Marcus decreed that a silver statue of Faustina be set up after her death and that couples about to be married make offerings at an altar set up there (Dio 71.31.1). For the propaganda purposes of this portent, see Rubin (1980), 73-74.

64. See BMC V, lxxxvi.

65. The legend on the reverse reads ROMAE AETERNAE. Aureus: Caracalla, BMC V, 210, 2; RIC IV, 233, no. 143A. Denarius, Geta, BMC V, 247, *; RIC IV, 316, no. 19, 321, no. 54; Cohen, no. 176. Hill (1978), 58-59 dates these issues to 206.

66. Hasebroek (1921), 92. Also Birley (1988), 115-116. The earliest inscriptions with this title appear in 196: CIL 12.43-45, 14.120. See Murphy (1945), 103. This title also appears on Julia Domna’s coinage throughout the reign. Aurei: (196-211) BMC V, 164, nos. 56-59, pl. 28.8-10; RIC IV, 168-169 nos. 563A and B, 567 and 569; Cohen nos. 132-134. Sestertius: (196-209) BMC V, 309, no. 774, pl. 47.3; RIC IV, 209, no. 860; Cohen no. 135. Dupondius or as: (196-209) BMC
V, 312-313, nos. 789-790, pl. 47.14; \textit{RIC} IV, 210, nos. 880-881 and 883; Cohen nos. 120-121, and 136. The resemblance of Julia Domna’s portraits to those of Faustina II has already been noted. Kettenhofen (1979), 80 suggests that this title was intended to represent Julia Domna as the rightful successor of Faustina, as Severus was that of Marcus Aurelius. The title may also have been given to Commodus’ wife Bruttia Crispina. See Ghedini (1984), 7.

67. See Lusnia (1995), 122-124 and 139 who notes that this connection to the Antonine empresses was important in the early period of Severus’ propaganda in order to emphasize his adopted heritage and the legitimacy of his rule. See also Ghedini (1984), 189.

68. For the emphasis within the Severan propaganda on Julia Domna’s role as mother in the transmission of hereditary power and the establishment of the new dynasty, see Ghedini (1984), 8-9.

69. As early as 197 dedications were made to Julia Domna as mother of the \textit{imperator destinatus}: \textit{CIL} 8.5699, 6702. For the title Mater Augusti, see for example \textit{CIL} 8.2527 and 9.2165 = \textit{ILS} 6488. In \textit{CIL} 8.9035 = \textit{ILS} 459, 17871, and \textit{CIG} 1075 Julia Domna is called the Mother of Antoninus Augustus and Geta Caesar. On the coinage of Julia Domna the legend MATER AUGG occurs on the reverse in association with Cybele. \textit{Aureus}: (199-207) \textit{BMC} V, 163, no. 47, pl. 28.3 \textit{Dupondius} or as: \textit{BMC} V, 312, no. 788, pl. 47.9. Although Geta is only Caesar, he is included under the title Augusti. For the title Mater Castrorum, see \textit{CIL} 13.7417 = \textit{ILS} 443 and \textit{AE} (1984), no. 921.

70. The title appears consistently in inscriptions after 211. This title is found on the dedicatory inscription of the Arch of the Argentarii, but appears to have been a later addition after the erasure of the names of Plautianus and Plautilla (\textit{CIL} 6.1035 = \textit{ILS} 426). For a late date for the title, see Instinsky (1942), 200-219. Benario (1958b), 67-70, suggests that this title may belong to Severus’ reign on the basis of \textit{CIL} 6.3401 = 14.2255 = \textit{ILS} 2398, in which Severus is not referred to as \textit{divus}. Kettenhofen (1979) 86-96 also dates the bestowal of this title before the death of Severus, between 205-211, suggesting that it was an attempt by the senate to placate the emperor. Kuhoff (1993), 259-271 comes to a similar conclusion, connecting the conferral of the title on Julia Domna by the senate to Plautianus’ fall in 205. See also Ghedini (1984), 13-14 and 27-28.

71. Tied to the idea of motherhood are the issues representing the female virtues Pudicitia and Pietas. See Lusnia (1995), 124-128.
Felicitas, Fortuna Felix and Venus Felix appear on the reverses of her coinage. Felicitas was often associated with the justification of dynastic succession, and also appears frequently in the Antonine period. See Rubin (1976-77), 153-172.

This belief seems to be based to a large degree on the opinions of earlier scholars such as Domaszewski (1909), 148 who even claimed that Severus, like a new Hannibal, brought about a Semitic vengeance on Greco-Roman culture. It is accepted, for example, by L’Orange (1947), 81 and more recently by Palmer (1978), 1085.

Domaszewski submits the issue of coinage in 203-204, which depicts this goddess on the reverse with the legend INDULGENTIA AUGUSTORUM IN CARTHAGINEM, as evidence for the introduction of this goddess to Rome. Mundle (1961), 228-237 has shown, however, that this coinage was minted to commemorate some favour towards the city of Carthage which Severus and his family visited in 203. There also does not seem to be sufficient evidence to suggest that Julia Domna was worshipped as Dea Caelestis at Rome during the reign of Severus. The single extant inscription which refers to Julia Domna as Dea Caelestis, CIL 13.6671 from Mainz, actually dates to the reign of Caracalla, between 213-217 and appears to be a personal dedication. Another inscription, CIL 7.759 from Carvoran on Hadrian’s wall, does not name Julia Domna directly, and may not even belong to the Severan period. See also Halsberghe (1984b), 2211-2213 and Ghedini (1984), 144-148. Domaszewski’s theory is still accepted, however, by McCann (1968), 56-57, especially n. 105. For the refutation of Julia Domna’s role in orientalizing the state religion, see Kettenhofen (1979), 143 and Ghedini (1984), 189-193.

97-98 A.D. CIL 6.789. There is also a dedication from the second century A.D.: AE (1950), no. 53.

Halsberghe (1984b), 2203-2223.

Dio 79.12; Herodian 5.6.4-5. See Mundle (1961), 236 and Halsberghe (1984b), 2241. The existence of the temple of Dea Caelestis is known from a dedication dating to 259 (CIL 6.37170 = ILS 4438).

McCann (1968), 57.
Cybele occurs on the reverses of Sabina, Faustina I and II, and Lucilla, the wife of Lucius Verus. On issues commemorating the apotheosis of Faustina I the goddess is called Salutaris. See Turcan (1989), 54.

For the lack of evidence connecting Julia Domna with Cybele, see Ghedini (1984), 136-140 and 189. The choice of the goddess on the coinage seems to have been intended to emphasize Julia Domna’s fertility and role as mother of the new dynasty since Cybele was mater deum.

Severus 17.4: iucundam sibi peregrinationem hanc propter religionem dei Serapidis et propter rerum antiquarum cognitionem et propter novitatem animalium vel locorum fuisse Severus ipse postea semper ostendit. The visit took place in 199-200. See Hasebroek (1921), 114-124, Hannestad (1942-44), 194-222 and Kienast (1990), 157.

The identification of a Serapis portrait type for Severus was first proposed by L’Orange (1947), 82-86 and followed by McCann (1968), 53-56, 109-117, and 155-178, Birley (1988), 138, Witt (1971), 237 and Kleiner (1992), 320. The Serapean iconography is said to be reflected in some portraits of the emperor, such as on the Arch of the Argentarii at Rome and the so-called Capitoline Triad relief from the Arch at Lepcis, where corkscrew locks hang over the emperor’s forehead and his long beard is divided in the centre. L’Orange also argues that in the “Capitoline Triad” relief Severus is seated in a similar fashion to Serapis as depicted in a statue by Bryaxis, from the third century B.C., supposedly copied from the cult statue at Alexandria. Severus would therefore be the first emperor to be represented as Serapis.

HA Severus 17.4 relates that he received great pleasure when he participated in the worship of the god during his visit to Egypt, but this gratification was also due to the antiquity and novelty of the land. As noted by Baharal (1989), 572, a visit to other temples by other emperors is not necessarily interpreted as a desire for self-identification with this deity. The only appearance of an Egyptian deity on the coinage is an issue of Julia Domna depicting Isis suckling Horus with the legend SAECULI FELICITAS. Denarii: (199-207) BMC V, 166, nos. 75-82, pl. 28.18. Rather than an assimilation between Julia Domna and Isis, the appearance of Isis lactans seems to have been intended to exult imperial motherhood. See Ghedini (1984), 155-156.

Ferguson (1970), 32 notes the support for Serapis and the Egyptian cults by the Flavian and Antonine dynasties. The facade of the Iseum in the Campus Martius is depicted on Vespasian’s coinage. This temple was later rebuilt by Domitian. For Vespasian’s visit to Egypt and Serapean
omens, see Tacitus, *Histories* 4.81, Suetonius, *Vespasian* 7.2, Philostratus, *Vita Apoll.* 5.27. For his promotion of Serapis’ divine favour, see Liebeschuetz (1979), 180-182. Hadrian was also intrigued with Egyptian religion, and coins of his reign also depict the Iseum as well as the emperor and empress welcomed to Alexandria by Isis and Serapis. Marcus Aurelius during his visit to Egypt in 175-176 probably also visited the Serapeum. *HA Marcus* 26.3: *apud Aegyptios civem se egit et philosophum in omnibus stadiis templis locis.* Commodus was also an avid devotee of Isis and minted coins depicting Serapis with the legend SERAPIDI CONSERV AUG. See Turcan (1989), 92-93 and n. 122 infra.

85 See Turcan (1978), 1038 and (1989), 94. Baharal (1989), 568-569 has noted that there are subtle differences between the rendering of Serapis’ coiffure and that of Severus on these portraits, and points out that more distinctive attributes of Serapis, such as the *modius* or Cerberus, are missing. If Severus desired such a connection, would not a less elusive approach have been used? Baharal (1989), 577-578, suggests that the hairstyle in the so-called Serapis portraits can actually be closely identified with that of Marcus Aurelius. The desired association of the seated figure on the Lepcis Arch also seems to have been Jupiter rather than Serapis, since Juno and Minerva of the Capitoline triad are also present and an eagle is represented at the feet of the seated figure. See Hornbostel (1972), 356-357, 383-384 and Turcan (1978), 1038. On another panel of the arch Severus is also depicted in a sacrifice scene holding a small thunderbolt in his right hand, another allusion to Jupiter. See Fears (1981a), 115.

86 Mattingly (1932), 177-198 notes an attitude of indifference towards Serapis on Severus’ Roman coinage. McCann (1968), 54 identifies the *modius* of Serapis on the head of the figure of Jupiter seated in a shrine on issues of the emperor and his sons with the legend IOVI SOSPITATORI. *Denarius*: (206) Severus on obverse, *BMC V*, 219, no. 341, pl. 35.17. *Denarius*: (206-210) Caracalla on obverse, *BMC V*, 256, no. 507, pl. 40.16. *As*: same as previous, *BMC V*, 332, no. 826. *Sestertius*: (205-209) Geta on obverse, *BMC V*, 339, no. 840, pl. 50.9. McCann suggests that the shrine, of the syncretized god Jupiter-Serapis, may have been in the royal apartments or the inner sanctuary of the Serapeum in the Campus Martius. Hill (1978), 61-62 accepts McCann’s identification. This is the only hint of Serapis on the coinage of Severus’ reign, and the occasion of its issue is unclear. Hill suggests that the coin may have been struck to advertise Severus’ departure for Africa and may have been in some way connected to the health of Severus. Mattingly (*BMC V*, cli), however, does not recognize any allusion to Serapis on this
coin. Serapis does appear on the Severan eastern coinage from cities such as Alexandria, Nicomedia, and Diospolis-Lydda, but these probably reflect the local cult. See Vogt (1924), 114-116, Wroth (1889), 185, no. 38, pl. 34.10, and Hill (1914), 43, nos. 1 and 5. Ghedini, (1984) 80-87, while still recognizing an assimilation of Serapis/Jupiter/Severus in the relief from the arch at Lepcis, notes that this is the only reference connecting Serapis to Severus in both monumental and epigraphic sources, and does not see any evidence for a special promotion of this god.

87. Wild (1984), 1811 suggests that the worship of Serapis at the Iseum located in the Campus Martius was only added during the reign of Severus. He bases this on the belief that Severus promoted the god and the fact that, while writers of the first and second century seem to refer primarily to the worship of Isis, the building appears as the Iseum and Serapeum on the Severan Forma Urbis and is referred to as this also by Dio (66.24.2). Coarelli (1982), 63-64, however, has shown from Dio 47.15.4 that this sanctuary was referred to as the temple of Isis and Serapis as early as 43 B.C.

88. The devotion to Serapis of Severus’ son and successor Caracalla is perhaps more evident. He received the title Philosarapis and the image of Serapis occurs on the reverses of his coinage from 212 on. He may also have constructed a temple to the god within the pomerium of the city. See Turcan (1989), 94. Caracalla also showed an interest in the worship of Isis. See Witt (1971), 318, n. 46.

89. The number of inscriptions referring to Sol Invictus Elagabalus from throughout the Empire indicates that this cult was expanding during the early third century A.D. See Halsberghe (1984a), 2182. The majority of these belong to the reign of Caracalla, after 211.

90. Nero appeared on his coinage with a radiate crown and erected the Colossus, a gigantic statue of himself in the guise of Sol. The earliest inscription referring to the cult of Sol Invictus in Rome, CIL 6.715 = ILS 2184, dates to 158 A.D. and therefore the cult’s introduction may have been the result of intensified contact with the east during the reigns of Trajan and Hadrian. For the introduction of this cult of Sol to Rome, see Halsberghe (1984a), 2182. Under Hadrian, Sol in his quadriga appears frequently on the coinage. Hadrian also eliminated Nero’s features from the Colossus and had it rededicated to Sol. An interest in the sun-cult continued with the Antonine dynasty. On Antoninus Pius’ eastern coinage Sol in his chariot is represented in an issue of 145-146 from Rome with the legend PAX AUG(USTI) which depicts the emperor with the sun’s

91. BMC V, 199, no. 244, pl. 32.18, and no. 245. McCann (1968), 58 identifies the bust as Caracalla, but since this is an issue of Geta, who appears on the obverse, the portrait on the reverse may also be his. Mattingly, BMC V, cxlii, identifies Caracalla in the catalogue, but amends this to Geta in the introduction.

92. BMC V, cxxix. On the issue of 201 with CONCORDIA AETERNA Severus is represented with the rays of the sun, and Julia Domna with the crescent of the moon.

93. PACATOR ORBIS: (208) aureus, Geta on obverse, bust of young Sol radiate on reverse, BMC V, 221, no. 353, pl. 36.6; denarius, same as previous, BMC V, 221, no. 354, pl. 36.8; aureus, Caracalla on obverse, same reverse as previous, BMC V, 258, no. 513, pl. 40.20; denarius, BMC V, 258, no. 514, pl. 41.1. RECTOR ORBIS: (199-200) sestertius, Caracalla on obverse, young Sol (Caracalla?) standing on reverse, BMC V, 316, no. 797a; dupondius, Caracalla on obverse, Sol depicted in act of mounting chariot on reverse, BMC V, 316, no. 797b. Sol also appears on Severus’ coinage of 197: aureus, Sol mounting a chariot on the reverse, BMC V, 57, no. 226, pl. 10.19; denarius, Sol standing with whip in hand on reverse, BMC V, 57, no. 227, pl. 10.20; denarius, Sol standing with whip in left and right hand raised in blessing on reverse, BMC V, 116, no. 463, pl. 19.17.

94. For Commodus’ alterations to the Colossus: HA Commodus 17.9-11; Dio 72.22.3. Gagé (1928), 106-122 argues that the radiate statue to the left of the amphitheatre and behind a fountain which can be identified with the Meta Sudans on medallions of Alexander Severus and Gordian is the repaired Colossus, and suggests that this repair was conducted by Severus. The HA does state that these alterations were later replaced: ... postea cuncta sublata sunt. A denarius of 198 (BMC V, 62, no. 263, pl. 11.20) which depicts a standing radiate Sol may be identified as the restored Colossus.


96. Denarii, BMC V, 94, nos. 365-367, pl. 16.6-7; also legend INVICTO IMP TROPAEA, denarius, BMC V, 94, no. 368, pl. 16.8.

97. BMC V, 112, §.
98. Fears (1981b), 823.


102. As noted by Mattingly, *BMC* V, cxl. The sacred stone that was the fetish at Emesa was represented on Elagabalus' coinage, as well as a new type depicting Sol as a charioteer with the solar symbol. *BMC* V, ccxxxvi-ccxxxvii.

103. A Titus Julius Balbillus is referred to as a *sacerdos Solis* or *Solis Alagabali* in inscriptions dating from 201-202. *CIL* 6.708 = *ILS* 4329, 6.1603 = *ILS* 1346, 6.2129. The provenance of the inscriptions indicates that the cult was still situated outside the pomerium, probably in Trastevere. See Halsberghe (1984a), 2182 and Turcan (1989), 175.

104. For a discussion of the introduction of Sol Invictus Elagabalus to Rome by this emperor, see Halsberghe (1984a), 2184-2193 and Baldus (1991), 175-178. While sun-worship may have become a major theme of the later Severan dynasty, as noted by McCann (1968), 58 and Ferguson (1970), 50, this was certainly not true for the reign of Severus himself.

105. Dio 79.12; Herodian 5.6.4-10; *HA Heliogabalus* 1.4-7; 3.4; 6.5-7.1.

106. See Nock (1933), 129.

107. As noted by Barnes (1967), 103-104. Besides the Dea Caelestis issues there are some issues of Severus and Albinus which depict Saeculum Frugiferum, the deity of Hadrumetum, as well as the legend AFRICA S C, but these are restricted to the early part of the reign. Issues of 207 depict a god flanked by two snakes which Hill identifies as the Punic Aesculapius Eshmun. Hill (1978), 61-62 suggests that they were minted in connection with the African visit and the emperor's health. Grant (1950), 120 proposes that the Aesculapius issue may have commemorated the half millenary of the arrival of this deity in Rome, fifty years after the issue of coins and medallions by Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius in honour of the 450th anniversary.

108. Dio 76.16.3.
For a more detailed examination of Severus’ promotion of Hercules and Bacchus, see the discussion of their temple constructed by the emperor *infra* 301-316.

See Baharal (1989), 572, n. 28.

For the use of Jupiter in the imperial ideology of Severus, see Fears (1981a), 114-115. Also Ferguson (1970), 51-52.

From 194, after the defeat of Niger, Jupiter appears on *aurei* clasping the hand of Severus in the act of conferring victory on him. *BMC V*, 31, no. 67, pl. 7.5. On other issues of this year Jupiter is shown presenting a globe to Severus, endowing him with his rule. Also an *aureus* of this year depicts Jupiter seated holding a victory and sceptre, *BMC V*, 31, no. 68, pl. 7.6; *RIC IV*, 95, no. 34; Cohen nos. 379, 380.

The seated figure of Jupiter in the so-called Capitoline Triad relief from the arch at Lepcis bears a close resemblance to Severus. Unfortunately, the upper part of the face is missing, but the lower part of the beard of the god has the characteristic features of the portraits of Severus. See Townsend (1938), 516 and Turcan (1978), 1038. On another relief panel depicting a sacrifice scene, Severus is shown holding a small thunderbolt in his right hand. See Fears (1981a), 115. A resemblance to Jupiter has also been noted in a portrait of Severus which survives on a fragment of another relief. See Bartoccini (1931), 96, fig. 64.


For a more detailed discussion of the associations that were cultivated between Severus and Jupiter and Julia Domna and Juno, see the section on the restoration of the Temples of Jupiter and Juno in the Porticus Octaviae, *infra* 244-246.

*BM C V*, lxxi, n. 3.


For the connections between Julia Domna and Juno on the Lepcis Arch, see Bartoccini (1931), 80 and Ghedini (1984), 62-63, 80-87, and 125-128.

For the relationship between Julia Domna and Vesta, see the section on the restoration of the Aedes Vestae, *infra* 78-83.
As noted by Lusnia (1995), Severus seems to have chosen more traditional types for his coinage, including that of Julia Domna, in order to portray his dynasty as a “continuity of tradition.” See also Ghedini (1984), 187-189 for the intentional connection of Julia Domna with the traditional goddesses of the Roman pantheon as part of the Severan policy of respecting and renewing ancient customs.

Also noted by Ghedini (1984), 84.

Legend SERAPIDI CONSERV AUG. Serapis on reverse: (191-192) denarius, BMC IV, 756, nos. 359-361, pl. 100.10; RIC III, 397, no. 261; Cohen nos. 703-704. (191) sestertius, BMC IV, 834, no. 684, pl. 110.3, RIC III, 434, no. 601; Cohen no. 705. (191) dupondius, BMC IV, 836, RIC III, 435, no. 605; Cohen no. 707. (191) as, RIC III, 435, no. 607; Cohen no. 706.

According to the HA (Commodus 9.4 and 6; Pescennius Niger 6.8; Caracalla 9.11) Commodus even went so far as to shave his head in honour of Isis and carried the image of Anubis in the processions while making all of the ritual pauses.

HA Caracalla 9.11 records that Caracalla brought the worship of Isis to Rome, built splendid temples to the goddess and celebrated the rites with greater reverence than they used to be celebrated. In the next line, however, the author rejects the introduction of the cult to Rome by Caracalla, since Commodus was known to have already participated in the rites of Isis.

As noted by Grant (1950), 117-121 and 160-161, who has identified at least five issues: the 450th anniversary of the Temple of Fides Publica in 196-198, the half millenary of the Temple of Salus in 197-198, the seventh centenary of the vowing of the Temple of the Dioscuri on an issue of Geta of 200-202, the 500th year of the cult of Aesculapius at Rome in 207, and the half millenary of the Temple of Jupiter Victor on an exceptional silver medallion of 207.

For the chronology and origins of the Games, see Brind’Amour, (1978), 1334-1417 who also provides an extensive bibliography on the subject.

For the evidence regarding these games, see Pighi (1965), 79-88. See also Nilsson (1920), col. 1696-1720.

CIL 6.32326-32335 (32327 = ILS 5050a). The reference to the seventh Games is recorded in the Acta at I.1 and I.17. See Pighi (1965), 140-141. The planetary associations of seven may also have been exploited by Severus, who had an interest in these matters. See Birley (1988), 156.
129 Herodian 3.8.10. Herodian states that three generations had passed since these Games had last been celebrated and the intervening period between one celebration and the next is described as being longer than the life-span of a man. The Severan Acta records the span as one hundred and ten years. I.20: teneo [memoria quod cecinit Sibylla, sanctissima vates: Longissimum,] inquit, humanae vi[tae te]mpu[s centensi]mus et d[ec]imus annus e[st]. See Pighi (1965), 142.

130 For example an epitaph found in Rome records the death of a man who died in the city after coming from Tripolis in Asia to see the Games (CIG 5921.2).

131 For the procedures of the Games, see Pighi (1965), 140-175.


133 Acta Ib.14-15, Pighi (1965), 141. This date of 456 B.C. for the first games appears to have been a later contrivance. The earliest authenticated date for their celebration is 249 B.C. The Games were next held in 146 B.C. Since they were associated with the Valerian gens, it is thought that the Games may first have been held in 348 B.C., the year of the first consulship of Valerius Corvus. See Brind’Amour (1978), 1334-1417.


135 CIL 6.32323 = ILS 5050. Augustus, the founder of the imperial line and renovator of the Roman state, was obviously a much more important forefather than Domitian, who had suffered damnatio memoriae.

136 Romanelli (1931), 340 suggests that the longwinded quality of the Severan text is due to the bureaucratic taste of the time, but the excessiveness displayed here and in other inscriptions of the time may in addition be overcompensation in the pursuit of legitimacy. Compared to the Augustan text the conservatism of the formulae is notable.

137 This allowance for particular honours, in particular during the Carmen Saeculare, is noted by Mundle (1957), 165-175.

138 Acta Va.65. Hercules may also have been honoured in a passage now lost.
See Tocchi (1956), 3-20.


During the Augustan prayer to Juno Regina, Agrippa, not Livia, is the leader. See Pighi (1965), 361. For the special role of Julia Domna in the Severan Games, see Williams (1902), 273, Mundle (1957), 157-160 and Ghedini (1984), 32-33 and 188.

Pighi (1965), *passim*.

J. Gagé (1934), 38-78 suggests that the Games were celebrated in connection with the birth of a child to Caracalla and Plautilla. He bases this upon a reconstruction of a fragmentary passage of the *Carmen Saeculare* which refers to Juno Lucina as well as coinage of Plautilla depicting Pietas holding an infant (*BMC V*, 237-238, nos. 422-426; 323, nos. 804-806). The literary sources, however, make no mention of an issue from this marriage. For arguments against Gagé’s theory, see Rubin (1976-77), 157-159.


Dio 73.11.3 reflects the contemporary feeling, calling the sale of the Empire disgraceful and unworthy of Rome. Dio also viewed the reign of Commodus as a descent to an age of iron and rust after an age of gold (71.36.4). For Severus’ preoccupation with restoration and renewal, see Turcan (1978), 1004.

Dio 74.2.1-2; Herodian 2.14.3. In Dio’s *History* the same oath was taken by Nerva, Trajan, Marcus Aurelius, and Pertinax. Unfortunately for the senate, however, Severus would later violate this oath.

2.14.3: ... βαρυτάτην ευδαιμονίαν τοῖς ἀρχομένοις παρέξειν.
For the role of Julia Domna in the representation of the Felicitas of the imperial family and the use of this theme in relation to dynastic succession in the Antonine period, see Rubin (1976-77), 153-172.

See Fears (1981c), 904. Fears has noted that Severus’ coinage invoked a great variety of virtues.

Dio 76.1.1-5; Herodian 3.10.1-2.

These included the publication of Antipater’s Res Gestae and the presentation of Dio’s pamphlet on Severus’ military victories. See Rubin (1980), 34.

Coinage of Severus with legend FUNDATOR PACIS on reverse: (200-202) aureus, BMC V, 192, no. 189, pl. 31.13; denarii, BMC V, 192, nos. 190-191, pl. 31.14; 217-218, nos. 330-331, pl. 35.9. Hill (1964), 26, dates these issues to 201. Roma seated on reverse with legend RESTITUTOR URBIS: (200-201) aureus, BMC V, 221, no. 358, pl. 36.11; denarii, BMC V, 221-222, nos. 359-361, pl. 36.12. Same legend with Severus in military dress on reverse: denarii, BMC V, 222, no. 362, pl. 36.13; 287, no. 671, pl. 44.12.

The importance of establishing a link to the Severan dynasty and the continuing prestige of Severus can perhaps be seen in Macrinus’ addition of the name Severus to his own (HA Macrinus 5.7). See also Mattingly (1953), 963.

De Caesaribus post Tranquillum Tetrasticha 20-21:

tuque, Severe pater, titulum ne horresce novantis,
non rapit imperium vis tua, sed recipit.

Impiger egelido movet arma Severus ab Histro,
ut parricidae regna adimat Didia.

Punica origo illi; sed qui virtute probaret
non obstare locum, cum valet ingenium.

For Ausonius favourable portrayal of Severus, see Rubin (1980), 192-193.

De VI cons. Honori 417-421:

quos mutua virtus legit
et in nomen Romanis rebus adoptans

iudicio pulchram seriem, non sanguine duxit:

hic proles atavum deducens Aelia Nervam

tranquillique Pii bellatoresque Severi.

See Syme (1971), 92-93.
III. SEVERUS' BUILDING PROGRAMME

The embellishment and improvement of the capital city had been the prerogative of the emperor since Augustus. The building activity of an emperor was seen as an expression of imperial liberalitas or munificentia and a duty for the public welfare. The extent and type of building activity carried out by an emperor was often included in the evaluation of his reign by ancient writers.\(^1\) The buildings of Rome were constructed to impress not only the city’s inhabitants; there were also visitors who came to Rome to see the various shows and contests, during which time they would be able to view the building programme.\(^2\) The emperor could thus obtain support and enhance his prestige by constructing and restoring temples and other public buildings.\(^3\)

The significance of buildings and monuments in presenting an imperial image and influencing public opinion was not lost on the Severan regime. By setting up new monuments and restoring others, Severus sought to portray himself as the legitimate heir and the restorer of the Roman state. During his reign the connection between the city and the emperor was reinforced by the official designation of Rome as urbs sacra.\(^4\) Severus' attention to and interest in the capital city was therefore necessary, for it was important for the centre of the empire to be worthy of its designation. As an emperor of provincial origin, this concern for Rome was perhaps even more essential. The enhancement of the capital was also accomplished through a number of administrative changes.\(^5\) For example, under Severus a regular distribution of oil was instituted, the number of vici in the Transtiberine region was probably increased, and the administration of the grain dole and the water
supply were united under a single curator operating from the Porticus Minucia. He also reformed the praetorians, and increased the size of the urban cohorts, the *equites singulares* and the *vigiles*.

An opportunity was provided for Severus to show his concern for the physical beauty and magnificence of the capital city by the pressing need to repair the damage caused by the massive fire that occurred near the end of the reign of Commodus. This fire is recounted in the works of Dio, Herodian and Galen. Dio describes it as a portent of Commodus’ death and Herodian also includes it among the ominous events that occurred during the period of Commodus’ declining mental state and increasing loss of popularity.

The later sources Hieronymus and Orosius recount two fires during Commodus’ reign. A fire is recorded for 188/189, which began when the Capitolium was struck by lightning and destroyed a library and other nearby buildings. There is no evidence, however, for the presence of any library on the Capitoline or any Severan restoration in this area. It has been suggested that there may be some mistake in the location of this earlier fire, and that the library referred to is actually that of the Porticus Octaviae, a complex which Severus is known to have restored in 203. The second fire recorded in these later sources occurred in 191/192 and destroyed parts of the Forum and Palatine. The location of this second fire coincides with the account of Dio, Herodian, and Galen.

Both Herodian and Dio indicate that the fire began in the area of the Templum Pacis, which was the first building extensively damaged by the blaze. Dio reports that it then spread to the storehouses of Egyptian and Arabian wares. These storehouses must be the Horrea Piperataria located immediately to the south-east of the Templum and
extending as far as its eastern flank, in the area later occupied by the Basilica of Maxentius. From the Horrea the flames swept directly south-west across the Forum, destroying the Aedes Vestae in its path. The nearby Atrium Vestae must also have been affected. The fire appears to have cut a rather narrow swathe across the Forum, as there does not seem to have been any damage to the Temple of Antoninus and Faustina, the Temple of Divus Julius, or the Temple of Castor and Pollux in this immediate area.

From the Forum the fire moved up to the Palatine Hill, where Dio says it damaged extensive parts of the palace. Unfortunately the literary record does not specify which particular buildings were damaged. Dio does recount that many of the state records were destroyed at this time, which perhaps refers to some sort of archive, perhaps the Tabularium Caesaris. Galen also reports that some of his works contained in great libraries were destroyed during this fire. Library complexes were known to have been connected both with the Temple of Apollo and the Domus Tiberiana.

It is unclear from the literary accounts which other areas of the city were destroyed. According to Herodian the fire burned for several days, spreading to a great part of the city and burning down some magnificent structures. Dio does not offer any details other than mentioning the destruction of parts of the Palatine. The archaeological record is not much more helpful. While Severan repair and building that may indicate damage caused by the Commodan fire have been identified in isolated areas throughout the city, no definite course beyond the Palatine can be determined. The most extensive damage seems to have been restricted to Regio IV: Templum Pacis, Regio VIII: Forum Romanum, Regio X: Palatine, and possibly Regio XI: Circus Maximus.
The fire must have had a devastating effect on the inhabitants of the city. Herodian records that many rich men were reduced to poverty when their valuables, deposited in the Templum Pacis for safekeeping, were destroyed in the blaze and that everyone lamented both the public and personal loss. The catastrophe must also have had a great psychological impact. Both Dio and Herodian claim that the fire was difficult to extinguish and represent it as an omen, almost supernatural in its force. Herodian maintains that the blaze was checked only when rain began to fall, which the people believed was sent by divine will.²¹ Dio records that the conflagration could not be doused by human power, but finally just spent itself. The destruction of the state records was seen as a sign that the evil would not be confined to the city, but would extend over the inhabited world.²²

Since Commodus was assassinated at the end of 192 and the fire appears to have occurred shortly before his assassination, there was not much time during his reign to begin the reconstruction. With his death the empire was plunged into a period of instability with the short reigns of Pertinax and Didius Julianus, followed by the civil war. Most of the ruined buildings must have remained in disrepair until Severus was able to establish himself securely on the throne. The rebuilding of the areas of the city damaged by the Commodan fire was an important manifestation of his policy to restore and renew the Roman state. Relief from this catastrophe was also a further proof of Severus’ liberalitas.²³

The literary sources reflect the importance of the restoration of the city in the Severan propaganda message. Among the concluding passages of the biography of Severus in the Historia Augusta is the statement that the restoration of all of the aedes publicae at Rome which were falling into ruin through the passage of time was among the particularly
noteworthy achievements of the emperor’s life. The author also records that Severus did not inscribe his name on these buildings, but preserved the names of the original builders, underlining the emperor’s respect for tradition. This account from the *Historia Augusta* seems very likely to have come from a pro-Severan source which portrayed Severus’ restoration as necessary and noteworthy. The source for this positive depiction may even have been Severus’ autobiography or the *Res Gestae* written by Antipater.

In contrast, Dio offers a critical account of Severus’ building programme. He reports that the emperor restored a very large number of the ancient buildings, but inscribed his own name on them, just as if he had erected them in the first place with his own funds. Dio also accuses Severus of spending a great deal uselessly repairing other buildings and in constructing new ones. His comments may be a reaction to Severus’ propaganda message, which sought to promote the emperor’s good works for the city. Dio was not overly fond of many of Severus’ policies and often counters the official version of events in his work. Despite his criticism, Dio’s comments indicate that the building activity of the emperor was significant and made an impact on his contemporaries.

Severus’ rebuilding and repair of buildings from earlier periods was a means of establishing his legitimacy by connecting his reign with previous dynasties in the public mind. The reconstruction undertaken also reflects a respect for important Roman traditions. Much repair was required in the venerated Forum to buildings such as the Aedes and Atrium Vestae. It was also in this area of the city that Severus set up some of his own monuments, recognizing the importance of associating them with the Forum. The Campus Martius was also a traditional centre for monuments which glorified the ruling emperor
and his family, and Severus was responsible for restoring a number of complexes associated with previous dynasties. The repair of a number of temples throughout the city could also be seen as a demonstration of his religious piety. Much of the restoration seems to have been concluded in time for the sacred ceremony of the Secular Games in 204.

The building carried out in the emperor's name allowed Severus to maintain a strong presence in the capital during his prolonged absences. Occupied with both foreign and civil wars and extensive travels to various parts of the empire, Severus and the imperial family were in Rome only for brief visits in 193, 196, and 197. From 202-208 they were present in the city, although a trip to Africa was also made during this period. The last years of the reign were spent waging war in Britain. By means of his changes to the urban landscape of Rome Severus continued to assert his presence and authority. Through the extensive use of inscriptions on both new and restored buildings throughout the city Severus also sought to establish a place for his dynasty. As the imperial family was present in public ceremonies, so the names of his co-emperor Caracalla, and the Caesar Geta appear with his in the dedications on the buildings, advertising the line of succession and the dynasty's stability.

Both Severus' rebuilding and new constructions would also have had an economic effect upon the city. Although looked back on as a Golden Age, the reign of Marcus Aurelius in fact was a period of barbarian invasions, plague and a declining economy which left a financial crisis at the end of the reign of Commodus. These economic problems were tied to the lack of expenditure on public works and state buildings under the Antonines. The resultant decline in all sectors of the building industry is reflected in the production of the
brick figlinae. From the time of Antoninus Pius many figlinae began to disappear and under Marcus Aurelius a crisis in the building industry occurred. The decrease in production affected first the small and medium workshops, but eventually there was a sharp decline and then the almost complete disappearance of private figlinae belonging to the Roman aristocracy. The monopoly of the imperial officinae also expanded, particularly when Marcus Aurelius inherited the figlinae of the gens Domitia. The diminished building activity of Commodus, reflected in the scarcity of brick stamps attributable to his reign, also led to a decrease in the production of bricks by the imperial officinae.  

The scarcity of brick stamps dating to the early years of Severus' reign, when the emperor was preoccupied with consolidating his power, indicates that the difficulties in the building industry continued. There seems, however, to have been an increase in activity around 203, coinciding with and undoubtedly sparked by the emperor's own building programme. At this time there was a reorganization of the declining figlinae carried out by the Praetorian Prefect Plautianus, who came into possession of many of the imperial figlinae until his death in 205. This brief period of control of the industry by Plautianus appears to have resulted in an increase in brick production, which continued into the reign of Caracalla. The imperial monopoly in the building industry was also consolidated during Severus' reign, with only eight figlinae remaining in private hands.  

There has been much debate as to whether one of the motives of public building by Roman emperors was employment of the urban plebs. L. Casson has argued that this could not be the case since the work force in the building industry was slave labour. P.A. Brunt, however, has convincingly shown that, while the specialized workers were slaves, the
casual unskilled labour was probably drawn from the free population. While the employment of the urban poor was hardly likely to have been a primary motive for Severus’ public building, the increased activity brought about by the imperial programme would have resulted in economic benefits to the population. Severus’ interest in keeping good relations with the urban populace can be seen in his six congiaria and the number of games which he presented. The increased construction would also have benefited other classes who were the contractors and producers of the materials.

The availability of imperial funds must have aided and perhaps stimulated Severus’ building projects. G. Bodei Giglioni has demonstrated that public works were closely tied to the circulation of money. Periods of building occurred only when financial resources allowed. Severus seems to have had no shortage of funds. Dio notes that even though his expenditures were enormous, Severus left behind a large sum. Herodian reports that he bequeathed to his sons a greater wealth than any previous ruler. Confiscations of the property of the supporters of his rivals during the civil wars had added substantially to the imperial treasury. To counter the financial and economic problems that he had inherited from the Antonines, Severus also undertook the reorganisation of the currency system, by reducing the silver content and by issuing large quantities of money to stimulate the economy. A considerable part of this money was spent on the army, but another expenditure was the building programme at Rome. Not all agreed that this was a proper expense. As we have seen above, Dio criticized Severus for what he regarded as a waste of funds on the building programme.
Despite being occupied with the civil and foreign wars during the beginning of his reign, the planning for some of the constructions in Rome seems to have been undertaken during Severus' brief sojourns in the city in 193, 196 and 197. For example, the new castra for the increased *equites singulares* seems to have been finished by 197. The coin issues of 200 with the legend RESTITUTOR URBIS may have been minted to commemorate the commencement of the rebuilding programme at Rome. The majority of building attributable to his reign seems to have been completed by 204 in time for the Secular Games. From 202-208 Severus was present in Rome for an extended period, although a visit to Africa was also made some time during this period. It seems likely that this visit was made in 202-203, although some scholars contend that it occurred in 207. If Severus made the trip in the earlier period he must have been back in Rome for the dedication of the Septizodium, the arch in the Forum, and many of his repairs in 203. These projects may have been set in motion during the stay in Rome in 202 to celebrate the *decennalia*, or even during the earlier visits, since some may have taken longer to complete.

Since Severus spent a great deal of his reign outside of Rome, it is difficult to determine the extent of his personal supervision and attention to the design and details of construction carried out in his name. Considering the diligence with which Severus is said to have handled all matters, however, it is likely that he at least played some role in the general conception and must have had overall authority. There are no specific anecdotes referring to Severus' particular interest in architecture such as exist for Hadrian or to personal participation as in the case of Vespasian. On his various travels, however, Severus does seem to have made a point of observing the architectural wonders of the
places that he visited. As a young man studying in Athens he viewed that city’s public monuments and antiquities. During a trip to Egypt, after becoming emperor, he was greatly taken with its antiquities and architectural wonders, and paid particular attention to the site of Memphis, the colossal statues of Memnon, the Pyramids, and the Labyrinth.

One figure who may have assisted the emperor or even have played a major role in determining the scheme of the imperial building activity in Rome was Plautianus, Severus’ influential compatriot and friend, Prefect of the vigiles from 193 and later Praetorian Prefect. According to Dio, Plautianus was privy to everything that Severus either said or did and the emperor yielded to him in all matters to such an extent that he was virtually an equal in power. Dio also reports that the statues erected in honour of Plautianus in other cities and even in Rome were more numerous and larger than those of the emperors. Unfortunately, the sources do not elaborate on Plautianus’ role within the government and do not provide details of his duties or operations, but tend to concentrate on his greed and desire for power. One indication of Plautianus’ interest in building and the building industry, however, may be seen in his reorganization of the brick industry in 203 when he became dominus of a number of figlinae. He may also have been involved in the city’s water supply. Although we have no direct evidence of his involvement in setting up public monuments from the sources besides the reference to the great number of statues erected in his honour, perhaps it is no coincidence that the imperial building activity appears to be confined to the period before Plautianus’ demise in 205.

During Severus’ extended absence from the city from 193-202 and the possible visit to Africa over 202-203 others were left in charge of the capital. Some person or
persons must have been appointed to oversee the building projects. Who these individuals were is difficult to ascertain. One of the basic problems is the fact that the logistics of public building in general, particularly during the later empire, have not been clearly established. Curatores seem to have been in charge of individual projects, assisted by equestrian officials and imperial freedmen, but which individual, if any, had overall responsibility for all of the building projects, especially during the emperor’s absence, has not been determined.

Severus’ trusted friend Plautianus may have served in this capacity, since his reorganisation of the figlinae may indicate an interest in the building programme, but inscriptional evidence seems to demonstrate that Plautianus accompanied Severus during all of his campaigns and travels from 197 when he served as Praetorian Prefect. Although Plautianus appears to have been in Rome during the early part of the reign, serving as Prefect of the vigiles and seeing to the new emperor’s interests while he was fighting Niger in the East, anecdotes from Dio recording Plautianus’ presence at Tyana and Nicaea indicate that he was present on the second Parthian campaign. Evidence that he was in Egypt with Severus in 199-200 is provided by a rescript. Plautianus also seems to have accompanied Severus during his visit to their home province of Africa.

Another candidate for responsibility for the building programme during Severus’ absence is his Urban Prefect Fabius Cilo. Traditionally the Urban Prefect played an important role in the city during the emperor’s absences. This senatorial magistracy, established by Augustus to keep order in the city, was endowed with imperium and command over the Urban Cohorts. The Urban Prefect also had a judicial role, seeing to
the administration of justice through an independent court. Possibly as early as the mid-second century, in order to create a strong central administration of the city, the Urban Prefecture seems also to have assumed primary authority over the regions. Some scholars have suggested that under Severus the Prefect's judicial jurisdiction was further expanded and may also have included the administration of public building.

The Notitia Dignitatum indicates that by the late fourth century the curators responsible for the maintenance of streets and aqueducts and the repair or construction of public buildings had become dependent on the Urban Prefect. The earliest direct inscriptive evidence for an Urban Prefect taking independent action in public works is the restoration in 344 of the Baths of Agrippa by the Prefect Q. Rusticus. The belief that this change to overall responsibility for public works took place during the tenure of Fabius Cilo is based upon a passage of the Historia Augusta in which the author notes that when Severus had the Septizodium constructed he intended it to be an aditus to the Palatine, but the plan was thwarted when the Urban Prefect placed a statue of the emperor in the centre of the structure. If Severus’ visit to Africa occurred in 202-203, the emperor would have been absent during the construction of the Septizodium, as the passage suggests, and Fabius Cilo would have been the Urban Prefect during this period. On the other hand this report in the Historia Augusta that the original intention of the Septizodium was changed by the Urban Prefect is problematic because of its anecdotal nature, and appears to be of dubious origin. The Septizodium seems to have been strictly a facade building and nymphaeum, and was never designed to serve as an entrance to the Palatine. The story found in the Historia Augusta seems to have been a later invention
based upon a misunderstanding of the function of the Septizodium.\textsuperscript{65} It was possibly inspired by some connection between the statue of the emperor standing in its central niche and the Urban Prefect, perhaps in the form of an inscription on the base of the statue indicating that it was dedicated by this magistrate.\textsuperscript{66}

The personal initiative of the Urban Prefect as reported in the passage of the \textit{Historia Augusta} has been shown to be questionable as evidence for his role as the director of the imperial building programme. The simple dedication of a statue by Cilo for the decoration of the Septizodium cannot be used as proof that the office of the Urban Prefecture had overall responsibility for the administration of public works.\textsuperscript{67}

Nevertheless, Fabius Cilo, as a trusted friend and confidant of Severus may well have taken some active role in the building programme.\textsuperscript{68} Indeed as Urban Prefect, he probably played a major role in overseeing the survey that was carried out in the city and which was recorded in another monument, the Marble Plan set up in the Templum Pacis.\textsuperscript{69} Cilo was absent from the city in the early part of the reign serving as a general and then as governor of various provinces, but does seem to have been Prefect from 201 or 202 when most of the construction attributed to Severus' reign took place.\textsuperscript{70}
1. For building as *liberalitas* and the opinions of ancient writers, see Kloft (1970), 115-117. For example, Nero is criticized by Suetonius (*Nero* 31) for wastefulness in his architectural projects, while Pliny, *Pan.* 51.3-5 emphasizes that Trajan constructed buildings for public use instead of private. See also Rouveret (1991), 3072-3078 and 3083-3089.

2. Millar (1977), 365 suggests that these occasions were not only an attraction in themselves, but provided opportunities to actually see the emperor, even if from some distance, and also to press demands and complaints on him. One such occasion occurred during the reign of Severus, when heralds were sent throughout Italy summoning people to attend the Secular Games in 204 (Herodian 3.8.9-10). Evidence for such visitors is provided by an epitaph from Rome which records the death there of a man from Tripolis in Asia Minor during his visit to see the Games (*CIG* 5921.2).

3. For the importance of monumental sources in highlighting the specific features and general overtones of the imperial policy, see Rubin (1980), 15 and Fears (1981c), 910.

4. This expression had become current under Hadrian, but was made official by Severus. See Robinson (1992), 24.

5. For Severus’ important role in the development of the urban organization of the capital, see Homo (1951), 135.


7. See Birley (1988), 196 and (1969), 63-82. A new camp was constructed for the increased horse guard. See *infra* 330-332.

8. Dio 72.24.1-3; Herodian 1.14.2-6; Galen 13.362; 14.66; 19.19 (ed. Kühn, 1821-33). There is no mention of the fire in the *HA*, although the restoration by Severus of all the *publicae aedes* which had fallen into ruin is recorded at *Severus* 23.1. Birley (1988), 85 suggests that the reason for this might be the fact that Marius Maximus, who seems to have been the source for the more reliable
parts of the *HA*, was serving on the Danube at this time and was therefore not present to witness the fire. The fire, however, was probably just omitted by the author of the *HA*.

9. Many scholars would place the fire within 191, but there is no reason why the event could not have taken place in 192. The fire is related by both authors as a portent of Commodus’ downfall; so it seems to have been connected with the events of 192. Werner (1906), 36 accepts the date of 192, also Birley (1988), 85 on the grounds that this event is reported as an omen of Commodus’ downfall. Commodus was assassinated on the last day of 192, which provides a *terminus ante quem* for the fire.

10. See Werner (1906), 38. For a discussion of the Severan repairs to the Porticus Octaviae, see *infra* 239-248. It is also possible that these later sources confused the dates and events of the fire of 191/192. Galen states that many of his works were destroyed when libraries were burned on the Palatine. Perhaps the destruction of libraries on the Capitoline recorded in the later accounts were actually those on the Palatine referred to by Galen. The existence of the earlier fire is accepted, however, by Canter (1931-32), 277.

11. For the two fires, see Hieronymus, *Abr.* 2204 and 2208 (ed. Helm, 1913). A second fire, for which no date is provided, is also recorded by Orosius 7.16.3 (ed. Zangemeister, 1889).

12. Dio 72.24.1 reports that the fire started in some dwelling nearby and then leapt to the Templum Pacis. Herodian 1.14.2 does not specify the exact location, but relates that the fire, started by a flash of lightening or an earth tremor, first gutted the Templum Pacis. The destruction of the Templum Pacis is also recorded by Galen at 13.362 and 19.19 (ed. Kühn, 1821-33).

13. On the Forma Urbis a street runs behind the apsidal building of the Templum Pacis. It is flanked by a number of tabernae on both sides, which seems to be part of the *Horrea Piperataria*. This warehouse has been identified in the remains of a large utilitarian complex excavated under the Basilica of Maxentius. Lugli (1946), 230, Coarelli (1980), 92, (1983a), 40, and Richardson (1992), 194, s.v. “*Horrea Piperataria*.”

14. Herodian records that the statue of the Palladium was exposed to view when this structure went up in flames, indicating extensive damage. It was snatched away to safety along the Via Sacra by the Vestal Virgins. The destruction of the Aedes Vestae is also included in the account of Hieronymus and Orosius. Dio does not make mention of it.
Damage to the Atrium is recorded by Eusebius 2.174 (ed. Schoene, 1866).

Dio 72.24.2: ...πολλα πάνυ αὐτοῦ κατέκαυσεν. The Palatine is also mentioned by Hieronymus, Orosius, and Eusebius.

For the Tabularium Caesaris, also known as the Scrinium or Sanctuarium Caesaris, see DarSag, vol. 5, 17, s.v. “Tabularium.” The precise location of the archive is not known, but it was probably located near the palace on the Palatine.


1.14.4.

As identified by Werner (1906), 41. The Circus Maximus region includes the Forum Boarium, where Severan building has also been identified through archaeological excavations, see infra 317-329.

1.14.5-6.

72.24.2-3.

For disaster relief as an expression of imperial liberalitates connected to building activity, see Kloft (1970), 118. The increase in the number of vigiles was probably carried out in response to the devastation of this fire. CIL 6.1057, a dedication of the Fifth Cohort of the vigiles, shows that 54 percent of the men were recruits in 205, indicating that the corps was possibly doubled in size.

HA Severus 23.1-2: ... quod Romae omnes aedes publicas, quae vitio temporum labebantur, instauravit musquam prope suo nomine adscripto servatis tamen ubique titulis conditorum.

Dio 76.16.3.

For Dio’s attitude toward Severus and his criticisms, see Millar (1964), 138-150. There is in fact no indication that Severus ever replaced the name of the original builder with his own or that he took sole credit for building a structure that he restored.

For the decline of the building industry under the Antonines, see Bloch (1968), 300 and 339, and Steinby (1974-75), 23, (1978), col. 1515 and (1983), 221.

This reorganization of the brick industry by Plautianus was first recognized in a study of stamps from Ostia by Bloch (1968), 292-303, and confirmed by Steinby (1974-75), 107-108 and (1978), col. 1527. Plautianus is named as dominus of these figlinae and in order to underline the new
management he changed not only the stamps, but also the type. Steinby has shown that Plautianus' reorganization is also reflected not so much in the greater number of stamps, but in the greater number of officinares working for him. After Plautianus' death these figlinae passed back to the ownership of the emperors.

29. These probably belonged to the senatorial class. The monopoly was possibly achieved by means of the property confiscations resulting from the civil war. Severus had also inherited almost all the figlinae belonging to Commodus when he took control not only of the fiscus and patrimonium on becoming emperor, but when he also inherited the res privata of the Antonines by the fictitious adoption. See Steinby (1978), col. 1515, 1520, and 1527.


31. Brunt (1980), 81-100. Brunt argues that the demand for unskilled labour could not have been met economically by exclusive reliance on slaves. Free labour must have been cheaper and was available when needed during building booms. Only the work force that could be kept continually employed was servile. See also Skydsgaard (1983), 225, who also brings forward the inscriptions of the collegia of the building industry as evidence for a structure of slaves, freedmen and free citizens.

32. On his decennalia in particular Severus gave ten gold pieces each to the entire population on the grain dole, as well as the praetorians. Dio (76.1.1) records that no emperor before had ever given so much to the whole population at once, 220 million denarii in total.

33. For the contractors and producers of materials involved in the building industry, see Steinby (1983), 220.


35. Dio 76.16.4; Herodian 3.15.3.

36. The confiscations are recorded at Dio 74.8-9, Herodian 3.8.2 and 3.8.7, and HA Severus 12.1-6. According to the HA the new office of procurator rerum privatarum was first established at this time to deal with this enormous accumulation of wealth. The growth of the res privata of the emperor is a feature of the reign. See Platnauer (1918), 183-184 and Birley (1988), 128.

Could Dio's comment perhaps be evidence of the social welfare aspect of Severus' building? As a member of the senatorial class Dio would perhaps view this attention to the urban plebs with suspicion.

A dedicatory inscription found there indicates that the troops were established in their new barracks before January 1, 197. See Speidel (1994b), 128.

As suggested by Hill (1964), 6 and 25.

A date of 202-203 was proposed by Babelon (1903), 159-161 based on coinage of this date depicting the Carthaginian goddess Dea Caelestis on the reverse with the legend INDULGENTIA, and on a dedication from Lambaesis (CIL 8.2702) of the familia rationis castrensis, which is thought to have accompanied the emperor on all of his journeys. The date of 202-203 is accepted by Hasebroek (1921), 133, Murphy (1945), 33, Halfmann (1986), 132-133 and 222-224 and Birley (1988), 146-154. Others argue that the inscription does not necessarily indicate that the emperor was present. Mattingly (BMC V, clvii and clix) suggests that the coinage of 207 with types of Africa, the emperor on horseback (profectio), and a galley offers evidence of a trip to Africa in this year. See also Hill (1964), 3 and 33, and McCann (1968), 67 and 75.

The arch and the Septizodium, being smaller monuments, may have taken a shorter amount of time, but the restoration of the Porticus Octaviae and the Templum Pacis, both extensive complexes, probably required a longer period to complete. The constructions on the Palatine must also have taken some time to complete.

Severus was reputed to have possessed a keen intelligence and a great eagerness for learning (HA Severus 18.5-6: philosophiae ac dicendi studiis satis deditus, doctrinae quoque nimis cupidus). Dio at 77.16.2 states that he was mentally vigorous, but was eager for more education than he obtained.

Hadrian's interest in architecture: Dio 69.4.2-6; HA Hadrian 16.10; Epit. de Caes. 14.2. Vespasian inaugurated the restoration of the burned Capitolium by collecting the first basketful of rubble and carrying it away on his shoulders. Suetonius, Vespasian 8.5.

HA Severus 3.7: Athenas petit studiorum sacrorumque causa et operum ac vetustatum.

HA Severus 17.4. Dio (76.13) records that during the same trip Severus inquired into everything, being the kind of person to leave nothing uninvestigated, whether human or divine.
Severus also locked up the tomb of Alexander after his visit. Bowersock (1984), 21-32 has shown that the long held belief that the singing statues of Memnon were mended, and therefore silenced, during Severus’ visit is unfounded, since there is evidence that the statue was unrepaired after his reign. Bowersock proposes that the silencing of the statues did not take place until the time of Zenobia, who was known to have restored many of the monuments of Egyptian antiquity.

47. 76.14-16. Dio reports that Plautianus’ control over Severus was so great that there was some question as to who was the emperor and who the Prefect.

48. 76.14.6-7. These were erected not only by individuals or communities, but by the senate itself. These statues, however, later caused problems between Severus and his Prefect. Severus became displeased on one occasion when an extraordinary number of statues had been made for Plautianus, and ordered some of them to be melted down (Dio 76.16.2). The HA Severus 14.5 reports that Severus’ displeasure was caused when Plautianus set up his own statues among the emperor’s kinsmen.

49 For the difficulty in evaluating Plautianus’ abilities and actual power, see Grosso (1968), 52.

50. It is unclear how Plautianus came into possession of the imperial figlinae, but it may have occurred when he took almost total control of the private patrimony of the imperial family. See Steinby (1978), col. 1515.

51. See Steinby (1994), 659-660. The two fistulae found on the Quirinal bearing the name of Plautianus (AE [1902], 190; AE [1903], 45, 125, 126 = ILS 8689), previously connected to a large domus on the north-west slope of the Quirinal identified as the residence of Plautianus, each have the names of two different procurators in their stamps. Since procurators do not occur on the fistulae of other private citizens, Steinby proposes that these pipes do not belong to a private residence, but that Plautianus’ name is present because he was the official in charge of the aquae. The domus on the Quirinal which was identified as the house of Plautianus largely because of the discovery of these fistulae in its vicinity, has also been shown to have been transformed into a large residence not at the time of Severus, but at the end of the third century. See Lissi Caronna (1985) 360-365 and (1995), 105-106.

52. Plautianus may have been responsible for the construction of a private bath known as the Lavacrum Plautiani, which, according to the HA (Heliogabalus 8.6), Elagabalus opened up to the
public. This is the only reference, however, to these baths and their location is unknown. Richardson (1992), 234, s.v. "Lavacrum Plautini" suggests that the reading might rather be a corruption of Palatini. See also Platner-Ashby (1929), 316, s.v. "Lavacrum Plauti(a)ni."

53 The construction and maintenance of public buildings during the Republic are better understood. See Strong (1968), 97-103.

54 Curatores are known at least during the early Empire. See Brunt (1982), 84-86, and Robinson (1992), 53. In the second century equestrian subcuratores were appointed beside the curatores. Under Severus the subcuratores were replaced by equestrian procuratores. Homo (1951), 138.

55 Plautianus is called comes of the emperors on all their expeditions in CIL 6.1074 = ILS 456. Corbier (1974), 213-218 suggests that this title for Plautianus should also be restored on a dedication from Lepcis (AE 1967 no. 537). For Plautianus' career and movements, see Stein (1910), col. 270-278 and PIR² F 554. The belief of Mattingly (BMC V, xii and xxxvii) that Plautianus remained in Rome during Severus' absence from 197-202 seems to be unfounded.

56 Dio 76.15.3-4. An inscription of 195 from Ostia names him as Prefect of the vigiles (CIL Supp. 14.4380). Plautianus was also ordered by Severus to imprison the sons of Niger in Rome (HA Severus 6.10). See Grosso (1968), 14-16.

57 P. Col. 123. CIL 6. 225 = ILS 2186, dated to April 200, a dedication erected in Rome by the equites singulares PRO SALUTE, ITU, REDITU ET VICTORIA of the emperors also originally included the name of Plautianus. See Grosso (1968), 26-27.

58 Plautianus' visit to Africa is confirmed by a dedication made at Lepcis to Jupiter Dolichenus on behalf of the safety, victory, and return of the emperors and Plautianus in urbem suam, which seems to refer to Lepcis Magna and not Rome. See Grosso (1968), 32-42

59 Palmer (1975), 77-79.

60 Vitucci (1956), 59-81 proposes that the judicial function of the Urban Prefecture was increased at this time. He bases this upon Ulpian, Dig. 1.12.1.1, which quotes a letter from Severus to Fabius Cilo attributing omnia omnino crimina to the Prefect. Vitucci also argues from Dig. 1.12.1.4 that the jurisdiction of the Prefect was limited at this time to one hundred miles from Rome. Homo (1951), 141 suggests that this judicial expansion included the overall administration of public works, following in part Vigneaux (1896). For a refutation of Vitucci’s
conclusions, however, see Cadoux (1959), 156-159 who suggests that Severus’ reign was not as important a landmark in the development of the Urban Prefecture as Vitucci claims. He does, however, admit that Severus did make some additions to the Prefect’s competence.

61 See Chastagnol (1960), 43.

62 CIL 6.1165. Ammianus Marcellinus 27.3.7 also records that Lampadius, the Urban Prefect in 365, put his name on restorations. For the overall responsibility in public works of the Urban Prefect in the later Empire, see Robinson (1992), 53.

63 Severus 24.3-5: Cum Septizodium faceret, nihil aliud cogitavit quam ut ex Africa venientibus suum opus occurreret. nisi absente eo per Prefectum urbis medium simulacrum eius esset locatum, aditum Palatinis aedibus, id est regium atrium, ab ea parte facere voluisse perhibetur.

64 The topography of the area precludes an entrance at this point to the Palatine, for which, see Picard (1962a), 78, Rodriguez-Almeida (1981), 74, and Richardson (1992), 350, s.v. “Septizodium.” Some scholars, however, accept this passage at face value. For example Desnier (1993), 598-611 suggests that Cilo, by placing the statue in the central apse, changed the intended entrance into a Septizodium, and that this inclusion of the statue of the emperor in such a scheme was an innovation.

65 The later assertion in the same passage of the HA that Alexander Severus had planned to make an entrance in the same place but was prevented by unfavourable omens by the soothsayers can also not be substantiated.

66 Behind this tradition perhaps there lurks recorded in a pro-Severan source some tale of false modesty on the part of Severus connected with this dedication, similar to the account of Augustus’ refusal to have his statue placed in the Pantheon among the gods as recorded by Dio 53.27. For Augustus’ intention, see Coarelli (1983b), 45.

67 As noted by Chastagnol (1960), 44-45 and 52, Severus’ reign does not seem to have been as pivotal in the official expansion of the Prefecture as Vitucci and Homo have suggested. Chastagnol cites inscriptive evidence that the curatores of public works were still independent until the time of Maxentius and suggests that the jurisdictional change probably occurred in the period after this emperor, most likely under Constantine in 331, coinciding with the establishment of Constantinople.
In the letter recorded by Ulpian (Dig. 1.12.1.4) Severus does entrust the city to Cilo: ... *cum urbem nostram fidei tuae commiserimus*. This may, however, only encompass the judicial capacity of the Urban Prefect. Desnier (1993), 590-591 makes the suggestion that Cilo as a consul in 204 was one of the two *togati* represented on the principal facade of the Arch of the Argentarii, thus indicating his importance in urban policy. These figures, however, are so badly corroded that they have also been variously identified with equally convincing reasons as Severus and Caracalla, the consuls of 203, Severus’ brother Geta and Caracalla, or the *patroni* of the college of the *boarii*.

For Cilo’s connection with the Forma Urbis, see the discussion *infra* 156-157.

For the career of Fabius Cilo, see *PIR*² F 27, and Vitucci (1956), 77 and 119. He accompanied Severus to the East against Niger in 193, and then governed Bithynia Pontus (194), Moesia Superior (196 or 197) and Pannonia Superior (196 or 197-201). The exact date of his appointment as Urban Prefect is not known. He was *consul ordinarius* for the second time in 204; so it occurred before this date, probably in 201-202. The earlier Urban Prefects were C. Domitius Dexter from 193-196 (*PIR*² D 144) and P. Cornelius Anullinus (*PIR*² C 1322) in the years around 199.
IV. THE FORUM ROMANUM (Figure 1)

The importance of the Forum Romanum as the traditional centre of the city of Rome was recognized by Severus, who made this venerated area an important site for the promotion of his divine destiny and the legitimacy of his rule, his military victories, and the establishment of a Severan dynasty. At the very beginning of the reign this interest in the traditions of the Forum was shown when Severus carried out one of his first public acts after assuming power, an elaborate funeral for Pertinax.¹ The funeral is described by Dio Cassius who as a senator was present at the event.² Near the Rostra a small building with gold and ivory columns was constructed on a wooden platform, in which a wax effigy of Pertinax was laid out on a couch also of gold and ivory covered with a purple cloth. After the funeral procession, Severus gave the laudatio funebris for Pertinax from the Rostra in his role as avenger and legitimate heir.

The Forum had always been the traditional location for the funerals of eminent individuals from a very early period and was also the site of other imperial funerals. The Rostra was used for displaying the corpse and delivering the eulogy.³ In order to demonstrate his re-establishment of the stability of the Roman state as well as to declare his own legitimacy Severus conducted this ceremony in the Forum in the tradition of the imperial ancestors.⁴ He was observing the proper rituals of succession which had been neglected after the assassination of Pertinax and the virtual sale of the Empire to Julianus.⁵
Many other important ceremonial events of the reign also took place in the Forum Romanum. The procession of the participants of the Carmen Saeculare passed along the Via Sacra through the Forum on the route from the Palatine to the Capitoline. In 202 the wedding gifts for the marriage of Plautilla and Caracalla were also carried through the Forum to the Palatine. This must have been an extravagant display, since Dio says that Plautianus gave as much for his daughter’s dowry as would have sufficed for fifty women of royal rank. The six largesses which Severus gave during his reign may also have been held in the Forum Romanum, which was one of the customary sites for acts of public liberality. The coinage commemorating these events depicts the emperor seated on a platform that seems to be the Rostra. The Forum and its Rostra were probably also the scene of the ceremonial reception of Abgarus, the king of Osrhoene, who had submitted to Severus during the first Parthian campaign. At some point during the reign this monarch came to Rome with a large retinue probably in an act of fealty, and the event would have been staged with some splendour by Severus. Another public ceremony which very likely took place in the Forum, perhaps the presentation of Caracalla and Geta as the consuls of 205, is represented on the so-called Palazzo Sacchetti relief.

Severus also chose to emphasize the Forum Romanum in his building programme. The restoration of the parts of the Forum damaged by the fire of 191/192, which seem to have gone unrepaired during the turmoil after Commodus’ assassination, was an important act in portraying Severus as the Restorer of the city. The damage offered the opportunity to restore one of the Forum’s most venerated shrines, the Aedes Vestae, and the adjacent Atrium of the Vestals. By adding some new monuments of his own Severus
also intended to establish a presence for his new dynasty within this traditional centre of the city. The Forum Romanum had not received a major monument in sixty years, the last addition being the Temple of Antoninus and Faustina. No major monuments or buildings had been added during the reigns of Marcus Aurelius or Commodus. Under Severus the first triumphal arch was constructed in the Forum since the time of the Julio-Claudians, and a large bronze equestrian statue was set up to dominate the central square. Various smaller dedications were also placed within the area. Among these was a statue of Julia Domna as Mater Castrorum situated along the Via Sacra. A bronze statue of Severus’ brother Geta was also set up in the area after his death.

The Aedes Vestae

Herodian records that the Aedes Vestae was burned so extensively during the Commodan fire that the ancient Palladium was exposed to view for the first time, and had to be snatched away by the Vestal Virgins to the Palatine. This temple was one of the most sacred spots in the city, the foundation of which was credited to Numa. The sanctity of the temple was attested by the fact that although it had been rebuilt many times its round form had always been preserved. Severus was able to exploit the opportunity of rebuilding this mainstay of Roman tradition in his role as the restorer and builder of both Rome’s institutions and buildings.

The rebuilding of the Aedes Vesta during the reign of Severus is indicated by the issue of coins depicting the restored temple. Interestingly the temple does not appear on the coinage of the emperor himself, but only on the issues of Julia Domna. The Aedes, with its typical round form, is represented on some reverses of her coinage minted during
Severus' reign, designated by the legend VESTA MATER with either a group of six figures sacrificing in front (Plate I.1), or a single veiled sacrificant (Plate I.2), perhaps the empress herself.\textsuperscript{19} This connection of the temple of Vesta exclusively with the empress seems to indicate a special association and suggests that the restoration was carried out under the patronage of Julia Domna.

The repair of the temple of Vesta by Julia Domna would be consistent with the prominent position given to the empress during the reign and the important associations that were developed between her and this goddess. Julia Domna as the loyal consort of Severus and the mother of the future rulers was officially promoted within the dynastic ambitions of the new regime.\textsuperscript{20} The empress was given the title Mater Castrorum in 195, and from 197 many inscriptions were made in her honour, not only as the wife of Severus and Mater Castrorum, but also as mother of an emperor and of a Caesar.\textsuperscript{21} A statue dedicated to Julia Domna in her role as Mater Castrorum was set up on the Via Sacra.\textsuperscript{22} During the Secular Games of 204 the empress also took an active role as the foremost matron of the city, leading the public prayer of the 110 matrons to Juno Regina and presiding over the sacrifice, assisted by the two chief Vestal Virgins.\textsuperscript{23}

In her capacity as wife of the \textit{pontifex maximus}, the empress also was involved in the state cult of Vesta. Already during the second century, the relationship between the empresses and Vesta was being emphasized, and in the tradition of these Antonine empresses from the beginning of the reign Vesta appears on the coin issues of Julia Domna.\textsuperscript{24} During the course of the reign, however, the relationship between the empress and goddess was expanded as Julia Domna's role as the premier matron of the state and
her interest in this important state cult was highlighted. Vesta appears with the new epithet Sancta on the coin reverses.\textsuperscript{25} The goddess is also called Mater on coinage depicting the restored temple, possibly an allusion to the empress as Mater and a reflection of Julia Domna's important role in the cult.\textsuperscript{26} As the premier mother of the state Julia Domna was acting as the patroness of the rebuilding of the Aedes Vestae Matris.\textsuperscript{27}

The damage to the temple during the fire of 191/192 seems to have been extensive, as the inner shrine where the Palladium was kept was exposed. The extant remains indicate that an almost complete rebuilding was required.\textsuperscript{28} The podium consists of four strata of concrete around 15 m. in diameter and 2.17 m. thick. The uppermost level of concrete, the conglomerate of which consists of reused pieces of broken and charred marble, travertine, and tufa, probably the refuse material from the previous phase of the building destroyed by the fire, can be assigned to the Severan rebuilding.\textsuperscript{29} All of the architectural fragments of the superstructure of the temple that have been discovered also belong to this phase.

The podium, which was raised and approached by steps, was originally revetted in marble and ornamented by jutting pilasters carrying an extremely narrow colonnade of Corinthian columns around the cella. Corinthian columns were also engaged in the walls of the circular cella. The columns are 0.51 m. in diameter, but as no complete columns can be restored, the height can only be conjectured to have been c. 4.45 m. Holes have also been identified in the surviving columns; these probably held metal rods for the grillwork that screened the space between the columns, as shown in the inter-columniations of the temple depicted on the coinage of Julia Domna. Marble coffers
covered the ceiling of the colonnade. The outer columns carried an entablature decorated with a frieze of sacrificial instruments and attributes associated with the cult of Vesta.\(^{30}\)

The roof of the temple was a cupola, as illustrated on the coinage (see Plate I.1-2).\(^{31}\)

The Severan rebuilding of the Aedes Vestae seems to have followed its antecedents, as far as can be determined from representations of the previous phases of the temple on reliefs and coinage.\(^{32}\) The earliest representation of the temple is on denarii of Q. Cassius of 55 B.C., where it appears as a round domed building with columns.\(^{33}\)

Through various rebuilding, with some alteration and updating of its ornamentation, the temple maintained this round form.\(^{34}\) The Aedes Vestae was a hallowed site and not a place for radical changes; the Severan rebuilding, therefore, apparently with a conscious conservatism, followed the traditional plan of the temple, and compared with the flamboyant baroque characteristics seen on other Severan monuments, the decoration of the rebuilt Aedes Vestae is noted for its sobriety.\(^{35}\)

A slight innovation in the plan of the temple, however, may be seen in the higher podium of the Severan phase.\(^{36}\) The podium of the earlier phases of the temple is not very clearly illustrated on the coin representations, but a round stylobate approached by steps on all sides seems to be depicted. This type of podium is also shown in drawings by G.A. Dosio, G. da Sangallo and an anonymous work from the Codex Destailleur of ancient reliefs, which also seem to portray the temple of Vesta.\(^{37}\) The Severan rebuilding saw the raising of the colonnade of the temple on a podium with the columns set up on projecting pedestals, to create a dramatic effect of light and shadow, a style popular in Severan
architecture. The columns framing the passageways of the Severan triumphal arch were placed on pedestals in a similar manner.\textsuperscript{38}

The exact date of the Severan restoration of the Aedes Vestae is difficult to determine, as no inscriptions are extant recording the event. The coin issues of Julia Domna depicting the restored temple unfortunately also belong to a large undated series that range in date from 196 to 209.\textsuperscript{39} It can probably be assumed, however, that the rebuilding of the Aedes Vestae must have been a priority of Severus on the establishment of his rule, considering the importance of the temple to the city and its very sacred nature. The ornament of the temple in fact is characteristic of the early Severan period, suggesting that the restoration should date to the very early years of the reign.\textsuperscript{40}

A \textit{terminus ante quern} for the completion of the rebuilding of the temple can perhaps be provided by the celebration of the Secular Games in 204. The temple must have been restored by this date since the processions of the Secular Games passed through the Forum area.\textsuperscript{41} All of the dated works undertaken by Severus fall within the years 201-203 and appear to have been carried out in time for the Secular Games. The complete repair and renewal of the damaged buildings of the Forum would have been essential for this event.

The restoration of the damaged Aedes Vestae by Severus was an important step in easing anxiety and establishing stability. By associating Julia Domna with this undertaking, Severus was able to highlight both the role of his wife, and the interest of the imperial family in the sanctity of the traditional religion of the state. The restoration of the Aedes Vestae must also have included the reinstatement within the inner shrine of the
Palladium, the emblem of the eternity of Rome saved from the fire by the Vestals. This very sacred and symbolic act was probably observed with due ceremony and effect by the regime.\textsuperscript{42}

**The Atrium Vestae**

The fire of 191/192 that destroyed the Aedes Vestae also affected the Atrium Vestae, the residence of the Vestal Virgins located immediately to the south-east. This necessitated repair to at least part of the structure during the Severan restoration of the Forum.\textsuperscript{43} Consisting of a large court surrounded by a series of rooms, this building had a complex history, having been previously restored and expanded on several occasions before its repair by Severus. The Atrium Vestae was first constructed during the Republican period.\textsuperscript{44} It was rebuilt on a larger scale by Nero on its present orientation after it was damaged by the fire of 64. An extensive renovation of the complex was also undertaken during the time of Trajan.\textsuperscript{45}

The damage caused to the Atrium Vestae by the fire of Commodus seems to have been confined to the western and north-western side in the immediate vicinity of the Aedes. Severan rebuilding has been identified on the upper part of the walls in this area.\textsuperscript{46}

The rooms to the south and the east, apparently undamaged by the fire, were not changed, and the fundamental outlines of the building remained the same after the Severan restoration. To what extent redecoration was carried out within the various rooms is difficult to determine.\textsuperscript{47}

There was, however, one alteration affecting the overall plan of the complex that was undertaken during the Severan repair. The interior courtyard was extended to the east
so that it now dominated the surrounding rooms on both sides of the complex.\textsuperscript{48} Damage to the original courtyard caused by the fire may have provided the opportunity to expand the courtyard. The extended peristyle now added symmetry to the construction and united the rooms on the east to the rest of the complex. The colonnade was two stories, the lower columns constructed of cipollino and the upper storey of breccia corallina. The columns of the new Severan section of the courtyard were more widely spaced than those of the original colonnade. This increase in the intercolumnar spaces, which was not regular, was apparently needed to distribute the new columns of the peristyle, six on either side, into the space predetermined by the earlier structures.\textsuperscript{49} The Severan alterations to the courtyard also affected its interior arrangement. The large central basin around which the earlier peristyle had been arranged was demolished, and was replaced by two smaller basins at either end of the extended area. The large octagonal structure presently in the centre of the peristyle may also have been added at this time.\textsuperscript{50} Statues dedicated in 201 to the head Vestal Virgin Numisia Maximilla and in 209 to Terentia Flavola were also set up within the courtyard.\textsuperscript{51} These were the two Vestals who performed the sacrifice with Julia Domna at the Secular Games.\textsuperscript{52}

The date of the repair to the Atrium Vestae is not recorded in any extant inscription, but the dedication of the statue to Numisia Maximilla in 201 provides a \textit{terminus post quem}. Like the Aedes Vestae the renovation of the fire-damaged Atrium would have been a priority, and was at least completed in time for the Secular Games. Julia Domna may also have been the patroness of the rebuilding and redecoration of the residence of the Vestals.
The Temple of Vespasian

The Temple of Vespasian was located at the foot of the Capitoline next to the Temple of Concord. It was begun by Titus and completed by Domitian in 94, when it was dedicated to both the deified Vespasian and Titus. The plan was prostyle hexastyle, 22 m. wide and 33 m. deep. Because of the limited space of the site, the front steps were set back between the columns of the facade and the rear of the temple was built up to the substructures of the Tabularium. The concrete podium of the temple, and three Corinthian columns supporting the entablature of the north-east corner, are now extant. The entablature is carved with a frieze decorated with sacrificial implements and bucrania. Another extensive section of the entablature from the back of the lateral side of the temple is also preserved in the substructures of the Tabularium.

The restoration of the Temple of Vespasian by Severus is known from an inscription, no longer extant but copied in the late eighth or early ninth century by the Einsiedeln Pilgrim when the front of the temple was apparently standing. Today only the final word of the inscription, RESTITUER(unt), can be seen on the piece of architrave still extant, supported by the remaining three corner columns. The text of the whole inscription as copied by the Einsiedeln Pilgrim reads:

DIVO VESPASIANO AUGUSTO S P Q R / IMP CAESS SEVERUS ET ANTONINUS PII FELIC AUGG RESTITUERUNT  CIL 6.938 = ILS 255

The date of the restoration of the Temple of Vespasian is not indicated on the inscription. It was some time after 198 when Caracalla was made joint Augustus. The repair was possibly undertaken around the same time that attention was paid to this end of
the Forum with the construction of the arch, and was probably completed in time for the Secular Games of 204. Neither is the reason for the Severan restoration of the Temple of Vespasian recorded in the inscription. There is no record that the great fire of 191/192 affected this temple, or any of the buildings in its immediate vicinity. The damage to the Forum caused by this fire seems to have been limited to the area of the Aedes Vestae, from where it spread to the Palatine. Perhaps the restoration of the Temple of Vespasian was necessitated by an isolated fire or because it had fallen into disrepair through the passage of time.

Since little of the temple survives, it is difficult to determine the extent of the Severan restoration. The style and workmanship of the extant column capitals and the sculpted frieze of the entablature found in the substructures of the Tabularium have been identified as being typical of the late Flavian period, indicating that they were from the original structure and that the temple was not completely rebuilt. The restoration of the temple may have consisted only of the repair of certain features, or simply of re-decoration which no longer survives.

The extant portion of the architrave at the front corner of the temple presents an interesting problem regarding the extent of the Severan restructuring of the temple. R. Nardi has observed that there is no indication on this portion of the architrave in the form of abrasion or holes for the letters of a previous inscription over which the Severan lettering was placed. This would indicate that either the architrave of the Flavian temple was left blank with no inscription or decoration, the free space being filled in only later with the name of Severus and that of his son, or, as Nardi proposes, the Severan
restoration entailed an entire replacement and rearrangement of the architrave. It may be argued, however, that not enough of the architrave survives to confirm the truth of Nardi's conclusion that there was no original inscription. The Flavian inscription may have been much shorter, concluding farther to the left and leaving no trace on the extant portion.

The position of the Severan text on the architrave, however, is instructive. The original Flavian dedication would likely have been centred within the space of the architrave. If the Severan inscription was then simply added below this inscription, the letters would have been on a much smaller scale, and placed at a lower level. The extant Severan lettering, however, is centred in the bottom half of the architrave. This would seem to indicate that it was the second line of a full inscription set out at this time. Therefore the first line of the inscription which read DIVO VESPASIANO AUGUSTO S P Q R, according to the text copied by the Einsiedeln Pilgrim, would not have been the original inscription, but was inscribed on the architrave at the same time as the second line IMPP CAESS SEVERUS ET ANTONINUS PII FELIC AUGG RESTITUER.

The fact that both lines of the inscription were contemporary demonstrates that either the Flavian inscription was erased, leaving no trace on the extant portion, and a new spacing was set out in order to accommodate the Severan addition, or an entirely new architrave was required in the renovation on which the new inscription was carved. The presence of the carved frieze and column capitals from the Flavian period also shows that if there was some reconstruction involved during the Severan period the original architectural elements were reused.
Whatever the extent of the restoration, Severus proudly proclaimed his attention to the temple with his inscription. By adding his name and that of his son and co-emperor on the Temple of Vespasian he was able in a sense to create another Severan monument at this end of the Forum. The repair of this temple also gave Severus the opportunity to connect his name to that of Vespasian and the Flavian dynasty, to match the rebuilding of the Templum Pacis destroyed by the Commodan fire. Like Severus, Vespasian had come to power through civil war, and after restoring order to the Empire was able to establish a dynasty. An association with the success of this emperor was important for the demonstration of the stability of Severus' position. The association of father and son in the rededication of this temple, originally dedicated to both Vespasian and Titus, also reflected the joint rule of Severus and his son and the establishment of a dynasty.

The Triumphal Arch

His restoration of the Aedes Vestae and the Temple of Vespasian demonstrates Severus' interest in preserving the monuments of the venerated Forum Romanum. This renewed activity in the Forum under Severus also included the addition of a new monument, a triumphal arch dedicated in 203 by the Senate to Severus and his two sons. The erection of this triumphal arch marked an important return to building in the Forum area. The last major imperial construction in the Forum had been the Temple of Antoninus and Faustina in 141. The monument was also the first triumphal arch to be set up in the Forum in almost two centuries since that of Tiberius and Germanicus was erected in 16 A.D. on the Vicus Iugarius. The arch would be the culmination of Severus' activity in the Forum area and the focal point of his attempt to make his own mark on this
important area of the city. It is now one of the best preserved and most studied monuments of Severus’ reign.\footnote{61}

The arch, over 23 m. high and 25 m. wide, consists of a large central bay and two smaller lateral arches.\footnote{62} The openings are flanked by four free standing columns resting on tall pedestals, creating a tetrastyle facade on both sides. These columns carry a deep projecting cornice, above which is the attic on which the dedicatory inscription was inscribed. On top of the monument there was originally bronze statuary, featured on the reverses of coins struck by Severus and Caracalla depicting the arch (Plate I.3).\footnote{63} The attic statuary, as shown on the coins, consists of a central group of a figure in a six-horse chariot flanked by two standing figures and two equestrian statues facing outwards on either side.\footnote{64} The coins also show a stylised motif of crossed lines along the base of the attic. It has been suggested that these hatched lines are meant to represent a balustrade of some sort, and recent examination of the arch undertaken during restoration seems to confirm this identification. A series of holes has been discovered on the base of the attic, which probably held the posts of this metal balustrade.\footnote{65}

Relief sculpture decorates the arch throughout.\footnote{66} The plinths of the columns are carved with large scale figures of Roman soldiers leading enemy captives. The four spandrels contain depictions of Victories bearing trophies and below these are personifications of the Seasons. The sculpture on the keystone of the central arch of both facades is a fully armoured figure of Mars. Personifications of river gods are sculpted in the spandrels of the lateral arches. The figures on the keystones of the side arches have unfortunately suffered heavy damage and are therefore difficult to identify with certainty.
The best preserved is that of the north-western arch, which has been identified as Hercules by the nude muscular torso and what appears to be a lion skin. Hercules was one of the *di patrii* of the Severan family and his appearance on the arch would not be unexpected. It is possible that Liber, the other patron god of Severus, may also have appeared, perhaps on the south-eastern keystone, which is now missing, although Jupiter or a Genius have also been suggested in this position. The other two keystones, on the north-east and south-west, are carved with draped female figures also now badly preserved. The goddess Virtus for the north-eastern and Minerva, Juno, or Fortuna for the south-western keystone have been suggested because of their association with Severan iconography.

The simple style of the ornamental decoration of the arch derives inspiration mainly from the "Augustan revival." The decoration of the arch obviously pertains to the triumphal theme, but there are also references to the overall Severan dynastic propaganda. The seasons on the lateral spandrels reflect the *Felicitas Temporum* ushered in by the Severan dynasty, while the river gods may represent fertility. The whole ensemble signifies the prosperity ensured for the Roman state by the military victories of the emperor. This iconography follows the themes and political references already established in previous triumphal arches and in this aspect the arch of Severus can be said to be a traditional monument.

However, the four unusual panel scenes placed above the lateral openings, two on each facade, are unique in triumphal arch decoration. These panels, depicting the events of the Parthian campaigns for which the arch was dedicated, reject the large scale figures of the Grand Tradition, and instead employ many smaller figures in multiple registers,
similar to the panoramic views seen on the columns of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius. It has been suggested that these reliefs may have been based on paintings carried in the triumphal procession, and which Severus is said to have ordered to be sent from the east and displayed to the public.\(^7^3\) The panels represent a great innovation in Roman triumphal arches by their depiction of a non-allegorical, explicitly historical narrative of the military events leading to the triumph.\(^7^4\) The intent was not merely documentary, however, but also to show the virtus of the emperor in action. This was achieved in the composition by isolating the most important scenes and emphasizing the emperor by the use of oblique and vertical lines and portraying him frontally.\(^7^5\)

The panels depict Severus’ wars in the east carried out during the years 194-195 and 197-199, but the historicity of the battle scenes and their identification have been the subject of some controversy and discussion because of the poor state of preservation of the reliefs themselves and the sometimes sketchy accounts of the wars found in the ancient sources.\(^7^6\) It is generally agreed among scholars, however, that the panel on the left on the Forum side depicts the conquest of Nisibis while that on the right the capture of Edessa, both of which took place during the first campaign.\(^7^7\) The reliefs on the side facing the Capitol are more problematic. Brilliant identifies the left panel as the capture of both Babylon and Seleucia, conflated into a single topographical locale, and the right panel as the conquest of Ctesiphon.\(^7^8\) According to Z. Rubin, however, details of the left panel such as the presence of siege-craft and fleeing barbarians seem to agree rather with the siege of Ctesiphon than Babylon or Seleucia, which were abandoned before they were taken.\(^7^9\) Rubin would identify then the right panel on the Capitol side as the siege of
Hatra, the final event of the Second Parthian War. The depiction of the events of Hatra on the arch has often been rejected because Severus was unsuccessful in this siege and had to withdraw before the city was taken. Rubin argues, however, that although Severus was unable to capture the city, he did achieve some sort of success in the form of an agreement, perhaps even the eventual imposition of a Roman garrison, which is not recorded in the sources. According to Rubin's proposal Hatra is therefore represented on the arch as a victory, and the Parthian campaign is portrayed as a complete success.\(^{80}\)

Below each of the four great relief panels on the facades of the arch is a narrow band containing a figured frieze in high relief of a procession moving from left to right. The first section consists of wagons laden with spoils, ending with a seated female figure, identified as Parthia. A parade of Roman soldiers and captives makes up the second half of the procession, concluding with the figure of Roma. This relief appears to represent a triumph, although there is some question as to whether Severus actually celebrated one for his Parthian victory in 202. The *Historia Augusta* reports that when the senate offered him a triumph, Severus declined it because his gout did not allow him to stand in the chariot; and in his stead, Caracalla held a triumph over Judea.\(^{81}\) Many scholars accept this account of Severus' refusal at face value, while also rejecting the suggestion that Caracalla held a triumph in his place.\(^{82}\) S. De Maria therefore suggests that this relief on the arch depicts the *adventus* of Severus rather than the triumph, noting that some details that are usually included in a triumphal procession are missing.\(^{83}\)

Victory celebrations, however, certainly took place in 202. Dio states that there were spectacles in honour of Severus' return, the marriage of Caracalla and Plautilla, the
completion of his ten years of power, and his victories. Herodian reports that the emperor was received in triumph (νικηφόρος) by the Roman people with great acclamations and ceremony. Religious sacrifices and holidays were instituted and special victory games held. While a triumphal procession is not recorded in detail in either of these accounts, it was very likely part of the victory celebrations. The processional relief on the arch therefore alludes to the triumph held by Severus in 202, as do other elements of the decoration such as the Parthian prisoners and the bronze statuary of Severus in his triumphal chariot placed on the attic.

Another important aspect of the decoration of the arch is the large inscription, originally in gilded bronze letters set in channels cut into the marble:

IMP CAES LUCIO SEPTIMIO M FIL SEVERO PIO PERTINACI AUG PATRI PATRIAEPARTHICOPARTHICO ARABICO ET / PARTHICO ADIABENICO PONTIFIC MAXIMO TRIBUNIC POTESEXIIMP XI COS III PROCOS ET / IMP CAES M AURELIO L FIL ANTONINO AUG PIO FELICI TRIBUNIC POTESEXI COS PROCOS P P / OPTIMIS FORTISSIMISQUE PRINCIPIBUS / OB REM PUBLICAM RESTITUTAM IMPERIUMQUE POPULI ROMANI PROPAGATUM / INSIGNIBUS VIRTUTIBUS EORUM DOMI FORISQUE S P Q R

CIL 6.1033 = ILS 425

"To the emperor Lucius Septimius Severus, son of Marcus, Pius Pertinax Augustus, Pater Patriae, Parthicus Arabicus and Parthicus Adiabenicus, Pontifex Maximus, holding tribunician power for the eleventh year, Imperator for the eleventh time, consul for the third time, proconsul, and to the emperor Caesar
Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, son of Lucius, Augustus Pius Felix, holding tribunician power for the sixth time, consul, proconsul, Pater Patriae, the best and bravest rulers because the state was restored and the Empire of the Roman people was expanded by their outstanding virtues at home and abroad, the Senate and People of Rome (dedicate this).”

This extensive use of text spread across the entire width of the attic on both facades is new for triumphal arches, where previously the inscriptions were restricted to the central plaque of the attic. The Severan arch therefore serves as a billboard proudly announcing the military victory of the emperor.

The fourth line of the inscription originally contained the name and titles of Geta, probably in the form of ET / P SEPTIMIO L FIL GETAE NOBILISS CAESARI, which were replaced after his death and damnatio memoriae. The XI tribunician power of Severus and VI of Caracalla indicate that the arch was dedicated between the tenth of December 202 and the ninth of December 203. In the tradition of triumphal arches in the city of Rome it was commissioned by the Senate. The title Parthicus Arabicus Parthicus Adiabenicus is that conferred in 195 and the inscription therefore retains the wording of the original vote of the arch by the Senate after the First Parthian War. The dynastic associations of this inscription are evident, as both of Severus’ sons are also included in the honours. The arch was dedicated on behalf of their virtutes at home and abroad, which had brought about the restoration of the state and an increase of Empire. Severus had brought about stability by victory over his rivals in the civil war and Rome’s external enemies.
The Severan arch was the first triumphal arch to be set up in the Forum since the time of Augustus and Tiberius, almost two centuries before. The location of the arch within the Forum is significant. Other emperors had chosen to avoid the already crowded Forum and to erect their arches in other locations of the city, often connected to their own forum complexes or other constructions. The erection of this triumphal arch marked an important return to the Forum area, and underlines Severus' interest in the historic centre of the city and its Roman traditions. The restoration of the Roman Forum was also a notable part of Severus' building programme, and this message of renewal was declared by the prominent placement of his triumphal arch within the Forum, reinforced by the expression RES PUBLICA RESTITUTA in the inscription on the attic. The theme of restoration expressed in this inscription is one that runs throughout Severus' policy, and one that plays an important role in his building programme, as the restoration of the state extended to the physical remains of the city of Rome itself.

The Severan arch was constructed in a dominating position in the north-western corner of the Forum, just before the rise of the Capitoline hill. It was placed within the area of the ancient Comitium in front of the temple of Concord, and partially hid the facade of the temple. The choice of this site was probably somewhat dictated by necessity, since by the beginning of the third century A.D. the Forum was already crowded with monuments. The Comitium, which had undergone many changes since its Republican origins, appears to have remained an open paved area of some size into the later Empire, and was probably the only free space available. Although the construction of the arch encroached on the area of the Comitium, the site still retained its
topographical significance as it is mentioned in the *Acta* of the Severan Secular Games. The meeting of the senate in 203, at which the *quindecimviri* announced that the games would be held, is recorded as taking place *in Comitio in Curia Julia*.97

It was thought by some scholars in the past that the site where the Severan arch was constructed was previously occupied by an earlier triumphal arch, possibly of Marcus Aurelius. The presence of an earlier structure was based on the belief that the reliefs of the Anaglypha Traiani of the second century A.D. depicted both the north and south sides of the Forum. In this panoramic view the arch placed behind the Rostra on the *adlocutio* relief would be in the position later occupied by the Severan arch.98 This interpretation of the monuments, however, has been convincingly refuted by M. Hammond, who points out many faults in the identification of the reliefs as opposite sides of the Forum.99 More recently, Torelli has also noted that the facade of the Basilica Aemilia is different from the building identified as such on the relief, and points out that the same order of fig tree and Marsyas on both reliefs, and the repetition of the basilica arcades, favours the view that the reliefs depict a continuous view of only the south side of the Forum.100 The *adlocutio* scene of the Anaglypha would then depict the Rostra located in front of the temple of Divus Julius and the arch behind it would be that of Augustus. There is no evidence, therefore, to indicate that the site where the arch of Severus was constructed was previously occupied by any other arch.101

Coarelli, however, in his recent re-examination of the topography of the Forum suggests that the Ficus Ruminalis and the statue of Marsyas, venerable monuments dating back to the time of the Republic, were displaced at the time of the erection of the arch in
the Comitium area. He identifies the fig tree depicted on the Anaglypha Traiani as the Ficus Ruminalis or Navia, which was known to have been located in the Comitium. On the basis of this identification he also locates in this same area the statue of Marsyas, depicted in connection with this tree on the reliefs. Since the Anaglypha reliefs date to the second century A.D., Coarelli suggests that the Ficus Ruminalis and the Marsyas statue stood in the Comitium at least until this time and were only removed, and possibly eliminated, when the arch of Severus was erected in their location. As further evidence for this Coarelli points to the changed position of the reliefs of the Anaglypha Traiani, which he considers, following a proposal by Torelli, to have been originally used as an enclosure in the Comitium for the sacred area containing the fig tree and the statue of Marsyas. He suggests that when the arch was constructed the reliefs were moved to the location between the column of Phocas and the Rostra.

Coarelli’s proposal for the location of these Republican monuments in the area occupied later by the Severan arch is by no means conclusive. His position for the Marsyas statue depends on the interpretation of the fig tree represented on the Anaglypha as the Ficus Ruminalis of the Comitium. The tree, however, is more often identified as the Ficus which, together with an olive tree and a grapevine, was located in medio foro at the Lacus Curtius. Since the literary sources indicate that the Marsyas statue was connected to the Rostra, many scholars would therefore place it not in the area of the Comitium, but in front of the Rostra, near the Lacus Curtius in the central area of the Forum. The proposal that the reliefs of the Anaglypha were originally an enclosure for the Ficus Ruminalis and the Marsyas statue is also questionable. The original use and
location of these reliefs, and the date of and the reason for their repositioning remains enigmatic.\textsuperscript{108}

It is also unlikely that Severus, who in his restorations of the Forum appears to have wanted to tie himself to Roman traditions, would have removed these venerable objects.\textsuperscript{109} The Marsyas statue and the fig tree were symbols of \textit{libertas}, especially of the plebs, and remembered as the site of the earliest administration of justice.\textsuperscript{110} The continued significance of these monuments into the Empire is attested by their appearance on the Anaglypha Traiani.\textsuperscript{111} The implication of Severus' destruction of these monuments for the placement of a triumphal arch would have had a negative effect on his effort to establish a stable rule, especially considering their plebeian associations.\textsuperscript{112} It seems likely that the fig tree and Marsyas statue were located in a different area altogether, and continued to exist into the Severan period.\textsuperscript{113}

While the placement of the arch in the north-west corner of the Forum was probably dictated for the most part by necessity, this location gave convenient opportunities for associations with other monuments in the Forum area. The arch of Severus was topographically associated with the earlier triumphal arches erected in the Forum. The Arch of Augustus, which had also been erected in honour of a Parthian victory, stood on the south side of the Temple of Divus Julius, diagonally across the Forum pavement.\textsuperscript{114} The Porticus of Gaius and Lucius, dedicated to Augustus' adoptive sons, who had similarly been instrumental in the success of eastern campaigns, was located directly opposite the Severan arch along the Via Sacra.\textsuperscript{115} Across the Rostra, in the other corner of the Forum, was the triumphal arch of Tiberius.\textsuperscript{116} The Severan arch
was therefore tied to the Augustan tradition by its placement as a counterpoint to these earlier Imperial monuments. A connection between the exploits of Severus and those of Augustus was further reinforced by the inscription on the Severan arch, which refers to the preservation of the state, also accomplished by Augustus, and the extension of Empire, alluding to the Parthian victories of Augustus as well as Tiberius’ victory over the Germans.117

An inscription copied by the Einsiedeln Pilgrim also records the existence of a monument of Marcus Aurelius located nearby on the Capitoline. This monument may have been an arch straddling the Clivus Argentarius, to which the relief panels now in the Palazzo dei Conservatori may have belonged. The evidence for such an arch is circumstantial and its existence has been disputed. The inscription of the Einsiedeln Pilgrim and the provenance of the panel reliefs in the area, however, seem to indicate that there was a monument or monuments of Marcus Aurelius in the immediate area to which Severus was able to make a connection.118

The north-west corner of the Forum where the Severan arch was positioned also had associations with many of the venerable places of the Republic, such as the Lapis Niger.119 The placement of the arch within the Comitium and its proximity to the Curia was perhaps an attempt at reconciliation with the senate.120 This site was also significant for the promotion of Severus’ divine election. Both Herodian and Dio report a dream of Severus in which Pertinax, riding along the Via Sacra, was thrown from his horse at the Comitium, at which point the horse allowed Severus to mount and carried him to the centre of the Forum where he was shown to the people.121 This omen was commemorated
by the erection of a large equestrian statue in the middle of the Forum at the spot where Severus was carried. The arch placed in the Comitium area, marking the site where the exchange was made, commemorated the fulfilment of this dream, and was therefore also thematically connected to the Severan equestrian statue.\textsuperscript{122}

The triumphal arch was also closely tied to the structures immediately surrounding it. Its position partially in front of the Temple of Concord visually connected it to this shrine, serving in a sense as a monumental entrance. The theme of Concordia was prominent in Severus' political and dynastic policy, which sought to highlight the unity of the imperial family and the harmony of the re-established \textit{respublica}. The arch was also situated very close to the Rostra, a circumstance that required some changes to this structure, including the replacement of some of its marble ornament.\textsuperscript{123} There is evidence that as part of the restructuring of the Rostra, the arch was actually drawn into the physical space of the Rostra by an enclosing wall.\textsuperscript{124} A physical and symbolic relationship was therefore established between this new triumphal monument and the Rostra, the prestigious site of the commemoration of earlier victories.\textsuperscript{125} The Umbilicus, constructed by Severus to signify the importance of the capital city of Rome and his own attention to it, was also closely tied to the Rostra and the new arch. By its position, therefore, the Severan monument could be associated with the established traditions of the Forum.\textsuperscript{126}

One of the elements of the topographical significance of the arch that has not been sufficiently recognized was its role within the ceremonial of the Forum area. Fundamental to this is an understanding of the means of access through the central arch. Stairs are still
preserved within the two side bays, indicating that they were only accessible to pedestrian traffic. Although they are no longer present, it has been generally thought that the central space was also approached by stairs, and that the arch was therefore an isolated monument not traversed by a roadway. This was in part based upon the belief that the Via Sacra did not run along this side of the Forum, but branched at the Regia to pass before the Aedes Vestae through the arch of Augustus and then along the Basilica Julia. Coarelli, however, has convincingly shown, from a reanalysis of the ancient sources and the topography of the Forum, that the Via Sacra and the triumphal route actually passed along the northern side of the Forum in front of the Temple of Antoninus and Faustina and the Basilica Aemilia and therefore led toward the Severan monument.

The roadway which passed through the arch in fact existed along this side of the Forum until the turn of this century, when it was unfortunately removed during the excavations of 1899/1900 by Boni. He considered it to be medieval, but recent re-analysis has determined that the construction of the road was contextual with the Forum pavement and therefore ancient. Although the Severan arch is evidently located on the route of the Via Sacra it has still been suggested that at the time of its construction access through the central passageway was by means of a staircase, and that the roadway under it was not constructed until the late Empire. No evidence, however, of this central staircase has ever been confirmed and there is no reason for supposing that the roadway is not contemporary with the arch itself.

The careful positioning and orientation of the arch in relation to other structures on this side of the Forum confirms that it was intended to be traversed by the Via Sacra.
For example, the close proximity of the arch to the Rostra and its placement at a slight angle seems to have been the result of practical considerations as well as a desire to create a visual association. This positioning was necessary in order to line up the arch with the Via Sacra which is directed obliquely to the south. The arch also follows in its orientation the Basilica Aemilia, the Temple of Divus Julius, and the Temple of Antoninus and Faustina, which were aligned along the Via Sacra. This careful positioning in order to line up the central span of the arch with the roadway of the Via Sacra would seem to indicate that it was intended as a gateway, and not a monument isolated from its surroundings. If the arch was intended to be an isolated monument it would more effectively have been placed farther to the north in a more open area, with a different orientation and not crowded next to the Rostra.

Further evidence that the access through the arch was by a roadway can be found in the Acta of the Severan Secular Games. The procession of the participants of the Carmen Saeculare which led from the Palatine to the Capitoline is recorded as proceeding per [via]m sacram forumque romanum arcum Seve(r) et Anton(i)ni Aug[g ....]. The text also indicates that this pompa included quadrigae, bigae, and asinarii who drove the carts in which the images of the gods were transported. During this ceremony, therefore, wheeled traffic passed through the arch (See Figure 19). Since the Severan arch was positioned on the path of this ceremonial route, it seems logical that it would be constructed with a roadway in order to allow the passage of such a procession. The monument was an integral part of the pageant, standing as a marker of the new dynasty which was promising the renewal of the state with the celebration of the
Games. It honoured the victories of the emperor that had established this period of peace and prosperity, and stood as a testament to the stability of the new regime. This branch of the Via Sacra has also been shown to be the triumphal route through the Forum, and the arch must therefore have been intended to be accessible to the triumphal chariot. It seems unlikely that Severus would block the traditional route of the ancient Via Sacra through the Forum by a staircase in the central span of his own triumphal arch.

The evidence demonstrates, therefore, that although staircases did give access through the side arches, the central passageway was traversed by the roadway of the Via Sacra. The arch of Severus was not an isolated monument, but was intended to be a prominent element along the processional route of ceremonies that took place within the Forum. It acted as a backdrop for the approach along the Via Sacra, and as a point of transition as the procession turned on its way to the Capitoline. The significance of the monument to posterity was ensured by its location on the triumphal route through the Forum.

The prominence of the arch within the topography of the area was further underscored by its position at an important point at the confluence of roads at this end of the Forum - the Vicus Iugarius from the Tiber, the Clivus Capitolinus from the Capitoline, the Clivus Argentarius from the Quirinal and the Argiletum on the north-east. As well as being the terminus of the Via Sacra, the arch of Severus therefore acted as a monumental entrance into the Forum from this direction, and as a sign-post of the Severan interest in the traditional centre of the city.
The Equestrian Statue

One of Severus’ tactics in legitimizing his claim to the throne was to emphasize occurrences of apparent divine favour that took place during the civil war and even when he was still a private citizen.\textsuperscript{141} According to Herodian the omens were also all listed in Severus’ autobiography and were commemorated in public monuments.\textsuperscript{142} A large equestrian statue located in the Forum Romanum was apparently one such monument set up to commemorate a prophetic dream of Severus. In the dream the emperor Pertinax, as he was riding along the Sacra Via, was shaken from his horse at the place where popular meetings used to take place in Republican days, that is, the Comitium. Pertinax’s horse then allowed Severus to mount and carried him to the middle of the Forum where it held him up high for everyone to see and honour. Herodian says that in his day there was still a huge ($\mu\epsilon\gamma\iota\sigma\tau\eta$) bronze statue on that spot.\textsuperscript{143}

The Forum had been the location of equestrian monuments traditionally decreed by the senate in honour of victorious generals during the Republican period.\textsuperscript{144} In the late Republic Marcus Antonius set up a statue of his brother Lucius on horseback near the Basilica Aemilia and, on the proposal of Cicero, Aemilius Lepidus was also honoured with an equestrian monument.\textsuperscript{145} Equestrian statues of Sulla, Pompey, and Caesar had also been placed before the Rostra and the senate honoured Octavian with an equestrian statue on the Rostra itself in 43 B.C.\textsuperscript{146} In the imperial period Domitian erected in the Forum Romanum a colossal equestrian statue in honour of his campaigns in Germany, which was probably dismantled after his damnatio.\textsuperscript{147} Equestrian monuments of later emperors, however, were set up in other areas of the city in connection with their own
complexes. This process had already begun with Augustus when a *quadriga* dedicated to him by the senate was set up in the his Forum.\(^{148}\) An equestrian statue of Trajan was located in the centre of the square in his own complex, the Forum Traiani.\(^{149}\) The original location of the equestrian monument of Marcus Aurelius is unknown, but it was possibly in the Lateran area of the Caelian Hill, where it was known to have been situated during the Middle Ages, before its transfer to the Capitoline in 1538.\(^{150}\)

The fortuitous location of Severus' dream in the Forum Romanum and the decision to commemorate it with a large equestrian statue provided another opportunity for Severus to demonstrate his interest in this traditional centre of the city.\(^{151}\) Severus' equestrian statue also had added significance as a commemoration of the divine favour that foretold his success both over his adversaries in the civil war and the barbarians in the east. The monument highlighted his destiny to be the restorer of the *res publica*.

Herodian states that the equestrian statue of Severus that he saw standing in the Forum was made of bronze and very large, but does not give any other details of the representation. There are many depictions of Severus on horseback that may be based upon the monument in the Forum. One type appears on an *aureus* of 198-200 depicting the emperor with billowing cape on the back of a rearing horse, brandishing a javelin at a Parthian soldier on his knees under the front feet of the horse (Plate II.1). Since Herodian does not make mention of a cowering enemy in his description of the monument, this representation probably does not depict the statue of Severus in the Forum.\(^{152}\)

On issues of 196-197 the emperor appears in military dress, with his right hand raised in address or in a sign of clemency, seated on a prancing horse (Plate II.2).\(^{153}\) In
some depictions the bridle of the horse is held by a foot soldier (Plate II.3). This adventus type is similar to and may have been influenced by the equestrian statue of Severus’ adopted father, Marcus Aurelius. If these coin issues of 196-197 are based on the equestrian statue in the Forum, as suggested by Babut, then the statue would have been one of the first monuments set up by Severus. An early date may be explained by the important need to legitimize his rule by commemorating this sign of divine sanction.

Another type on the coinage that may depict the equestrian statue in the Forum shows Severus on a pacing horse, holding an inverted spear in his right hand and a victory in his left (Plate II.4). This type first appears on aurei and sestertii of 201 with the legend OPTIMO PRINC(IP)I. This issue of Severus on horseback is very similar to the coinage of Trajan of 113, which has the same representation and legend and is thought to depict the statue of this emperor located in the centre of his Forum. Perhaps the equestrian monument of Trajan set up in the Forum of Trajan served as a model for the Severan statue. Trajan was one of the emperors Severus seems to have emulated, tracing his lineage back to this emperor in his titulature and setting up numerous inscriptions in the Forum Traiani. The significance of this image is indicated by the similar representation of Severus on issues of 206, 207 and 208, perhaps denoting the fact that it was based upon the equestrian monument. Unfortunately no external evidence exists which can help to confirm which one of these coin types, if any, represents the equestrian monument of Severus or the date of its erection, but a date of around 201 for the construction of the monument, based upon the first issue of the Trajanic type, would coincide with the period of Severus’ other building activity in the city of Rome.
The precise location of the Severan equestrian monument within the Forum can also not be determined with certainty, as no part of the actual statue or its inscription has been found. Some have suggested that the monument was located in the Comitium area near the Severan arch.\textsuperscript{161} Herodian’s report of the dream, however, seems to indicate that the statue was located not at the Comitium, but at that place in the middle of the Forum where Severus was carried by the horse and held up on high. This would be a more meaningful position, as it was the place where Severus was presented to the people, and more prominent since it would not be overshadowed by the triumphal arch. The position of the triumphal arch across the Forum in the Comitium area in fact complemented the equestrian statue, since it commemorated the moment in the dream when the prophetic horse exchanged Pertinax for Severus.

There are a few possible candidates for the site of the statue in the central area of the Forum. The location of the Equus Domitiani has been identified in a rectangular patching, 7.80 m. wide by 12.20 m. long, which covers a mass of concrete underneath, situated in the travertine pavement in the centre of the Forum (Figure 18, no. 6).\textsuperscript{162} Severus’ equestrian monument may have been placed in the area where Domitian’s statue had previously stood. Severus may have utilized the base of the Domitianic monument, or if the base had been dismantled when the statue was torn down, he may have set up an entirely new base on the same site.\textsuperscript{163} Either scenario would require, however, that Severus’ statue be of the same colossal size as that of Domitian. The Severan monument would also have had to have been removed at some point during antiquity and replaced by the patching in the Forum.
pavement. It is true that an Equus Severi is not mentioned among the monuments of the Forum in the Regionary Catalogues, which suggests that it may have been removed either by Diocletian during his reorganization of the Forum area, or later by Constantine. The absence of the Equus Severi from the list in the Regionary Catalogues, however, need not lead to the conclusion that it was no longer in existence, since there are other monuments that stood in the Forum in the fourth century that are not mentioned in the Catalogues of Regio VIII.\textsuperscript{164} Also, the fact that Severus seems to have enjoyed a great reputation during the later Empire makes the removal of his statue questionable.\textsuperscript{165}

Another possible identification for the site of the Severan equestrian monument is a quadrilateral structure located south-east of the Domitianic statue (Figure 18, no. 10). This structure, 6.0 m. long, 4.0 m. wide, and 0.70 m. high, rests directly on the present level of paving of the Forum. It now consists of a concrete core, but was probably originally revetted in marble. Fragments of a travertine moulding also survive. The shape, size, and position of the structure suggest that it was the pedestal for a statue.\textsuperscript{166} Soon after its discovery, this structure was identified as the equestrian statue of Constantine, known to have been set up in the Forum in 334 from an inscription copied by the Einsiedeln Pilgrim and listed in the Itinerary and in the Regionary Catalogues.\textsuperscript{167} As early as 1900, however, Babut, noting that both the Regionary Catalogues and the Einsiedeln Itinerary seem to indicate that the equestrian statue of Constantine was located in the northern area of the Forum near the Rostra and the Severan arch, suggested that this base in the centre of the Forum was rather that of the Equus Severi.\textsuperscript{168}
Unfortunately, definitive evidence, such as an inscription identifying this structure as the base for Severus' statue, is unavailable, but many of its features would fit the Severan monument. The construction technique of the base with reused pieces of worked marble in its conglomerate dates it to the later Empire, including the reign of Severus, for reused materials have been found in other Severan structures.\textsuperscript{169} The location of this concrete base would coincide with the site of Severus' statue as recorded by Herodian. It was placed in the very middle of the Forum along its long axis halfway between the temple of Divus Julius and the Rostra.\textsuperscript{170}

Severus' equestrian statue erected in the Forum Romanum, like his triumphal arch, marked an important return to this area. The new statue would have dominated the Forum area, providing a counterpoint to the arch. By its nature this type of monument had a military connotation, but the Severan statue also was associated with the divine sanction of his rule. Prominently positioned and of considerable size it thus served as the centre piece of the renewed Severan Forum.

**The Umbilicus Romae**

Situated in the north-west corner of the Forum Romanum next to the Arch of Severus and abutting the northern end of the Rostra is a small monument made up of three round tiers of brick-faced concrete. The lowest cylinder has a diameter of 4.60 m., the middle 4.0 m., and the top 2.90 m. Some mouldings around the bottom and middle ring are preserved \textit{in situ}. This structure has been identified with a monument called the Umbilicus listed in two late sources.\textsuperscript{171} In the Regionary Catalogues an Umbilicus Romae is listed in Regio VIII (Forum Romanum) between the Temple of Concord and the
Temples of Saturn and Vespasian. In the Itinerary of the Einsiedeln Pilgrim the Umbilicus is recorded in the vicinity of the church of SS. Sergio e Bacco, which was situated between the Temple of Concord and the arch of Severus before it was torn down in 1536. The position of this monument near the temple of Concord and the arch of Severus agrees with these descriptions and its round form corresponds well with a monument called an Umbilicus.

There are several indications that this monument is Severan in date. The construction technique is characteristic of the period, similar to Severan work identified in the Atrium Vestae and on the Palatine. The alterations to the paving around the Rostra necessitated by the construction of the arch of Severus also seem to be contextual with the construction of the Umbilicus. The level of pavement between the southern flank of the arch and the Rostra appears to have been raised at this time. The drums of the Umbilicus seem to have been intended to some extent to join the different levels of pavement that were created by the Severan construction. The highest drum of the Umbilicus stood out from the new Severan pavement, corresponding to the south-west corner of the arch, while the two lower rings functioned as a link between this new level and the Forum pavement that remained at its original Augustan elevation. In order to line up with the Via Sacra which passed under it, the arch of Severus was also placed at a slight angle to the Rostra. The position of the Umbilicus at the back of the Rostra next to the arch may have been intended to visually offset the angle that was therefore created in the space between these monuments.
The name Umbilicus Romae suggests that the structure consisted of some sort of
type of representation of an _omphalos_. Such monuments, marking the centre of a city, or
claiming to be the centre of the earth itself, existed in Greek and Hellenistic cities such as
Delphi, Athens, Megara, Antioch, and Byzantium. It is unclear what the Roman
monument looked like in its original form, since only the concrete core with its brick
facing survives. The stepped cone itself, covered in marble, may have served as a
representation of an _omphalos_. Alternatively the tiers may have been the stepped base for
an _omphalos_ carved in marble placed on the top drum. It is also possible that the round
tiered structure of the Umbilicus may have served as the base for a column or pillar.
Depictions of _omphaloi_ are sometimes shown surmounted by pillars. A column placed
on top of the Umbilicus would have balanced the column shaped Milliarum Aureum at
the other side of the Rostra.

The reconstruction of a monopteral shrine around the brick-faced core of the
Umbilicus has been proposed by M. Verzár, using the mouldings still _in situ_ on the
structure in combination with some curved fragments of travertine found in the vicinity,
one of which preserves the outline of a column. On the basis of the form of the travertine
mouldings, which she dates to the second century B.C., and the suggestion by Coarelli
that this was the site of the Mundus, Verzár and Coarelli propose that the brick nucleus of
the Umbilicus is a reconstruction of an earlier Republican monument damaged during the
construction of the arch.

Another basis for Coarelli’s identification of the Umbilicus as the site of the
Mundus is the presence of a cavity in the core of the brick structure revealed by
electromagnetic exploration. He sees evidence for a small doorway, facing west in the characteristic orientation of chthonic cults, giving access to a small cylindrical room under the Umbilicus, which he interprets as the sacred lower chamber of the Mundus.  

Recent examinations of the notes of the first excavators and the structure itself, however, have shown that this room was probably created in the 1800’s when a large hole was discovered in the base during the excavation, the top of which was reinforced, creating the impression of a room. This hole was probably created, as were others in the vicinity, when the area was used as a garden in the eleventh century.

If the Severan brick core was a reconstruction of a circular shrine of the second century B.C., one would also expect to find the remains of a round foundation on this site, but excavations in the area have actually identified a quadrangular foundation of an Augustan structure, originally faced with marble, onto which the Umbilicus was later built. The presence of this quadrangular Augustan structure below the Umbilicus would seem to preclude the previous existence of a round shrine at this site, and it would be unlikely that a place as sacred as the Mundus would have been moved.

The reconstruction of a monopteros from the available evidence is also problematic. The three fragments which Verzar uses to reconstruct the upper portion of the shrine are not in situ, and their original place of discovery is unknown. There are also problems with placing this circular shrine on the brick-faced foundation since the two lowest rings are only three quarters of a circle, being partly built onto the Augustan structure below. The only logical base for the monument would be the top drum which is completely circular. The diameter of this drum, however, is 2.90 m. while the
reconstructed diameter of the cornice of the shrine is 4.30 m.¹⁸⁸ Coarelli’s complex discussion based on the literary sources to prove the location of the Mundus and its relation to the Umbilicus has also not been widely accepted.¹⁸⁹ The proposal for a correlation of the Umbilicus and the Mundus and the presence of an earlier monopteral shrine on the site which was rebuilt because of damage during the construction of the Severan arch is therefore not convincing, and the Umbilicus may therefore be regarded as an original Severan construction.¹⁹⁰

The construction of a monument called the Umbilicus Romae in the Roman Forum, which served to mark both the centre of the city, and perhaps also to designate Rome itself as the centre of the world, would fit with Severus’ overall building programme. During his reign the city received the official designation urbs sacra, an indication of Rome’s complete transformation to the centre of Empire at this time.¹⁹¹ By setting up the Umbilicus in the Forum of Rome, Severus, a provincial himself, was declaring his interest in the city of Rome and its renewal under his building programme.¹⁹²

From its position next to the Rostra the Umbilicus balanced the Milliarium Aureum of Augustus, an emperor whom Severus sought to emulated with his building programme. Some of the fragments associated with the Milliarum have been dated to the third century, which may indicate that this monument was also restored by Severus.¹⁹³ It is possible that the Umbilicus may also have had significance as a type of victory monument associated with the civil wars that brought Severus to power. There is evidence for the existence of omphaloi in the eastern cities of Antioch and Byzantium.
These two cities were the centres of operations for Severus’ opponent Pescennius Niger, and after they had been taken were harshly treated by Severus, who even had the walls of Byzantium torn down. Perhaps the Umbilicus set up in the Forum was taken from one of these cities as a trophy, or a copy may have served as a symbol of his triumph over these cities and his rival. The Rostra was the site of other victory monuments, and the Umbilicus was associated with the nearby triumphal arch, which commemorated the victory over the Parthians, but also alluded to the Civil Wars.

The Forum Romanum was clearly an important component of the Severan building programme. Severus showed his respect for tradition, and underlined his claim as Restitutor Urbis, by restoring the historical centre of the city. By setting up new monuments of his own he was also able to exploit the historical and cultural significance of the area. Rather than constructing a new Forum complex to display these monuments, in returning to this venerable site he was able in some sense to transform the Forum, by combining its previous traditions with significant additions of his own, into a showpiece for his dynasty and a fitting venue for the important ceremonies of the reign.
Pertinax, however, had already been buried after his assassination by Julianus *quanto potuit honore* and his remains placed in the tomb of his wife’s grandfather (*HA Pertinax* 14.8-9). Divine honours had previously been voted to Pertinax when the senate met to sentence Julianus to death and name Severus emperor as he waited outside Rome at Interamna (Dio 73.17.4-5). When Commodus was later deified there is no record that an elaborate ceremony was carried out.

1. That this elaborate ceremony was viewed rather cynically by some senators can perhaps be seen in Dio’s comment (74.4.2) that the funeral was carried out in spite of the time that had elapsed since Pertinax’s death.

2. For the role of the Forum and the Rostra in imperial funerals, see Richardson (1992), 171, s.v. “Forum (Romanum or Magnum)” and Purcell (1995), 341. For imperial funerals in general, see Toynbee (1971), 56-61 and Wesch-Klein (1993), 19-38. The funerals of Julius Caesar (*Suetonius, Divus Julius* 84.7) and Augustus (*Suetonius, Augustus* 100) were held in the Forum. The specific site for the funerals of other emperors is not recorded in the sources, but they were possibly also held in the Forum Romanum. Since Trajan was buried in his column, it is possible, however, that his funeral took place in the his own Forum. The imperial successor traditionally appears to have delivered the funeral oration. Augustus was given two funeral eulogies, by Tiberius from the Rostra Divi Iulii and by Drusus from the Rostra at the north-west end of the Forum (*Suetonius, Augustus* 100). Gaius delivered the funeral speech for Tiberius (*Suetonius, Gaius* 15), Nero for Claudius (*Suetonius, Nero* 9). Both Lucius Verus and Marcus Aurelius gave eulogies for Antoninus Pius from the Rostra (*HA Marcus* 17.11).

3. Later the effigy was carried to the Campus Martius for the cremation and *consecratio*. For the funeral pyre erected in the Campus Martius for the *consecratio* and the provisions for the imperial cult of Pertinax, see infra 233-239.

4. The function of the ceremonial of imperial funerals was to assist a smooth take-over of power and to provide a continuity from one emperor to the next, as noted by MacCormack (1981), 318, n. 49. The element of divine election in imperial consecration and its dynastic aspect is also discussed by MacCormack (1981), 105 and 319, n. 55.

5. Dio 76.1.2.
7. Liberalities were conducted by Severus in 193 at his accession, in 196 for his return to Rome, in 202 for his second return to Rome, in 204 in honour of the Secular Games, in 205 for the joint consulship of Caracalla and Geta, and in 209 for the elevation of Geta. Caracalla claimed a share of the second to sixth, Geta the third to the sixth. See BMC V, cl, n. 2.

8. For example, coinage of 193 commemorating the first liberality depicts a togate Severus seated on a curule chair on a platform. A lictor stands behind him and the figure of Liberalitas stands in front. Before the platform stands a citizen with coins in the fold of his toga. **Aureus**: Severus on obverse, BMC V, 220, no. 352, pl. 36.5; RIC IV, 126, no. 279; Cohen, no. 33. **Sestertius**: Severus on obverse, BMC V, 118, no. 473, pl. 20.4; RIC IV, 180, no. 654; Cohen, no. 285. The platforms depicted have circles on the front which are probably meant to indicate the beaks of the ships on the Rostra. Similar representations are also seen on coins of Hadrian (BMC III, 472, *, pl. 88.8; Cohen no. 945) Antoninus Pius (BMC IV, 33, nos. 216-219, pl. 5.12-14), Marcus Aurelius (BMC IV, 477, no. 635, pl. 66.4; 479, no. 646, pl. 66.9), Commodus (BMC IV, 700, no. 74, pl. 92.17), and Pertinax (BMC V, 8, no. 40, pl. 2.6).

9. Abgarus’ loyalty was secured by allowing him to keep his capital of Edessa and a small part of the surrounding territory. See Birley (1988), 115 and Platnauer (1918), 115. The submission of Abgarus is depicted on Panel II of the arch.

10. The reception of Tiridates and the conferment of his crown by Nero is described as taking place in an elaborate ceremony at the Rostra by Dio at 63.3.4-6.1. Dio’s account may perhaps have been influenced by the Severan ceremony which took place in his day. The only record of the visit of Abgarus that survives in Dio’s history is found in a reference to the arrival of the retinue of the athlete Zoticus, a paramour of Elagabalus, which Dio reports was larger than that of Abgarus in the reign of Severus or that of Tiridates in the reign of Nero (79.16.2-3).

11. For the Palazzo Sacchetti relief, see Wace (1907), 263-270, Budde (1955), Franchi (1964), 33-34, Hornbostel (1971), 363-367, Hannestad (1986), 268-270, Koeppel (1986), 82-84, who also provides an extensive bibliography, and Kleiner (1992), 332-334. The provenance of this relief is unknown, but it was found built into the Palazzo Sacchetti from which it received its name. On the relief Severus is shown seated on a *sella curulis* on a podium surrounded by five figures, which have been identified as a soldier, Plautianus, Aemilius Papinianus, Caracalla and Geta. The emperor’s arm is outstretched in a gesture of presentation towards a group of eleven *togati*, probably senators, who approach from the left. In the background is a portico with four columns
or pilasters and a richly decorated architrave which is interrupted by a single niche between the first and second column from the left. On the left side of the scene is a triumphal arch, set somewhat obliquely, through which some of the senators emerge in order to give some perspective to the scene. In the spandrels of the triumphal arch are Victories - the one on the left carrying a trophy and that on the right a wreath. Budde (1955), 58-61 proposes that the podium was a temporary structure set up for the event and has identified the triumphal arch as that of Titus, which has similar Victories in the spandrels, and the portico in the background as the facade of the imperial buildings on the Palatine. It is also possible, however, that the podium is the Augustan Rostra, the portico the facade of the Basilica Aemilia, and the triumphal arch that of Augustus. Wace (1907), 263-270 proposed that the scene depicted the introduction of Caracalla as imperator destinatus in 197, but Budde (1955), 1-49 on the basis of the style of the relief and the portrait of Caracalla, which he identifies as the figure standing behind Severus, suggests that the presentation of Caracalla and Geta as joint consuls in 205 is represented. Kleiner (1992), 334 notes that the message of the relief is consistent with Severan policy, depicting the emperor as the founder of a new dynasty in the presence of his two sons who represent its continuity.

After the Caesarian and Augustan reorganization, emperors had added a few major monuments to this area. Tiberius erected an arch and began the Temple of Augustus which was finished by Caligula. Domitian completed the Temple of Vespasian begun by Titus and erected a large equestrian statue in the centre of the Forum, which was torn down after his damnatio. After Domitian, however, building in the Forum waned as emperors focused on the new imperial fora - the Forum Transitorium begun by Domitian and finished by Nerva and the Forum of Trajan. Hadrian’s Temple of Venus and Rome was constructed outside the Forum proper.

Fragments of numerous inscriptions referring to Severus and the imperial family have been found within the Forum area: CIL 6.36898, 36901, 36921, 36927, 36929, 36932, 36933. Of note among these is 36932, from a large marble tabula, found in the Forum in front of the Curia, dedicated to the imperial family by the Kalatores Pontificum et Flaminum, which may have been the base for a statue group of the domus divina, and 36930, seven fragments of a tabula which refers to the restoration of some unknown structure [...VE]TUST[ATE COLLAPS...] The editor of the CIL suggests that the schola of the Kalatores of the above dedication may have been restored.
The base of this statue with its inscription (CIL 6.36934) was found in the Forum along the Sacra Via between the temples of Antoninus and Faustina and Romulus. Hill (1989), 73 identifies this statue on coinage of the empress with the legend MATER CASTRORUM that shows Julia seated, holding a phoenix on a globe in her right hand and a sceptre in her left. BMC V, 164, no. 58, pl. 28.10.

Dio 76.2.4. On his deathbed Geta revealed to Severus the duplicity of Plautianus.

Herodian 1.14.3-6.

Ovid, Fast. 6.257-60; Plutarch, Numa 11.1; Festus 320L.

When the temple was actually constructed is unknown, but votive deposits dating back to c. 575 B.C. have been excavated. At least seven phases have been identified. It was burned in the Gallic sack of 390, in 241, and 14 B.C. and then again in the Neronian fire of 64 A.D. See Platner and Ashby (1929), 558-559, s.v. “Vesta, Aedes.” Lugli (1946), 202-207, (1975), 264, and Richardson (1992), 412-413, s.v. “Vesta, Aedes.”

Group of six: aureus, BMC V, 169, no. 97, pl. 29.6; dupondius or as, BMC V, 314, no. 796, pl. 47.11; RIC IV, 171, no. 585; Cohen nos. 239-244. Single sacrificing figure: aureus, BMC V, 169, no. 96; RIC IV, 171, no. 584. Mattingly suggests that the single figure may be Julia Domna. A billon medallion of Julia Domna dating to 207 has the bust of the empress on obverse, holding in her right hand a statuette of Concordia and cornucopia (an attribute of Concordia), Julia Domna with attendants sacrificing at the Aedes Vestae on reverse, Kent (1978) no. 384; RIC IV, 171, no. 587A; Cohen, no. 240. Although the precise chronology of Julia Domna’s coinage has been difficult to establish these issues definitely belong to Severus’ reign. Her title IULIA AUGUSTA indicates that they were minted after 195, but before Severus’ death in 211, when she was called IULIA PIA FELIX AUG. See Mattingly BMC V, cxxxi-cxxxii and Lusnia (1995), 120-121.

The coinage of Julia Domna with the legend LIBERAL AUG reveals that she distributed imperial largesses with money stamped with her own name, and she was also the first empress to be honoured with coins to FORTUNA REDUX. Her name is included on inscriptions to the imperial family all over the Empire, and she is depicted on reliefs with the domus divina, such as those adorning the Arch at Lepcis Magna or the Arch of the Argentarii at Rome. For the prominent position of Julia Domna and the importance of her public image to the regime, see Williams (1902), 259-305 and Lusnia (1995), 119-139.
Julia Domna’s coinage also reflects this idea of motherhood, with issues depicting Venus Genetrix, the mother of Aeneas and the Julian gens, Fecunditas with two children at her side, Cybele, the mother of the gods, and Juno Regina. See BMC V, lxxxvi. This trend of emphasizing the maternal aspects of the empress and the marital harmony of the imperial couple had been developing during the course of the second century as the emperor took on a more paternal role. See Fantham, et al. (1994), 352-359 and also Gagé (1934), 70.

See n. 14 supra.

Acta IV.9-10, Pighi (1965), 157. For the expanded role of Julia Domna in the Severan Secular Games, see Gagé (1934), 69 and Romanelli (1931), 323.

Early coin issues of Julia Domna from 193-196 depict Vesta seated holding the Palladium: BMC V, denarii, 28, nos. 56-57, pl. 6.17; sestertii, BMC V, 123, nos. 491-493, pl. 21.3; RIC IV, 165, no. 538, 171, no. 583; Cohen, nos. 220-225. Vesta is also depicted on the coinage of Plotina (BMC III, 106, no. 525, pl. 18.12; 107, no. 528, pl. 18.14), Sabina (BMC III, 356, nos. 914-918, pl. 65.3), Faustina (BMC IV, 8, no. 37, pl. 1.19; 10, no. 47, pl. 2.6), Faustina II (BMC IV, 408, 175, pl. 56.15; 544, no. 1004), Lucilla (BMC IV, 575, no. 1190-1193, pl. 77.5).

On these issues Vesta is depicted standing, veiled, holding a patera and sceptre. Denarii: BMC V, 169-70, nos. 98-101, pl. 29.8; RIC IV, 171, no. 587; Cohen, nos. 246-248. See also Hill (1964), 20, no. 262. According to Mattingly (BMC V, cxxii) the epithet Sancta is unusual in the Roman idiom and has an eastern flavour. The new epithets given to Vesta by the regime are perhaps indicative of a revival of the cult at this time, perhaps affected by the religious impetus current at the time for the cult of mother goddesses such as Cybele, as noted by Gagé (1934), 72.

There is also a type with seated Vesta holding sceptre with this same legend: denarius, BMC V, 168, no. 95, pl. 29.5; RIC IV, 171, no. 583; Cohen no. 245. Medallions of Lucilla and Crispina (Gnecchi [1912], ii.13 and 5) depict a sacrifice before the temple, but do not have the legend VESTA MATER.

Julia Domna’s role as patroness of the matronae can also be seen in her restoration of a building especially constructed by Sabina in the Forum of Trajan for the matronae, recorded in CIL 6.997 = ILS 324.

When the temple was first discovered in 1489 it was mainly intact, but in 1549 most of the structure was torn down for the lime kilns. Some fragments were discovered in excavations of
1883 and 1887. See Lanciani (1987), 224. The architecture was studied by Jordan (1886) and Auer (1888). Excavations were carried out at the turn of the century by Boni (1900), 159-191. An extensive reconstruction of the temple, incorporating the few original architectural fragments, was carried out under Mussolini. See Carettoni (1927).

29 Van Deman (1912), 422. Richardson (1992), 413.

30 The cornice, the coffers of the colonnade, and the entablature above the cella were carved from one single piece of marble block.

31 According to Pliny, *NH* 34.13, the roof of the temple was always of bronze, and the Severan rebuilding probably followed the established tradition.

32 The building history of the temple of Vesta is difficult to determine because of the problems inherent in artistic representation on coinage. The matter is further complicated by the possible existence of a second temple of Vesta on the Palatine constructed by Augustus, and the problems that arise in determining whether a certain coin or relief represents this temple of Vesta or the one in the Forum. The existence of this second temple on the Palatine, however, has been disputed by Degrassi (1966-67), 77-116. See also Richardson (1992), 412-413.

33 *The British Museum, Coins of the Roman Republic* I, 420, no. 3971, pl. 48.11. The order of the columns of this phase cannot be identified. Fuchs (1969), 15-17 suggests that the temple of Vesta may also be depicted on the earlier coinage of L. Rubrius Dossenus of 87/86 B.C.

34 Augustus probably rebuilt the temple in marble and in the Ionic order after the fire of 14 B.C., as represented on the pedestal relief from Sorrento, as well as on *dupondii* of 14 A.D., *BMC* I, 140, no. 142, pl. 25.10. Some scholars, however, have suggested that both of these representations show the Augustan temple on the Palatine. See Rizzo (1933) and Fuchs (1969), 45. The temple was rebuilt by Nero after the fire of 64 and also appears as Ionic on his coinage. *BMC* I, 213, nos. 101-106, pl. 40.10. Representations of the temple on the issues of Vespasian, however, show a Corinthian temple. Hill (1989), 23, no. 25. It is possible that the Neronian coinage depicts the temple in its projected form only, and that it was then completed as Corinthian.

35 Palchetti (1965), 311.

36 Platner and Ashby (1929), 557-559, s.v. “Vesta, Aedes.”

In the relief, now in the Uffizi Museum in Florence, the temple is shown with a similar podium to the Severan structure, but is often thought to depict an earlier phase of the building. Lugli (1946), 204-205, for example, suggests that this relief dates to the Julio-Claudian period and represents the Augustan phase of the temple on the basis of the Ionic volutes of the capitals. The capitals on the relief are not pure Ionic, however, but composite. The extensive use of the drill in the relief makes a late second or early third century date possible, as suggested by Stucchi (1958), 93. Perhaps this relief actually represents the Severan phase of the temple, with the error of composite capitals rather than Corinthian.

The legend of the obverses of these coins reads simply IULIA AUGUSTA, and therefore falls within the period after 195 and before 211. Mattingly (BMC V, cxxxi-cxxxv) has attempted to make further divisions within this broad range on the basis of the treatment of the portraiture and hairstyle, but some of these differences are slight. He dates the coinage depicting the temple to the period 207-209. Since the temple may have been repaired in time for the Secular Games of 204, perhaps an earlier date may be assigned to these issues. During the reign of Caracalla issues that can be dated to 214 depict the emperor sacrificing before the temple of Vesta. Sacrifice scenes at the temple of Vesta also appear on the regular coinage of Julia Domna as well as a great silver medallion, probably also from 214. Caracalla: aureus, BMC V, 450, nos. 101-2, pl. 70.5-6. Julia Domna: aureus, BMC V, 435, *, sestertius, BMC V, 471, *; RIC IV, 311, no. 594; Cohen, nos. 233 and 235, dupondius or as, BMC V, 471, no. 220, pl. 74.4; RIC IV, 313, no. 607; Cohen no. 234. For the medallion, see Gnechi (1912), i.45. Hill (1978), 59-60 proposes that these coins were issued in connection with the payment of vows for Caracalla’s health. Grant (1950), 123, suggests that they were anniversary issues for the bicentennial of the consecration of Augustus in 14 A.D. The Severan restoration may also have been related in some way to the Augustan date, considering the emulation of this emperor by Severus. It is also possible that these types were issued to celebrate the decennial of the restoration of the temple, which therefore occurred in 204.

Strong (1953), 151 notes that the decoration is closer to the Flavian imitation work of the second century and therefore from the early Severan period.

The Severan Acta of the games indicate that the procession of those participating in the Secular Hymn passed per [via]m sacram forumque romanum [arcum Sev]er[i] from the Palatine to the Capitoline (Va.73, Pighi [1965], 166). As was stated above the Vestals together with Julia
Domna played a prominent part in the ceremonies of these Games; so the restoration of the temple of Vesta would also be significant.

42 Perhaps the issues of Severus announcing his role as Restitutor of the city that depict Roma on the obverse holding the Palladium allude to this event. For example BMC V, 221, no. 358, pl. 36.11 (aureus).

43 Damage to the Atrium Vestae is recorded in Eusebius 2.174 (ed. Schoene 1866).


45 The history of the scholarly analysis of the Atrium Vestae is almost as complex as its building phases. After its excavation in 1883-84 Lanciani (1883), 480 and (1897), 40 and 226 attributed all of the surviving structure to the restoration at the time of Severus, but Jordan (1884), 88 soon modified this conclusion, dating the structure to the time of Hadrian from the presence of a few brick stamps and a Hadrianic aedicula located to the right of the entrance. Further investigations by Auer (1888) revealed that the Atrium was not of a single period. He identified three building phases, the first attributed to Nero, the second to Hadrian, and the third to Diocletian. After excavations in 1901-03 on the west wing, a study by Van Deman (1909a) based on a close analysis of methods of construction and the character of the materials, defined six phases of the building - a smaller Republican complex at a different orientation, then a rebuilding on a larger scale by Nero after the fire, followed by some Flavian alterations, another major enlargement and renovation on a grander scale under Hadrian and further building by Antoninus Pius and Severus. A re-examination of the brick stamps of the building by Bloch (1968), 67-85 revised Van Deman’s analysis. He showed that the Hadrianic and Antonine phases actually represent only one phase and that this major renovation belonged to the second half of the reign of Trajan. The Trajanic building is confirmed by coinage of the emperor that depicts the goddess Vesta holding palladium and sceptre, BMC III, 405, no. 280, pl. 15.20; 482, no. 414, pl. 17.12; holding patera and torch, no. 2, pl. 9.2. Bloch’s attribution of the main phase of the Atrium to Trajan is now accepted. For an overview of the building phases of the Atrium Vestae, see most recently Scott (1993), 138-142.

46 Van Deman (1909a), 43 dates this to the Severan period on the basis of the building method. Of the 220 brick stamps found in the Atrium only one has been identified as dating from the time
of Severus, (Bloch [1968], no. 432, [162b]), but in light of the fire damage there does not seem to be any other possibility than to attribute the western wing to Severus. See Bloch (1968), 85.

47. An extensive study of all the materials discovered in the Atrium Vestae is unfortunately lacking. Recent examinations have concentrated on the earlier Republican phases. A list of some of the materials appears in the early work of Middleton (1886a), 401-407, who dates most of the alterations to the time of Severus.

48. The wall that limited the earlier courtyard to the east was levelled at this time to allow for the extension. The remains of this wall can be seen in the plans from the excavation undertaken by Boni.

49. See Van Deman (1909a), 43. Schulze (cited in Jordan [1884], 37) suggests, however, that this increase between the columns was an architectural refinement for perspective.

50. Van Deman (1909a), 44 dates this structure to the Severan period and suggests that it was built in order to conceal the irregularity between the two sides of the courtyard. Lugli (1946), 209 suggests that it was added by Constantine on the basis of brick stamps found in the structure that date after Diocletian, but these may come from a later repair.

51. CIL 6.32411 = ILS 4925; CIL 6.32413 = ILS 4926. See also Coarelli (1980), 84.

52. Acta IV.13-14, Pighi (1965), 157-158. The fact that these are the earliest inscriptions among the statues of the Head Vestals set up along the sides of the courtyard seems to indicate that this practice may have begun at this time.

53. The building is listed as Templum Vespasiani et Titi in the Regionary Catalogues (Jordan-Hülser [1871-1907] II, 552; Nordh [1949], 84).

54. A large base, probably for the statues of the deified Vespasian and Titus, can also still be seen at the back of the cella.

55. The Pilgrim copied the full word restituerunt, but there is no room for the unt at the end of the architrave, which is complete at this point. For the Einsiedeln Pilgrim’s copy of this inscription, see Walser (1987), 37 and 94.

56. For a stylistic analysis of the sculptural remains of the Temple of Vespasian and the Flavian date, see Blankenhagen (1940), 60-62.

58. There is no physical evidence for the suggestion by Hülsen (1905), 91 that a lower band was united by a cornice to an upper band containing the original inscription to afford space for the Severan addition. The slab on which the inscription was placed is one piece.

59. The sparse remains of the Temple of Vespasian make any definite conclusions about the Severan restoration difficult. Perhaps a detailed analysis of all of the architectural elements may clarify the situation. The difference of 2.3 cm. in the height of the columns of the temple detected by Rockwell (1987-88), 55, which was compensated for by the insertion of a small slab of marble into the top of the shorter shaft in order to level the entablature, may perhaps be accounted for by a Severan reconstruction.

60. The temple would be viewed along the route of the Via Triumphalis which passed under the Severan arch and then proceeded along the Clivus Capitolinus on the way up to the Capitoline. The procession of the participants in the Carmen Saeculare also passed along this route during the Secular Games of 204. The Umbilicus and arch were also located at this end of the Forum.

61. The most comprehensive discussion to date of the Severan Arch is Brilliant (1967). Additional studies were also carried out in the 1980’s during the extensive restoration and cleaning of the arch undertaken by the Soprintendenza Archeologica di Roma. For the preliminary reports of this work, see Nardi (1982-84), 299-313, (1985), 41-55, and Masini et al. (1985), 34-40. The arch owes its preservation to its incorporation into later buildings. In 1199 Pope Innocent III gave the southern half of the arch to the church of SS. Sergio and Bacco, and the northern to a private family who turned it into a feudal stronghold. The arch was included in the route which was used for the triumphal procession of Charles V in 1536. The later fate of the arch was less glorious. The side passages were walled up and used as shops in the 1700’s, with the last occupant, in 1803, being a fruit seller. See Brilliant (1967), 253-264 and Lanciani (1897), 285.

62. The central arch is 12 m. high and 7 m. wide. The lateral bays are 7.80 m. high and 3 m. wide.

63. Severus: denarius, BMC V, 216, no. 320, pl. 35.5; RIC IV, 124, no. 259; Cohen, no. 104; as, BMC V, 342, *; RIC IV, 195, no. 764; Cohen no. 53. Caracalla: denarius, RIC IV, 226, no. 87A, 242, no. 212A; as, BMC V, 344, †; RIC IV, 280, no. 419; Cohen no. 15.

64. The figure in the chariot may be Severus and the flanking figures Geta and Caracalla. See Richardson (1992), 29, s.v. “Arcus Septimii Severi” and Brilliant (1993), 104.
For the recent investigations of the arch and this suggestion, see Nardi (1982-84), 303-304 and Masini, et al. (1985), 36-37. The balustrade was probably utilized during maintenance of the arch. This use seems to be confirmed by an internal staircase within the southern pier, which has exits to both this level of the attic and the roof of the arch. For the interior chambers and staircase, see Brilliant (1967), 63-71.

The most comprehensive study of the decoration of the arch and its meaning is by Brilliant (1967), 99-250.

See Brilliant (1967), 125-128.

For the identification of the keystones, see Brilliant (1967), 101-105 and 121-128.

The “Augustan revival” style developed in the Hadrianic period as a reaction against the florid decoration of the Flavians and continued to be used in the Severan period alongside the so-called “Flavial revival” adopted for some Severan public monuments. For the use of this style in the decoration of the arch in the Forum, see Strong (1953), 141 and Brilliant (1967), 83.

For an analysis of the themes represented by the decoration of the arch, see Brilliant (1967), 120-221 and (1993), 103-104.

The very traditional nature of the arch of Severus is noted by De Maria (1988), 180-181. The victories, river gods, and seasons seem to have been particularly influenced by the Trajanic Arch at Beneventum. Severus appears to have desired an association with Trajan and his Parthian victories. The Feriale Duranum I.14-16 records the tendentious coincidence of the date of Trajan’s accession with the fall of Ctesiphon and Caracalla’s elevation to Augustus. See Brilliant (1967), 99.

For a brief summary of these panels, see Koeppel (1990), 1-32. His discussion also includes a catalogue, with excellent photographs and schematic drawings of the panels.

Severus’ orders are recorded in Herodian 3.9. The HA (Severus 21.22; Caracalla 9.6) also reports that the exploits of Severus were displayed in a portico, believed by many to have been built by Caracalla. The suggestion by Turcan (1991), 301-302 that this portico was actually the arch seems unfounded, but the source for both of these monuments may have been the drawings sent back from the front. For a discussion of the possible artistic inspirations for the panels, see Brilliant (1968), 223-232. Picard (1962b), 7-14, noting a close affinity between the reliefs and
the report of Herodian, suggests that the source for both the master designer of the arch and the historian were these drawings ordered by the emperor, which Herodian saw either at Antioch or at Rome.

74. Fragments of relief sculpture assigned to Claudius' British Victory Arch on the Via Lata seem to depict scenes from the war. See Barrett (1991), 4-5. It is unclear, however, whether actual episodes from the battles are represented as on the Severan arch. Stucky (1986), 35-37 makes the interesting suggestion that Severus rejected the Grand Tradition style of representation used on previous arches and turned rather to the popular art tradition of historical narrative as seen on triumphal paintings in order to reinforce bonds with the simple soldier and to characterize himself as a soldier emperor.

75. For a discussion of the composition and style of the reliefs, see Brilliant (1967), 219-220, (1984), 111-112 and De Maria (1988), 182-183. Hamberg (1945), 145-148, by an analysis of the adlocutio scenes on the left eastern and right western panels, has detected differences in the technique and the composition, and concludes that there were two masters or at least workshops responsible for the carving of the panels, one of which was closer to Antonine works, while the other was less conservative. For a refutation of this analysis, see Franchi (1964), 30-32, who argues that there was one overall artistic vision.

76. First Parthian War: Dio 74.1.1-3.3; Herodian 3.5.1: HA Severus 9.9-11. Second Parthian War: Dio 74.9-13; Herodian 3.1-12; HA Severus 14.11 and 15.1-7. Our knowledge of the first campaign is especially incomplete as the HA makes only brief mention of it, and Herodian's account is confused. Turcan (1991), 306-308, suggests that the account in the HA may actually have been influenced by the panels on the arch themselves, since only successes are recounted and none of the difficulties of the campaigns, which contrasts sharply with the contemporary historians. The author of the HA, however, obviously used sources for the Life of Severus, and he probably just omitted the accounts of the first Parthian War.

77. See Brilliant (1967), 177-179; Hannestad (1986), 263; Koeppel (1990), 4-5. Franchi (1964), 27 suggests that the capture of Seleucia, which took place during the campaign of 197-199, is depicted on the second panel (also followed by De Maria [1988], 306), but the representation of the events of the first campaign on one side of the arch and the second war on the other seems to give more symmetry to the arch, as observed by Koeppel (1991), 7.
Brilliant (1967), 180-182. Hannestad (1986), 263, recognizes only the capture of Seleucia in this panel.

Rubin (1975), 427. The riding figure depicted on the left side of the panel may also be equated with the king, who fled during the siege. For the abandonment of Babylon and Seleucia, see Dio 75.9.4.

Rubin (1975), 426-427 and 441. See also Koeppel (1990), 6-7. The identification of the fourth panel as the siege of Hatra was first suggested by Bendinelli (1934), 227-232. For the possible submission of King Barsemius and installation of a Roman garrison at Hatra under Severus, see Birley (1988), 133.

HA Severus 16.6-7: inde in Syriam redit victor, et Parthicum deferentibus sibi patribus triumphum idcirco recusavit, quod consistere in curru affectus articulare morbo non posset. filio sane concessit, ut triumpharet; cui senatus Judaicum triumphum decreverat. idcirco quod in Syria res bene gestae fuerant a Severo.

See Platnauer (1918), 125, and Hasebroek (1921), 70-71. This section of the HA, which is the only reference to Severus’ refusal, is in fact rather garbled and should perhaps be treated with suspicion. Rubin (1980), 211-212, however, suggests that both statements are from Marius Maximus and proposes that Caracalla actually received a Jewish triumph, based upon some hints about the suppression of a Jewish and Samaritan rebellion in Palestine recorded as taking place in the fifth year of Severus’ reign, that is, 197, in Hieronymus’ Chronica, and in the first year in Michael Syrus and Bar-Hebraeus. Rubin would assign Severus’ XI imperial acclamation to this victory, and proposes that in 202, the year of Caracalla’s consulate, Severus allowed his son a triumph for a victory allegedly won under his auspices. The existence of this Jewish-Samaritan war and Severus’ intervention, if any, in events in Palestine is problematic. Michael Syrus and Bar-Hebraeus actually refer to an outbreak of fighting between Jews and Samaritans. See Birley (1988), 135 and 250, n. 12. Even if there was some sort of Roman victory, it still seems unlikely that Caracalla would have held a triumph without his father. Both of Severus’ sons were probably included in the celebrations for the Parthian victory.

Elements such as the bearers of the tabulae and fercula, and especially the triumphal chariot. See De Maria (1988), 184.
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84. 76.1.3. Xiphilinus' epitome seems to have preserved a fairly complete account of this section of Dio's original text.

85. 3.10.1-2. At 3.9.12 Herodian also refers to the commissioning of paintings by Severus, probably intended for the triumph, after the victory over the Parthians.

84. It seems likely that Severus' refusal of a triumph due to illness, being more noteworthy than holding a triumph, would have found its way into the account of his contemporary Dio, and been included in Xiphilinus' epitome.

87. See Brilliant (1967), 137 who suggests that the relief is a synoptic representation of the pompa triumphalis. See also Kleiner (1992), 331. Koeppel (1986), 85-86, no. 44, identifies a relief fragment in the Museo Nazionale as a Severan triumphal procession. Triumphal elements are also present on the private dedication of the Arch of the Argentarii. On the western side of the western pilaster of this gateway is a relief depicting Roman soldiers and barbarians, probably Parthian prisoners, taking part in the triumphal procession, a frieze depicting military arms, and then a relief depicting a group of animals led by a male figure, that has been interpreted as an allusion to war booty. See Franchi (1964), 14-15. Pallottino (1946), 92, however, sees this as an allusion to the activity of the negotiantes boarii. Further evidence of a Severan triumph can be found on the north-west and south-east panels on the attic of the arch at Lepcis Magna, where a procession with Severus in a triumphal chariot and prisoners is depicted. This scene is thought to be either a triumph held at Lepcis over the indigenous tribes or Severus' adventus at Ostia. Ghedini (1984), 69-74, however, suggests that this procession took place during the celebrations of 202, and proposes that the tower-like structure represented on the north-west panel, considered by others to be either a pharos at Lepcis or Ostia, is actually a trophy tower. Perhaps the visit of Abgarus to Rome during the reign of Severus recorded by Dio at 79.16.2-3 also took place during the triumphal celebrations of 202.

88. For example, the Arch of Titus at Rome or the Arch of Trajan at Beneventum.

89. For the billboard analogy of triumphal arches, see MacDonald (1986), 119.

90. This is A. Nibby's restoration, which is also accepted by Dessau, *ILS* 425, n. 3.

91. The title Parthicus Maximus came into use after 198.
Rubin (1980), 15 and 157, n. 118, suggests that because the arch was dedicated by the senate, who did not approve of the dynastic affiliation to the Antonines, this aspect has been somewhat played down. Although Caracalla is called Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, Severus is referred to not as the son of Divus Marcus, but simply L SEPTIMIUS M F SEVERUS. The lineage and titles recorded on this inscription are toned down in comparison with other excessive Severan examples, which may be due to the fact that this was a senatorial dedication.

The Arch of Titus is located on the slope of the Velia, and not in the area of the Forum proper.

De Maria (1988), 154-160 notes that in the second century A.D. honorary arches were more often used in connection with some urban project, often as propylae to closed porticoes of fora or temple complexes, as for example, the triumphal arch constructed as an entrance to Trajan’s Forum, or that erected on the Via Lata in connection with the temple of Divus Hadrianus.

The arch was probably also included on the Forma Urbis commemorating the restoration of the city. Rodriguez-Almeida (1981), 170-171, Tav. LX and (1993a), 106 identifies the arch on fragments no. 681 and 687. Only part of the inscription [ ]AR[ ]VERIA[ ] is preserved on fragment no. 687. Jordan suggested the reading AR[EA][SE]VERIA[NA]. See Caretonni, Colini, Cozza, and Gatti (1960), 158, Tav. XIII, LIX. Rodríguez-Almeida proposes to join this fragment with no. 681 which has part of an inscription reading [ ]VS/[ ]NVS at the top, a quadrangular monument with columns at the corners approached by steps, and below this part of an inscription ME[ ]. The joined inscription at the top would then read AR[C]VS/[SE]VERIANUS, which must be that in the Forum Romanum, and the inscription below restored to MENIA, referring to the Columna Maenia or Menia which is known to have stood near the arch. For objections to this identification, however, see Harris (1995), 370 in his review of the LTUR I, who notes that the Columna Maenia was located on the other side of the arch.

The Comitium originally consisted of a circular stone staircase built in the early third century B.C. replacing an even earlier assembly place of undetermined character. It seems to have already lost its political significance by the middle of the second century B.C. when it became too small for the voting by the tribes, an activity which was moved into the Forum itself. The Sullan construction of a larger Curia encroached into the area of the Comitium, which was completely buried, preserving only those monuments that could not be moved because of religio. Caesar’s transformation of the area, finished by Augustus, saw the removal of the Rostra and Graecostasis and a reorientation of the Curia. The remaining part of the Comitium became an
open space with only symbolic associations. See Coarelli (1977), 166-288 and (1985), 11-27. Hannestad (1986), 262 suggests that this area was freed because of damage caused by the fire during the reign of Commodus, but there is no evidence of restoration to the nearby Temple of Concord or the Curia and the fire damage to the Forum seems to have been restricted to the area of the Aedes Vestae.

97 *Acta* Ib.5, Pighi (1965), 140.

98 This view was first suggested by Henzen (1872), 274-281 and accepted by Platner and Ashby (1929), 454 in their discussion of the Plutei Traiani, *s.v.* “Rostra Augusti” and Lugli (1946), 162-163. Suggestions for the possible identification of this earlier arch were that of Drusus the Younger (Platner and Ashby [1929], 39, *s.v.* “Arcus Drusi”) or Marcus Aurelius (De Ruggiero [1913], 456-457).

99 Hammond (1953), 125-183. For example, the mouldings of the Rostra are different in both scenes and the facade of the building identified as the Curia does not match what is known of that building.

100 Torelli (1982), 92.

101 Brilliant (1967), 86 rightly points out that Severus would be unlikely to tear down an arch of Marcus Aurelius, with whom he wanted to establish dynastic ties. For the possible existence of an Arch of Marcus Aurelius on the Clivus Argentarius, see *infra*.

102 Coarelli (1985), 37-38, 87-123, and fig. 21.

103 Many of the Republican monuments that had stood in this area had already disappeared by the beginning of the third century A.D. For example, the construction of the Sullan Curia and its expansion into the Comitium saw the disappearance of the statues of Pythagoras and Alcibiades, located on either side of the old Curia Hostilia, along with many other monuments also on the south side of the piazza which were covered by pavement (Pliny *NH* 34.26). The statue of Attius Navius that stood in front of the senate house, along with its base, was burnt in the fire of 52 (Pliny *NH* 34.21).

104 Torelli (1982), 108.

105 Pliny, *NH* 15.78. See Hülsen (1905), 150, and Lugli (1946), 89-90. The olive and vine are not depicted on the relief, but perhaps this is only due to artistic shorthand. It is also equally probable
that the Marsyas statue was not near any fig tree at all, but that it was only depicted together with the Ficus Ruminalis as they were both associated with the theme of libertas. See infra.

106 Horace, Satires 1.6.119-120; Seneca, De Beneficiis 6.32.1. Later sources even indicate that it was on the Rostra (pseudo-Acron, ad Horatium, Satires 1.6.120). For a full list of the literary sources, coinage, and inscriptions relating to the Marsyas statue in the Forum, see Small (1982), 132-142. Small (1982), 77-83, Rawson (1987), 11 and Richardson (1992), 370-71, s.v. “Statua Marsyae” locate the Marsyas statue in the central area of the Forum. For the most recent archaeological research in the central area of the Forum, see Giuliani and Verduchi (1987), 95-103 and fig. 133, who suggest that the statue may have been placed in front of the Rostra near the Tribunal Praetorium and north of the Lacus Curtius. The exact position of the Marsyas statue, however, remains unresolved.

107 For objections to this identification, see Smith (1983), 228 who suggests that these reliefs would probably have dwarfed the statue of Marsyas, and Pollini (1983), 573 who notes that the finished ends of the reliefs makes their integration into an enclosing structure difficult to reconstruct.

108 Another suggestion for the original placement of the Anaglypha reliefs is at either end of the Rostra, although their height and size also make this questionable. See Hülsen (1905), 104, Lugli (1946), 164, and Richardson (1992), 292-293, s.v. “Plutei Traiani.” The recent examination of Giuliani and Verduchi (1987), 79-80, has determined that the removal of the reliefs from their original location to the position where they were discovered incorporated into the medieval Torre del Campanero, took place much later than the Severan period. The new foundations of the reliefs are at an elevation higher than the monuments of the Forum securely dated to the time of Diocletian, and therefore they appear to have been placed in this position after this period, probably not before the end of the fourth century A.D.

109 Another Republican monument, the Columna Maenia or Menia, also seems to have retained its original position after the construction of the arch. The column stood until the fourth century A.D. (Symmachus, Epist. 5.54.3).

110 Statues of Marsyas were also set up in the fora of Roman cities as a testament to their status as civitates liberae. (Servius, ad Aen. 3.20, 4.58; CIL 8.4219 = ILS 6849, 16417, 27771). A statue of Marsyas has been excavated in the Forum at Paestum. For a list of coins and inscriptions
referring to Marsyas from various parts of the Empire, see Small (1982), 133-142. For the significance of the statue as a symbol of libertas, see Small (1982), 82-92, Torelli (1982), 102 and Coarelli (1982), 93. The ficus Ruminalis was also connected with the concept of continuitas imperii. See Torelli (1982), 99.

111. They are possibly meant to signify here the plebeian liberation from foenus. See Torelli (1982), 105.

112. On his tenth anniversary of rule Severus presented ten gold pieces a head to the entire populace that received the grain dole as well as the praetorian guard (Dio 76.1.1). His desire to win the favour of the people is evident.

113. Torelli locates the Marsyas and fig tree in front of the Curia, but on the southern side of the Comitium. He suggests that they survived for a long time and were carefully preserved because of their significance. If the Ficus Ruminalis and the statue of Marsyas had been located in the position occupied by the arch, as Coarelli suggests, perhaps they were destroyed at some point before its construction by fire or some other natural disaster, or were removed for some other reason. Commodus is said to have set up before the Curia a statue of himself as an archer, which was replaced by one of Libertas after his death. (Herodian 1.14.9-15.1). Perhaps the Marsyas and fig tree were removed when Commodus' statue was set up in this area, an action which would be in line with his autocratic nature. It is interesting to note that the majority of examples of Marsyas appearing on the coinage of Roman cities come from the Severan period, indicating that the statue probably still stood in Rome at this period. See Small (1982), 82.

114. Erected in 19 B.C. to commemorate the return of the standards lost by Crassus, according to Schol.Veron., ad Virg. Aen. 7.606, it was located iuxta aedem Divi Iulii. Footings for a triple arch have been excavated on the south-west side of the Temple, which is thought to be the position of this arch. The earlier single bayed Actian arch erected in 29 B.C. may have been replaced by the Parthian arch, but the original location of the Actian arch is unclear. See S. De Maria (1988), 269-271. Coarelli (1985), 258-308, has proposed that the Parthian arch, which he identifies in sketches of Ligorio, was actually located on the north side of the Temple of Divus Julius and attached to the facade of the Basilica Aemilia. Coarelli's location of the Parthian arch, accepted in reviews by Wiseman (1986), 308, Gros, (1986), 63, and Maggi (1988), 208, would offer more symmetry to the placement of the Severan arch, but the objections offered by Kleiner
(1989a), 617 and (1989b) 198-199 seem to preclude Coarelli’s reconstruction, as well as the recent excavations of Nedergaard (1988a), 224-239 and (1988b), 195-206.

115 This structure, built by Augustus (Suetonius, *Augustus* 29.6), seems to have consisted of an arched gateway located in front of the Basilica Aemilia. It may be identified by footings discovered in this area in the excavations in 1954 by Gamberini Mongenet. An inscription set up by the senate in honour of L. Caesar in 2 B.C. (*CIL* 6.36908) was also discovered in 1899 between the Basilica Aemilia and the Temple of Divus Julius. The Porticus of Gaius and Lucius seems to have been erected at the same time as the restoration of the southern portico of the Basilica Aemilia, after the fire of 14 B.C. See De Maria (1988), 274-275. The suggestion by Coarelli (1985), 294-297 that the Parthian arch was converted into this Porticus seems unlikely.

116 Brilliant (1967), 87 notes that although this arch, erected in 16 A.D., celebrated victories in Germany it also had Parthian connections in that Tiberius played an important role in Augustus’ Parthian victories and had received the Parthian standards. It was also related to the Augustan arch by the fact that it too was erected to celebrate the recovery of standards. The Tiberian arch was once thought to have stood facing the Augustan arch on the road which ran north of the Basilica Julia. It has now been convincingly located near the north-west corner of the Basilica Julia and the Temple of Saturn, facing north and south and straddling the Vicus Iugarius. Coarelli (1985), 55; De Maria (1988), 275-276.

117 Stucky (1986), 38 from an examination of the inscriptions in *CIL* and the legends on imperial coinage has found that the expression *RES REPUBLICA RESTITUTA* is uncommon in the middle and late Empire, but that its use goes back to the time of Augustus. For Augustan themes also reflected in the reliefs of the Severan arch, see Desnier (1993), 554-569. The use of the “Augustan revival” style for the ornament of the arch was probably also intentionally chosen to emphasize the Augustan connection.

118 The inscription copied by the Einsiedeln Pilgrim (*CIL* 6.1014 = *ILS* 374) refers to Marcus Aurelius’ victories over the Germans and the Sarmatians and dates to 176. Unfortunately the monument on which this inscription was found in not recorded and only the location in *Capitolio* is given. The existence of an arch spanning the Clivus Argentarius is based upon a reference in the *Mirabilia* to an *arcus panis aurei* and an *arcus argentarius* listed in a papal itinerary (Jordan-Hülsen [1871-1907] II, 458, 669-670). The panels of Marcus Aurelius are assigned to this arch.
because they were brought to the Conservatori from the Church of S. Martina located near the Curia, and therefore their provenance was likely in this vicinity. See Ryberg (1967), 5-7. Mingazzini (1963), 147-155, however, argues that the arches referred to in the Mirabilia and the papal itinerary cannot be located on the Clivus Argentarius, and suggests rather that the relief panels came from a building near the Curia which was later converted into the Church of S. Martina. See also Brilliant (1967), 153-154 and Richardson (1992), 23-24, s.v. “Arcus M. Aurelii.”

As noted above, the designation of the Comitium in the Acta of the Secular Games indicates that this site retained its importance. In fact up to the time of Diocletian the area from the Lapis Niger to the Comitium and from the Argiletum to north-west of the arch of Severus seems to have been kept unencumbered to allow for public assemblies. See Richardson (1978), 367.

Officially the arch was a dedication to the emperor by the senate and Brilliant sees its location near the Curia as an attempt by this body to placate Severus and remind him of their place within the administration. He also notes, however, that the arch loomed directly next to the Curia, as if to overawe the senators.

The erection of the arch for the year of Severus' decennalia was also significant. See Bloch (1943), 31-32.

The approach to the speakers platform was blocked, necessitating the removal of most of the north-east wall of the Rostra, and a small courtyard was also created by cutting away the Augustan platform. The Augustan foundation of the eastern corner of the Rostra was also extended at this time. See Scheel (1928), 255; Sydow (1973), 572-573; Richardson (1992), 336, s.v. “Rostra Augusti.” The stamps from the brick paving of the room under the Rostra show that this was paved later by Caracalla. One of the marble blocks (Kähler [1964], 55, F3) is dated by Wegner (1987), 332, pl. 145, to the time of Severus. A head of Eros decorating this piece resembles the depictions of Erotes found on the Forum arch and the ornament is also similar in style to that found on the Arch of the Argentarii.

See Sydow (1973), 572.

Brilliant (1967), 88-89, notes that placing the arch at a slight angle to the Rostra, which the arch now dominated, created a visual association from a distance, adding to the relationship.
As noted by Stucky (1986), 37, by situating his arch within the sacred and civil heart of the Forum, Severus was able to portray himself as a new leader in the old Roman tradition and for this reason the historical type of relief was used for the panels. The suggestion by Stambaugh (1988), 81 that the siting of the arch in the north corner of the Forum was intended to cut off the Curia completely from the main area of the Forum in a deliberate attempt to disregard the remnants of Republican traditions seems to be unjustified.

Hülsen (1905), 23; Lugli (1946), 120; Brilliant (1967), 85 and (1993), 103.

Hülsen (1905), 219, followed by Brilliant (1967), 87. Lugli (1946), 76 suggests that the Via Sacra divided into two branches at the Regia.

Coarelli (1983a), 1-118, especially 50-56.

The travertine curbs, conserved 31.75 m. on the north side and 61.75 m. on the south, have been shown to be carefully fitted to the Forum paving stones. The post-antique materials that were found by Boni under the street, which suggested to him that it was medieval seem to have been the result of previous work carried out in this area for the installation of drains, as well as of excavations in 1803 and 1827-35. See Giuliani and Verduchi (1980), 60 and (1987), 33-38.

Giuliani and Verduchi, relying in part upon their belief that the last level of pavement in the Forum is Severan, propose that the patch of roadway under the arch was constructed during the Diocletianic restructuring of the Forum, and that originally a staircase or a sloping ramp gave access to the central span. Richardson (1992), 28, s.v. “Arcus Septimii Severi” suggests that in antiquity no road ever passed through the arch.

As noted by Coarelli (1985), 58-59 and 221-22, the onus is on those to prove the contrary. The examination of the central span of the arch by Brilliant provided no evidence of a marble pavement or steps, but selece blocks which formed part of the road bed were still in situ. See Brilliant (1967), 61-62 and 89. Giuliani and Verduchi do not offer any archaeological evidence for their conclusions, and in fact would date the road which leads from the Argiletum to the arch to the time of Severus, excluding only the stretch immediately against the arch.

The placement of the Umbilicus at the back of the Rostra next to the arch seems to have been intended to visually offset the angle created in the space between these monuments.

Acta Va.73. Pighi (1965), 166 and 270.
This procession of vehicular traffic through the arch was noted by Romanelli (1931), who suggests that either a temporary ramp was set up over the staircase of the central passageway or that the wheeled traffic jogged off to the side while the pedestrian traffic proceeded through the arch. Such a scenario, however, would surely lessen the impact of the spectacle.

The 7.05 m. width of the central span would indicate that it was intended to be traversed by wheeled processions, and not just foot traffic. The central passageway of the Severan arch is wider than that of the arch of Titus which is 5.36 m.

In fact steps are carved into the travertine curbs of the roadway, indicating that the roadway was slightly raised from the Forum pavement as it approached the arch, probably in order to prolong the slope for vehicular traffic towards the Capitoline. See Coarelli (1983a), 53-56 and (1985), 221-222.

The steps of the side arches and the raising of the Via Sacra at this point were probably intended to add to the pageantry of the procession as it passed through the arch.

The triumphal route also would pass in front of another Severan monument, the Septizodium, situated at the beginning of the road that led between the slope of the Palatine and the Caelian toward the Forum.

In light of the position of the arch, Nardi (1982-84), 304-305 makes the interesting suggestion that the attic statuary, which has been assumed in reconstructions to have been directed toward the Forum, actually faced in the other direction to greet those entering the Forum. He also notes that the balustrade which ran around the attic of the monument is interrupted over the central span on this side, perhaps for some sort of decoration which may have marked the north side of the monument as the main facade. The foot imprint on the statue of the base of the monument of Stilicho also seems not to have faced the Forum, but rather looked toward the arch and those entering the Forum from this side. See Giuliani and Verduchi (1987), 78. The orientation of this statue may have followed that of the arch.

For a discussion of Severus' *omina imperii* reflected in the historical sources, see supra 11-12. Dio's first publication was a pamphlet of dreams and portents that foretold Severus' ascension to the throne which he presented to the emperor (72.23.1).

2.9.4.
2.9.6. Herodian’s account of the dream is much more detailed than Dio’s. It is possible that Herodian obtained his information from an inscription on the base of the statue describing the reason for its construction, or that he had read about it in Severus’ autobiography or an intermediary source. Dio at 74.3.3, in a section that was probably extracted from his pamphlet about Severus’ *omina imperii*, recounts that in the dream a horse that had thrown Pertinax readily took up Severus, but does not make mention of the statue. The fact that the statue is not mentioned in Dio’s account may be due to his own lack of interest in such things (scarce reference is made to any building by Severus) or that of his epitomator, Xiphilinus. It is unlikely that Herodian would invent the statue or its connection to the dream since he was writing at a time when it still existed. See Rubin (1980), 23. This omen seems to have been promoted by the regime, as it is recorded both in Dio and Herodian.

The earliest known equestrian statues set up in the Forum were for L. Furius Camillus and C. Menius after their triumph over the Latins and the Volsci in 338 B.C., and to Q. Marcus Tremulus for his defeat of the Hernici in 306 B.C. Livy, 8.13.9.


Velleius Paterculus 2.61. The statues of Sulla and Pompey restored by Caesar after they were toppled by the mob as recorded in Suetonius, *Caesar* 74.4 are thought to be these equestrian statues. Lugli (1946), 105. The statue of Sulla may be represented on *aurei* of his quaestor A. Manlius. See Hill (1989), 67.

This colossal statue was celebrated in Statius, *Silv.* 1.1, who locates it in the centre of the Forum. The monument may be represented on a *sestertius* in the Ashmolean Museum. See Hill (1989), 68.

*Mon. Anc.* 35.

Ammianus Marcellinus 16.10.15. This statue is probably depicted on Trajan’s coinage (*BMC* III, 93, nos. 445-448, pl. 16.18). Hill (1989), 69.

Richardson (1992), 145, s.v. “Equus Marci Aurelii.” The Domus of Annius Verus where Marcus Aurelius grew up was located near the Lateran, and perhaps this area had significance for the emperor.
It is of course possible that the details of the dream were created after the fact or altered for more effect in order to coincide with Severus' programme of renewed construction in the Forum. BMC V, 179, no. 142, pl. 30.8-9; RIC VI, 109, no. 146; Cohen no. 763. This issue with the legend VIRTUS seems to have been intended to represent the emperor's military prowess and victory over the Parthians. Mattingly, BMC V, cxxxviii. Caracalla also has a similar representation on his coinage. Denarius, BMC V, 256, no. 506, pl. 40.15.

Denarius, BMC V, 46, no. 151, pl. 9.8; sesterii, BMC V, 147, nos. 595-598, pl. 25.5; Cohen no. 6.

Aureus, BMC V, 45, no. 150, pl. 9.7; as, 149, no. 607, pl. 26.1; RIC IV, 100, no. 73; Cohen no. 5.

Some have suggested that a bronze equestrian statue of a Roman emperor that once stood in the Piazza del Duomo at Pavia, to where it was transported from Ravenna in 1532, represents Septimius Severus. See Giglioli (1940), 57-66 and Bovini (1963), 138-154. Unfortunately this statue was destroyed in the eighteenth century, but it is illustrated on seals of the city of Pavia and on many woodcuts, engravings and drawings. The statue shows a rider with curly hair and a peaked beard very similar in profile to Severus, holding a bridle in his left hand and raising his right hand in an attitude similar to this coin representation. If this statue is indeed Severus, then perhaps it was a copy set up in Ravenna of the original statue in the Forum.

This type is identified as the equestrian statue by Hill (1978), 59 and (1989), 68, and Mattingly, BMC V, cxlii.

Legend SPQR OPTIMO PRINC on reverse: Aureus, BMC V, 97, no. 389, pl. 16.20; RIC IV, 113, no. 169; Cohen, no. 653. OPTIMO PRINC SPQR PM TR P VIII appears on sestertii.

Represented on aurei, denarii, and bronze issues of 113 A.D. The emperor holds an inverted spear and a victory. For the identification of this statue with Trajan's equestrian monument in his Forum, see Hill (1989), 69.


(206) denarius, BMC V, 253, no. 494, pl. 40.8; RIC IV, 196, no. 772; Cohen, no. 481; (207) denarius, BMC V, 264, no. 540B; RIC IV, 196, no. 773; Cohen, no. 496; (208) sestertius, BMC V, 350, no. 854, pl. 51.10; RIC IV, 197, nos. 779-780; Cohen, no. 519. This last issue seems to
have been produced for the *profectio* to the British campaign. The emperor appears on horseback in the company of soldiers.

161. Brilliant (1967), 86 places the statue in the Comitium where the horse threw Pertinax in the dream. Whittaker in his commentary to the Loeb edition of Herodian, 200-201, n. 1, proposes that it was placed near the arch. The suggestion by Coarelli (1995a), 231-232 that a concrete structure in front of the lateral passage of the arch can be identified as the Severan equestrian statue, which may later have been altered to that of Constantine, is unlikely. The Severan statue would have been overshadowed by the contemporaneous construction of the arch and therefore less conspicuous. The placement of the equestrian statue in this position would also have made the lateral passageway of the arch useless. It seems more likely that this base was a later construction, probably for the equestrian statue of Constantine, as it appears to be later than the Diocletianic structures in the area.

162. The Equus Domitiani had previously been considered to be the concrete foundation farther to the south, with three travertine blocks thought to be the supports for the horse’s leg, excavated by Boni in 1902. The recent reanalysis of the Forum area by Giuliani and Verduchi has shown, however, that this structure is actually Augustan in date, and that the site of Domitian’s statue should be identified with the rectangular patching. See Giuliani and Verduchi (1980), 35-49, (1987), 118-122, 133-139 and Giuliani (1995), 228-229.

163. Giuliani and Verduchi (1987), 122 suggest that the Domitianic base may have remained *in situ* and was possibly later used by Severus. See also McKay (1984), 246.

164. Such as the Augustan or Tiberian arch. The Equus Severi may have been included in the *Breviarium* of the Catalogues, where the existence of twenty two *equi magni* in the city are recorded.

165. For example, the Severan arch in the Forum remained intact and no Severan material was incorporated into the Constantinian triumphal arch.

166. Coarelli’s proposal (1983a), 288-289 that this structure was actually the fourth century phase of the shrine of the Doliola has not met with acceptance. See Giuliani and Verduchi (1987), 145 and Richardson (1992), 111, s.v. “Doliola.”
167. *CIL* 6.1141 = *ILS* 698; Einsiedeln Itinerary 1.7, 7 (Walser [1987], 91-92); *Notitia* (Nordh [1949], 84). First suggested by Jordan (1877), 255, and followed by Lanciani (1897), 258-259. See also Nash (1968) I, 388, s.v. “Equus Constantini.”

168. Babut (1900), 208-222. In the Regionary Catalogues the Equus Constantini is listed after the Rostra. The Einsiedeln Pilgrim in the Itinerary seems to have passed through the arch of Severus and viewed S. Hadriano on his left and a Cavallus Constantini on his right, and then proceeded into the Forum (Jordan-Hülser [1871-1907] II, 647 and Walser [1987], 145 and 162). The copy of the inscription recorded as being *in basi Constantini* is also listed immediately before the inscription of the Arch of Severus. Giuliani and Verduchi (1980), 21, (1987), 69-73 and Verduchi (1995), 227 have recently proposed that the Equus Constantini may be identified with a concrete structure located in front of the Severan arch near the so-called Rostra Vandalica. The identification of this monument with the Equus Severi proposed by Coarelli (1995a), 231-232 seems unlikely, as Herodian indicates that the Severan monument was located in the centre of the Forum. See also n. 161 *supra*.

169. The reused material may have come from the debris of the Commodan fire, as is also found in the podium of the Aedes Vestae.

170. Giuliani and Verduchi (1987), 122 propose that Diocletian may have removed the statue of Severus from an original position on the previous site of Domitian’s statue to this base because it did not meet with his new conception of the area. They maintain that the concrete base cannot date to the time of Severus because it was lined up with the central column of the new Rostra Orientalia, and was therefore contemporary with Diocletian’s changes to the Forum. Is it not possible, however, that the Diocletianic Rostra may have followed the orientation of the earlier statue of Severus?

171. When first excavated at the beginning of the nineteenth century (Bunsen, *BdI*, 1835, 70 and 78), this structure was considered to be the Milliarium Aureum which was set up by Augustus in the Forum at the point where the roads of Rome converged. (Dio 54.8.4; Plutarch, *Galba* 24.4). The Milliarum, however, seems rather to have been located at the southern end of the Rostra and has been identified with various marble fragments of a cylinder located near the temple of Saturn. This accords with the accounts of the literary sources which place it *sub aede Saturni* (Pliny, *NH* 3.66; Tacitus, *Hist.* 1.27; Suetonius, *Otho* 6.2). Hülser (1905), 75; Nash (1968) II, 64, s.v. “Milliarum Aureum.”
172 Nordh (1949), 84.

173 Einsiedeln Itinerary, 1.5; 7.7; 8.8. For the location of SS. Sergio e Bacco, see Bonfioli (1974), 55-85.

174 For the identification of this monument with the Umbilicus, see Middleton, (1886b), 432; Lanciani (1987), 280; Van Deman, (1909b) 181; Platner and Ashby (1929), 544, s.v. “Umbilicus Romae;” Hülsen (1905), 76; Lugli (1946), 146-147 and (1975), 241; Nash (1968) II, 484 s.v. “Umbilicus Romae.” The proposal of Sydow (1973), 573-574 (after an unpublished suggestion by R. Gamberini-Montgenet) that this brick structure is actually the base of the golden statue of the Genius of the Roman People dedicated by Aurelian in 354, and that the Umbilicus should rather be equated with another circular base in the area of the Porticus Divorum Consentium, depicted in a drawing made of the area before it was covered over by the Via Consolazione, is unconvincing. Such a location for the Umbilicus is quite far from the indications given in the Notitia and the Einsiedeln Itinerary that it was as near the Temple of Concord and the Arch of Severus. The statue dedicated by Aurelian is said to have been placed in rostris (Chron. a. 354, 148 [ed. Mommsen, 1892]), that is, actually on the Rostra, while this brick structure is located beside it.

175 Because the Umbilicus is mentioned only in late sources it has been assigned a date in the later Empire, ranging from the Severan period to the fourth century. Van Deman (1909b), 186 who believed that the curved steps at the rear of the Rostra, the so-called Hemicycle, were a later addition built in connection with the erection of the arch of Severus, dated the Umbilicus later than the Hemicycle and therefore to a period after Severus. These curved steps, however, have been convincingly shown by Coarelli (1985), 237-257 to be Caesar’s original construction of the new Rostra, earlier in date than the rectangular tribunal later added by Augustus. An early fourth century date for the Umbilicus is also cited in Nash (1968) II, 484, s.v. “Umbilicus Romae” and repeated by Richardson (1992), 404, s.v. “Umbilicus Romae.” This dating is based on the identification by Kähler (1964) of the base of one of the columns of the Tetrarchic Monument of A.D. 303 with a quadrangular cement structure behind the Hemicycle onto which the Umbilicus was in part subsequently built, thus giving it a Tetrarchic date at the earliest. A re-examination of this area by Verduchi (1985), 29-33, however, has more convincingly identified the bases of the Tetrarchic monument between the Hemicycle and the front of the rectangular tribunal. The cement structure has been shown to be earlier than the Hemicycle, consequently late Republican in date. The Umbilicus, therefore, need not be later than the Tetrarchic monument of the fourth century.
The length and thickness of the bricks and their ratio is typical of the period of Severus. See Scheel (1928), 210, 217, and 255.

The travertine blocks of the foundations of the arch are cut into a level of paving contextual with the construction of the Rostra Augusti, that is, the Augustan level. On top of this Augustan level was placed a new Severan pavement, covering both the older level, as well as the foundations of the arch. This Severan level is indicated in places by chisel marks found on the earlier level intended for the placing of the paving slab. See Giuliani and Verduchi (1987), 50-51, and fig. 50. For problems with their proposal that the entire paving of the central area of the Forum belongs to the time of Severus, see infra Appendix I, 423-441.

See Verduchi (1982-84), 337.

For the presence of omphaloi at these cities, see Cook (1928), 167-168 and DarSag, vol. 4.1, 200, s.v. “Omphalos.” That these were known at the time of Severus is confirmed by coins struck by Severus and Geta at Megara depicting a worshipper (Severus?) in front of an omphalos surmounted by two eagles with Apollo standing to the right. (Cook [1928], 185, figs. 127 and 128).

The Umbilicus may have been modelled after the Delphic Omphalos which is depicted in artistic representations as a cone-shaped mass, sometimes on a stepped base, ornamented with a net-like cover or hanging fillets and garlands. A conical limestone block, once coated with stucco has been excavated at Delphi, probably a model of the Omphalos. According to Pindar (Pyth. 4.6) and Strabo (9.419) two golden eagles were set on the sides of the Delphic Omphalos. For the Delphic Omphalos, see Cook (1928), 169-193, DarSag, vol. 4.1, 197-200, s.v. “Omphalos,” Roux (1971), 121-22. For the possible reconstructions of the Umbilicus, see Middleton (1886b), 432.

For example, coins from Byzantium depict an omphalos with pillar. See Cook (1928), 166-168, figs. 111-113. Columns, often topped by statues, were known to have been set up as victory monuments on the Rostra, such as those of Duilius and Octavian. See Richardson (1992), 96, s.v. “Columna Rostrata (Augusti)” and 97, s.v. “Columna Rostrata C. Duilii (2).”

A structure in Rome that is somewhat similar in form to the Umbilicus is the Meta Sudans, the Flavian fountain near the Colosseum, which may have also served to mark the convergence of five of the Augustan regions of the city. The centre of this fountain has a tiered brick structure.
In depictions of this monument on coins a column of some sort appears in the centre, which probably gave the name *meta* to the fountain.

183. Verzar (1976-77), 378-398. Coarelli (1976-77), 346-377 and (1983a), 199-226. Arguing largely from a passage in Plutarch’s *Life of Romulus* that places the Mundus near the Comitium, Coarelli suggests that the location of the Umbilicus is actually to be correlated with the Mundus, a subterranean *sacrarium* connected to the underworld gods. To explain why it is referred to only as the Umbilicus in later sources, Coarelli argues that the two terms were interchangeable and Umbilicus, probably the popular name, became the more prevalent in the later period. He proposes that originally a small circular shrine was constructed on the site of the Mundus during the monumentalization of the Forum at the end of the 2nd century B.C. This structure is seen as the model for similar *monopteroi* found on the terrace of the hemicycles of the Temple of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste and in the Triangular Forum at Pompeii, both dated to the same period. The shrine in the Forum, however, had an *omphalos* in the centre instead of an open well.


185. Verduchi (1982-84), 338-340. The steps of approach to this area also appear to have been created only during the excavations undertaken by Boni at the beginning of the century, as can be seen in the photos from the period.

186. This structure has been reconstructed as a niche or exedra cut into this side of the Rostra at the time of the addition of the Augustan tribunal. Verduchi (1985), 33 and (1982-84), 334-338.

187. These fragments seem to have been placed on the Hemicycle after their undocumented discovery during the previous century, and may belong to any number of monuments such as the shrine of the Genius of the Roman People located near the temple of Concord recorded at Dio 47.2.3 and 50.8.2.

188. Verzar (1976-77), 384-385 reconstructs the shrine on the second level, but, as noted above, this lower drum does not form a complete circle.

189. While the location of the Mundus is unclear, other sources point to the Palatine, and Plutarch’s reference is problematic. For a convincing refutation of Coarelli’s identification of the Mundus with the site of the Umbilicus, see Castagnoli (1986), 32-36.
Coarelli (1983a), 211, n. 37 suggests that the shrine was restored at the time of Alexander Severus, on the basis of the presence of anepigraphical brick stamps *in situ*, as yet undocumented. If the rebuilding of an earlier shrine was required because of damage caused by the construction of the arch, it seems more likely that the more exposed cornice and decoration would have required repair, rather than the nucleus of the structure, as this proposal suggests. This later date would also require a delay of two decades between the construction of the arch and the restoration of the shrine. The Umbilicus seems to be closely tied to the repaving necessitated by the addition of the arch, and therefore contemporaneous with it.

This designation had been developing during the course of the second century. It is interesting to note that Aelius Aristides (*Or. 42.301 [519]*) describes Rome as being the *omphalos* of the Empire.

The form of the monument may have even been a personal selection on the part of the emperor, who was known to have taken an interest in antiquities and religions during his journeys. *HA Severus* 3.7 (Athens); 18.1 (Egypt). Severus portrayed himself as the Restitutor Urbis and was responsible for the restoration of a number of buildings. The Secular Games, which solemnly inaugurated a new Golden Age, also signified the restoration of the Roman state.

For the date of the marble fragments of the Milliarum, see Lugli (1946), 147. The suggestion by Richardson (1992), 404, s.v. "Umbilicus Romae" that the Milliarum was moved to a position on top of the Umbilicus when the arch was constructed, and that the Umbilicus and the Milliarum were one and the same, is unconvincing, given that the *Notitia* lists both monuments separately.
V. THE TEMPLUM PACIS (Figure 2)

The Templum Pacis was another major structure that Severus was required to restore as a result of the fire of 191/192. The blaze began in some dwellings nearby and destroyed this complex before spreading to other areas of the city. The original building was decreed by Vespasian in 71, after the victory over Judea and the pacification of the east, and completed in 75. It was decorated with masterpieces of painting and sculpture and the famous trophies of Titus from the Jewish Wars. A library was also located within the complex.

The damage suffered by the Templum Pacis during the Commodan fire appears to have been considerable. According to Herodian’s account the temple was burned to the ground and the entire precinct was gutted: πᾶν τὸ τῆς Εἰρήνης τέμενος κατεφλέχθη ... καταφλέξαν δὲ τὸ πῦρ τὸν τε νεῶν κοί πάντα τὸν περίβολον. Such extensive destruction indicates that an almost total rebuilding of the complex was required. Although very little of the Templum Pacis survives, its plan can be reconstructed from some fragments of the Forma Urbis and by evidence from excavation. The plan of the Templum Pacis found on the fragments of the Forma Urbis is that of the building as restored by Severus, which seems, however, for the most part to have followed the original Vespasianic layout. The complex was located adjacent to the Forum Romanum across the Argiletum from the Forum Augustum. It consisted of a large open space, c. 110 x 135 m., which was enclosed on the sides and rear by porticoes. There was no portico at the front of the enclosure facing the Argiletum; but a thick wall with openings flanked
inside by a row of columns with only a decorative function. Two square niches with two columns at their entrances also opened off the rear of each of the side porticoes. The temple itself, a simple apsidal hall, was placed at the back of the enclosure. It did not project into the open space, and the columns of its porch were aligned with those of the portico, but distinguished from these by their greater size. This integration of the temple within the portico differed from a typical forum in which the temple dominated. Large halls opening off the portico flanked the temple on both sides. A large rectangular structure, probably the altar, was located in front of temple. Three narrow bands with indentations depicted on the marble plan on both sides of the altar appear to represent garden plots, suggesting that the interior of the enclosure was laid out as a formal garden.

Isolated architectural remains of the Templum Pacis giving some indication of the construction have been recovered during excavations at the end of the last century and in the 1930's and 50's. Under the Palazzo Niccolini-Serini, between Via Cavour and Via de' Pozzi, part of the north-eastern side of the complex has been recovered. These remains include a small portion of the perimeter wall of peperino blocks and the concrete flooring of the portico in front of this wall. The latter terminates in a series of four steps, indicating that the portico was raised from the central area of the Forum. The presence of a marble drain at the edge of these steps, probably for rain water, 12.50 m. from the rear wall, gives the span of the portico's roof. A number of pieces of red granite column shafts and Corinthian capitals from the colonnade were found throughout the area.

The three walls of a rectangular niche opening off of the portico on the north-eastern side of the complex were also discovered within the medieval construction of
Torre dei Conti. These walls were constructed in *opus quadratum* of tufa and then peperino on a foundation of travertine. Pieces of fluted columns of white marble and a Corinthian capital built into the medieval wall indicate that there were columns, probably two in number, in the opening of the exedra.\(^1\) The Severan repair in these sparse remains is difficult to determine. The niche constructed of *opus quadratum* preserved in the foundations of the Torre dei Conti appears to have been part of the original construction by Vespasian.\(^2\) The Corinthian capital, however, displays an extensive use of the drill characteristic of the Severan period, and may therefore belong to the restoration.\(^3\)

From the south-western side of the complex there is little evidence from excavation. In 1890 Lanciani discovered under Via del Lauro traces of three steps with fragments of Africano and granite columns that probably belonged to the portico on this side.\(^4\) Three large pieces of one of the columns in African marble, with an estimated height of 12 m., are the only architectural remains from the north-western part of the complex, which the fragment of the Forma Urbis shows had no portico in its final form, but only a decorative wall flanked on the inside by a row of columns.

The remains of one of the large halls that flanked the temple at the southern end of the complex are the most extensive and the most completely excavated part of the Templum Pacis. This hall in the south west corner was preserved when it was transformed into the Church of SS. Cosma and Damiano in the sixth century.\(^5\) The hall was 37 m. in length, with the width varying between 15.8 in the north-east to 20.70 on the south-west, and seems to have been partitioned into two rooms. These remains provide some indication of the extent of Severan repair, at least in this area of the complex.
The foundations and lower parts of the walls in *opus quadratum* are Vespasianic in date. A large brick wall of Flavian construction also lined the inside of part of the south-eastern side. Severan brick construction, however, has been identified on the upper section of the north-western wall as well as in the central area of that on the south-west, including a large arch of Severan construction. The north-western wall was also extensively restored by Severus. The lower part of the podium of this wall is Flavian brickwork up to 1.85 m., while the structure above is completely Severan to a height of about 18 m. The upper part of a stairwell on the south-eastern side of the hall is also Severan in construction. In the interior of this hall during the Severan rebuilding a brick lining, 65 cm. thick and 10.75 m. in height, was also added. With this brick construction three niches were also created on each wall, the centre ones 60 cm. deep and those on the sides 30 cm. These niches appear to be too narrow for statues and may have held cupboards.

Adjacent to this hall, and next to the temple was another room which had an open portico to the courtyard. One wall of this room, that which it shared in common with the neighbouring hall, is also still partly extant. As was noted above, the lower part of this wall up to 1.85 m. was the original Vespasianic construction, but the rest of the structure up to 18 m. is Severan brickwork. The decoration on this side of the wall, to which the marble plan of the city was attached, is also completely Severan in date. The lower podium of the wall was faced with a socle of Portasanta marble topped by a cornice. Next was a series of alternating wide and narrow marble panels of various marbles. Above this was placed another cornice sculpted with acanthus leaves, and then a fascia. On the upper
part of the wall, above this decorative podium, were placed the marble slabs on which the map of the city was incised.19

The Severan construction identified in these structures preserved in SS. Cosma and Damiano indicates that only the foundations and lower parts of the original complex survived the fire of 191/192. The upper portions of the walls and most of the decoration belong to the Severan rebuilding which, however, followed for the most part the original layout.20 The basic plan was probably respected in order to preserve the traditional associations of the building.

An inscription found in the area of the Templum Pacis may refer to Severus’ restoration of the Templum Pacis complex:


Precise titles for Severus and Caracalla are not provided, so the date of the restoration can only be placed between 198, when Caracalla was made joint emperor, and 209, when Geta was also made Augustus. The titles of Vespasian in this inscription are those of 78, but according to Dio, the Templum Pacis was originally dedicated in 75.22 It is possible that Dio’s date may be in error, or that the inscription, which is probably completely Severan as the original would not have survived the fire, recorded the Vespasianic dedication incorrectly. This discrepancy has also led to the suggestion that the inscription did not refer to the restoration of the entire complex, but commemorates only the restoration of the Forma Urbis.23 The Vespasianic and Severan parts of the
inscription, however, may not even belong together, as they were discovered at different times and in different locations. The inscriptions may not refer to the restoration of the Templum Pacis at all.

Pliny the Elder listed the Templum Pacis among the noblest buildings the world had ever seen. Herodian referred to it as the largest and most beautiful of all the buildings in the city and the richest temple, adorned with offerings of gold and silver. The Templum Pacis was therefore a prominent feature of the urban landscape of Rome, and its rebuilding was an important element in Severus’ programme of the renewal and restoration of the capital city. The complex had also originally been endowed with many works of art, some of which were probably destroyed in the conflagration. Some, however, seem to have been salvaged. Statue bases discovered during excavations have inscriptions of Severan date referring to a sculpture of Ganymedes by Leochares and another of Pythocles by Polykleitos, indicating that they were set up again during the Severan restoration. That the complex was restored to its original magnificence by Severus is indicated by the fact that it was admired by Constantius as one of the most beautiful building of Rome and was still listed among the splendours of the city by later authors.

Severus’ restoration work in the city of Rome indicates a desire on his part to connect himself with the original builder. The opportunity of restoring the Templum Pacis, therefore, gave Severus the occasion to associate himself with the emperor Vespasian and the Flavian dynasty. In the Forum Romanum he had also restored the Temple of Vespasian, an act recorded in the inscription placed on the architrave of the
temple. In restoring the Templum Pacis Severus was also able to capitalize on the original associations of the construction. The building of the Templum Pacis by Vespasian, as in the case of Augustus’ Ara Pacis, highlighted the return of peace after the turbulence of civil and external wars. Severus also claimed to have restored tranquillity to the Empire after a period of internal strife and foreign wars. Peace and prosperity were celebrated in the coin issues. During the civil war of 194-195 denarii were minted with the seated goddess on the reverse and the legend PACI AUGUSTI. In the midst of the campaign of 197-198 Pax also appears on the coinage with the legend PACI AETERNAE. On the reverses of aurei and denarii of 200-201 Severus himself is depicted in a toga, the garb of peace, holding in his hand the roll of the civil magistrate in the role of Fundator Pacis. The permanence of the Severan peace was proclaimed in 208 with Sol depicted as Pacator Orbis. With the restoration of the Templum Pacis Severus was also able to associate his name and his dynasty with the cult of Pax and to represent himself as the Fundator Pacis. Perhaps a reference to the restoration of the Templum Pacis was also associated with these coin issues.

The Forma Urbis

In 1562 a large group of fragments of heavy marble slabs incised with a plan of Rome was discovered in the garden behind the church of SS. Cosma and Damiano, at the foot of the rear wall. The better preserved pieces were set up in the Antiquarium of the Palazzo Farnese, while the others were broken up and used for building material in the gardens of the Palazzo. In 1742 the fragments displayed in the Antiquarium were transported to the Vatican, at which time thirteen were lost and many damaged.
Fortunately, at the end of the nineteenth century many of the pieces used in the garden of the Palazzo were recovered. Some of the fragments which had been lost or broken in transport or during their use as building material were also able to be reconstructed from sketches made upon their discovery in 1562.

All of the surviving fragments, including new ones discovered during further excavations, were gathered together and reconstructed on a wall in the garden of the Palazzo dei Conservatori by Lanciani in 1903. This was again dismantled for study after the Second World War and the fundamental edition of the fragments of the Forma Urbis was finally published in 1960. This analysis has since been refined by subsequent scholars, in particular E. Rodriguez-Almeida, whose studies have clarified the placement and identification of some of the fragments and furthered our knowledge of the method of composition and surveying for the plan. The survival of portions of the Forma Urbis has been invaluable for the study of the topography of the city of Rome and much attention has been given to them in this light. The purpose of the following discussion will be to consider the map as a Severan monument and its significance within the building programme.

The wall on which the Forma Urbis was originally located (the south-west wall of the room immediately south of the temple) is still extant up to 18 m., preserved when part of the Templum Pacis was converted into the church of SS. Cosma and Damiano. The lower part of the podium, 1.85 meters from the pavement, belongs to the original Flavian construction, but the rest of the wall is of Severan brickwork. The surviving decoration of
the podium can also be dated to the Severan restoration. Above this podium were placed the marble slabs on which the map of the city was incised.

The clamps and clamp holes still visible on the wall indicate where the marble panels were attached and an analysis of their positions has allowed for a reconstruction of the placement of many of the surviving fragments. The pattern of placement consisted of eleven rows of slabs of varying height and length, some set horizontally, others vertically, covering an area 13 m. high by 18.1 m. wide, i.e. 235 m. square. The map of the city that was incised on these marble slabs consisted of a detailed reproduction of the ground plan of the public and private buildings of the city at a scale of approximately 1:240, but there are considerable variations in individual buildings. Some structures, such as aqueducts, are shown in elevation, probably because they would be difficult to recognize in plan. Seven hundred and twelve fragments of the map survive, accounting for only a little more than ten percent of the entire map. Less than fifty specific buildings have been identified, and their original position on the map located. From those fragments whose position can be identified, however, it can be determined that the map was oriented with the south-east at the top. The area of the city within the pomerium seems to have been the focus, with the result that large portions of Regiones I, II, V and XII were excluded. The presence of the Septizodium on the plan provides a terminus post quem of 203 for the carving of the map. The names of Severus and Caracalla as Augusti also appear on another fragment indicating that the map was completed before Severus' death in 211.
This marble plan of the city, set up at some point between 203 and 211, has been considered a Severan replacement for a Vespasianic plan which was also set up in the Templum Pacis. Although a map of the city was probably produced as a result of the remeasurement of the city that took place during the censorship of Vespasian and Titus in 73-74, definite evidence for an earlier Vespasianic map at this site has so far remained elusive. While in some fragments differences have been noted between the plans of certain buildings and their present remains, suggesting that these pieces may belong to an earlier map, these discrepancies may simply have resulted from the fact that the information on which the Severan map was based was not completely up to date. Different hands have also been identified on some of the fragments, but this is what one would expect considering the size of the project. If the Severan plan was a replacement of a Vespasianic version set up in the Templum Pacis, the original was probably completely destroyed in the fire of 191/192. The entire upper portion of the wall on which the marble panels were placed is Severan in construction, indicating the extent of the damage and the need for extensive rebuilding. It is also possible, however, that a map of the city was set up in the Templum Pacis by Severus only after its rebuilding, and that the Vespasianic map was located elsewhere.

The Severan Forma Urbis in fact seems to have been one of a number of maps of the city made at different times for various purposes, probably in a variety of media. When the city was divided into regions during Augustus’ censorship a map of the city was probably produced and perhaps displayed in the Porticus Vipsania. As noted above, a Vespasianic map was probably also made during the censorship of 73-74. The discovery
in 1983 in Trastevere of a fragment of a new marble plan, probably dating to the first half of the second century, provides direct evidence that other maps of the city were also incised in marble and seem to have been publicly displayed, possibly for either commercial or administrative purposes.\textsuperscript{49} A few other fragments of possible maps are also known to exist.\textsuperscript{50}

The Severan Forma Urbis was probably produced as a result of an extensive survey of the city that was required after the destruction and rebuilding after the fire of 191/192. Rather than merely adding the new Severan constructions within the Vespasianic format, the Severan map in fact seems to represent a complete resurveying. According to Pliny's account, the centre for the Vespasianic measurement was the Milliarum Aureum in the Forum near the temple of Saturn. The mathematical centre of the Severan survey was the area in front of the present day Church of the Aracoeli at the highest point of the Capitoline.\textsuperscript{51}

The function of the map and the building in which it was placed has been a question of much debate. Relying on the early identification of the structures preserved in the Church of SS. Cosma and Damiano as the Templum Sacrae Urbis or the Templum Penatis, Jordan first proposed that the building in which the Forma Urbis was located was the secretarium and tabularium of the Urban Prefect, while Lanciani suggested that it was the archive of the imperial cadastre.\textsuperscript{52} The Templum Sacrae Urbis has since been identified as the Templum Veneris et Romae, and the Templum Penatis has been located on the Velia. The headquarters of the Urban Prefecture has also now been shown to have
existed in the quarter of the Carinae in the area between the Temple of Tellus and the
Baths of Trajan.53

Gatti, however, in his study of the Forma Urbis still supports a connection with
the administration of the Urban Prefecture. He argues that the plan was engraved at the
initiative of the Urban Prefect, Fabius Cilo, because his residence and the gardens
belonging to his wife are the only private properties labelled on the map.54 The inscription
ILONIS on fragment no. 677 has been restored to CJILONIS and appears to refer to the
large residence, the Domus Cilonis, which was given to the Prefect by Severus. The
inscription HORTI CELONIAE FABIA(E) preserved in a sketch of the broken fragment
no. 45, of which only the letters ONIAE are now extant, is thought by Gatti to be a
misreading for CILONIAE. The owner of these gardens would then be a Cilonia Fabia,
the presumed wife of Cilo.55 Since the possessions of Fabius Cilo are depicted on the
map, Gatti suggests that the Forma Urbis was connected to the administration of the
Urban Prefecture. He proposes that the room in which it was placed was the office of the
servi urbani, and the adjoining hall with niches, now preserved in SS. Cosma and
Damiano, may have been an archive, perhaps for real estate and property evaluations.

This function of the Forma Urbis as a working administrative map connected to
an archive of the Urban Prefecture within the Templum Pacis has attracted much
support.56 Upon reflection, however, I find the evidence advanced for this conclusion
rather tenuous. The designation of the gardens on fragment no. 45 to a Cilonia Fabia who
was the wife of Cilo is problematic, since a Roman woman’s name did not derive from
her husband, but her father. A more likely reading of the inscription would seem to be HORTI CEIONIAE FABIAE as suggested by Klebs. Ceonia Fabia was a well known sister of Lucius Verus. Also only ten percent of the map now survives, too little to conclude that only Fabius Cilo’s property was labelled. As Urban Prefect Fabius Cilo may have had some involvement in the survey upon which the map was based, but the appearance of his name does not necessarily indicate that the marble version should be associated only with an office of the Urban Prefecture. As the discovery of the fragment in Trastevere of the Pianta di Via Anicia indicates, there were probably many maps of the city set up in different places for various purposes. Cilo’s residence may have appeared on the map because it was one of the most impressive of the time and was donated by the emperor.

The size, placement and medium of the Forma Urbis also seem to preclude a limited use as a working administrative map. The upper regions of the map were 18 m. above the viewer below and would not have been easily legible. The original survey sheets from which this map was adapted could be much more easily consulted for details than a large map. Extensive portions of Regiones I, II, V and XII were also not represented in the layout of the marble map, so it could not have been used directly for the administration of the regions. The marble format would be difficult to update and there is no evidence that it was ever recut. The map would soon have become obsolete for practical purposes, but it continued to exist in its place within the Templum Pacis until late antiquity without alteration. This suggests that the map in its marble form was intended to be something other than purely functional.
It is here proposed that the purpose in having such a map inscribed in marble was commemorative. The intent was to record and commemorate in marble the survey which was undertaken during the reign as a result of the rebuilding necessitated by the fire of 191/192. In the resulting plan of the restored city the new Severan buildings were carefully included as well as those that were rebuilt. It is interesting to note that the Roman Forum, which was the site of much Severan attention, was located in the very centre of the map. The Forma Urbis may then be considered a public commemoration in a durable material of the city of Rome, restored and renewed by the new Severan dynasty.\(^6^1\)

This commemorative map may then not necessarily have been located in a building which served some administrative function. The room with niches located behind the Forma Urbis, which has been identified as an archive connected to the Urban Prefecture, could just as likely have been the famous library that is known to have existed in the Templum Pacis.\(^6^2\) The two symmetrical halls in each corner of the complex may have held the Greek and Latin works respectively. The room in which the Forma Urbis was located was entered from the portico through a series of four columns, and therefore had open access. Such an arrangement suggests a more public use for this space than an administrative office. It was possibly the forecourt to the library. Since the Forma Urbis was an advertisement of the Severan restoration of the city, it would have been important for it to be accessible to the public. The portico of the Templum Pacis was said to have been decorated with sculptures and other works of art, and the Severan map would have served as another adornment of the complex. The Templum Pacis, with its associations of
peace and prosperity, was an appropriate setting for this monumental map that depicted the renewed city of the Severan age, including the new Severan monuments. The Forma Urbis was therefore an important monument in its own right, serving to highlight the restoration of the capital that resulted from the Severan rebuilding.

2. Josephus, *Bell. Iud.* 7.5.7. Pliny, *NH* 34.84 records that many of these works of art had been taken from Nero's Domus Aurea.

3. Aulus Gellius 5.21.9 and 16.8.2. Also Galen 13.362 (ed. Kühn, 1821-33). There was probably both a Greek and Latin library.

4. 1.14.2-4. Herodian adds that many rich men were reduced to poverty by the fire because their possessions were deposited in the temple. Galen (13.362) also records the complete destruction: τὸ τῆς Ἐιρήνης τέμενος ὄλον ἑκκατόμη (ed. Kühn, 1821-33).

5. Forma Urbis: Carrettoni, Colini, Cozza, and Gatti (1960), 73, Tav. XX, and Rodríguez-Almeida (1981), 95, Tav. XII.

6. Anderson (1982a), 101-110 has found evidence to suggest that the north-west side originally also had a portico identical to the other sides and on the exterior another line of columns for a series of tabernae facing onto the Argiletum. Anderson suggests that the portico on the north-west side was dismantled and the circuit wall moved up to the line of the interior colonnade in order to make room for the Forum Transitorium constructed by Domitian. This later alteration by Domitian, recorded by Statius (Silv. 4.3.17), would explain the unusual form of this side of the Templum Pacis which breaks the symmetry of the complex.

7. The two rows of six columns at the entrance to the temple are depicted on the Forma Urbis as being of a slightly larger size that those of the portico and set on square plinths.

8. The complex had more of the aspect of a temple and precinct. The nature of the cult of Pax and the function of the complex as a garden and art gallery may have dictated this form. See Anderson (1982a), 105. The complex was called the Ἐιρήνης τέμενος by Greek authors (Josephus, *Bel Iud.* 7.15.8; Dio 65.15.1; Herodian 1.14.2; Galen 13.362; 19.19 [ed. Kühn, 1821-33]), but τὸ Ἐιρηναῖον by Dio at 72.24.1. It is referred to as templum in Latin (Suetonius, *Vespasian* 9.1; Pliny, *NH* 36.102) and was called a forum only by late authors (Ammianus 16.10.14; φόρον Ἐιρήνης in Procopius, *Bell Goth.* 4.21.11).

9. Rows of trees were also planted in the open space around the Claudianum, another Vespasianic building. See Ward-Perkins (1981), 65-67. The inspiration for this type of gardened plan may have been the late Republican-early Augustan monuments that were connected to parks, such as
the Porticus Pompeii and the Porticus Liviae. Stucky (1986), 27-41 suggests that Vespasian intentionally recalled these forerunners and their Republican association in the Templum Pacis. For a possible reconstruction of a garden with extensive flower beds, see Lloyd (1982), 91-93.

10 Colini (1937), 7-40; Castagnoli and Cozza (1956-58), 119-142; Blake (1959), 90; Coarelli (1980), 120-121; Richardson (1992), 286-287, s.v. “Pax, Templum.” The architectural remains found in excavations carried out in the 1930's are now covered by the Via dei Fori Imperiali. Unfortunately, little of the Templum Pacis has been excavated.

11. These remains were first discovered during the construction of drains for the Via Cavour and were further defined when the Palazzo was demolished in 1935. The remains of the perimeter wall are 0.74 m. long and consist of five rows of peperino blocks now 0.71 m. high resting on a block of travertine. The columns have a diameter of 0.90 at the lower part of the shaft and 0.74 at the upper. The capitals were 1.04 m. high. See Colini (1937), 15-17, 27, and 30, and figs. 17-19.

12. The opus quadratum walls are over 16 m. high on three sides forming a large space 9.80 m long and 7 m. wide. The columns are 0.85 m. in diameter, and the capital about 1.0 m. high. Various pieces of red granite columns and a capital, probably from the colonnade of the portico, were also found built into the medieval structure. Colini (1937), 23-27.

13. See Blake (1959), 90.

14. No significant analysis of the various architectural fragments from the Templum Pacis has been undertaken, and many are now scattered in museum store-rooms, but as far as can be seen in the photograph in Colini (1937), 27, fig. 16, this capital is very similar to the Severan examples from the propylon of the Porticus Octaviae. See Petrignani (1960), figs. 14-15.

15. For the description of Lanciani's discovery and a plan of the finds, see Colini (1937), 16 and 18, fig. 6.

16. This hall was excavated to the ancient floor in 1955-56. See Castagnoli and Cozza (1956-58), 119-142 and Coarelli (1980), 120-121.

17. The wall on this side of the hall was restored with blocks of peperino during the Severan repair.

18. This room may then have served as a library or an archive. For a discussion of the function of this hall, see infra. On the north-west wall there is evidence of a door, 5.70 m. high and 4.10 m. wide, and two openings, 2.25 m. wide and 6.30 m. high., which may have been doors or niches.
belonging to the Vespasianic phase. These were blocked off when the Severan brick construction was added. See Castagnoli and Cozza (1956-58), 124 and 131, fig. 15.


20. As in the case of the Porticus Octaviae, where some changes to the original plan have been detected in the Severan rebuilding, it is possible that during the reconstruction of the Templum Pacis parts of the Vespasianic plan were altered.

21. For the assignment of the inscription to the restoration of the Templum Pacis, see Murphy (1945), 45.

22. Dio 65.15.1; Aurelius Victor, De Caes. 9.7.

23. See Castagnoli (1948), 285, n. 1. For a discussion of this problem, see the section on the Forma Urbis.

24. See Carettoni, Colini, Cozza, and Gatti (1960), 214. One part of the inscription was found about 1530 in Piazza della Consolazione and the other in 1612 near the steps of S. Francesca Romana.

25. Pliny, NH 36.102.


27. See Coarelli (1980), 124. Also McKay (1984), 245. Procopius (Bell. Goth. 4.21) also records that an ancient fountain, a bronze bull by Pheidias or Lysippus, and a calf by Myron were still standing in the area in front of the Templum Pacis in his own time. These were probably also salvaged from the original decoration.

28. Ammianus Marcellinus 16.10.4. It is also noted at HA Triginta Tyranni 31.10, and Symmachus Relat. 3.7.

29. CIL 6.938 = ILS 255.

30. See Anderson (1984), 101 and Blake (1959), 90.

31. BMC V, 32, nos. 70 and 71, and 35, no. 85; RIC IV, 96, no. 37, 97, no. 54, 101, no. 89; Cohen no. 359.

32. Denarii, BMC V, 61, nos. 253-254; RIC IV, 105, no. 118; Cohen no. 357. Sestertius, BMC V, 154, ||. A type with Mars Pacator also appears during the wars, BMC V, lxxxvii-viii.
33. Legend FUNDATOR PACIS: *Aureus, BMC V, 192, no. 189; RIC IV, 112, no. 160; Cohen nos. 202-203. *Denarii, BMC V, 192, nos. 190-191; RIC IV, 106, nos. 128-129; Cohen nos. 204 and 207. Similar *denarii were also minted in 203: BMC V, 217-218, nos. 330-332; RIC IV, 124, no. 265, Cohen no. 205.


35. For the complete story of the discovery and fate of the Forma Urbis, see Riemann (1942), col. 2120-2122, Carettoni, Colini, Cozza and Gatti, (1960), 23-37 and Anderson (1982b), 69-73. See also the review of Carettoni, Colini, Cozza and Gatti by Bloch (1961), 143-152.

36. The earliest scholarly edition of the Forma Urbis was H. Jordan’s *Forma Urbis Romae Regionum XIIIIE (Berlin 1874), but this soon became out of date with the rediscovery of the fragments from the garden of the Palazzo Farnese.

37. These are discussed and reproduced in Carettoni, Colini, Cozza, and Gatti (1960), 41-52 and Tav. I-XIV.


39. In particular *Forma urbis marmorea, aggiornamento generale 1980 (Rome 1981), but also in many other articles.

40. This analysis was carried out by L. Cozza. See Carettoni, Colini, Cozza, and Gatti (1960), 179-189. See also Rodriguez-Almeida (1981), 35-43.

41. The identified fragments, now located in the Palazzo Braschi, the Museum of Rome, fit within a roughly triangular area in the top half of the map, probably reflecting the later robbing of the more accessible panels. It appears that the podium was robbed first and then the lower slabs. When the height became greater than could be reached from the floor, panels were then removed more conveniently from the side walls, resulting in the survival of those within this triangular shape. This pattern of removal seems to preclude the location of any of the so far unidentified fragments in the north and north-east area of the city. See Rodriguez-Almeida (1977), 253-256 and (1981), 43-53.
42. See Carettoni, Colini, Cozza, and Gatti (1960), 231-233.

43. A date before 208 has been suggested by Kubitschek (1919), col. 2029-2030 since Geta is not listed as co-emperor in the inscription. This inscription, however, seems to have referred to a specific building constructed by the joint emperors and not the map itself.

44. The possibility of an original Vespasianic map on the site was first proposed by Jordan, Forma Urbis Romae Regionum XIII, 11. See Carettoni, Colini, Cozza, and Gatti (1960), 218, and Rodriguez-Almeida (1987), resumé in Dilke (1988), 92.

45. At a conference in Ann Arbor in October, 1996 A. la Regina reported that a fragment of a pre-Severan marble plan was recently discovered in the area of the Forum Transitorium. This may be part of a Flavian Forma Urbis. Thanks to Professor G. Koeppel for this information. For the remeasurement of the city during the censorship of Vespasian and Titus, see Pliny NH 3.65-66. Palmer (1980), 217-233 proposes that this map was connected to Vespasian’s concern for the customs barrier and was an official record of the pomerium and the fiscal boundary.

46. For discrepancies in some of the details of the plans of the Porticus Aemilia and the Area Sacra Argentina, see Cressidi (1949-50), 91. For Gatti’s arguments against an earlier date for these fragments, see Carettoni, Colini, Cozza, and Gatti (1960), 214, n. 15. Castagnoli (1948), 285, n. 1, has proposed that the inscription found in the area of the Templum Pacis (CIL 6.935) actually refers to the restoration of the Forma Urbis, thus explaining the date of 78 on the Vespasianic portion which is later than the known dedication date of the complex itself in 75. There is no evidence, however, to directly connect the inscription to the Forma Urbis, and it is possible that it may record the restoration of the Templum complex itself or some other monument altogether.

47. See Carettoni, Colini, Cozza, and Gatti (1960), 213-214.

48. See Carettoni, Colini, Cozza, and Gatti (1960), 218, and Rodriguez-Almeida (1987), resumé in Dilke (1988), 92. Palmer (1980), 227 proposes that such a map of the city was set up in the Porticus Vipsania together with the orbis pictus of Agrippa. It was possibly produced under the auspices of Agrippa in connection with his overhauling of the water and sewer systems in 33 B.C.

49. Part of a thin plate of marble, made up of seventeen fragments measuring all together 32 x 29.5 x 2 cm, was discovered during excavations in the area of the Caserma di Polizia di Via Anicia and has been given the name Pianta di Via Anicia. The piece depicts the plan of the Temple of Castor and Pollux in Circo Flaminio and some other buildings along the bank of the
river Tiber, which in fact overlaps part of the Severan plan. The scale was 1:240, the same as the Severan plan, but was oriented toward the north-east. See De’ Spagnolis (1984), 9-28. De’ Spagnolis (1984), 29-32 and 60 suggests that this map had a commercial use, while Rodriguez-Almeida (1988), 126-128 proposes that it had an administrative purpose and perhaps was set up in the offices of the *cura alvei Tiberis et riparum* located near its find spot.

50 For example, the so-called Pianta della Polveriana and four still unpublished fragments in the storerooms of the Forum/Palatine. There is also a fragment found at Ostia from a possible map of this city. See Rodriguez-Almeida (1988), 131.


52 Jordan, *Forma Urbis Romae Regionum XIII*, 9; Lanciani (1897), 94-98.

53 For the location of the office of the Urban Prefecture, see, in particular, Chastagnol (1960), 243-251. See also Lugli (1975), 497, Coarelli (1980), 210-211.


55 First suggested by Hülsen in Jordan-Hülsen (1871-1907) I:3, 188, n. 15a.


57 As noted by Bloch (1961), 146. See also Salway, (1994), 124-145. We do not have any reference to the actual name of Cilo’s wife. Rodriguez-Almeida (1981), 58, however, accepts Gatti’s interpretation without question. These gardens are also listed under Cilonia Fabia in Grimal (1943), 174, n. 5 and 8.

58 *PIR*¹ C 509. Also Stein *PIR*² C 612. So listed in Richardson (1992), 197, s.v. “Horti Ceioniae Fabiae.”

59 As noted by Anderson (1984), 116, n. 56. He suggests that the purpose of the plan was decorative.

60 Gatti, in Carettoni, Colini, Cozza, and Gatti (1960), 214-215 argues that if the *Forma Urbis* was to have a decorative function, a scenaegraphic rather than planimetric representation would have been used. It is true that if Severus wished simply to represent the great monuments of the city at the time of his reign he could have chosen another means than the intricate plans,
including those of private buildings and *insulae*, and dense array of inscriptions which appear on the *Forma Urbis*, but this assumes a purely decorative intent for the map.

61. Perhaps a modern analogy may be bronzed versions of important documents.

62. Such is the conclusion of Colini and Cozza (1956-58), 141. The library of the Templum Pacis is recorded at Aulus Gellius 5.21.5; 16.8.2. Galen 13.362 and 19.9 (ed. Kühn, 1821-33) also refers to the destruction of his works contained in the library of the Templum Pacis during the fire of 191/192. Its mention in the *HA Triginta Tyranni* 31.10. indicates that it existed after the Severan rebuilding of the Templum Pacis.

63. If a Vespasianic map did exist previously in the Templum Pacis it also must have had a decorative purpose, since it would have been two centuries out of date by this time. Rodríguez-Almeida (1987), resumé in Dilke (1988), 92, suggests that the purpose of the supposed Vespasianic map was to commemorate Rome’s recovery from civil war and fires. Considering Severus’ desire to be associated with the Vespasianic dynasty, it is not be surprising that he should have had a similar purpose in setting up his own map.
VI. THE PALATINE (Figure 3)

The Palatine was the site of some of Rome’s most ancient and sacred places.¹ During the Republic it had also been an exclusive residential area. With Augustus the Palatine became the place of the official residence of the emperor. After his house was struck by lightning Augustus constructed a Temple to Apollo on the spot, and a new residence was constructed for him at the public expense north-west of the temple.² Augustus’ immediate successors continued to reside on the Palatine. The Domus Tiberiana, a large unified complex constructed on the Germalus overlooking the Forum, however, was probably not built until the time of Claudius.³ Nero constructed part of his Domus Transitoria in the south-east, and the Domus Aurea which replaced it after the fire of 64 also encompassed the Palatine Hill. The Domus Aurea was abandoned by Vespasian who chose to live in the Horti Sallustiani on the Pincian.⁴ Titus, however, seems to have returned to the Domus Tiberiana.⁵

Domitian was responsible for a massive new palace, containing both an official and private wing, which was built on the ridge south of the Domus Tiberiana and extended over the saddle between this ridge and the Germalus. A vast platform for the new buildings was created over the various levels by filling in earlier structures and cutting into the existing slope. With its monumental facades and magnificent state halls Domitian’s residence represented imperial majesty and reinforced the image of the emperor as dominus et deus.⁶ The emperors who immediately followed Domitian appear to have distanced themselves from his palace and its embodiment of imperial luxury.
Nerva, for example, who had the words *publica aedes* inscribed on the complex, seems to have chosen instead to reside in the Horti Sallustiani. Some alterations and additions were made to Domitian’s palace, however, by Hadrian who probably resided there when in Rome. The Antonines appear to have preferred the Domus Tiberiana as the imperial residence. During the early part of his reign Commodus is said to have lived in the Domus Palatina Commodiana. It is uncertain whether this refers to the Domus Tiberiana or is another name for the Domitianic complex. Later in his reign Commodus moved from the Palatine to the Domus Vectiliana on the Caelian Hill.

On his accession Pertinax took up residence again on the Palatine, and to indicate that normalcy had returned, he invited the magistrates and leading men there to a banquet, a practice that Commodus had neglected. Pertinax refused the title of Caesar for his grown son and did not bring him to live in the palace, but chose to have him remain in the family home. Herodian states that this was a sign that Pertinax was modest and unpretentious, but it was also a signal that he was not setting up his son as successor. His precarious position, especially with the soldiers, did not allow for the imposition of a dynasty which the residency of his son in the palace might have indicated. Pertinax’s decision not to bring his son into the palace demonstrates the close association between the physical site of the palace and the emperor that had developed by the end of the second century.

The procession of the new emperor to the palace, escorted by the soldiery and citizens, also seems to have been an important ceremony in the conferment of the imperial power. Herodian reports that on Pertinax’s accession to the throne, after the
usual oaths and sacrifices had been made, the new emperor was escorted to the palace by
the populace and the praetorians waving laurel branches.\textsuperscript{18} Didius Julianus, who
succeeded Pertinax after his assassination, was not received so favourably, but had to be
shielded from stones during his procession to the palace.\textsuperscript{19} A brilliant spectacle, however,
greeted Severus when he arrived in the capital.\textsuperscript{20} After first making sacrifices on the
Capitol and at other temples, he proceeded to the palace. This procession had an added
significance: the standards of the praetorian guard, which he had disarmed and disbanded,
were carried before him \textit{supinis, non erectis} as a sign of victory.\textsuperscript{21} He was now taking up
residence on the Palatine as the avenger of Pertinax and as his rightful successor.
Although Dio states that Severus was warmly greeted by the people this welcome appears
to have been achieved not without some coercion.\textsuperscript{22}

By the time of Severus' reign the importance of the palace and its connection to
the emperor had therefore been established. At some point during his reign Severus
undertook some alterations and repair to the existing complexes on the Palatine, and also
a major expansion of the imperial buildings to the south. This attention to the Palatine
was a significant act on the part of the emperor in order to emphasize the stability and
continuity of his reign. Unlike Pertinax, Severus indicated his dynastic intentions, making
Caracalla Caesar in 195 and co-emperor in 198 when Geta was also declared Caesar. The
Severan expansion on the Palatine would be an important symbol of the establishment of
this new dynasty.
Restoration and Repair

The Severan building activity on the Palatine was in part necessitated by the damage caused by the Commodan fire, which seems to have affected the northern part of the hill towards the Forum. Severan repair has been identified on the northern slope of the Palatine along both the Clivus Victoriae and the Via Nova. Domitian had extended the eastern facade of the Domus Tiberiana down to the Clivus Victoriae. In order to widen the plan of the Domus Tiberiana further Hadrian brought it up to the Via Nova at the edge of the Forum by the construction of multi-storied tabernae.23 Severan work on the Clivus Victoriae and the Via Nova consisted of reinforcement to these earlier constructions (Figure 4).

On the Clivus Victoriae the series of arches which had been carried over its western end during the Hadriamic extension of the Domus Tiberiana were reinforced by the addition of two more arches. In order to provide greater strength these were made double.24 Extensive repair was also undertaken along the Via Nova.25 The Hadrianic tabernae along the south side of this street were strengthened by the addition of massive reinforcing walls up to two levels high in the corners of the rooms and by narrowing the entrances.26 A series of six double arches was also constructed, spanning the Via Nova, in order to support these Hadrianic tabernae and the rear wall of the Atrium Vestae on the other side of the street. The pilasters of these arches were abutted to the facade of the tabernae and buttressed the second floor of the Atrium Vestae.27

The reinforcement of the tabernae further to the east probably also belongs to the Severan repair of the constructions along the Via Nova. The walls of the tabernae were
reinforced inside and out and their facade was buttressed by a series of pilasters, which may have carried arches over the street, although corresponding pilasters are missing from the other side. A complete arch, however, similar to the six Severan reinforcing arches to the east, survives adjacent to the Scala Farnesina. At the angle of the Via Nova and the Clivus Palatinus four rooms of Severan construction have also been discovered. Some walls of Severan date have also been identified on the northern side of the Via Nova among the structures between this street and the Via Sacra. The repair and refurbishment of this northern slope of the Palatine was probably closely tied to Severus’ attention to the Forum area, as these structures served as the visual backdrop for the southern side of the Forum.

Dio’s account of the Commodan fire indicates that extensive portions of the Palatine itself were consumed by the flames. He does not specify which buildings were affected, except that he notes that a large number of γράμματα located in an archive were destroyed. This archive was possibly the Tabularium Caesaris, which contained materials such as the private correspondence, family papers, and literary works of the emperor. Its exact location is unknown, but it was probably near the palaces on the Palatine. As reported by Dio, the destruction of the records in the state archives was considered an omen that the evil would extend beyond the city itself. The rebuilding and repair of the fire damage was therefore probably undertaken by Severus as an integral part of his restoration of the state.

Galen records that some of his work and that of other authors were destroyed when μεγάλα μυθικα located on the Palatine were burned during this fire. Two
Palatine library complexes are known to have existed. The Bibliotheca Apollonis Palatini was built by Augustus in connection with the temple of Apollo. This library has been identified with the two apsidal rooms discovered south-west of the Triclinium of the Domitianic palace. There does not seem to be any evidence of rebuilding or major restoration in these remains or in the immediate area of the Temple of Apollo which would indicate that the library was damaged in this fire.

Another library was associated with the Domus Tiberiana on the Germalus. This library seems to be the more likely candidate for the library referred to by Galen, since the path of the fire moved from the Templum Pacis to the Forum, across the Via Nova up the northern slope of the Palatine, and possibly then to the area of the Domus Tiberiana. The archive referred to by Dio may have also been located here. The exact site of the Bibliotheca Tiberiana, unfortunately, is unknown. Since the library in the Domus Tiberiana is referred to in later antiquity, it is likely that it was Severus who undertook its restoration, if it was indeed damaged.

Severan repair has not been determined within the Domus Tiberiana itself, but much of this complex has not been systematically excavated, as it was built over by the Horti Farnesiani in the fifteenth century. Severan building activity, however, has been noted in the precinct of the Temple of Magna Mater to the south-west, which may be related to restoration required in this area because of fire damage.

The Palace of Domitian also received attention during the Severan building of the Palatine. The Domus Augustana appears to have been utilized by Severus as the imperial residence, and he added his own expansion to this complex. Extensive rebuilding of the
existing palace at this time has not been identified and the Severan activity within the original Domus Augustana seems to have been limited to redecoration and the repair of isolated structures necessitated by the passage of time rather than damage from the Commodan fire.

The so-called Hippodromos located to the east of the domestic wing of the palace was one of the areas in which repair work was undertaken. This was in actuality a sunken garden laid out in the form of a stadium, with its two long sides and the slightly curved end at the south-west lined by a double portico and five vaulted rooms, giving the effect of starting gates located at the short north-east side. At either end semicircular fountains were placed in the position of the metae and a large vaulted exedra was situated in the middle of the long south-eastern side, perhaps to simulate a pulvinar. Severus’ repair to this construction did not affect the original plan, which was kept intact, but did include the reinforcement of the portico and alterations to the vaulted rooms. The areas of Severan repair to the Hippodromos are shown in Figure 5.

The restoration of the portico required the repair and in some cases the entire replacement of the supporting pilasters.\(^41\) Domitianic brickwork is present at the base of the pilasters at the shorter ends of the portico, and the rear perimeter wall remained entirely Domitianic.\(^42\) On the long sides of the portico all of the pilasters are Severan in construction, but these retained the ornamental motif of an engaged half column found in the Domitianic phase. During the Severan repair of the portico the vaults carrying the second story were also strengthened by the addition of pilasters abutted to the long sides of the rear perimeter wall. These were positioned opposite the pilasters of the colonnade.
At the south-eastern and north-western corners, instead of the counter pilasters two complete brick walls were built in front of the enclosure wall, apparently to add greater stability to these areas.

The addition of reinforcing pilasters to the perimeter wall resulted in a dramatic narrowing of the doorways of the three lower rooms of the large exedra that opened off the long south-eastern side. The entrances to these rooms were partly filled at certain points where rear pilasters were required to correspond to those of the interior portico. An opening in the perimeter wall immediately to the south of the exedra was also now completely closed off. A doorway at the rear of the exedra was probably opened at this time in order to compensate for the reduced access to the garden. The rooms of the exedra were also repaired and redecorated. Severan brick work has been identified in the large central room, as well as in the smaller room to the north-east where part of a wall decoration of third century date is also preserved.

The most significant Severan modification to the Hippodromos occurred at the north-eastern end where the symmetry and decorative function of the original Domitianic rooms were dramatically altered, probably in order to provide support for the upper floor. The large central room was divided into two by a partition, as was also the smaller room immediately to its right. Massive reinforcing walls were also added to the two smaller rooms on the other side, closing off the farthest one completely. The addition of these partitions created six rooms of various sizes and shapes, which functioned simply as service areas and support for the upper story. The means of access to these rooms was now provided by four small doors placed at irregular intervals. The ornamental effect of
the original design, where wide entrances allowed access to richly coffered rooms, was now lost. The two end pilasters along this side of the portico were also joined together at this time to give added support to the upper story and possibly to mask the lack of symmetry that was created by the change to the rooms behind.

Most of the architectural pieces recovered from the Hippodromos appear to belong to the Severan period, indicating that an extensive renovation of the decoration was undertaken along with the structural repair. The bases of the half columns of the pilasters along the portico were of white marble and the brickwork shafts were revetted in Portasanta. A Severan date for this revetting is confirmed by the inscribed name of the consul of 195 on one of the slabs. A fascia of Portasanta marble also decorated the base of the counter pilasters and the perimeter wall. Column shafts of granite and cipollino which probably come from the colonnade have also been recovered as well as both composite Tuscan and Ionic capitals of white marble. Some of these capitals may have been reused from the Domitianic phase. One composite capital with ram’s horns for volutes and an oak wreath for ovuli is characteristic of the fantasy capitals found in the Baths of Caracalla and can definitely be assigned to the Severan redecoration. Some cornices of Domitianic style found in the area may also have been reused.

Although the Hippodromos is the only area of the Domitianic palace where extensive Severan work has been identified, it is likely that repair, or at least redecoration, also took place in other parts of the complex. Numerous fragments of Severan architectural decoration have been discovered on the Palatine, many of which seem to come from the area of the Aula Regia. These fragments include friezes decorated with
griffins and candelabra and parts of cornices and simae from the Severan refurbishment of the palace. The style of these architectural pieces is very similar to that of the Flavian period and appears to have been inspired by the original Domitianic ornament. The Severan work, however, is much more decorative and tends toward lavish use of the drill.

Severan redecoration of the Domitianic complex may also be indicated by the report of Dio that the ceilings of some of the rooms in the palace were decorated with his imperial horoscope so that it would be visible to all. Since Dio specifies that these paintings were located in rooms where the emperor held court he is probably referring to the state rooms known as the Domus Flavia, which seem to have remained in use as the official wing of the palace until late antiquity, and not the Severan expansion of the palace which does not seem to have had a public function. The throne room, or Aula Regia, and the Triclinium of the Domitianic complex both had large spans and possibly were timber roofed, although concrete vaults for these rooms have also been proposed. The smaller spans of the Basilica and Vestibule, or Lararium, were probably covered by barrel vaults. Severus’ horoscope may also have been painted only on the half domed apses of these rooms. The Basilica, Aula Regia, and Triclinium all had apses, where the emperor probably presided over state functions, as a focus of their plan.

The imperial horoscope would have served as an appropriate backdrop for the emperor as he received audiences or embassies. This addition to the decoration of the palace by Severus also had significant implications for the new regime’s claim of
legitimacy. The depiction of Severus’ horoscope within the public rooms of the palace commemorated in a highly visible manner the divine sanction of his rule.\textsuperscript{56}

**Severan Expansion**

By the time of Severus previous emperors had created a plateau of imperial buildings on the Palatine by bridging the surrounding slopes with their constructions. The Domus Tiberiana covered the area to the north-west towards the Forum, and the Domus Augustana extended over the south central part of the hill. Domitian’s palace, however, had been the last significant building on the Palatine in over a century. Just as Severus had chosen to make his mark in the traditional centre of the Forum, so the construction of a major addition to the palace by Severus was a significant display of the presence of a new Severan dynasty in the imperial centre of the Palatine.\textsuperscript{57}

The Severan expansion to the imperial structures on the Palatine seems to have covered about five hectares of the south-eastern corner that sloped toward the Circus Maximus (Figure 5). Severus probably chose to expand in this area because it had remained relatively free of major constructions.\textsuperscript{58} He also intended to create an imposing facade for the Palatine Hill when viewed from the Circus Maximus and the Via Appia. Although the Severan expansion is often referred to by modern scholars as the Severan Palace, it does not appear to have been intended as separate living quarters, but as an extension of the existing palace on a series of substructures of many levels that artificially enlarged the plateau of the Palatine.

The original layout of all of the Severan constructions on the Palatine and the functions of the individual structures have been difficult to determine because much is
still unexcavated or is badly preserved. This area of the Palatine has only recently been
the object of detailed investigations and analysis. Excavations which were carried out in
the nineteenth century were not completed and never fully documented. Massaccesi’s
study in the 1930’s of the brickwork defined the limits between the Domitianic and
Severan phases in the area behind the Hippodromos. Some excavations and restoration
work were also carried out between 1964-70 among the structures overlooking the Circus
Maximus. Recent restoration and investigations have concentrated on the Severan
structures next to the Hippodromos of the Domus Augustana, of which a partial plan has
been reconstructed. A complete understanding of the Severan structures on the Palatine,
however, has still not been achieved, but from the present state of knowledge it can be
concluded that Severan building on the Palatine was substantial and important in shaping
the appearance of the Palatine.

In the area beside the Domus Augustana, behind the so-called pulvinar of the
Hippodromos, Severus undertook the construction of a bath complex. Under Domitian a
series of substructures, creating an artificial level, had already been laid out in this area. It
is possible that Domitian had also intended to build a bath system since his extension of
the Aqua Claudia had been built in this direction, but his plan remained incomplete under
his immediate successors. Only under Severus was the bath complex on the Palatine
realized. The recent excavations in this area have revealed a number of rooms whose
features attest to their thermal function. Associated service areas have also been located
to the south-east. Staircases indicate the presence of upper floors and there were also
large underground service corridors. Extant polychrome marbles, mosaics, niches and
exedrae give some impression of the decoration. Only a partial plan of these structures has been ascertained, but the general appearance of the architecture indicates that the complex was of monumental size and covered a large area.66

The restoration by Severus of the Arcus Caelimontani, the extension of the Aqua Claudia that had been constructed by Domitian from the Caelian to the Palatine, is recorded in an inscription. The repair of this aqueduct was probably connected to the construction of the bath complex on the Palatine. The date of the restoration was 201 and may have been quite extensive, as the inscription records that in many places the repair had to be undertaken a solo, and much Severan repair has been identified in sections of the surviving arches of the aqueduct.67 Since the aqueduct system was restored in 201 the bath complex was also probably also constructed at around this time.

To the south-west of this bathing and service complex Severus also began a completely new expansion of the Domitianic palace with a series of substructures extending in the direction of the Circus Maximus and towards the south-east edge of the Palatine.68 The Domitianic construction in this area ended with a series of wide halls, now badly preserved, which lined up with the south-east corner of the stadium.69 A series of arches was later built in front of these halls, possibly during the time of Trajan.70

Under Severus a row of two storied chambers flanking these arches was added in order to expand the southern facade of the palace.71 The facade of the Severan rooms, however, ran somewhat obliquely to the orientation of the earlier row of arches behind. This placement appears to have been intended to correct the alignment of the structures in this area. The second century arches added to the Domitianic halls had actually diverged
from the orientation of the Hippodromos and the Domitianic palace. The Severan structures returned to the orientation and alignment of the Domitianic plan.

The addition of these Severan rooms created a substructure for a terrace that overlooked the Circus. The level of this terrace was slightly lower than that created by the arches built in the second century, and the Severan level was continued back to the north by inserting vaults into the earlier substructures. Part of the service terrace was covered with low groin-vaulting, some of which still survives at the western end. Farther to the east a large irregular stump of Severan masonry survives, indicating that the Severan substructures continued in this direction. 72

The type of structures that existed on this Severan terrace are unknown. Much of the construction to the rear of the terrace is badly preserved or has been subject to many additions and alterations. One Severan structure that has been identified to the north is a large basin built into the earlier Domitianic structures. This basin appears to have been too shallow to have been used for bathing and therefore probably had a decorative function. 73 The recent analysis by Carettoni of the building technique and brick stamps of the area has shown, however, that the double arches carrying large barrel vaults added in front of the service terrace were not Severan, as had previously been thought, but were actually constructed under Maxentius. 74 The addition of these outer vaults blocked the windows of the Severan substructures behind. On the widened terrace a bath complex was constructed which has also been shown to be Maxentian in date. 75

As part of the Severan expansion another series of Severan substructures was constructed farther to the south-east, possibly extending to the edge of the Palatine.
Previously modern topographers had identified all of the structures here as the “Substructiones Septimii Severi,” but Carettoni’s investigations have shown that those of the front row were constructed during the time of Maxentius. The substructures that were built at the time of Severus, the vaults of which have now all fallen, have been identified behind these later additions. The purpose of these substructures was to extend the palace towards the slope by artificially enlarging the level of the Palatine. The original appearance of the structures is difficult to reconstruct because of the later alterations and the fact that much of this area of the Palatine has not been excavated, but the Severan expansion appears to have continued to the south-east towards the corner of the hill, where the Septizodium was built at the foot of the slope.

A small portion of the plan of the edifices in the south-eastern corner of the Palatine during the Severan period, including the Septizodium, is provided by some of the fragments of the Forma Urbis (See Figure 6). On the plan are shown a portico with pilasters along a wide street dividing the buildings at the foot of the Palatine from the Circus Maximus. Behind this portico is a long double row of rooms with a common rear wall. The rear rooms open out onto another parallel street across from which is visible another series of rooms of various dimensions. Unfortunately, the fragments break off at this point, so the relationship between the buildings depicted on the plan and the Severan structures that are extant cannot be clearly established. Only a detailed study of the topography of this area of the Palatine, taking into account the recent investigations, will reveal the extent of the Severan building.
The Septizodium

As part of his extension of the imperial buildings on the Palatine Severus constructed a monument called the Septizodium at the foot of the south-east corner of this hill (Figure 5). It was dedicated in 203. Although no longer extant, the Septizodium is probably one of the most discussed monuments of Severus’ reign aside from the arch in the Forum. Scholarship has tended to concentrate on the reconstruction of the monument. Much debate has also focused on the relationship of the design and the name of the Septizodium, resulting in some unfounded assumptions about the overall design and meaning of the monument. A re-evaluation of the evidence concerning the Septizodium is therefore in order, to determine its role within the emperor’s building programme and the urban plan of Rome.

The basic form of the Septizodium can be reconstructed from a portion of its plan that survives on a fragment of the Forma Urbis (Figure 6). Two apses lined with columns and a projecting wall or anta at the south-west end are depicted. The columns are carried around the end projection. In the centre of the apse to the north-east is a squared structure. The right side of the apse is not complete, indicating that the plan continued in this direction. The missing part of the plan is restored to include one more apse bordered by another anta-like structure mirroring that on the south-east side.

Recent excavations in the area of the Septizodium have confirmed the plan of the Septizodium as it appears on the Forma Urbis. The foundations have been discovered 6.60 m. below the present level. The length of the monument was between 93-95 m. and extended from the south-east corner of the Palatine almost up to the curve of the Circus.
Maximus. Remains of the central exedra have been discovered as well as evidence for a projecting wall or anta on the northern end. This confirms the hypothesis that the north part of the building not preserved on the Severan plan was the same as the south.\textsuperscript{83}

The elevation of the Septizodium can be reconstructed to some degree from the drawings and sketches of its last remains that stood until the end of the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{84} Two portions of the structure, designated \textit{septem solia maior} and \textit{minor}, survived into the Middle Ages, the larger destroyed in 1257 and the smaller in 1588-89 by Sixtus V. These drawings depict the north-eastern corner of the structure, and show a shallow rectangular wing surrounded by columns and part of a straight wall which breaks off, presumably, at the point just before the apse opened out. The structure rises to three stories with Corinthian columns on each level. The columns of the upper levels were set on a plinth in the Severan style. An inscription was engraved in a single line across the architrave of the lowest colonnade, forming the major decoration of this frieze. The decoration of the second level consisted of an architrave with two fasciae, decorated with a moulding of \textit{ovuli}, at least as it is depicted in the Renaissance drawings. The top level was already in ruins at the time of these drawings, so its decoration is unknown, but probably followed the pattern of the second level.\textsuperscript{85}

From the evidence provided by the plan on the Forma Urbis and the Renaissance drawings the Septizodium can therefore be reconstructed as a type of monumental columnar facade building on three levels punctuated by three monumental niches. Wings projected out at the two ends of the monument. Because of the lack of other evidence only conjectured reconstructions can be proposed for the details of the design of the
missing parts of the building. For example in Dombart's reconstruction the niches are
given half domes, and extend only to the second story, with a flat wall above. In order to
accommodate the inscription Hülsen prefers to make them rectangular with smaller
curved niches at the angles. Dürm restores the ground level with a second row of columns
in the interior of the niches, and the third level projects only at the ends. 86

The material, which is known to have been dispersed to construct and restore
various buildings in the city when the monument was torn down, does give some hint of
the original magnificence of the Septizodium. For example, the marble was used for the
restoration of the Antonine column, the construction of the tomb of Sixtus V in S. Maria
Maggiore and that of Pius V. The columns and marble entablatures were also reused in
various churches, especially for the construction of the new Saint Peter's Basilica on the
Vatican. Blocks of travertine from the base were used for the foundation of the Vatican
obelisk.

Suetonius records that Titus was born prope Septizonium, indicating that a
monument with this name existed in Rome during the first century A.D., but nothing is
known of the form of this earlier structure. 87 Fragments of the Forma Urbis preserve
portions of the inscription that labelled the Severan monument, and indicate that the
building was officially called a Septizodium, and not Septizonium as it is referred to in
some sources. 88 The two terms, however, may have been interchangeable, since in
inscriptions from Africa the names Septizodium and Septizonium are both found, and
even the form Septidodium occurs. 89 Basing their opinions on the reading Septizonium,
which was thought to refer to seven vertical or hortizontal zona, some earlier scholars
proposed that the structure consisted of seven stories of superimposed columns, although the Renaissance drawings show only three levels. Such a height, however, is both structurally and aesthetically unlikely. Similar Roman facade-buildings are usually limited to three stories at most. Another suggestion for the derivation of the name is from the Greek *zoalzodion* referring to celestial bodies.

Some evidence for the basic design of this type of monument is provided by the few structures called Septizodia/Septizona that have been identified in Africa. At Lambaesis a Septizonium was excavated in the middle of the last century, but it is unfortunately now completely destroyed. The Lambaesis monument, probably constructed in the early third century, consisted of a large apse flanked by two wings. In the apse, as well as the wings, were niches for statues. An inscription indicates that this monument also served as a nymphaeum. At Cincari in northern Tunisia a structure called a Septidodium has been discovered in connection with a bath building. Erected in the beginning of the third century as an addition to the frigidarium of an earlier bath complex, it consisted of seven niches between pillars. The niches appear to have originally held statues, fragments of which were discovered during the excavation. The heads of Mars and Saturn and a torso of Sol have been identified, suggesting that the decorative scheme consisted of statues of the planetary gods, one in each of the seven niches. The presence of the statues would seem to confirm an astrological significance for these monuments as suggested by the name. A two-sided facade building raised on one or two stories decorated with columns and with niches for statues has also been discovered at Augusta Raurica (Augst) in Switzerland. On the basis of its design and the
presence of a bronze water basin depicting the days of the week, this structure has also been identified as a Septizonium.

The decoration of the Severan monument at Rome probably also consisted of some sort of arrangement of the planetary deities within the niches of the facade. Its purpose may have been to honour the planetary gods and their astrological influence. An astrological significance for this monument would not be surprising, since Severus is known to have had an interest in astrology.

Other information about the Septizodium in Rome indicates that it was also a nymphaeum. Ammianus Marcellinus refers to the monument as an operis ambitiosi nymphaeum. The discoveries of recent excavations confirm the use of water in the monument. In front of the central exedra were found remains of a large collecting basin with a slab of its original revetting of Luna marble still in situ. The recent excavations have also produced fragments of red porphyry from a curved basin of considerable size that seems to have been situated inside the central niche. From this fountain water flowed into the collecting basin in front. Part of a large statue of a reclining river deity has also been recovered, indicating that the Septizodium’s fountains were decorated in a manner typical of nymphaea. The water source for the Septizodium was probably the nearby Aqua Claudia.

In function and design the Severan monument then seems to have had a close relationship to the large civic nymphaea that were common in many cities in Asia Minor during the first and second centuries A.D. Like the Septizodium, these nymphaea had the form of monumental columnar facades. The major influence behind this design appears to
be the theatral *scaenae frons* which, by the second century, had become elaborate
columnar structures. One of the earliest examples of these monumental fountain buildings
comes from Miletus and dates to the time of Trajan. Large civic nymphaeae were
constructed at places such as Side, Aspendos, Perge, and Sagalassos in commanding
positions within the urban structure.\(^{103}\)

The use of niches or exedrae in a columnar screen is also a basic feature that the
Severan monument had in common with structures specifically known as
Septizodia/Septizonia, popular in Africa at sites such as Cincari and Lambaesis. Water
also seems to have been used in connection with these structures, since the Septizodium
at Lambaesis was a nymphaeum, while that at Cincari, although not directly supplied with
water works, was constructed in association with a bath complex.\(^ {104}\)

One of the more problematic questions about the design and meaning of the
Septizodium arises from an anecdote in the *Historia Augusta*. The author records that the
original intention of the monument as an entrance to the Palatine palace was impaired
when a statue of Severus was placed in the middle of the monument by the Urban Prefect
during the emperor’s absence.\(^ {105}\) Domaszewski, always doubtful of the reliability of the
*Historia Augusta*, denied the existence of a statue and saw this reference as a later
interpolation.\(^ {106}\) The fragment of the Forma Urbis, however, in fact depicts a squared
structure at the back of the niche which is thought to be a statue base (Figure 6, frag. 7a).
Recent excavations confirm the existence of some sort of foundation in this area, located
not at the back of the niche as on the plan, but in line with the columns lining the
exedra.\(^ {107}\) Whether this was the base of a statue of the emperor cannot be determined with
certainty, but the existence of such a statue of the emperor in the central niche of an imperial monument would not be unexpected. The size of the statue would have been relatively large, considering the dimensions of the base. The statue would therefore have been placed in the central intercolumniation of the colonnade of the exedra, behind the large basin which excavations have shown to have been located in its centre.

The presence of this statue within the decorative scheme of the monument has led to the suggestion, proposed by J. Guey and H.P. L'Orange, that Severus himself was depicted in the colossal statue as Sol, the principal planetary deity. According to this view Severus sought to portray himself in the Septizodium as a Cosmocrator enthroned in the vault of heaven, overseeing the celestial spheres and zodiacal signs. This interpretation, with its implications for the meaning of the Septizodium and for Severan religious policy in general, has been accepted and repeated. There is no concrete evidence, however, to conclude that Severus was depicted as one of the cosmic deities, other than the likelihood that a statue of the emperor was included in the design of the Septizodium and that this monument had planetary associations.

As the examination of the religious policy of Severus has shown, there are no other indications that the emperor portrayed himself openly as Sol or Serapis. Given this lack of evidence, the proposal that Severus himself was represented in the guise of the central planetary deity should be viewed with caution. Such an arrangement also does not take into account the dynastic aspirations of Severus. It is reasonable to suppose that a statue of Caracalla, being co-emperor and along with his father co-dedicant of the Septizodium, would also have been included. Also considering that the prominent role
within the reign of other members of the *domus divina* is reflected in the conspicuous place they are given on other monuments, one may suppose that they too were represented here.\(^{113}\) It is equally probable, however, that the decoration of the monument may also have consisted of some representations of the seven planetary deities separate from the statues of the imperial donors of the monument. A symbolic association between a favourable cosmic order and the new regime that brought about the restoration of the Empire may have been intended, without Severus himself appearing as a divinity. The depiction of water deities and fountains may also have been tied to the symbolic meaning of the monument.\(^{114}\)

Certain assumptions about Severus’ intention in constructing the Septizodium have also arisen from the anecdote in the *Historia Augusta*. The author reports that the original purpose of the monument before the placement of the statue was as an entrance to the Palatine palace, and that Severus had no other thought in constructing this building but that it should greet those coming from Africa.\(^{115}\) This statement has often been accepted in the discussions concerning the Septizodium as the reason for its construction.\(^{116}\) L’Orange takes this statement one step further and suggests that the African orientation of the monument was an example of Severus’ disregard for Roman traditions, a result of his provincial and African background.\(^{117}\) He notes that while the older palaces were oriented towards the venerable public edifices of Rome, the new Severan palace on the Palatine - the Septizodium being its focus - turned its back on the sacred centre of the city. This view has recently been repeated by J. Stambaugh.\(^{118}\)
In its design, the Septizodium, however, seems never to have been intended as an entrance. The slope of the Palatine on this side rises sharply and access would be impractical. The Severan structures behind the Septizodium also seem to have been for the most part service buildings to which a monumental entrance such as the Septizodium would have been illogical. The author of the *Historia Augusta* seems to have been misunderstood the function of this structure as a facade building or false entrance.\(^{119}\) The construction of the Septizodium also did not alter the traditional orientation of the Palatine. With the construction of the Domitianic complex on the southern part of the hill the focus of the Palatine palaces had already been oriented toward the Circus Maximus.

As has already been observed in the discussion of Severus' treatment of the Roman Forum and other constructions in the city of Rome there is no evidence that Severus' African origins made him ignorant of or unsympathetic to Roman traditions.\(^{120}\) On the contrary, Severus seems for the most part to have been mindful of the Roman architectural heritage. Structures with some astrological significance called Septizodia seem to have been popular in Africa and it is possible that the construction of such a monument in Rome may have been an acknowledgement of the emperor's native land.\(^{121}\) The African orientation of the Septizodium may also have been no coincidence, but it seems unlikely that Severus' sole intention in constructing such a magnificent building in Rome would be just to greet visitors from Africa. This statement in the *Historia Augusta* should be seen rather as an explanation devised by the author, and another misinterpretation of the purpose of the building.\(^{122}\)
The Septizodium in fact played an integral role in the urban layout of this part of the city of Rome. The monument functioned as a dramatic facade screening the Severan buildings on this side of the Palatine. It also served as a monumental approach to this district of the city. As noted above, the inspiration seems to have been the large civic nymphaea of the eastern Mediterranean. These nymphaea in the form of monumental columnar facades were used, like the Septizodium, as a concealing screen or as a backdrop for a street, and also functioned as important civic markers within the urban plan. The Septizodium’s notable impact upon the urban landscape of Rome and its role as a civic landmark are perhaps reflected in the fact that at the time of Ammianus Marcellinus it was still recognized as a celeber locus and was a place of gathering for the urban plebs. It was also known to the author of the Historia Augusta as one of Severus’ principal extant public works.

The position of the Septizodium within the urban layout of Rome is provided by fragments of the Forma Urbis (Figure 6). Fragment 7b indicates that there are no structures immediately in front, but a large open area. To the south bordering the curve of the Circus Maximus is a building fronted by a series of rooms which seems to have been aligned along the southern side of this area. The northern side of the area adjacent to the Septizodium is missing from the plan, but it probably consisted of a symmetrical arrangement on this side. The alignment of buildings along the northern axis of the Septizodium, depicted on another fragment positioned farther to the east (Figure 9) indicates that this open square may have extended for some distance, possibly encompassing the area of the modern Piazza Porta Capena. Recent excavations have
shown that the base of the monument probably sloped down to the ancient street level in a series of steps.\textsuperscript{129}

The square in front of the Septizodium appears to have been an important crossroads where a number of streets converged.\textsuperscript{130} The road coming from the west between the flank of the Circus Maximus and the Palatine, which then curved around the end of the Circus Maximus passed alongside the southern corner of the monument (Figure 7, frags. 7a-b).\textsuperscript{131} The street between the Caelian and the Palatine from the area of the Flavian Amphitheatre ran in front of the east face of the Septizodium. This street, which runs along the course of the modern Via S. Gregorio, is often called Via Triumphalis because it was on the triumphal route, but its ancient name is unknown.\textsuperscript{132} The route from the Porta Capena to the south-east also probably issued onto the area in front of the Septizodium. The Septizodium thus provided a link to Regio I, where Severus is known to have constructed a bath complex. There is also evidence that Severus may have constructed a new wide avenue which linked this area to the Septizodium.\textsuperscript{133}

The construction of the Septizodium thus provided a significant new focus for this quarter of the city. It served both as a facade to the Palatine and as a monumental backdrop for the open square located next to the Circus Maximus that serves as an important cross-roads. Severus was able to take full advantage of this prominent position for his advertisement of the Severan regime. Like the arch in the Forum, the Septizodium acted as an imperial sign or billboard indicating the emperor’s interest in the capital city and its renewal under his rule.\textsuperscript{134} Drawings of the monument show that an inscription, consisting of about 240 letters, was engraved in a single line across the architrave of the
lowest colonnade, the text of which survives from copies. As is the case with inscriptions on other Severan monuments, the lineage of the co-emperors is listed all the way back to Nerva, connecting the new dynasty to the imperial legacy.135

The decoration of the monument probably reflected the themes that the regime sought to promote. It may have consisted of some representations of the seven planetary deities, perhaps indicative of the cosmic harmony brought about by Severus’ restoration. The focal point of the monument may have been a large statue of the emperor placed in the centre, perhaps intended to portray Severus as the vigilant patron of the city.136 Statues of the imperial family were probably also included in the decorative programme following the dynastic theme.

The decoration of the Septizodium may also have included specific references to Severus’ military achievements. The monument was also able to draw on triumphal associations from its position. The triumphal route passed in front of the Septizodium as it proceeded from the Circus Maximus along the street between the Palatine and Caelian toward the Via Sacra and the Forum where another Severan monument, the triumphal arch, was encountered.137 The placement of the Septizodium at this cross-roads next to the Circus Maximus also seems to have been connected to the celebrations of the Secular Games (See Figure 19). A *pompa sacrificalis* was conducted around the Circus Maximus where the final spectacles of the Games were also held. The Septizodium would have been in full view of this ceremonial route.138 Besides its role as a monumental demonstration of the Severan presence in the city, the Septizodium also performed a
significant utilitarian function. As a nymphaeum it must have provided a source of respite in this busy hub of the city, in particular for spectators at the Circus Maximus.
1. The Palatine in fact consisted of both the Germalus and the Palatine proper, but the whole area is referred to here under the one name.


3. For the most recent study of this complex, see Krause, et al. (1985) and (1995), 189-197. Tiberius has often been credited with beginning the complex, which was thought to have been later modified and enlarged by other Julio-Claudians, but evidence for this is lacking. The sources indicate that up until the time of Claudius the imperial palace consisted of a number of houses that had been acquired as imperial possessions, and not a single complex. The facade of this complex was later extended down to the edge of the Forum, first by Domitian, and then by Hadrian.

4. Dio 56.10.4.

5. Pliny, NH 36.37.

6. For the Palace of Domitian in general, see MacDonald (1982), 47-74, Wataghin Cantino (1966), and Sasso D'Elia (1995), 42-44.

7. Pliny, Pan. 47.4.; Chron. a. 354, 146 (ed. Mommsen, 1892). Trajan is also known to have conducted judicial business at his new villa at Centumcellae (Pliny, Ep. 6.31).

8. These modifications included the addition of a hypocaust system in the Triclinium, buttressing in the Basilica, two series of spur walls between the peristyle and the Basilica, and tabernae along the outside of the peristyle. For a discussion of these alterations, see Bloch (1968), 211-218 and Boatwright (1987), 152-154.

9. For the Antonines and the Domus Tiberiana: HA Pius 10.4; Marcus 6.3, Verus 2.6. Dio 71.35.4 also states that Marcus resided in the Domus Tiberiana when he was Caesar. Dudley (1967), 175, suggests that the Domus Tiberiana was only the official residence of the Caesar, but HA Pius 10.4 clearly indicates that Antoninus lived there as emperor: cum Apollonium, quem e Calchide acciverat, ad Tiberianam domum, in qua habitabat, vocasset, ut ei Marcum Antoninum traderet.


11. This reference to the Domus Commodiana has been interpreted by some as a restoration of the Domus Tiberiana under Commodus, which so far has not been confirmed by any archaeological
evidence. See Lugli (1946), 481 and Krause et al. (1985), 73. It is possible that the megalomaniac Commodus simply renamed the palace in honour of himself as he had renamed the months of the year and even the city of Rome itself: *HA Commodus* 8.5-9, 11.8-12.9. Platner and Ashby (1929), 177, s.v. “Domus Commodiana” suggest that this title was another name for the Domitianic palace. See also Palombi (1995a), 150. Commodus does seem to have begun some building here. See *infra*.

12. *HA Commodus* 16.3. Commodus was said to have moved because he could not sleep in the palace. The Domus Vectiliana is listed under Regio II in the Regionary Catalogues (Nordh [1949], 75). See Palombi (1995b), 211.

13. *HA Pertinax* 5.7 and 6.3.

14. For the refusal of the title of Caesar; Dio 72.5.3. For the reference to the palace; Herodian 2.4.9.

15. For Pertinax’s position with the soldiers, see Birley (1988), 91-95.

16. The direct connection between residence in the palace and the position of successor is also reflected in the fact that Antoninus Pius, after designating Marcus as Caesar, orders him to come into the Domus Tiberiana. *HA Marcus* 6.3: *in Tiberianam Domum transgredi iussit et aulico fastigio renitentem ornavit*.

17. The importance of ceremonies of this type and their relationship to the topography of the city warrants further study. For the importance of the ceremony of the *adventus* of the emperor in late antiquity, see MacCormack (1981), 17-61.

18. Herodian 2.2.10. *HA Pertinax* 5.4-7 also indicates that he proceeded to the palace after fulfilling the vows on the Capitoline.


20. The whole city was decked with garlands and laurel branches. Dio 74.1.3-5. Also Tertullian, *Apol.* 35.4; Herodian 2.14.2; *HA Severus* 7.4.

22. Dio 74.1.3-5. According to the *HA Severus* 7.2-4, the occupation of the aedes of the Palatine and other areas of the city by the army was necessary. The next day Severus appeared before the senate also surrounded by armed men, both friends and soldiers. Dio's account of these events has a strong pro-Severan bias and seems to have been incorporated into his history, without much modification, from an earlier tract written for Severus on the civil wars to win favour with the emperor. See Birley (1988), 104 and Rubin (1980), 57-60. Herodian 2.12.1-2 also describes the panic in the city caused by the arrival of Severus' soldiers.


24. The lower arches are no longer preserved but their attachments can still be seen in the pilasters. For the Severan repair of the Clivus Victoriae, see Massaccesi (1939), 120 and Krause, *et al.* (1985), 112 and 126-127.

25. For the Severan construction along the Via Nova, see Massaccesi (1939), 118-19 and Krause, *et al.* (1985), 98-99 and 126-127.


27. The upper arches have now collapsed. Bloch (1968), 85 would date these arches to the time of Marcus Aurelius on the basis of the discovery of one brick stamp from the time of this emperor, but this could have been a reuse. The brickwork of these arches is characteristically Severan and their construction appears to have been related to restoration necessitated by the fire of 191. See Massaccesi (1939), 118, n. 2. This traditional dating to the time of Severus has been stratigraphically confirmed by recent excavations. See Krause (1995), 194 and 197.

28. Massaccesi (1939), 120 would tentatively date these structures to the time of Severus, but not with absolute certainty. Krause, *et al.* (1985), 99 also identifies the reinforcement of these tabernae.

29. Massaccesi (1939), 119-120. These structures between the Via Nova and the Via Sacra were to a large extent destroyed during the excavations of the nineteenth century, but the plan can be restored as a series of rooms, which were thought to belong to the Porticus Margaritaria. This
Porticus, however, is now considered to have been located in the area of the Velabrum, or at the base of the Capitoline between the Fora Boarium and Holitorium. See Richardson (1992), 314-315, s.v. “Porticus Margaritaria.” Coarelli (1980), 91 suggests that these structures between the Via Nova and Via Sacra may be the insulae recorded in the Regionary Catalogues under Regio X (Nordh [1949], 90).

30. Dio 72.24. The fire's effect upon the Palatine is also recorded in the description of Eusebius 2.174 (ed. Schoene, 1866) as well as in Orosius 7.16.3 (ed. Zangemeister, 1889): deinde alius incendium postea Romae exortum aedem Vestae et Palatium plurimamque Urbis partem solo coaequavit. Also Hieronymus, a. Abr. 2208 (ed. Helm, 1913). Herodian does not make mention of damage to the Palatine in his account of the fire.

31. This was also known as the Scrinium or Sanctuarium Caesaris. See DarSag vol. 5, 17, s.v. “Tabularium.”

32. 73.24.2.

33. Galen 13.362 (ed. Kühn, 1821-33). Orosius 7.16.3 (ed. Zangemeister, 1889) records that a library was burned when the Capitoline was struck by lightening during a fire in 189: fulmine Capitolium ictum, ex quo facta inflammatio bybliothecam illam, maiorum cura studioque compositam, aedesque alias iuxta sitas rapaci turbine concremavit. Also Hieronymus, a Abr. 2202 (ed. Helm, 1913). This is the only reference to the existence of a library on the Capitoline. See Platner and Ashby (1929), 84, s.v. “Bibliothea Capitolina,” Richardson (1992), 59, s.v. “Bibliotheca Capitolina,” and Palombi (1993b), 196. It is possible that Orosius has confused his information and is here referring to the burning of the library on the Palatine which Galen mentions, or perhaps to an isolated fire in the Porticus Octaviae.

34. See Dziatzko (1897), col. 418.

35. Ovid, Tristia 3.1.60 ff.; Suetonius, Augustus 29; Dio 53.1.3. It was built at the same time as the temple, dedicated in 28 B.C. and restored by Domitian after the fire of 64. The excavated rooms have niches in their walls and a large apse at the end in the manner of library architecture. The plan corresponds to that found on fragment 20b of the Forma Urbis. See Lugli (1946), 475, Nash (1968) I, 204, s.v. “Bibliothea Apollinis Palatini,” Richardson (1992), 58-59, s.v. “Bibliotheca Apollinis Palatini,” and Gros (1993), 55-56.
36. Aulus Gellius 13.20.1; *HA Probus* 2.1.

37. Massaccesi (1939), 118 identifies both the archive mentioned by Dio and the library recorded by Galen with the Bibliotheca Tiberiana. For the suggestion that the imperial archives were contained in the Bibliotheca Tiberiana, see also Lugli (1946), 481 and Krause, (1993), 196.

38. A library may have been part of the complex of buildings at the north-west foot of the Palatine later converted to the church of Santa Maria Antiqua. This complex was earlier thought to be the Templum Divi Augusti and its adjacent library, but this identification has now been rejected with the revised location of this temple. See Krause *et al.* (1985), 73 and 97. Coarelli (1980), 74 and 136 suggests that it may be the Athenaeum, but the function of this complex, built by Domitian over earlier structures and altered by Hadrian, still remains uncertain.


40. Pensabene (1985), 189-191. Severan work has been identified in the portico on the eastern side of the temple which limited the area of the sanctuary. A Corinthian capital found in the area dating to the beginning of the third century, as well as column shafts of red Egyptian granite and cipollino, may be attributed to this structure.

41. This discussion of the Severan repair of the Hippodromos is based to a large extent on the study by Massaccesi (1939), 121-128. See also Sasso D’Elia, (1995), 44.

42. Domitianic construction has been identified at the base of the pilasters on the curved south-west side and at the north-east end, as well as the first pilaster on the longer south-west side and the first two on the north-east.

43. This doorway is flanked with Severan brickwork and does not appear to have been part of the original plan.

44. Wall painting of the Severan period has also been identified on the wall along the set of steps on the south-east end of the stadium. See Massaccesi (1939), 129.

45. The large central room now consisted of two narrow rooms with only one opening at the front. A doorway in the partition wall gave access to the other room. A similar situation occurred in the smaller room to the right.

46. Only the first room on the south-east retained its original plan and decoration. The utilitarian function of the other rooms is attested by the lack of plastering.
For the decorative elements recovered from the Hippodromos, see Massaccesi (1939), 128-130.

CIL 13.169.

For the composite capital, see Massaccesi (1939), 129.

For the Severan architectural elements from the Palatine, see Blanckenhagen (1940), 67-68 and 93-96, Tav. 30, Abb. 83 and 84; Tav. 31, Abb. 85, 86 and 87; Tav. 32, Abb. 88 and 89; Tav. 33, Abb. 90 and 91, Tav. 34, Abb. 92.

For a discussion of the differences between the Flavian and Severan examples, see Blanckenhagen (1940), 90-99 and Strong (1953), 147-151.

Dio 76.11.1. As a member of the senate Dio probably had many opportunities to view these paintings.

The restoration of the Hippodromos demonstrates the continued use of the Domitianic palace under Severus.

For the reconstruction of these rooms with timber vaults, see Ward-Perkins (1981), 80. Barrel vaults have been suggested by MacDonald (1982), 127-129 and Wataghin Cantino (1966), 66-69. The Aula Regia has also been restored as a porticoed open court. See Blake (1959), 119. The Domitianic ceilings may also have been decorated with the stars of the heavens. Statius, Silv. 4.2, describes the room in which he had attended an imperial banquet as being similar to the golden ceiling of heaven and Martial Epigrams, 7.56 also refers to the palace as astra polumque.

There is some consensus about the roofing of these rooms. See MacDonald (1982), 53, Wataghin Cantino (1966), 67 and Ward-Perkins (1981), 80.

Severus, however, seems to have been cautious about giving out too much information. Dio states that the exact hour of his birth was suppressed by depicting this portion of the sky differently in each room in order to prevent the prediction of his death by conspirators. For a discussion of the use of astrology in Severan propaganda and in particular this comment of Dio, see Rubin (1980), 33-38.

Hannested (1986), 268-270 suggests that the porticoed building with a niche in the centre in the background of the so-called Palazzo Sacchetti relief may represent a wing of the new Severan palace since this building is richly decorated in the manner of the “Flavian Revival.” The
presence of the triumphal arch in the scene, however, indicates that the setting is more likely the Forum Romanum. For the Palazzo Sacchetti relief, see also Wace (1907), 263-270, Budde (1955), Franchi (1964), 33-34, Hornbostel (1971), 363-367, and Koeppel (1986), 82-84.

58. Because this area of the Palatine has not been widely studied it is unclear what structures, if any, existed prior to the Severan expansion in this location, but the area does seem to have remained largely unoccupied. Domitian, however, appears to have intended to build in this direction, as Domitianic substructures have been identified under the Severan bath complex.

59. For the early excavations, see Gori (1867).

60. Massaccesi (1939), 130-133.

61. Carettoni (1971), 300-326 and (1972), 96-104. This examination has revealed that the massive substructures that presently can be seen from the Circus Maximus are probably Maxentian in date.


63. Domitian had constructed an extension of the Aqua Claudia from the Caelian across to the Palatine in order to supply his new palace. Nero had previously extended the Aqua Claudia up to the Caelian. For Nero’s and Domitian’s extensions of the Aqua Claudia see Ashby (1935), 249-250, Colini (1944), 105-106, Evans (1983), 392-399, and Richardson (1992), 27, s.v. “Arcus Neroniani.”

64. Brick stamps of officinatores active under Commodus have also been discovered in the area which may indicate some earlier activity under this emperor. See Iacopi, Tomei and Meogrossi (1986), 488.

65. The baths are briefly described in Lugli (1946), 517 and (1975), 200. Much of the complex is still unexcavated, but the recent restorations have clarified some areas. For the most recent investigations, see Carettoni (1971), 309-318 and Iacopi, Tomei and Meogrossi (1986), 486-498. Excavations have revealed hypocaust tiles, opus signinum lining, and drainage systems. An interesting semi-circular structure, paved in white mosaic bordered with black, discovered in the most recent excavations may be the remains of a large basin.

66. This bath complex may have been that which Elagabalus is said to have made public. HA Heliogabalus 8.6: Lavacrum publicum in aedibus aulicis fecit...
67. CIL 6.1259 = ILS 424: ... ARCUS CAELEMONTANOS PLURIFARIAM VETUSTATE CONLAPSOS / ET CONRUPTOS A SOLO SUA PECUNIA RESTITUERUNT. For the complete inscription, see Murphy (1945), 31-32. In their study of rebuilding inscriptions Thomas and Witschel (1992), 159-164 suggest that a literal interpretation of a solo should be approached with caution, since they have found that the actual work done to a structure was often exaggerated and the expression may rather have had a metaphorical meaning. In this case, however, the archaeological evidence indicates that extensive repair was undertaken on parts of the arcade of the aqueduct. See infra 344-349.

68. For the most recent analysis of the structures on this part of the Palatine, on which this discussion is based, see Carettoni (1972), 96-104 and Herrmann (1976), 403-424.

69. A couple of Severan pilasters have been identified within the Domitianic constructions in this area which may have been part of a portico added during the Severan rebuilding, but the poor state of preservation does not allow the reconstruction of an exact plan. For the limits between the Domitianic and Severan construction, see Massaccesi (1939), 130-133, although some of his conclusions have been modified by the more recent investigations.

70. These arches are difficult to date because of their poor state of preservation. Massaccesi (1939), 130 considered them Severan, but according to Carettoni’s analysis the surviving brickwork is closer to the Domitianic-Trajanic module than the Severan. The presence of a Trajanic brick stamp (CIL 15.97b, Bloch [1968], 38 and 47) in one of the pylons may indicate their construction at this time. No Severan brick stamps have been identified in these arches. Carettoni (1971), 307 and (1972), 101-102.

71. Carettoni (1972), 101 has identified the module of the brickwork of these chambers as typically Severan.

72. Herrmann (1976), 411 and fig. 1, 406.

73. Carettoni (1971), 312-313 and (1972), 103. Further investigations may be able to clarify the situation.

74. The difference in the two masonries can be distinguished in the structure of the vaults. Carettoni (1972), 102, n. 14: “Le volte severiane sono rivestite, nell’intradosso, con bessali mentre le volte massenziane presentano costolature di mattoni collegati - a distanza uniforme - da fasce di bipedali.” The presence of more piers in front, now destroyed almost to ground level,
indicates that the Maxentian extension of the substructures continued even further in this
direction than the arches now extant. See Herrmann (1973), 405.

75. The masonry of the apsed bath hall and adjoining structures, which consisted of a large
amount of reused material, was found to be Maxentian. Brick stamps from the Tetrarchic period
were also discovered in the floors of the plunges in the large apsed hall. See Carettoni (1971),
303-304. This bath complex was probably the *thermae in palatio* built by Maxentius that is
referred to by the *Chron. a. 354*, 148 (ed. Mommsen, 1892). Carettoni (1972), 104 suggests that
Maxentius may have restored the Severan baths, but Herrmann’s study has revealed no secure
traces of an earlier phase, and he concludes that this was a Maxentian project separate from the
Severan bath complex next to the Hippodromos.

76. For the “Substructiones Septimii Severi,” see Lugli (1946), 517 and Tav. VIII. The distinction
between the Severan and later substructures has been determined by Carettoni (1972), 96-104
and especially 100, fig. 2. See also Herrmann (1976), 405.

77. Fragments 8b, d, e, f, and g. See Carettoni, Colini, Cozza, and Gatti (1960), 66-67, Tav. XVII
and Rodríguez-Almeida (1981), 74, Tav. V. A relationship between the structures represented on
these fragments and the existing remains had previously been difficult to establish because it was
thought that all of the structures in this area dated to the Severan period. The differences between
the plan and the present remains may now be explained by the later additions that have been
discovered in the recent re-evaluation of the phases of construction in this area.

78. *CIL* 6.1032: The text of the inscription survives only from the copy of the Einsiedeln pilgrim.
The Septizodium of Severus is recorded at *HA Severus* 19.5, 24.3; *Geta* 7.2, Hieronymus, *a. Abr.*
2216 (ed. Helm, 1913), Cassiodorus, *Chron. anno* 201 (ed. Mommsen, 1894), *Chron. a. 354*,
147, (ed. Mommsen, 1892) and Ammianus Marcellinus 15.7.3, who incorrectly credits the
building to Marcus Aurelius, probably confusing Caracalla’s titles with the earlier emperor. It is
listed under Regio X in the Regionary Catalogues (Nordh [1949], 90).

79. Carettoni, Colini, Cozza, and Gatti (1960), 67, fragments 7 a-b and 8 a-b. Rodríguez-Almeida
(1981), 74.

80. Richardson (1992), 350, s.v. “Septizodium” suggests that this fragment reproduces only a third
of the plan of the original building, and that in order to match the accompanying inscription, the
Septizodium should extend farther to the north-east to include at least seven niches. Richardson
would reconstruct the plan with a large curved niche in the centre flanked by single rectangular
niches, with two pairs of curved niches at each end. The fragment of the Forma Urbis would thus
only depict the two curved niches at the south-east end of the monument. If the Septizodium did
continue for a greater length to the north-east as Richardson suggests, however, according to the
angle of the plan which the inscription seems to follow, the apses at this end of the monument
might possibly appear on the upper extremity of fragment 8a of the Forma Urbis containing part
of the inscription. Recent excavations have also shown that there is a recess of the rear facade on
the northern side of the Septizodium in the same position from the central exedra as the recess
which appears on the southern portion depicted on the Forma Urbis. This suggests that the
monument ended with a similar projecting wing on this side.

104-107, and Iacopi and Tedone (1990), 149-155.

82. The foundations consisted of a conglomerate of flint within a wood framework, indicated by
the imprint of some of the planks. The foundations are 15.40 m. wide and 11.5 m. thick.

83. Excavations have also confirmed that the rear facade falls back at the point where the antae of
the wings project, as shown on the plan from the Forma Urbis. The course of the foundations is
rectilinear along the entire length of the monument, but at both ends, 34.10 m. from the middle
transverse axis, the rear facade recedes 3.45 m. See Iacopi and Tedone (1990), 149.

84. For example, the drawings of E. Du Pérac, M. van Heemskerck and an anonymous artist from
the sixteenth century. See Bartoli (1909), 261. A less well known depiction comes from the
background of a painting by Marcino d’Alba dating to 1496. See Rodenwaldt (1924), 39-44.

85. The decoration seems to have conformed to the architectonic and decorative style found on
other Severan structures. See Palchetti (1965), 311 and Strong (1953), 141. A fragment of one of
the columns, probably from the first order, has been discovered in the recent excavations. See
Iacopi and Tedone (1990), 153 and 155, fig. 13.

86. For the various reconstructions, see Hülsen (1886), 17, Dombart (1922) and (1923), col. 1578-
1586, and Durm (1905), fig. 472. See also Platner and Ashby (1929), 473-4, s.v. “Septizonium.”

87. Suetonius, Titus 1. This structure seems to have been rather insignificant since it is not
recorded elsewhere or listed in the Regionary Catalogues. Both the Esquiline and the Quirinal
have been suggested for its location. See Platner and Ashby (1929), 473, s.v. “Septizonium” and
Richardson (1992), 350-351, s.v. “Septizonium.” It is uncertain whether this was a building with seven *zonae* or stories, or astrologically inspired.

88. Fragment 8a preserves part of the letters SEPT, while 8b has the curve of a D and part of an I, U, and M. See Carettoni, Colini, Cozza and Gatti (1960), 67. The spelling Septizonium is found in the *Notitia* and in the *HA* at Severus 19.5, but Septizodium at Severus 24.3 and Geta 7.2 and Ammianus Marcellinus 15.7.3. Medieval sources also record the names Septifolium, Sedem Solis, and Septem Solium.

89. Septizodium: *CIL* 8.14372 = *ILS* 5076 (Henchir Bedd, Tunisia); Septizonium: *CIL* 8.2657 = *ILS* 5626 (Lambaesis); Septidodium: (Cincari) Picard (1962), 89.

90. See Lanciani (1897), 181-182.

91. For example the *scaenae frons* of theatres and monumental civic nymphaea, in particular those from the Eastern Mediterranean and North Africa, which seem to be the inspiration for the Severan building have three stories.

92. Maas (1902).

93. For the monument at Lambaesis, see Janon (1972), 222-241. An inscription *CIL* 8.2657 = *ILS* 5626, dating to the mid-third century, records the restoration of this structure by Cominus Cassianus, probably a legate of Numidia: *Septizonium marmoribus musaeo et omni cultu... vetustate delapsum...restituit*. For the date of this inscription (247-48 A.D.), see Birley (1950), 60-62 and Thomasson (1960), 216-218.

94. *CIL* 8.2658. For confirmation of the use of water in the Lambaesis monument, see Janon (1972), 234-241.

95. The name Septidodium, found in an inscription on an entablature discovered in the area, appears to have been a provincial variation. For a discussion of this monument, excavated by M.J. Cintas in 1955, see Picard (1962), 77-93.

96. As noted by Picard (1962), 93, this evidence seems to indicate that the basic form of a Septizodium consisted essentially of statues of the seven stars, each placed in its own housing.

97. For the Septizonium at Augst, see Laur-Belart (1966), 110-113.

98. Durm’s reconstruction (1905), fig. 472 has statuary, while Dombart (1922) and (1923), col. 1583-1584 would place mosaics depicting the planetary deities on the third level. Both would
situate an image of Sol above the central niche. The suggestion of Dombart that the Septizodium served as a large state calendar, in which depictions of the seven days of the week and the zodiac for the twelve months were marked off to indicate the date, cannot be confirmed by any evidence.

99. Note, for example, Dio’s report that Severus’ horoscope was painted on the ceiling of the palace. Julia Domna’s astrological destiny to marry a king (HA Severus 3.9; Geta 3.1) also appears to have been one of the omena broadcast by the regime.

100. 15.7.3.

101. Chini and Mancioli (1989-90), 104-105, and Iacopi and Tedone (1990), 150-153. For the reconstruction of the position of the porphyry basin within the central exedra, see Iacopi and Tedone (1990), 154, fig. 12. Drainage systems relative to the water works has also been recovered.

102. This statue fragment of Greek marble, found in fill dating to the demolition of part of the monument in the 12-13th century, depicts the lower part of the torso of a semi-draped reclining figure two times life size. Adjoining this figure was a feline creature that contained a conduit from which water spouted. See Chini and Mancioli (1989-90), 105-107 and Iacopi and Tedone (1990), 150 and 153, fig. 11. A statue of a reclining river god has also been found in situ in the central niche of the Hadrianic monumental nymphaeum with a columnar facade situated at the end of the colonnaded street at Perge. See Mansel (1975), 83-92. A statue of a reclining river god pouring water from a vase is also depicted in the centre of a nymphaeum, perhaps constructed by Severus, represented on a Severan coin from Hadrianopolis, Thrace. See Crema (1959), 545 and Price and Trell (1977), 43, fig. 69. A river god may also appear in the nymphaeum depicted on a Severan coin from Nicopolis ad Istrum in Moesia (Price and Trell [1977], 43 and 49, fig. 70), but the representation is unclear.

103. For a discussion of columnar screens from Asia Minor and the use of nymphaea, see Ward-Perkins (1981), 286-303, especially 299.

104. Picard (1962), 90-93 makes the suggestion that columnar screens were the inspiration for the African Septizodia, but denies the connection with water, basing his opinion in part on his belief that the Septizodium in Rome was not a nymphaeum. Richardson (1992), 350, s.v. “Septizodium” also suggests that water was not used in the monument, but the statement in Ammianus
Marcellinus and the recent discoveries of drains and basins in the area of the structure confirm its presence. For the association of Septizodia and nymphaea, see Spano (1952), 144-174. For a discussion of these structures in North Africa in general, see Aupert (1974).

HA Severus 24.3-4: nisi absente eo per praefectum urbis medium simulacrum eius esset locatum, aditum Palatinis aedibus id est regium atrium, ab ea parte facere voluisse perhibetur.

Domaszewski (1916), 5-7.

This base was located 5 m. from the rear wall, not 2 m. as indicated on the plan, and was therefore in line with the columns in front of the niche. Chini and Mancioli (1987-88), 351.

The statue may have been the second colossus mentioned in the Breviaria of the Notitia and Curiosum (Jordan-Hülser [1871-1907] II, 571). See Platner and Ashby (1929), 474, s.v. “Septizonium.”

As noted by Iacopi and Tedone (1990), 153, the presence of this basin indicates that the statue could not be placed in the centre of the exedra, as has often been suggested.

Guey (1946), 156-157; L’Orange (1947), 83-86 and (1953), 35. L’Orange suggests that the Serapis portrait type was used for this depiction.

Most recently Desnier (1993), 600-609 proposes that Severus, while possibly represented as Mars or Jupiter, was most likely depicted in a pose with his right hand raised in the attitude of Sol or Serapis. See also Turcan (1991), 304. Desnier suggests that the addition of the statue of the emperor within this planetary or weekly scheme was probably an innovation on the part of the Urban Prefect Cilo who was inspired by the altars and statuettes from Gaul depicting the days of the week which he encountered during his tenure in this province. Desnier cites as evidence an octagonal altar from Isère dedicated on behalf of the Augusti that depicts the days of the week on seven sides and the bust of Severus on the eighth. He dates this altar to 198 and therefore earlier than the construction of the Septizodium. The inscription on the altar (CIL 12.2683: I O M E[T] CAETERIS DIIS DEABUS IMMORTALIBUS PRO SALUTE IMPERATOR L SEPTIMII SEVERI ET M AURELI ANTONINI [--]), however, could date to any time after 198 and may be as late as the British expedition. A relationship between such a minor work as an altar and the monumental construction in Rome seems to be rather tenuous and the artistic influence, if any, would probably have flowed in the other direction. The Septizonium at Augusta Raurica (Augst) was probably also inspired by the monument in Rome.
See supra 19-23.

For example, the imperial family is represented on the Arch of the Argentarii or the arch at Lepcis Magna.

Spano (1952), 160-162 suggests that the nymphaeum at Antioch, which was adorned with seven therapeutic fountains tied to the influence of the seven planets, was the inspiration for the Septizodium in Rome. He reconstructs the Severan monument with seven basins, each containing an image of a planetary deity. The sun in his quadriga is placed at the top of the monument, while the other six planetary gods are located in the lower part of each of the three exedrae of the second and third porticoes. Spano suggests that the existence of these seven basins (solia) is reflected in the alternative spelling Septisoliwm for the monument in later sources. Severus was responsible for some rebuilding of Antioch and had spent time there during the wars in the east; so he may have come into contact with the nymphaeum at Antioch.

HA Severus 24.3: cum Septizodium faceret, nihil aliud cogitavit quam ut ex Africa venientibus suum opus occurreret. nisi absente eo per praefectum urbis medium simulacrum eius esset locatum, aditum Palatinis aedibus id est regium atrium, ab ea parte facere voluisse perhibetur.


L'Orange (1946), 83-84.


Perhaps this misunderstanding resulted from the author of the HA interpreting the word aditus in some source referring to the Septizodium as entrance instead of its other meaning as approach.

The Punic inspiration which had often been seen in Severus' policies by scholars of the past is now regarded as overestimated. See, for example, Barnes (1967), 97-106.

If the dates of the Septizodia in Africa for the most part fall in the third century, is it not possible that the inspiration for their construction was the Severan monument in Rome and not vice versa? For example, Thomas and Witschel (1992), 166-167 suggest that the structure at Lambaesis was renamed a Septizonium only when it was redecorated twenty years after its construction. This new, more spectacular name, in place of the more ordinary nymphaeum, was possibly intended to allude to the monument at Rome.
122. The author of the *HA* seems to have been fond of pointing out Severus’ African origins, and this was another opportunity to make such a connection. For example at *Severus* 19.9 Severus is said to have retained an African accent until his old age and at *Severus* 15.7 his sister is accused of being scarcely capable of speaking Latin. Both of these statements are suspicious. If Severus did have an accent it was probably a provincial Roman one, and not Punic. The account of his sister’s lack of Latin may have been intended as a slander. See Birley (1988), 35 and Barnes (1967), 96-97.

123 The Republican Tabularium had served a similar purpose by providing a facade for the Capitoline when viewed from the Forum. See Crema (1959), 545.

124. For the urban placement of these nymphaea, see McDonald (1987), 198. The monumental nymphaeum from Side, probably Antonine in date, which also had a three tiered facade and projecting wings, was located just outside the main city gate near where the two main colonnaded thoroughfares converged. See Mansel (1963), 66-74. At Aspendos a similar nymphaeum was placed orthogonally between the basilica and the market hall. At Perge a monumental nymphaeum was built during the Hadrianic period at the end of the colonnaded street, and later another nymphaeum was constructed south-west of the Agora. This nymphaeum incorporated into its structure an earlier sanctuary dedicated to Artemis Pergaia. An inscription indicates that the renovation of the facade of the sanctuary, and therefore the addition of the nymphaeum, was undertaken by Severus and the imperial family, and statues of Severus and Julia Domna, which decorated the structure have been recovered in excavations at the site. See Mansel (1975), 65-71. Severus may also have also been responsible for a nymphaeum at Hadrianopolis, which is depicted on one of his coins from this city. See Price and Trell (1977), 43, fig. 69. See also Crema (1959), 545. Another nymphaeum is also shown on a Severan coin from Nicopolis ad Istrum, Moesia. See Price and Trell (1977), 43 and 49, fig. 70. As part of the Severan building programme at Lepcis Magna a large nymphaeum was constructed at the crossroads of the colonnaded street. This nymphaeum, which had the form of a hemicycle, also had a rear columnar screen. See Ward-Perkins (1993), 70-80.

125 Ammianus Marcellinus, 15.7.3-4.

126 *Severus* 19.5.

This fragment of the Forma Urbis, no. 42, containing the plan of a number of buildings and streets and the inscriptions [CLIV]US VICTORIAE and SEVERI ET A[N]TONINI AU[G]N was originally thought to belong to the area of the Palatine. It has been relocated to a position north-east of the Septizodium and south of the Temple of Claudius by Gatti in Carettoni, Colini, Cozza, and Gatti (1960), 110-111. This location has been confirmed by Rodríguez-Almeida (1981), 65-69, who relabels the fragment 5a. Colini (1944) 199, suggests that all of the space between the Septizodium and the Porta Capena was a paved area closed to traffic.

Chini and Mancioli (1989-90), 104-105. A similar approach of steps also can be seen to the facade of the Library at Celsus in Ephesus. A reference to the Septizodium by Ammianus Marcellinus at 15.7.4 in which he comments that crowds gathered at the monument were positioned as at the theatre may reflect this arrangement: Insidens itaque vehiculo, cum speciosa fiducia contuebatur acribus oculis tumultuantium undique cuneorum veluti serpentium vultus. “Then seated in his carriage, with every appearance of confidence with keen eyes he [the Prefect Leontinus] scanned the faces of the cunei (spectators in wedged-shaped blocks of seats) raging just as snakes.”

Rodríguez-Almeida (1981), 68, n. 8 makes the interesting suggestion that the name Septizodium was actually derived from septem odos, and was given to the monument because it was constructed at the cross-roads of seven streets. The area to the south-east was called ad Septem Vias in the Middle Ages, although this may have derived from the monument and not vice versa. Such a topographical origin for the term, however, does not explain the presence of structures with this name in African cities, unless they were ultimately inspired by the monument in Rome. A close examination of the dates of all of these structures is warranted.

This probably was a continuation of the Vicus Piscinae Publicae which ran between the Aventine Major and Minor.

A brief stretch of its paving has been discovered under the corner of the convent of S. Gregorio. See Colini (1944), 199.

See the discussion of the Via Nova infra 215-217.
For the Septizodium's function as a billboard, see MacDonald (1986), 198.

CIL 6.1032 and 31229. Sections of the inscription were copied while parts of the monument still stood. In the sixth century the Einsiedeln pilgrim copied one hundred and eighteen letters on the extreme left: IMP CAES DIVI M ANTONINI PII GERM SARM FIL DIV COMMODI FRATER DIVI ANTONINI PII NEP DIVI HADRIANI PRONEP DIVI TRAIANI PARTH ABNEP DIVI NERVAE. Forty five from the right side were recorded during the Renaissance by the anonymous Barberinianus (Cod. xxx, 25): AUG TRIB POT VI COS FORTUNATISSIMUS NOBILISSIMUSQUE. The intermediate part of the inscription, which probably was not recorded because this portion of the monument had already collapsed, has been restored in CIL by Mommsen and Henzen from the titles of 203. The whole inscription would therefore read: IMP CAES DIVI M ANTONINI PII GERM SARM FIL DIV COMMODI FRATER DIVI ANTONINI PII NEP DIVI HADRIANI PRONEP DIVI TRAIANI PARTH ABNEP DIVI NERVAE

[ADNEP L SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS PIUS PERTINAX AUG ARAB ADIAB PARTH MAX PONT MAX TRIB POT XI IMP XI COS III P P ET IMP CAES M AURELIUS ANTONINUS PIUS FELIX] AUG TRIB POT VI COS FORTUNATISSIMUS NOBILISSIMUSQUE


I agree with this suggestion by Desnier (1993), 610, but as stated above, this interpretation does not necessarily require that Severus be depicted as Sol.

The triumphal route has been established as departing from the Circus Flaminus across the Forum Boarium to the Circus Maximus, and then along the valley between the Palatine and Caelian to the Via Sacra, from which it ascended along the Clivus Capitolinus to the Capitoline and the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus. See Makin (1921), 25-36, Coarelli (1968a), 55-103 and (1988), 365. For the problems regarding the triumph of Severus, see the section on the arch in the Forum.

Severan *Acta* Va. 77-82, Pighi (1965), 167-168, and 183. See also Romanelli (1931), 337-338.
VII. REGIO I AND REGIO XII

The Slope of the Caelian

Evidence of Severan activity on the corner of the Caelian hill between the Clivus Scauri and the Via Appia, perhaps related to the development of the region that framed the Septizodium, is provided by fragments of the Forma Urbis (Figure 7). This piece of the marble plan (no. 42a-f), previously thought to depict the Horrea Agrippiana on the north-west slope of the Palatine, has now been convincingly relocated on the map between the Templum Divi Claudii and the Porta Capena. The top portion of the fragment depicts a trapezoidal area subdivided into three buildings, each with a colonnaded courtyard in the centre. On the east and west side of these courtyards is a series of rooms which open out onto the streets in front. The street to the west, which runs at an oblique angle, thus creating the trapezoidal area, is inscribed with the name Clivus Victoriae. The street on the eastern side, which is unnamed, is also lined by rooms on its other side. Both of these streets issue onto what appears to be an open area devoid of structures to the south, along which these building seem to be aligned. This alignment corresponds with the northern axis of the Septizodium, and may have formed one side of an open area that extended in front of this monument.

Below the trapezoidal space containing the three colonnaded buildings is a large triangular area formed by another street which runs obliquely in an east-west direction, forming a sixty degree angle with the unnamed street running north-south. From its position, this oblique street seems to be the Clivus Scauri, which is known to have existed in this location. A series of rooms opens onto the southern side of this street.
northern side is closed off by a solid wall, but with rooms behind. Within the triangular area is the inscription SEVERI ET A[N]TONINI AU[G] NN, the genitive form indicating some building constructed by the co-emperors. It is unclear, however, what the name of this structure may be since the fragment breaks off just below. To the right of the inscription the plan of a number of larger rooms is shown, some with what appear to be apses. Below the inscription, interrupting the series of rooms aligned along the south side of the presumed Clivus Scauri, is part of another building which gives access to the same street. Unfortunately, the Forma Urbis remains the only evidence for a Severan building in this area, since these structures are otherwise unidentifiable.

Rodríguez-Almeida proposes that this inscription does not refer to a separate building, but should rather be taken together with Clivus Victoriae and suggests that the street was constructed to celebrate Severus' triumph. The fact that the two inscriptions are incised with letters of differing scale and separated by a large amount of space, however, makes such a reading implausible. A Clivus Victoriae located in this area, however, may still have been constructed by Severus in honour of his military victories. Excavations conducted in the area of the Clivus Scauri indicate that there was renewed building in this area at the time of Severus. The construction or embellishment of this street, which issued onto the presumed square of the Septizodium, may have been part of this redevelopment. This enigmatic inscription referring to the co-emperors may therefore refer not to a specific building, but to Severan attention to the district as a whole.
The Area around the Porta Capena

An inscription indicates that the Aedicula Honoris et Virtutis was repaired during Severus' reign after it had fallen into ruin from old age. The exact location of this shrine, which had been established in the second century B.C., has never been discovered, but the literary accounts indicate that it was situated near the Porta Capena (Figure 6). The restoration of the temple may have been tied to an embellishment of the area around the Porta Capena, since this gateway would have given access to the square in front of the Septizodium.

The possible presence of a family tomb in this locality may also reflect its importance to the regime. The Historia Augusta reports that Geta was buried after his murder by Caracalla in the sepulchrum Severi which was located on the Via Appia to the right as one approached the Porta Capena from the south. This tomb is said to have been decorated in a manner similar to the Septizodium. The existence of this sepulchrum Severi has been rejected by some scholars who consider the passage suspect on the basis of references in Dio to the placement of Geta's remains in Hadrian's Mausoleum. The passages of Dio, however, which are cited as evidence, do not in fact contradict the report of the Historia Augusta. Dio 76.15.4 records that Severus' remains were placed in τὸ Ἀντωνινεῖον and at 78.9.1 that Caracalla was also interred there, but no mention is made of Geta. Dio 78.24.3 actually indicates that Geta was buried elsewhere at first and that he, along with his mother, was only later placed in τὸ τοῦ Ἀντωνίνου τεμένισμα by Julia Maesa.
It is therefore possible that Geta was originally buried in a family tomb along the Via Appia as recorded in the *Historia Augusta*. Severus himself, however, probably intended his own burial to take place in Hadrian’s Mausoleum following his imperial adoption, but the monument on the Via Appia may have been originally constructed for his brother Geta, who died in 204 and who was honoured with a bronze statue in the Forum. A tomb belonging to the Severan family may even have existed here previously, as members of Severus’ family had lived in Rome since the first century A.D. An earlier monument may then have been redecorated and embellished. The restoration or construction of a family tomb on the Via Appia may have been intended to reinforce the Roman aspect of the Severan family’s ancestry. Considering that numerous other tombs existed along this road, the location of such a monument in this area is conceivable.

The claim of the *Historia Augusta* that the *sepulchrum Severi* was decorated in a manner similar to the Septizodium also should not be discounted since the use of columns and exedrae for the facades of tombs was not uncommon. Such a design was perhaps intended to echo this important monument of the dynasty. Its position near the Porta Capena along the Via Appia would have made it a focal point on this route of access to the city, which culminated in the monumental facade of the Septizodium a short distance away.

**Severus and the Via Nova**

The Septizodium, constructed at the foot of the Palatine, provided a monumental facade for the Palatine when approached from the Porta Capena to the south-east. Severus also seems to have undertaken modifications to the urban plan of the area just beyond the
Porta Capena in Regiones I and XII with the creation of a wide avenue that ran along the boundary between these two districts towards the centre of the city. On a portion of the Forma Urbis that depicts the Mutatorium Caesaris in Regio I and the Area Radicaria of Regio XII is also shown a wide street running east-west between these sites, with a width, according to the scale of the Forma Urbis, of almost thirty metres (Figure 8).\textsuperscript{18} The name of the street is missing from the inscription with only the letters \textit{VI} of \textit{VIA} preserved. Jordan suggested that the identity of such an impressive route through this area of the city could be none other than the Via Nova, the spectacular street which the \textit{Historia Augusta} credits to Caracalla in connection with his bath complex and which is listed in the Regionary Catalogues under Regio XII.\textsuperscript{19}

If Jordan's identification of the Via Nova on the Forma Urbis is correct, we may reasonably assume that Severus was responsible for the construction of this major artery and that the development of this area of the city was begun during his reign.\textsuperscript{20} The creation of the street was probably tied to the raising of the level of the terrain along the valley between the Caelian and the Minor Aventine, an area which was subject to flooding. An artificial terrace was also subsequently created for the construction of the Thermae Antoninianae.\textsuperscript{21} Indeed, while brick stamps confirm that the Thermae Antoninianae were largely executed under Caracalla, it is possible that their layout had been planned and the terracing for their construction had already been begun during Severus' reign in conjunction with the preparations for the roadway.\textsuperscript{22}

The route of the Via Nova is usually considered to have been parallel to and south of the Via Appia, leading from the Thermae Antoninianae toward the south-east entrance
of the Circus Maximus. According to this scheme Jordan would place the fragment of the
Forma Urbis so that the Via Nova was directed toward the Circus Maximus (See Figure
10). The Via Appia, which led toward the Porta Capena, is identified on the fragment as
the smaller street running parallel to the Via Nova, onto which issued the Mutatorium.23
An alternate location, however, has been suggested by Colini, who proposes that this
broad avenue may have led rather toward the Septizodium, which would then have
provided an impressive background for its approach (see Figure 9).24 According to this
layout the new artery would have encountered the Via Appia in the area of the Porta
Capena, and perhaps have encompassed it at this point.25 A direct relationship between
the Septizodium, an important monument within the framework of the Severan building
programme, and this major new street would not be unexpected. Severus is also known to
have constructed the Thermae Severianae somewhere in Regio I of the city, and perhaps
their location may be tied to the route of the Via Nova.

Unfortunately, the wide street depicted on the Forma Urbis cannot be located by
definitive archaeological evidence, and the route of the Via Nova remains unconfirmed.
Its identification on the Forma Urbis, if correct, indicates that it was probably begun
during the reign of Severus. Whether it led directly to the Septizodium or the Circus
Maximus the creation of this major new artery dramatically changed the urban layout of
this area.

**The Thermae Severianae**

Thermae Severianae are included by the author of the *Historia Augusta* among the
extant *opera publica praecipua* built by Severus, and they are also recorded in the
Chronographer of 354, Hieronymus, and Cassiodorus. They are most likely the same Thermae Severianae listed in Regio I, along with Thermae Commodianae, in the *Notitia* and *Curiosum*. The location of the Thermae Severianae within the irregular outlines of Regio I, however, has not been determined with certainty.

In the *Notitia* and *Curiosum* the Thermae Severianae are listed together with the Thermae Commodianae between the *Balneum Torquati et Vespasiani* and *Area Apollinis et Splenis et Calles*. So many of the sites listed under Regio I, however, are unknown that it is impossible to make any certain statements concerning the locations of the monuments in relation to one another. At first glance the *Mirabilia* appear to provide promising information about the location of the Thermae Severianae. It locates these baths in the area of the Mutatorium which is identified with S. Balbina: *S. Balbina fuit mutatorium Caesaris. ibifuere thermae Severianae et Commodianae*. Unfortunately, this information is incorrect and only serves to further confuse the matter. The site of the Mutatorium has been shown not to have been in the vicinity of S. Balbina, but rather across the Viae Nova and Appia on the lower slope of the Caelian.

Jordan’s suggestion that the Thermae Severianae may be identified with a large building excavated at the south corner of the Thermae Antoninianae near the Via Appia in 1658 or the ruins of a large aula found on the north side of the so-called Monte d’Oro has not yet been confirmed. Other scholars have suggested that the baths were located south-east of the Thermae Antoninianae. Some have also suggested that they were later incorporated into the Thermae Antoninianae, but both thermae are listed independently in
the *Notitia* and *Curiosum*, indicating that they were regarded as separate complexes into
the fourth century.\(^{33}\)

Recently E. Tortorici has proposed that a large building excavated between 1670-
76 south-east of Porta Capena along the present Via Valle delle Camene in the area
known as Orto del Carciofolo, and reported to have had traces of pipes in some of its
rooms, as well as a black and white mosaic featuring Triton and Nereids, may belong to
the Severan bath complex.\(^{34}\) He would therefore define the limits of the Thermae
Severianae from the area of the structures in Orto del Carciofolo on the west up to the
Vigna Mattei to the east, encompassing roughly the present Via Valle delle Camene.\(^{35}\)
Tortorici’s proposed location for the Severan Thermae, however, is problematic because
it cannot be reconciled with what is known of this district from the Forma Urbis. Colini
has shown that pieces of the Forma Urbis depicting the Mutatorium and the Area
Radicaria may be located precisely in this area between the Caelian and the Minor
Aventine.\(^{36}\) In the position where Tortorici places the baths, the Forma Urbis actually
depicts a series of buildings that give the appearance of being shops or storehouses.

The elimination of the site discussed above does not rule out the possibility that
the Thermae Severianae may have occupied a site somewhere along the present Via Valle
delle Camene in the area between the Porta Capena and the Thermae Antoninianae
(Figure 9).\(^{37}\) This area of Regio I was supplied with water from a branch of the Aqua
Marcia called the Rivus Herculaneus which terminated in a castellum above Porta
Capena.\(^{38}\) The Aqua Marcia may have been restored by Severus, perhaps to service the
new baths.\(^{39}\) Such a position for the Thermae Severianae would also coincide with the
path of the Via Nova, the wide avenue created along the boundary between Regio I and Regio XII. If Severus was responsible for beginning the Via Nova, it is likely that the Thermae Severianae would have been located along its route. This street may have been constructed in order to connect the new Severan baths with the centre of the city. Later the Via Nova may have been extended to the south-west by Caracalla to provide access to the Thermae Antoninianae, the first stages of which may have been begun during Severus' lifetime.

The Thermae Severianae in Regio I seem to have been preceded by the construction of the Thermae Commodianae. Their site has also not been identified, and little is known about them. Herodian records that Cleander, Commodus' Praetorian Prefect, had built a very large gymnasium and bath which he then made over to the people to win their support. This complex is thought to have later been called the Thermae Commodianae. The Historia Augusta also records that the only extant work of Commodus was a lavacrum built by Cleander in Commodus' name. Since the Thermae Commodianae are listed together with the Thermae Severianae in the Notitia and Curiosum, they were probably located in the same vicinity. It is unclear, however, why Severus found it necessary to build another set of baths in the same region of the city. Although they are listed as Thermae in the Regionary Catalogues, perhaps the Commodan baths were not large enough to meet the demand, thus necessitating the construction of another, perhaps larger, complex.

The construction of the Thermae Severianae is recorded under the year 200 by Hieronymus and 201 by Cassiodorus. A date of 200-201 would fit within the framework
of Severus' building programme. With the construction of this complex Severus sought to provide needed bathing facilities in Regio I and the southern part of the city in general. Except for the rather obscure Thermae Commodianae, they were the first imperial baths built in Rome since the construction of the Thermae Traiani almost seventy years before. The erection of a public bath would be an important expression of the renewal of the city. Not only was the emperor concerned with the restoration of the outward appearance of Rome, but he was also seeing to the urban needs of the populace. The Thermae Severianae seem to have been of considerable size and magnificence, enough to warrant the attention of the author of the Historia Augusta and to be included by him among the conspicuous public works of the emperor.

The Domus Cilonis

L. Fabius Cilo was one of Severus' generals during the civil war and served as praefectus urbi from 203 or 204 to 211 and as consul ordinarius for the second time in 204. According to Aurelius Victor, Cilo was among the friends who received a residence as a gift from the emperor. The Domus Cilonis has been identified on a fragment of the Forma Urbis (Figure 9). It has also been proposed that the inscription HORTI CELONIAE FABIAE copied from another fragment, part of which is now lost, actually should read CILONIAE FABIAE and would refer to gardens of Cilo's wife located nearby. The gardens, however, more likely belonged to Ceionia Fabia, the sister of Lucius Verus. The Domus Cilonis is listed in the Regionary Catalogues under Regio XII. Because of the discovery of a fistula inscribed with the name of Cilo among the
remains near S. Balbina, this residence has been located on the Minor Aventine in the area of the convent and church.\textsuperscript{54}

A number of walls in \textit{opus mixtum} have been excavated under the convent. Along the Via G. Barelli leading up to the church is preserved a terracing wall with niches. According to the date of the brick stamps the nucleus of this building was constructed during the time of Hadrian. Brick stamps dating to the reign of Marcus Aurelius and the Severan period have also been discovered in the area.\textsuperscript{55} According to the Regionary Catalogue the \textit{privata Hadriani} was also located within Regio XII.\textsuperscript{56} The Hadrianic date of the original part of this residence in the area of S. Balbina suggests that it may have been part of Hadrian’s property that passed into the imperial possessions and was then given over to Cilo as a gift by Severus. The presence of Severan brick stamps may indicate that the structure was restored and expanded when the residence was endowed to Fabius Cilo.\textsuperscript{57} The remains, however, are too fragmentary to identify the building phases with any confidence, and there is no evidence to associate this \textit{domus} securely with Cilo.

While the Domus Cilonis is not part of the official public building programme it is included here since it seems to have been a conspicuous structure of the Severan period. It was still worthy of note by Aurelius Victor and in the Regionary Catalogues. Because the Domus Cilonis is one of the few private properties named on the Forma Urbis, Gatti has suggested that the marble plan was incised at the initiative of Cilo.\textsuperscript{58} While the Urban Prefect may have been responsible for the survey on which the map was based and its subsequent carving in marble, this need not necessarily be the reason why
his domus was specifically labelled. Only a little more than ten percent of the Forma Urbis survives; so it is not possible to say that other large residences were left unnamed.  

Perhaps the Domus Cilonis warranted inclusion on the Forma Urbis because it was a special presentation of the emperor. Aurelius Victor also singles out a number of other domus which Severus endowed to his friends, such as those of Annullinus, Bassus, Lateranus, and the Aedes Parthorum. These may also have been represented on the map. The location of the domus of Annullinus and Bassus are not known, but that of Lateranus was on the Caelian near the present Basilica of S. Giovanni. The Aedes Parthorum is also recorded in the Regionary Catalogues, under Regio XII, but its exact location is unknown.
The location of these structures on the Palatine, which rested on the presence of a Clivus Victoriae on this fragment, has been rejected by Gatti in Carettoni, Colini, Cozza, and Gatti (1960), 109-11. There is a discrepancy between the actual remains found in this area of the Palatine and the plan depicted on the fragment. The height of the slab itself (89 cm.) is also larger than the others in the row of the plan where it had been previously positioned (75 cm.). Fragment no. 42, both in its veining, thickness and height fits rather with fragment no. 5 which depicts the Templum Claudii, and the hole marks for the clamps also coincide with this position. This placement by Gatti has been confirmed by Rodriguez-Almeida (1981), 65-69 who relabels the fragment 5a.

This Clivus Victoriae would probably be the extension of the street which runs along the south-east side of the Templum Divi Claudii. See Carettoni, Colini, Cozza, and Gatti (1960), 111.

Colini (1944), 199 suggests that all of the space between the Septizodium and the Porta Capena was a paved area closed to traffic.


One major building undertaken by the emperor whose location has not yet been determined is the temple of Hercules and Bacchus, but there is no archaeological evidence for its placement here. The identification of this temple with the remains of the large complex on the Quirinal proposed by Santangeli Valenzani (1991-92), 7-16 is so far the most convincing. See the discussion of the Temple of Hercules and Bacchus infra 301-317.


A large brick construction dating from the beginning of the third century has been excavated in Piazza di SS. Giovanni e Paolo, which would coincide with the area of intersection between the Clivus Scauri and the Clivus Victoriae. Farther west along the Clivus Scauri the facade of an insula, preserved to two stories, built at the beginning of the third century may be seen still preserved along the wall of the south aisle of the Basilica. See Colini (1944), 168, 201-202, 207-208, and 415 and Astolfi (1995), 118.
The repair is recorded in a dedication made to the emperors in 205. *AE* (1946), 189:

\[
\text{[LARIBUS AUG ET GENIO IMP CAES L SEPTIIMI SEVERI PI PI FELICIS AUG ARABIC][L ET IMP CAES M AU]RELLI ANTONINI PI PI FELICIS AUG I [AEDICULAM REG I VIC]O HONORIS ET VIRTUTIS VETUSTATE COLLAPSAM EX [QUI INFRA SCRIPT]I SUNT M SERVILIUS CRISPUS SEN M SERVILIUS CRISPUS IUN DE]DIC III ID MART PER GN RUSTICUM PR VIG EV IMP CAES M AURELIO [ANTONINO...].
\]

The date of the inscription is 205.

The original temple of Honos was built in 234 B.C. by Q. Fabius Maximus, and that of Virtus vowed by M. Claudius Marcellus and dedicated by his son in 205 B.C. It was restored by Vespasian (Pliny, *NH* 32.120). Livy (26.34.2) locates it *in vestibulo urbis* and it is referred to as *ad Portam Capenam* in Cicero *Verr.* 4, 121, and Augustus, *Res Gestae* 11.29-30. The shrine is listed under Regio I in the Regionary Catalogues (Nordh [1949], 73).

HA *Geta* 7.1-2: *Fumus Getae accuratus fuisse dicitur quam eius, qui fratri videretur occisus. inlatusque est maiorum sepulchro, hoc est Severi, quod est in Appia Via eunitibus ad portam destra, specie Septizonii exstructum, quod sibi ille vivus ornaverat.* “The funeral of Geta is said to have been more elaborate than that of one who seems to have been killed by his brother. He was laid in the tomb of his ancestors, that is of Severus, on the right of those going to the gate, which that man (Severus?/Geta?) decorated for himself while still living, built in the manner of the Septizodium.” *Ille* is rather ambiguous, but it seems more likely to be used here to refer back to the last person mentioned or implied, that is, Severus.

Although Robathan (1939), 529-530 accepts many of the topographical references in the *HA*, she rejects this passage citing Dio 78.9.1 as evidence that Geta was buried in the Mausoleum of Hadrian and suggests that the author of the *Life of Geta* confused the Septizodium with the Mausoleum of Hadrian. Dio 78.9.1 does not refer at all to the burial of Geta. The confusion between these monuments on the part of the single author, who now is generally agreed to have written the work, also seems unlikely since he was clearly aware of the position of the Septizodium at the foot of the Palatine at Severus 24.3-4. Richardson (1992), 360, *s.v.* “Sepulchrum Severi,” is also sceptical.

Dio reports that Julia was at first buried in the Tomb of Gaius and Lucius (The Mausoleum of Augustus?), but does not indicate where Geta was originally buried.
13. Since Geta was condemned and suffered *damnatio memoriae* it would be unlikely that he would have received imperial burial in Hadrian’s Mausoleum under Caracalla.

14. Dio 76.2.4. Geta, who hated Plautianus, had warned Severus about the Prefect on his deathbed.

15. It is unclear whether Severus’ family was originally of Italian or African stock, but there were relations in Rome from the first century. Statius wrote a lyrical ode (*Silv. 4.5*) to a friend called Septimius Severus who had come to Rome from Lepcis when he was young. This may be either Severus’ grandfather (thus Birley [1988], 220), or grand uncle (Barnes [1967] 87-91). The descendants of this Severus became consuls (*HA Severus 1.2*), one of whom obtained senatorial rank for the young Severus when he arrived in Rome (*HA Severus 1.5*). Severus’ father seems to have remained in Lepcis.

16. In Livy’s day (1.26.14) the tomb of Horatia was still to be seen near Porta Capena. The tomb of the Scipios has been discovered on the Via Appia about a mile from Porta Capena. The tomb of the Marcelli may have been located near the Aedicula Honoris et Virtutis itself founded by Q. Fabius Marcellus, a leading member of the family (*Asconius, ad Cic. Pis. 44*). According to Cicero (*Disput. Tusc. 1.17.13*.), the tombs of the Metelli, Servilii, and Catilinae were also located along the Via Appia. In the wedge between the Viae Appia and Latina numerous columbaria, now known as the Columbari di Vigna Codini, for the freedmen of the imperial house have also been discovered. See Richardson (1992), 356, s.v. “Sep. Familiae Marcellae et Aliorum.” The existence of the *sepulchrum Severi* along the Via Appia is accepted by Benario (1958), 716 and Avetta (1985), 25.

17. For example, niches, exedrae, and columns are used on the facades of the tomb known as “La Conocchia” from Capua and the tomb beside the Via Celle near Pozzuoli. See Toynbee (1971), 155-156 and Ward-Perkins (1981), 169-170.

18. Fragments 1a-e, Carettoni, Colini, Cozza, and Gatti (1960), 59-60, Tav. XV. For the Area Radicaria, see also Rodríguez-Almeida (1993b), 119-120.


21. For the terracing of the Thermae Antoninianae, see Richardson (1992), 389, s.v. “Thermae Antoninianae (Caracallae).” For the raising of the level of this area at the beginning of the third century and its effect on the earlier necropolis, see Avetta (1985), 249-250.

22. The erroneous belief that the construction of these baths began in 206 was first suggested by Middleton (1885), 356 and repeated by Lugli (1975), 567, and, most recently, by Yegül (1992), 152. Bloch (1968), 299-303 has shown that the brick stamps from the Thermae do not date before 212. The peribolos of the Thermae was not completed until the reign of Alexander Severus.

23. See Jordan-Hülsen (1871-1907) I:3, 189, n. 16.

24. Caretoni, Colini, and Cozza, and Gatti (1960), 59. Colini would therefore locate this portion of the Forma Urbis slightly farther to the north-east so that the street is directed toward the Septizodium. He therefore does not recognize the Via Appia in the smaller street located to the north, since such an orientation would take the Via Appia onto the lower slopes of the Caelian. This placement of the Forma Urbis fragment is accepted by Rodríguez-Almeida (1981), 59, and fig. 14, and Avetta (1985), 23-24 and 249-252.

25. The Via Appia would therefore have been converted to a minor street providing access to public buildings in the area. See Richardson (1992), 33, s.v. “Area Radicaria” and 417, s.v. “Via Nova (2).”


27. Thermae Severianæ are also included in the list of Thermae in the Appendix of both the Notitia and Curiosum. See Jordan-Hülsen (1871-1907) II, 568-569 and Nordh (1949), 73, 101. The baths therefore stood until the fourth century, but seem to have disappeared before the eighth century as they are not included in the Itinerary of the Einsiedeln Pilgrim. They are mentioned in the Mirabilia (25), but this work appears to have borrowed heavily from the Regionary Catalogues, and the passage does not indicate that these baths were still standing: S. Balbina fuit
mutatorium Caesaris. ibi fuit thermae Severianae et Commodianae. This location is also incorrect, see n. 30 infra.

28. The Balneum Vespasiani and Calles are added to the list in the Notitia, but they are not included in the Curiosum.

29. Nothing is known about the location of the Balneum Torquati, the Balneum Vespasiani, the Area Apollonis or Calles. The Area Apollinis of Regio I had been identified on fragment no. 469 of the Forma Urbis inscribed JREA APOL[, but has since been assigned by Rodriguez-Almeida (1981), 99 to the Area Apollinis on the Palatine. The reading of Calles in the Notitia is doubtful and is otherwise unknown. See Jordan-Hülsen (1871-1907) I:3, 219 and Richardson (1992), 31, s.v. “Area Apollinis” and “Area Calles” and 50, s.v. “Balneum Torquati” and “Balneum Vespasiani.” The Area Splenis, however, has been identified in the immediate area of the church of S. Sisto Vecchio. The location of the Area Splenis is confirmed by a medieval legend which places it on the Via Appia near S. Sisto ad locum qui dicitur Spleni. See Richardson (1992), 37, s.v. “Area Splenis.” In the Notitia and Curiosum Regio I begins with the Aedes Honoris et Virtutis located near Porta Capena and names near its end the Aedes Martis, which stood on the north-east side of the Via Appia just outside Porta S. Sebastiano of the Aurelian Wall. All that can be said with certainty is that the listing appears to have moved from the Porta Capena at the north-west end of the Via Appia towards the south-east.

30. For the problems with this passage of the Mirabilia (25), which appears to be a manipulation of the information of the Regionary Catalogues, see Jordan-Hülsen (1871-1907) II, 512-513. The ruins of the Thermae Severianae seem to have already disappeared by the time that the Mirabilia was written in the twelve century. For the location of the Mutatorium, which has been identified from a fragment of the Forma Urbis (1a-e) see Carettoni, Colini, Cozza, and Gatti (1960), 59-60, Tav. XV, Rodriguez-Almeida (1981), 57 and Avetta (1985), 23.

31. Jordan-Hülsen (1871-1907) I:3, 209 and 217. The remains on Monte d’Oro have been identified as a cistern dating from the time of Hadrian to Antoninus Pius, but no Severan remains have as yet been recognized. See Tortorici (1993), 167.

33. See Benario (1961), 284. The Thermae Antoninianae are listed in Regio XII and both complexes appear in the list of Thermae in the Appendix of the Notitia and Curiosum.

34. Tortorici (1993), 168-170. For a description of the ruins discovered in Orto del Carciofolo, directly east of piazza Porta Capena and south-east of S. Gregorio, see also Avetta (1985), 27. Unfortunately, however, the ruins in the Orto del Carciofolo have since disappeared and cannot be dated, and the mosaic is known only from a drawing.


36. Fragments 1a-e, Carettoni, Colini, Cozza, and Gatti (1960), 59-60, Tav. XV. The Mutatorium is listed in Regio I and the Area Radicaria in Regio XII in the Regionary Catalogue. The fragment therefore depicts the boundary between the two regions which runs along the valley between the Caelian and Aventine. Colini’s positioning of these pieces is accepted by Rodríguez-Almeida (1981), 57. See also Avetta (1985), 23.

37. Perhaps they were located further west, closer to the Porta Capena.

38. For the Rivus Herculaneus, see Lugli (1975), 106-108 and Richardson (1992), 18, s.v. “Aqua Marcia.”

39. CIL 6.1247: TRIB] POT IIII [---] AQUAM [ARCIAM ---] INIURIIS D [---] EXCISIS [ET PERFORATIS MONTIBUS ---] AMPLIA [---] INTEGR [---]. The fragmentary text was copied by De Rossi from a piece of a large marble tablet which may have been placed on a monumental arch of the aqueduct. See Colini (1944), 85. Hülsen, the editor of CIL 6.1247, following the attribution of De Rossi, assigns the inscription to the time of Severus. The Severan date of the inscription, however, cannot be definitely confirmed.

40. This street, if it is actually represented on the fragment of the Forma Urbis, would indicate that Severus was responsible for the construction of this major artery and that the development of this area of the city was begun during his reign. This wide avenue either led toward the Circus Maximus, or accepting the placement of Colini, toward the Septizodium.

41. This first portion may be that depicted on the Forma Urbis fragment.

42. The layout of the Thermae Antoninianae may have been planned in conjunction with the preparations for the roadway at the time of Severus.
43. Notitia and Curiosum, Regio I; Chron. a. 354, 147 (ed. Mommsen, 1892); Hieronymus, a. Abr. 2199 = 183 (ed. Helm, 1913).

44. Herodian 1.12.3.

45. HA Commodus 17.5-6: opera eius praeter lavacrum quod Cleander nomine ipsius fecerat, nulla extant.

46. The later construction of the massive Thermæ Antoninianæ in the adjacent Regio XII, which were possibly planned by Severus, is an indication of the need in this area.

47. Hieronymus, a. Abr. 2216 = 200 (ed. Helm, 1913); Cassiodorus, Chron, anno 201 (ed. Mommsen, 1894).

48. For Cilo’s career, see PIR² F 27.

49. Epit. 20.6: in amicos inimicosque pariter vehemens, quippe qui Lateranum Cilonem Anullinum Bassum ceterosque alios ditaret aedibus quoque memoratu dignis, quarum praecipuas videmus Parthorum quae dicuntur ac Laterani.

50. Fragment no. 677 with the inscription ILIONIS has been convincingly restored to DOMUS CILONIS. See Carettoni, Colini, Cozza, and Gatti (1960), 157, Tav. LIX and Rodriguez Almeida (1981), 57, Tav. I.

51. Accepting this interpretation, Rodriguez Almeida (1981), 9 would place this fragment, and therefore these gardens, in the vicinity of the residence of Cilo.

52. See Bloch (1961), 145.


54. CIL 15.7447. Lanciani (1897), 540-541 reports that the two pedestals from statues dedicated to Cilo by the citizens of Ancyra and Milan were also recovered during excavations in the area in the sixteenth century (CIL 6.1408 = ILS 1141; CIL 6.1409 = ILS 1142; CIL 6.1410), but their exact provenance is unrecorded.

56. Nordh (1949), 93.


59. The more likely identification of fragment no. 45 as the *horti* of Ceonia Fabia, the sister of Lucius Verus, rather than Cilonia Fabia, the wife of Cilo, is evidence that other private property was named.

60. *Epit.* 20.6. T. Sextius Lateranus, consul in 197 (PIR\(^1\) S 469); P. Cornelius Annulinus, Urban Prefect from 197 until Cilo’s appointment (203/204), consul for the second time in 199 (PIR\(^2\) C 1322). Bassus is unknown.

61. *Curiosum:* VII domos Parthorum; Notitia: septem domos Parthorum (Jordan-Hülsemann [1871-1907] II, 560; Nordh [1949], 93). Jordan-Hülsemann (1871-1907) I:3, 197 suggests that they may be located on the heights between the Thermae Antoninianae and S. Saba. They have also been identified in the ruins north-west of the baths, because they are listed between the Thermae Antoninianae and the Domus Cilonis in the Regionary Catalogues, but without any supporting evidence. See Richardson (1992), 132, s.v. “Domus Parthorum (Aedes).” Liverani (1988), 903 and (1995c), 153 interprets the passage in Aurelius Victor as referring to only one *domus*. He suggests that it was first called Parthorum when hostages or ambassadors from the Parthian War were housed there, and later Laterani when it was given over to Lateranus. Most scholars, however, accept the existence of two buildings and connect the Aedes Parthorum with the listing in the Regionary Catalogues. See Santangeli Valenzani (1995), 176.
By the Severan period the Campus Martius had become one of the most monumental and elegant areas of Rome. The development of the area already had begun in the second century B.C. with the construction of temples and porticoes by triumphant generals around the Circus Flaminus, and continued into the first century with the monumental theatre complex of Pompey. During the Empire it continued to be built up with many magnificent complexes. Augustus restored many of the complexes around the Circus and built the Theatre of Marcellus. The Theatre of Balbus and the Amphitheatre of Statilius Taurus were also erected during his reign. Agrippa built the Pantheon and a public bath complex with an artificial lake, the Stagnum Agrippae, fed by the new Aqua Virgo and drained by the Euripus. He also completed the Saepta and the Diribitorium begun by Caesar. In the northern Campus, Augustus' Mausoleum, the Solarium, and the Ara Pacis were constructed.

Where space was available successive emperors added buildings of their own, which, following the precedent of Augustus, were intended to glorify the ruling emperor and his family. Nero built another bath complex north-west of the Pantheon. After the fire in 80 Domitian restored a number of buildings and constructed his Stadium, Odeon, the Templum Divorum and the Temple of Minerva Chalcidia on the west and east margins of the Augustan buildings. Hadrian built extensively in the Campus Martius, rebuilding the Pantheon, repairing the Saepta and erecting the Temple of Matidia. The Antonines also constructed their dynastic monuments, the Temple of Divus Hadrianus, the columns of
Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius, and the Temple of Divus Marcus within the Campus Martius.

Although Severus constructed no new buildings in the Campus Martius, he undertook some notable restoration in this area. During his reign the Porticus Octaviae was rebuilt, and the Pantheon and the Theatre of Pompey were repaired. No major catastrophe in the area of the Campus Martius is known to have occurred to necessitate this restoration. Perhaps damage was caused by the flooding of the Tiber, to which the Campus Martius was often subject, or by isolated fires or just the passage of time. These repairs and reconstructions may also be connected to preparations for the Secular Games, the celebration of which was concentrated in the area. Besides an actual need for repair, Severus also seems to have had an underlying motive in his attention to the Campus Martius - to connect his name to former emperors and institutions and to make a place for his own dynasty within the area so associated especially with Augustus and the imperial cult as well as with the more recent dynastic structures of his adoptive family, the Antonines.

The Funeral Pyre and Ara Consecrationis of Pertinax

In 193, in one of his first acts as emperor, Severus held an elaborate funeral for Pertinax. Part of this ceremony took place in the Forum Romanum, where the effigy of Pertinax was laid out in front of the Rostra and eulogized by Severus. Then the bier was carried to the Campus Martius for cremation and the completion of the consecration ceremony. Here a magnificent pyre had been constructed. Although this structure was only temporary and was intended to be consumed by flames, its construction was
politically significant for the contemporary population. Such a structure had last been built in the Campus Martius at the death of Marcus Aurelius. Commodus' body had been secretly buried during the night in the Mausoleum of Hadrian, although the senate and people had demanded that it be dragged with a hook and thrown into the river. Didius Julianus, condemned to death as a murderer of Pertinax, was buried by his wife in the tomb of his great-grandfather on the Via Labicana. Pertinax had also already received a quiet burial, but in staging an imperial funeral and consecration for Pertinax, Severus was legitimizing his own power by displaying pietas toward the emperor to whom he claimed to be the rightful successor.

The Campus Martius as the site for the cremation and subsequent consecration of a deceased emperor went back to the time of Augustus. Already in the last century of the Republic burial in the Campus Martius had become an honour voted by the senate to eminent individuals, and following this tradition Augustus chose this area for his Mausoleum. At his death his body was carried from the Palatine to the Forum and then to the Campus Martius for cremation on the funeral pyre constructed near the Mausoleum. The body was placed on the pyre, a decursio was performed around it, and then the pyre was set on fire. Augustus' apotheosis was confirmed when a witness swore that he had seen the emperor ascend through the flames. According to Strabo the site of Augustus' cremation was marked by an enclosure wall of white marble surrounded by a circular iron fence. The area was also planted with black poplars. The site of the Augustan ustrinum seems to have been located east of the Mausoleum where a travertine pavement and a number of cippi bearing the names of various members of Augustus'
family were recovered (Figure 12).\textsuperscript{16}

During the course of the first century the emperors who succeeded him were, with certain exceptions, deified on their death in consecration ceremonies probably similar to that of Augustus. The funeral pyres of Tiberius and Claudius seem to have also been located in the Campus Martius.\textsuperscript{17} Domitian probably transferred the ashes of Vespasian and Titus to the Aedes Gentis Flaviae, which he had constructed in Alta Semita near the family’s house on the Quirinal, but the location of the original cremation and burial of Vespasian and Titus is unknown.\textsuperscript{18} Nerva, however, who was laid to rest in the Mausoleum of Augustus, was very likely cremated on a pyre erected nearby in the Campus Martius.\textsuperscript{19}

In the second century the rite of consecration at which the emperor and members of the imperial family were deified continued to take place in the Campus Martius.\textsuperscript{20} Hadrian’s Mausoleum, which also became the place of interment for the Antonines, was constructed in the Ager Vaticanus on the right bank of the Tiber, but it was oriented towards the Campus Martius and was connected to it by the Pons Aelius.\textsuperscript{21} The personification of the Campus Martius that appears in the bottom left of the relief from the base of the column of Antoninus depicting the consecration of the imperial couple confirms that the Campus Martius was the site of the cremation of Antoninus and Faustina I at least, and probably other emperors of the second century and the members of their family.\textsuperscript{22}

The magnificent funeral pyres that were constructed in the Campus Martius for the consecration ceremonies of the Antonine emperors and their imperial consorts are
depicted on the reverses of their coinage, usually with the legend CONSECRATIO.\textsuperscript{23} The earliest example was issued in 141 to honour Faustina I. Similar representations also occur on types struck for Antoninus Pius in 161, Lucius Verus in 169, Faustina II in 176, and Marcus Aurelius in 180.\textsuperscript{24} Although they vary slightly in their details, the pyres are represented as monumental structures rising as a pyramid in a succession of tiers, usually four in number. The lowest tier, or base, is decorated with garlands. The second and third stories have arcades or niches, with doors and statues, and the top is surmounted by a chariot group, probably a \textit{quadriga} for a \textit{divus} and a \textit{biga} for a \textit{diva}. This type of monumental, tower-like funeral pyre was possibly a development of the mid-Empire when consecration ceremonies appear to have taken on more significance.\textsuperscript{25}

The \textit{ustrinum} where members of Hadrian and his family were cremated was at one time thought to have been discovered in the western Campus Martius under the modern Piazza Sforza. The structure found there, however, is now thought to be a monumental altar-tomb dating to the early Empire.\textsuperscript{26} The \textit{ustrina} of Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius respectively were identified in the similar rectangular structures excavated near the column of Antoninus Pius in 1703, and near that of Marcus Aurelius in 1907. They were believed to have been the base on which the wooden pyres were constructed.\textsuperscript{27}

More recent analysis of these monuments, however, has shown that they could not be the bases of the actual funeral pyres, since the materials would have been damaged in the conflagration. A more reasonable interpretation seems to be that they were monumental altars constructed after the cremations to commemorate the site where the
consecration took place. They can be reconstructed as large central altars surrounded by a perimeter wall with an outer precinct consisting of travertine cippi connected by a metal grill. These areae consecrationis seem therefore to have been part of a monumental area established for the Antonine dynasty on the west side of the Via Lata in the north-western Campus Martius, probably in emulation of the Augustan monuments farther to the north (Figure 12). In fact, a third and possibly a fourth monumental altar have been discovered in the adjacent area at a similar orientation, indicating that they were erected in a line defined by the Via Lata.

The monumental funeral pyre constructed for Pertinax's consecration may also have been built in the area where the Antonines had been consecrated, since Severus wished to show that Pertinax, and he himself in turn, were the legitimate successors of that dynasty. Dio describes the pyre as a tower with three stories. It was decorated with ivory and gold as well as a number of statues, and on the summit was placed a gilded chariot that Pertinax had often driven. This monument was commemorated on the reverse of a sestertius issued in 193 with the legend CONSECRATIO (Plate III.1). Although the details are obscured, a structure with a base and three tiers, surmounted by a chariot can be observed. It was similar to the monumental structures depicted on the reverses of Antonine coinage.

Although intended to be consumed by fire, the design resembled a permanent monument and was adorned with precious materials and statues. The pyre was an imposing structure of some size, as it towered four stories including its base. The temporary nature of the construction should not detract from its significance. Temporary
structures played a considerable role in political and social ceremonies and served to emphasize their significance. The elaborate funeral pyre was an essential element in the rite of consecration.

After the funeral pyre was set on fire an eagle was released signalling the apotheosis of Pertinax. The divinization of Pertinax was an important political act by which Severus hoped to share in Pertinax’s popularity. Severus was also intent on portraying his reign as a return to the Golden Age of Marcus Aurelius and the Antonines, the dynasty to which he and Pertinax were the true successors. It is very likely, therefore, that the site of Pertinax’s consecration was also commemorated with a monumental altar among those of the Antonine emperors. Perhaps Dio is referring to an *ara consecrationis* set up in honour of Pertinax in the Campus Martius when he records that Severus, upon establishing himself in power, erected a ήρωον to Pertinax. The attribution of the altars to Antoninus and Marcus Aurelius is, in fact, based only on their relative vicinity to the columns of these emperors, and no definite attributions have as yet been determined for the other two most recently recovered. The existence of other altars in the area is also very probable.

The towering funeral pyre that Severus had constructed for Pertinax in the Campus Martius was only a temporary feature of his building programme, but in itself it was an important initial construction. The ceremony which made Pertinax a divus was conducted in the Campus Martius in the tradition of imperial funerals, especially those of the Antonines. An *ara consecrationis* dedicated to Pertinax would be a significant permanent marker of Severus’ pietas toward his successor, and his intention to connect
his regime to the Antonine dynasty.

At his death in 211 Severus was also consecrated by his sons and heirs. A towering funeral pyre of five stories was constructed in the Campus Martius, decorated with golden embroideries, ivory statues, and paintings. Coin issues in honour of Severus’ consecration depict his funeral pyre as a structure with a garlanded base and four tiers, some decorated with statues, some with niches, and topped with a quadriga. After the pyre was filled with offerings of incense and aromatic herbs the pyre was set afire by his sons and an eagle released from the top to signal the emperor’s ascent. Probably in accordance with Severus’ own plans his ashes were then placed in Hadrian’s Mausoleum. The site of Severus’ consecration was probably also commemorated with an ara consecrationis along the Via Lata among the monuments of his adopted gens Antoniniana, where Severus seems also to have intended to establish a presence for his new dynasty.

The Porticus Octaviae (Figures 11 and 13)

The Porticus Octaviae was originally built sometime between 33 and 23 B.C. and was dedicated formally dedicated to Augustus’ sister Octavia and probably her son Marcellus. This complex replaced an earlier porticus begun by Q. Metellus Macedonicus in c. 146 B.C. The Porticus Metelli was built to enclose the Temple of Jupiter Stator, which was constructed at the same time, and an earlier Temple of Juno that stood on the site. The Augustan rebuilding of the porticus included the addition of two bibliothecae, one Greek and one Latin, and a curia and scholae. The Porticus Octaviae fell victim to the fire of 80 and was probably restored by Domitian.
An inscription on the surviving propylon records that the Porticus Octaviae was restored by Severus and Caracalla in 203 after it was damaged by fire:


"The emperor Lucius Septimius Severus, Pius Pertinax Augustus, Arabicus and Adiabenicus, Parthicus Maximus, holding tribunician power for the eleventh year, Imperator for the eleventh time, consul for the third time, Pater Patriae, and the emperor Caesar Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Pius Felix Augustus, holding tribunician power for the sixth time, consul, proconsul restored (this) having been destroyed by fire."

Some fragments of the Forma Urbis depict the plan of the Porticus Octaviae as it appeared at the time of Severus. It consisted of a double colonnade on a main axis north-east to south-west. The colonnade surrounded the prostyle hexastyle Temple of Juno and the Temple of Jupiter, which was peripteros sine postico. An apsidal building appears to have been located behind the temples.

The Severan reconstruction of the Porticus Octaviae is generally considered to have closely followed the Augustan plan, which in turn respected more or less that of the original porticus of Metellus. The addition of the curia and libraries by Augustus must have necessitated an amplification of the Metellan porticus to the north in order to
enclose the whole complex. The temple of Jupiter, which was originally *peripteros*, was probably converted to *sine postico* at the time of Augustus in order to accommodate the buildings behind it. The re-examination of the socle of the south-east side of the porticus by H. Lauter, however, has revealed some aspects of the earlier history of the building that do not correspond with the Severan plan found on the Forma Urbis.

The few remains in peperino of the Metellan phase indicate, at least in the south, that the original porticus had a two nave hall with Ionic columns in the inner row, but may have had a closed outer wall, possibly with exedrae in the Hellenistic manner. The Augustan phase in this area reveals restoration, but no drastic change to the plan and some re-use of the Metellan material. The Augustan porticus apparently also had a closed outer wall at least to the south. In the plan depicted on the Forma Urbis, however, the south side of the porticus is represented as having an outer row of columns, some of which remain *in situ*. At some point, then, after the Augustan building of the Porticus Octaviae, the outer wall of the south side was changed to an open colonnade. Whether this change first occurred during the Domitianic or Severan rebuilding is difficult to establish. The columns *in situ* appear to be from the Severan rebuilding. These remains and the plan on the Forma Urbis indicate that at least in the Severan phase the facade of the porticus was open with a row of two colonnades, through which the buildings in the interior could be viewed (See Figure 13, frags. 31u and cc).

Most of the structures of the Porticus Octaviae that survive to any height seem in fact to date to the Severan period, indicating that an extensive rebuilding was required. The best preserved part of the entire complex is the monumental entrance, or propylon,
which stood on the south side, facing the Circus Flaminus and the Tiber, and on which the inscription recording the Severan restoration was inscribed.\textsuperscript{56} The propylon consisted of a rectangular structure 15.60 x 10.95 m. with four large Corinthian columns between antae on both facades.\textsuperscript{57} Only the two left columns of the front and three of the internal facade remain.\textsuperscript{58} These columns support the architrave and pedimental cornice. Arches that pierce the brick walls on the sides give access to the propylon from the side. The inner and outer facades of the propylon extended outside and inside the line of the porticus.

The propylon is entirely a Severan construction. The Corinthian columns are typical of the period. The acanthus leaves of the capitals are deeply articulated by an extensive use of the drill and the carving has a rather careless quality.\textsuperscript{59} An eagle is inserted in the centre of the abacus in the manner of Severan figured capitals.\textsuperscript{60} The columns are raised on low plinths, a practice common in the third century.\textsuperscript{61} The brick construction of the side walls of the propylon is also characteristic of the Severan period.\textsuperscript{62}

The decoration of the propylon is noted for its elegance and sobriety.\textsuperscript{63} The soffit of the architrave is decorated with a simple geometric motif, and the frieze is occupied by the inscription which becomes the focus of the design. The Corinthian capitals of the columns also reflect a simplicity of composition. The only figured elements in the decoration are the eagles in the capitals and an eagle motif used for the lateral antefix. The sobriety of the propylon of the Porticus Octaviae contrasts with the flamboyant "baroque" decoration, heavily influenced by Flavian motifs, found on other contemporary
monuments, such as the Arch of the Argentarii with its exuberant vegetal ornamentation. The more simple and linear decoration of the propylon of the Porticus Octaviae, with its use of vegetal ornament only in the column capitals, was inspired by the more sober taste of Hadrianic-Antonine classicism. This simpler rigid decoration, sometimes called the “Augustan revival” because of its return to the severity of Augustan design, almost entirely avoids naturalistic plant ornamentation and is found in Hadrianic monuments such as the Pantheon or the Antonine Temple of Antoninus and Faustina. The decoration of Severus' arch in the Forum was in part also influenced by this current of Hadrianic-Antonine classicism.

Whether the Severan propylon was a replacement for a similar entrance in the previous phases of the complex cannot be determined. If the change in plan to an open colonnade on the south side was carried out during the Severan reconstruction, then the large imposing entrance way could also have been a Severan innovation to the plan. This monumental entrance became the visual focal point of the south facade of the porticus. The inscription commemorating the restoration by Severus and Caracalla, his co-ruler and heir, served as the main decoration of the propylon.

The columns that survive from the porticus itself also seem to belong to the Severan phase. Their capitals are copies of the capitals of the propylon, but on a smaller scale and with less attention to detail. Severan restoration has also been identified in the remains of the Temple of Juno Regina which was located inside the porticus, indicating that an extensive rebuilding of the whole complex was required.
Portions of the Temple of Juno Regina have been identified in the area between Via S. Angelo in Pescheria and Via della Tribuna Campitelli. Three columns of the pronaos and part of the architrave can be seen in the courtyard of one of the houses along Via S. Angelo in Pescheria, and part of the cella and pronaos have also been discovered in the cellar of another building. The capitals of the columns of the pronaos are composite with a double row of acanthus leaves and one of ovuli. Of the cella, a brick wall of Severan construction which formed part of the front is preserved. This wall abuts the marble doorpost of the cella and continues for 4.75 m. until it connects with the anta of the east wall and part of the corner. Part of the side walls in brick also remain. These walls were revetted in marble and rested on a moulded travertine base.

From these remains and the almost complete plan of the temple preserved on the Forma Urbis, the Severan phase of this temple can be reconstructed as prostyle hexastyle, set on a high podium with a deep pronaos. The rebuilding probably followed the traditional character and plan of the temple, respecting the antiquity and sacred nature of the temple, as in the case of the Aedes Vestae, but adopting the new stylistic elements of the composite capital.

The Temple of Jupiter was probably also restored at this time, as it is unlikely that this temple was spared in what appears to be extensive fire damage to the entire complex. No traces of its structure, however, have been uncovered to confirm this. If restoration was required for this building its plan as found on the Forma Urbis indicates that it retained the peripteros sine postico form that it probably received during the Augustan rebuilding. A fragment of a relief depicting an eagle, Jupiter's symbol, found in the area
of the Porticus Octaviae, may belong to the Severan rebuilding of the Temple of Jupiter.\textsuperscript{75}

There were important religious associations involved in the restoration of these venerable temples of Jupiter Stator and Juno Regina within the Porticus Octaviae. Their rebuilding gave Severus the opportunity to display his religious piety towards important divinities of the Roman pantheon. A relationship between the emperor and Julia Domna with Jupiter and Juno had also been cultivated in the imperial coinage and sculpture. From early in the reign Jupiter is depicted exclusively on Severus' coinage giving his divine approval to the new regime. On \textit{aurei} of 194 Jupiter is shown clasping the hand of Severus, conferring victory on him after the defeat of Niger.\textsuperscript{76} On other issues of this year Jupiter is represented presenting a globe, the symbol of the Empire, to Severus.\textsuperscript{77} Issues depicting Jupiter holding a Victory and sceptre, some with an eagle at his feet, were also minted from 194-196.\textsuperscript{78} Issues from 197-200, commemorating the second Parthian victory, depict either a seated Jupiter with the legend IOVI CONSERVATORI or the god advancing brandishing a thunderbolt with IOVI PROPUGNATORI.\textsuperscript{79} Jupiter also appears on the coinage of the latter part of the reign, probably in relation to the military campaign in Britain.\textsuperscript{80} An exceptional silver medallion was issued in 207 to Jupiter Victor, depicting Jupiter in his \textit{quadriga} throwing a thunderbolt at two giants on the reverse.\textsuperscript{81} Allusions to Jupiter in Severus' portraiture have also been noted, in particular, on the relief depicting the Capitoline Triad on the arch at Lepcis, where the figure of Jupiter shares some of the distinctive features of the portraits of Severus.\textsuperscript{82} A portrait of Severus preserved on a fragment of another relief from this arch also bears a close resemblance to Jupiter.\textsuperscript{83}
The emperor's relationship with the father of the gods was reinforced by connecting Julia Domna with the divine consort Juno. Julia Domna led the prayer to Juno Regina during the Secular Games. Several of her coin issues depict the goddess as the queen of heaven, Juno Regina, with her peacock. Juno Lucina holding a child also appears on Julia Domna's coinage. On the arch at Lepcis Magna two references are made to Julia Domna's relationship with Juno. In the so-called Capitoline Triad relief Juno is depicted with the distinctive hairstyle and features of Julia Domna. In another relief of a sacrifice scene Julia Domna, placed directly below the seated Juno, appears almost as the goddess's earthly counterpart. Statues also discovered at Lepcis depict a seated Severus and Julia Domna with the attributes of Jupiter and Juno. The restoration of the temples of Jupiter Stator and Juno Regina within the Porticus Octaviae gave Severus the opportunity to underline the special relationship between the divine consorts and the imperial couple.

In the restoration of the Porticus Octaviae and its temples the Severan architects respected the original design of the structure, although some alterations may have been made. Severus was presented as the restorer of an important complex dating back to Augustan times and associated with the founder of the imperial order. However, by prominently placing his inscription on the monumental entrance to the complex which now formed the focus of the building's facade, Severus was able to make his own claim to the Porticus Octaviae.

The association that developed between Severus and the Porticus Octaviae on account of the prominence of this inscription may perhaps be reflected in the fact that it
was known as the Porticus Severiana, Porticus Severini, and Templum Severianum in the twelfth century. This label may even go back to antiquity. According to the account of the *Historia Augusta*, there was a porticus in Rome named after Severus which honoured his military exploits and was believed to have been built by Caracalla. E. Tortorici suggests that this porticus is the restored Porticus Octaviae which was known as the Porticus Severi in the fourth century. The inscription on the Porticus Octaviae clearly indicates that the Porticus Octaviae was restored during the reign of Severus, but perhaps in the popular account it became associated with Caracalla, whose name also appeared on the dedication. The prominence of the Severan inscription at the entrance to the complex, and the lack of any reference to the original name, could easily have led to the development of Porticus Severi as its popular designation.

If Tortorici’s identification of the Porticus Severi with the restored Porticus Octaviae is correct, then the decoration of the restored Porticus Octaviae as described in the account of the *Historia Augusta* also included works commemorating Severus’ military exploits. The Porticus Octaviae had been the site of many famous objects, including the famous group depicting Alexander’s victory at Granikos brought back by Metellus and set up in the original Porticus Metelli. Some of these may have been restored after the fire, but the addition of works glorifying Severus’ achievements and the new dynasty to the decoration of the Porticus Octaviae would not be unexpected. The presence of these works of art within the porticus may have led to the close association of this building with Severus in the later Empire.
That Severus himself desired the complex to retain its original associations, however, is demonstrated by the retention of the name Porticus Octaviae on the Forma Urbis. On the plan of the Forma Urbis, the inscription [PORTI]CUS OCTAVIAE ET FIL[ ] appears above the south-east portico. The second part of the inscription is usually restored to ET FIL[IPPI] and considered to refer to the adjacent porticus surrounding the Temple of Hercules Musarum built by L. Marcius Phillipus, but L. Richardson Jr. has convincingly argued that it should rather read ET FIL[II]. The Porticus was therefore still associated with Octavia and her son at the beginning of the third century.

The inscription on the propylon indicates that the Porticus Octaviae was restored by Severus in the year 203. Like many of his other restorations this was carried out in time for the Secular Games of 204 which had their focus in the Campus Martius. It is possible that the building itself was the location of part of the ceremonies of the celebration. The porticus Marcelli mentioned in the Acta of the Severan Games may refer to the Porticus Octaviae as it is adjacent to the Theatre of Marcellus and the porticus itself was associated with Augustus’ nephew. The worship of Juno Regina was also prominent in the celebration of these Games.

The Pantheon (Figure 11)

According to an inscription added to the front architrave the Pantheon was restored by Severus in the year 202:

IMP CAES L SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS PIUS PERTINAX AUG ARABICUS
ADIABENICUS PARTHICUS MAXIMUS PONTIF MAX TRIB POTEEST X
IMP XI COS III PP PROCOS ET / IMP CAES M AURELIUS ANTONINUS
The emperor Lucius Septimius Severus Pius Pertinax Augustus, Arabicus Adiabenicus Parthicus Maximus, Pontifex Maximus, holding tribunician power for the tenth year, Imperator for the eleventh time, consul for the third time, Pater Patriae, proconsul and the emperor Caesar Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Pius Felix Augustus, holding tribunician power for the fifth year, consul, proconsul restored with all of its ornament the Pantheon which had been ruined with old age.”

The text states that the restoration was undertaken because the Pantheon was ruined by old age (*vetustate corruptus*). The Hadrianic building, however, now almost eighty years old, seems to have remained for the most part structurally sound. The Severan restoration appears to have been limited to the repair of cracks in the masonry that occurred during the settling of the building over time and some reinforcement to the walls and arches.

In order to reinforce the main entrance a large arch, 1.65 m. thick, was added above the bronze doors. Severan brick stamps have also been identified in the lower zone of the cupola, indicating some repair and restoration. A Severan wall has also been identified outside the rotunda, running north-south along the rear chamber walls, a little obliquely to the main axis of the Pantheon, and adjacent to the rotunda at its north end.
This wall, which is visible for about 20 m., is 1.18 m. thick at its base and is preserved to a height of over 1 m. Its purpose is unclear, but its thickness indicates that it could sustain some weight and perhaps was constructed to act as a buttress for the rotunda.\textsuperscript{103} It is also possible that the Severan construction was a repair to a boundary wall of a passageway that may have run along the west side of the Pantheon in order to connect the Thermae of Nero and the Thermae of Agrippa.\textsuperscript{104} Unfortunately, since the area west of the Pantheon remains largely unexcavated, it is uncertain how it was laid out in antiquity.\textsuperscript{105} The identification of brick stamps dating to the time of Severus in the remains of the Thermae of Agrippa suggests that Severan activity around the Pantheon may actually have been extensive.\textsuperscript{106}

While the Severan restoration to the structure of the Pantheon seems to have consisted only of some minor repair or maintenance in order to stabilize the building, the Severan inscription on the architrave does state that the building was restored with all of its ornament: \textit{cum omni cultu}. No identifiable Severan work, however, has been found among the extant decoration.\textsuperscript{107} As an explanation for the apparent contradiction between the inscription and identifiable Severan restoration of the decoration, K. De Fine Licht suggests that \textit{cultus} in the inscription should rather be interpreted as the organization of the religious ceremony, the ceremonial apparatus and furniture connected with the Pantheon.\textsuperscript{108} This explanation, however, seems rather forced. The term \textit{cultus} when used in connection with structures seems for the most part to refer to the physical appearance of the building, and not the religious ceremony, and there is no reason why the Severan inscription on the Pantheon should be an exception.\textsuperscript{109}
Taking the Severan inscription on the Pantheon as their starting point, E. Thomas and C. Witschel have recently argued that the particulars described in the rebuilding inscriptions on Roman monuments should be viewed with suspicion. From an analysis of the texts of extant Latin inscriptions from the Roman West dating from the second century B.C. to 500 A.D., and by comparing inscriptive and archaeological evidence where possible, Thomas and Witschel conclude that the expressions employed in these inscriptions do not always represent the actual details of the restoration, but were often used rhetorically for political effect.\textsuperscript{110}

In the case of the Pantheon, however, the fact that the Severan repair to its ornament may no longer be detectable should be taken into account before judgement is passed on the reliability of the inscription.\textsuperscript{111} As Thomas and Witschel themselves note, the improved surface appearance undertaken in a restoration often cannot be judged from the state of preservation of a building, which usually provides only information about the structural changes.\textsuperscript{112} Although better preserved than other ancient monuments, since antiquity the Pantheon has been subject to alterations and removal of materials.\textsuperscript{113} After eighty years of existence the original decoration of the Pantheon may have required some restoration, necessitated by exposure to the elements through the simple passage of time or even some natural disaster.\textsuperscript{114} The removal and replacement of sections of the interior veneer of the dome was probably required when the Severan reinforcing arch was added above the main doorway and the lower zone of the cupola was reinforced.

Some restoration of the external decoration now no longer extant may also have been undertaken. The pronaos of the Pantheon was adorned in antiquity with acroteria
and the tympanum held some sort of decoration, possibly a bronze *corona civica*.\textsuperscript{115} The front of the intermediate block has long been robbed of its decoration, but its two niches and the wall around them were once covered by marble slabs, as were the side walls.\textsuperscript{116} The manner in which the exterior of the rotunda was decorated is unclear, but the lower zones appear to have been revetted with marble while the upper part was probably covered with plaster and stucco.\textsuperscript{117} The dome was originally covered in bronze with marble tiles on the lowest step ring.\textsuperscript{118} In light of the fact that the surface ornament of the Pantheon is not preserved in its entirety, a Severan restoration to its original decoration should not be discounted. Some structural changes, although limited, have also been identified, and the Severan work does appear to have served some purpose in stabilizing the building, as no major repair work was required for many years after.\textsuperscript{119} Severus’ claim to have restored the Pantheon to its former splendour, even if somewhat exaggerated, was probably legitimate.\textsuperscript{120}

Even allowing for exaggeration in the claims asserted in the inscription, there was, however, a definite political motivation in undertaking this work of restoration.\textsuperscript{121} Severus’ desire to be associated with the Pantheon had implications for his own legitimization and security. The original Pantheon, built by Agrippa as a *templum omnium deorum*, also seems to have been intended as a dynastic sanctuary of the *gens* Julia and the family of Augustus.\textsuperscript{122} Dio describes the temple as containing the statues of many gods, including Mars and Venus who were the Julian and Augustan patrons. According to his account Agrippa at first wished to place the statue of Augustus among the gods and to name the building after him, but after the emperor refused this honour he placed a statue
of Divus Julius inside the temple, and the statue of Augustus and one of himself in the pronaos. With the passage of time the Pantheon seems to have maintained a connection with the divine ancestors of the imperial house and to have become the centre of worship of the imperial cult in the city of Rome. Although the Pantheon was rebuilt by Hadrian, he did not place his name on it, and at the beginning of the third century the building appears to have still been associated with Augustus. It was therefore important for Severus to associate himself and his dynasty with the building in order to legitimize his connection to the imperial house. Thus the inscription was placed across the architrave under that of the original Augustan builder, Agrippa, whose name had been retained on the Hadrianic building.

Severus’ attention to the Pantheon, one of the most magnificent buildings in the Campus Martius, was also significant in his portrayal of himself as Restitutor Urbis. The inscription was intended to be a prominent announcement of his concern for this important building and the state of the Empire itself. The choice of language used in the inscription reinforced this. Thomas and Witschel have noted that the expression *collapsus vetustate* was often used rhetorically in inscriptions to underline the importance of the structure concerned and the almost divine achievement of the restorer in countering the decaying effects of the force of time.

The astrological significance of this building may also have been utilized by the emperor to promote his own imperial fortune. The geometry of the building seems to have had planetary associations and the circular form of the ceiling may be seen as representative of the dome of heaven, ruled by the sun from the central oculus.
is known to have been personally interested in astrology, and this aspect of the Pantheon would probably have appealed to him.\(^{130}\) It was fitting for Severus, as the one chosen by divine providence to reestablish stability and peace, to restore a building representative of the cosmos and both the home of the gods and the imperial ancestors.

The inscription indicates that the restoration was completed in 202, a year of celebration in the city of Rome.\(^{131}\) After a five year absence the emperor and his family returned to the city from the victories in the east. The marriage of Caracalla and Plautilla was celebrated with a great procession through the Forum, Severus observed his *decennalia* and the emperor and his son served as joint consuls. The ceremony for the dedication of the Pantheon may have been connected to the celebrations of the *decennalia*.\(^{132}\) The restoration of the Pantheon was probably also connected with preparations in the Campus Martius for the Secular Games.

**The Theatre of Pompey** (Figure 11)

There is evidence for Severan attention to this building in the appointment of a *procurator operis theatri Pompeiani*. This duty was carried out by a Q. Acilius Fuscus, who set up inscriptions at Thubursicum Bure in Africa Proconsularis and at Ostia.\(^{133}\) Fuscus served as procurator for the theatre sometime before 209, as he was *procurator annonae Ostiensium* after this date.\(^{134}\) The nature of the work carried out by this procurator is unknown, since little of the theatre is now extant.\(^{135}\) Since the Severan building programme was very active in this part of the Campus Martius, it is very likely that this appointment concerned some restoration of the complex.\(^{136}\) *Ludi honorarii scaenici* were held in the Theatre of Pompey during the Secular Games and therefore
Fuscus may have been responsible for preparing the theatre for the events of this celebration.  

The Palazzo Farnese Area

In the area south-west of the Theatre of Pompey excavations under the Palazzo Farnese have revealed a number of walls and some mosaic floors belonging to a building complex that was the object of redecoration during the Severan period. A number of ancient walls have been discovered built into the foundations of the Palazzo, but unfortunately the remains are too scattered to supply a definite plan. From the building technique of the surviving structures the original phase of construction can be dated for the most part to the late-Flavian period extending into the beginning of the second century A.D. During the Severan period some alterations were made. A hypocaust system and a marine mosaic were added to the room discovered under the north gallery of the present Palazzo, which may have been converted to a bathing room at this time. A paving floor of bricks was also added to the room under the east gallery, and some of the walls also seem to have been strengthened.

The monumental nature of the structures discovered in the complex under the Palazzo Farnese suggests that it was some sort of public building. It may have been part of the Stabula Factionum located in the vicinity. Coarelli has suggested that the Trigarium, an area for the training of horses and charioteers, was located next to the Stabula Factionum, and therefore it is possible that the complex under the Palazzo Farnese was used by an equestrian group that also exercised at the Trigarium. One of the mosaics found depicts equestrian gymnasts, and the building may have been the
headquarters for this profession.\textsuperscript{144}

If the structure under the Palazzo Farnese was connected to the Stabula Factionum then the Severan restoration may have included other parts of the complex. Chariot racing was an important element of the Secular Games and the refurbishment of the Stabula may have been undertaken by Severus as part of his building programme in connection with this event.\textsuperscript{145}

**Tarentum**

Tarentum was the most important sanctuary of the western Campus Martius, and the location of the subterranean altar of Dis and Proserpina where the Secular Games had their origin and focus.\textsuperscript{146} In this area during the celebration of the Games *ludi scaenici* were held and sacrifices made to the Moerae, Ilithyiae and Terra Mater on the banks of the Tiber. In 1890-91, and later in 1930, several marble fragments belonging to large *cippi* on which were inscribed the *Acta* of the Secular Games of Augustus and Septimius Severus were found in the same area near the Ponte Vittorio Emanuele, between Corso Vittorio and Lungotevere degli Altoviti.\textsuperscript{147} Since the inscriptions indicate that the *cippi* were set up *eo loco ubi ludi futuri sint*, Tarentum seems to have been located here. From excavations carried out in this location, it can be reconstructed as a large area paved with travertine blocks, at one point crossed by the Euripus built by Agrippa which was covered by a bridge for foot traffic.\textsuperscript{148} Pavements of different orientation have been discovered indicating various periods of activity.\textsuperscript{149}

Severus was probably responsible for some development in this area in connection with his own celebration in 204. The fragments of the inscription discovered a few metres
from the intersection of Via Paola and Corso Vittorio indicate that a large marble and bronze cippus was set up to commemorate the Severan Games. These fragments, found nine meters in depth, all seem to belong to the lowest zone of the inscription, thus indicating that they were found in situ. The Severan monument was set up near an earlier Augustan cippus, fragments of which have been found in the same area. The Severan commemoration, however, must have overshadowed its predecessor, as its longer, more detailed text required a marble pilaster of greater height than the Augustan one. The Severan cippus that was set up in Tarentum may be depicted on coin issues of the emperor and his son (Plate III.2).

During the excavations of 1930 some sculptural pieces from the Severan period were also recovered in this area. On the basis of their style and size eight fragments belonging to the same sculptural relief, three of them joining, were identified. On the joined fragments the figure of a woman, now preserved only from the bust up, reclining on a kline is depicted. Three female figures in lower relief stand behind this woman and on both her right and left are masculine figures, of which the upper part of the torsos survive. The two other fragments each contain a muscular nude male torso preserved from the waist to shoulder and wearing a balteus. One of these fragments has an edge, and belongs to the end of the scene. The distinctive wig-like hairstyle of the recumbant female figure, similar to that worn by Julia Domna in her portraits, and the style of the carving date the relief to the time of Severus.

The thickness of the marble, the high relief of the carving, and the size of the figures suggest that this relief belonged to some sort of public monument.
fragmentary nature of the relief unfortunately makes interpretation of the scene difficult. Relying on analogies of this type of recumbant female figure on other reliefs, and the recognition of the opening of a cave in the background, Romanelli ventured to suggest that the scene represented Mars’ encounter with the sleeping Rhea Silvia.\textsuperscript{156} La Rocca, however, has noted the similarity of this depiction with representations of the dying Alcestis found on sarcophagi of the Antonine period. These funerary representations seem to have derived ultimately from a pictorial tradition, probably of Hellenistic origin, that illustrated the episodes of the myth of Alcestis as described in Euripides’ tragedy.\textsuperscript{157} That the myth of Alcestis is represented seems to be confirmed by the presence of Hercules in the relief. In the nude male torsos found on two of the other fragments the hero can be recognized from the presence of his lion skin and club.\textsuperscript{158} La Rocca, therefore, suggests that Hercules was present in more than one scene, and that more than one episode of the myth was represented.\textsuperscript{159}

Although they were not recovered in a clearly defined context, the fragments of the relief seem to have been deposited near their original position.\textsuperscript{160} Their provenance might therefore indicate their association with a monument located in Tarentum. The subject matter of the relief, Hercules and the rescue of Alcestis, would not be surprising in a Severan context, considering the promotion of this divinity as one of the \textit{di patrii} of the new dynasty. Hercules and Liber are represented on coinage minted in connection with the Secular Games, and appear to have played some role in the ceremony. One may conjecture that a cycle of Herculean myths, complemented by other scenes relating to Severus’ other patron Liber, was represented.\textsuperscript{161} The original form of the monument
cannot be reconstructed from the few surviving fragments, but, in light of its location and date, the relief was probably set up in connection with the Secular Games celebrated here by Severus in 204. Its purpose may have been to commemorate the event in the same way as the inscribed marble *cippus.*

**Theatrum Ligneum**

Part of the ritual of the Secular Games recorded in the Augustan *Acta* included the presentation of *ludi Latini at a theatrum ligneum* constructed in the Campus Martius near the Tiber in the area of Tarentum. Because the theatre was constructed of wood and therefore subject to fire, it probably had to be reconstructed by Domitian for his celebration of the Secular Games in 88. On the Domitianic coinage issued to commemorate this event the representations of the sacrifices to Ilithyiae and Terra Mater that took place in Tarentum during the second and third night have in the background an elaborate structure consisting of what seems to be a two storied portico decorated with triangular and rounded pediments. This may possibly represent the *scaena* of the *theatrum ligneum* set up near the Tiber.

The Severan *Acta* also record theatrical *ludi* held at a wooden theatre in the Campus Martius. This theatre seems to be represented on the Severan coinage issued to commemorate the sacrifice carried out to Terra Mater (Plate III.3). In the background of the scene a structure consisting of two columns supporting an architrave is shown. Above the architrave is an awning in a series of festoons. This edifice has been identified by G. Traversari as a schematized representation of a theatre *scaena* of the *siparium* type.
The Severan representation of the theatre located in Tarentum is completely different from that shown on the Domitianic coins, which suggests that it was built anew for the Games of 204 according to the ancient tradition. These wooden theatres were vulnerable to the elements, and probably did not endure for many years. They were possibly also intended to be temporary, and may have stood only for the duration of the celebration, since the existence of a \textit{theatrum ligneum} in Tarentum is recorded only in the Augustan and Severan inscriptions commemorating the Games.\textsuperscript{168}

Although the theatre had a wood frame it may still have been an elaborate structure. Unfortunately, the depictions on the Severan coinage are very schematic, but in some of the representations a decorated architrave and Corinthian columns can be discerned. It was probably also embellished with expensive materials.\textsuperscript{169} The \textit{theatrum ligneum} therefore served as an important structure in the Campus Martius and as the physical focus for the events in the area of Tarentum during the celebration of the Secular Games.\textsuperscript{170}
1 For a survey of all of the developments in the Campus Martius, see Wiseman (1993a), 220-224. A book on the Campus Martius by Coarelli is forthcoming.

2 For the Republican Campus Martius, see Castagnoli (1946), 93-193.

3 See Shipley (1933).

4 Buchner (1976), 319-365 discusses how these monuments celebrated Augustus as the bestower of peace and order to Rome and the cosmos.

5 For Hadrian’s building in the Campus Martius, see Boatwright (1987), 33-73.

6 Coarelli (1977b), 844 has suggested that the fire of 191/192 may have also spread to this area of the city. Dio 72.24 records only that the fire spread from the Templum Pacis to the Palatine, although Herodian 1.14.3 states that fire raged for several days, destroying many parts of the city. The inscription on the Porticus Octaviae records that it was repaired after a fire (CIL 6.1034), but there are no indications that the other buildings in the immediate area were repaired; so this may have been a separate, isolated case. The reason given for the restoration of the Pantheon (CIL 6.896 = ILS 129) was not fire damage.

7 For the flooding of the area of the Campus Martius, see Le Gall (1953), 29-30.

8 Dio 74.4; HA Pertinax 15.1; Severus 7.8-9.

9 HA Commodus 17.4 and 20.1-5.

10 HA Didius Julianus 8.10.

11 Severus also adopted the name Pertinax (HA Pertinax 15.2; Severus 7.9). This ceremony gave credence to Severus’ claim that he intended to model his administration on that of Pertinax, who in turn had followed the example of Marcus Aurelius. See Birley (1988), 105. In 195 Severus had himself adopted by Marcus Aurelius, and later Commodus was also deified, although an elaborate ceremony for this event is not recorded and was unlikely. See Birley (1988), 127.

12 For the sepulchra in the Campus Martius, see Wiseman (1993a), 221. Tombs are known for the P. Scipiones (Silius Italicus, 13.656-657); Sulla (Livy, Epit. 90; Plutarch, Sulla 38; Appian, BellCiv. 1.106; Lucan, 2.222), A. Hirtius and C. Pansa (Livy, Epit. 119; Velleius Paterculus, 2.62; CIL 6.37077 = ILS 8890 which refers only to Hirtius), and for Julia the daughter of Caesar (Livy, Epit. 106; Plutarch, Pompey 53; Caesar 23; Dio 39.64). For the funeral of Julius Caesar a pyre had been prepared in the Campus Martius near the tomb of his daughter, where he may also
have intended to be buried, but amid the tumult the corpse was burned in the Forum, and his ashes were later deposited in the temple dedicated to Divus Julius (Appian, BellCiv. 2.147; Suetonius, Iulius 84; Dio 44.35-51). See also Strabo 5.3.8.

13 The Campus Martius may also have been chosen because the apotheosis of Romulus was thought to have taken place here. This association also seems to have been exploited in the construction of the Pantheon. See Coarelli (1983b), 45. For the thematic unity of the Mausoleum, Ustrinum, Solarium, and Ara Pacis in the northern Campus Martius, see Buchner (1976), 319-365 and (1980), 355-373. The Pantheon was probably also thematically tied to these buildings. Recent excavations in the area of the Pantheon (reported in La Repubblica, May 10, 1996) have uncovered fountains, which may belong to the Agrippan development, flanking the pronaos, indicating that the Augustan complex was much more extensive than previously thought. Thanks to Professor J. Russell for this information.

14 Funeral of Augustus: Tacitus, Annales 1.8, Suetonius, Augustus 100; Dio 56.42. For imperial funerals and the consecration ceremony in general, see Toynbee (1971), 56-61 and Vogel (1973), 57-60 and bibliography 122, n. 52. Dio records that an eagle was released from the pyre to bear the emperor to heaven, but he is probably reading a later usage back into the early imperial ceremony. See Vogel (1973), 121, n. 48 and Hohl (1938), 175, n. 4. The release of the eagle is recorded by Dio (74.5.3-5) at the consecration of Pertinax and by Herodian for that of Severus (4.2.11).

15 Strabo, 5.3.8.

16 In 1777 below the intersection of the Via degli Otto Cantoni and the Via del Corso east of the Mausoleum there came to light an area of travertine paving c. 50 m. square, six cippi inscribed with the names of three sons and a daughter of Germanicus, Drusus’ son Tiberius, and a certain Vespasianus followed by the formula hic crematus est or hic situs(a) est (CIL 6.888 = ILS 181; CIL 6.889 = ILS 181a; CIL 6.890 = ILS 181b; CIL 6.891 = ILS 188; CIL 6.892 = ILS 172; CIL 6.893) and an alabaster urn. See Lanciani (1987), 463-44, Platner and Ashby (1929), 545, Boatwright (1985), 495, Richardson (1992), 404, s.v. “Ustrinum Domus Augustae” and Hesberg and Panciera (1994), 148-161.

17 Suetonius records only that Tiberius was cremated publico funere (Tiberius 75), but Claudius’ funeral was definitely modelled on that of Augustus (Tacitus, Annales 2.69, Suetonius, Claudius
Caligula’s body was partially cremated on a hastily erected pyre and then buried temporarily in the Lamian gardens. He was later exhumed by his sisters, cremated and entombed, possibly in the Mausoleum of Augustus, but the ceremony must have been private (Suetonius, Gaius 59). Nero’s cremation took place at his suburban villa and his ashes deposited in the family tomb of the Domitii on the Pincian (Suetonius, Nero 50). For the most recent discussion of the Mausoleum and, in particular, the inscriptive evidence for the interments which took place there, see Hesberg and Panciera (1994).

Domitian himself was cremated in the garden of his nurse Phyllis on the Via Latina, who secretly took his ashes to the Temple of the Flavian gens and mixed them with those of his niece Julia, which seem to have been placed there previously (Suetonius, Domitian 17). For the Aedes Gentis Flaviae and the Flavian family tomb, see Lugli (1975), 484, Coarelli (1980), 244-245, (1984), 147-158 (1995c) 368-369 and Richardson (1992), 181, s.v. “Gens Flavia, Templum.”

The depositing of Nerva’s ashes in the Augustan Mausoleum is recorded by Aurelius Victor, Epit. 12.12.

Trajan’s ashes, however, were deposited at the base of the column in the Forum Traiani (Dio 69.2.3; Eutropius 8.5.2; Aurelius Victor, Epit. 13.11). The site of his cremation and consecration is not recorded, but possibly took place in his Forum.

Boatwright (1987), 181 suggests that the orientation of the Mausoleum gave the impression that it belonged to the Campus Martius and thus enabled Hadrian to associate his tomb with the prestige of the Campus Martius, and especially Augustus, without having to ask the senate for a special decree for its construction there.

On the relief from the base of the Antonine column the reclining figure of a youth holds an obelisk, presumably that of the Horologium of Augustus. A similar reclining youth that also appears in the bottom left of the relief depicting the apotheosis of Sabina from the Arco di Portogallo is usually identified as the personification of the Campus Martius, but the figure lacks any distinguishing attributes. See Vogel (1973) 42, 47, and 117, n. 3, La Rocca (1984), 104 and Boatwright (1987), 228-229.

Some scholars, however, do not accept this identification. Hill (1989), 102 suggests that these coins do not depict temporary structures, but permanent crematoria in which the pyres were placed. He identifies the structures as the Ustrinum Antonini which was used for Faustina,
Antoninus, Verus and Faustina II, and the Ustrinum Marci Aurelii, which was used for Marcus. Hill’s identification, however, does not take into account the descriptions of funeral pyres as towers found in Dio and Herodian and the issue of these types for emperors and empresses after Marcus Aurelius up to the time of Constantius Chlorus. Squadrilli (1975), 22-31 and De’ Spagnolis (1976), 65-66 propose that the coins do not depict the funeral pyres of the emperors, but rather the Mausoleum of Hadrian, because these structures are fundamentally different from the remains excavated in Montecitorio which they believe to be the ustrina of Antoninus and Marcus. These structures, however, have now been identified as ara consecrationes, and not ustrina.

24. For a discussion and list of the Antonine issues representing the funeral pyre, see Toynbee (1971), 61 and 295, n. 244-252. See also Frazer (1975), 53-57. An issue of this type for Aelius Caesar (138 A.D.), known only from a sale catalogue and a cast in the British Museum, is thought to be spurious, as Aelius Verus was never actually consecrated. See Pink, (1933), 209-211 and also Frazer (1975), 53, n. 6. Toynbee (1971), 60-61, however, suggests that the coin may be genuine.

25. Descriptions in the literary sources of the funerals of earlier emperors do not describe the pyres as monumental structures, and these towering pyres do not appear on earlier coinage or in other artistic representations. The apotheosis of the emperor was commemorated on cameos and on coinage in the first century with the deceased often depicted on the back of an eagle. For the depictions of apotheosis in art, see Vogel (1973), 44-48. The development of these monumental funeral pyres, and their possible influences, is a subject which warrants further study.

26. This monumental edifice discovered in 1886-87, with five concentric walls of peperino and indications of a sixth, was first thought to be the Ara Ditis by Lanciani, but Castagnoli (1946), 152-157 determined that the Ara Ditis was located in the area called Tarentum near Ponte Vittorio. For the identification of the monument under Piazza Sforza as the Hadrianic ustrinum, reconstructed as a rectangular enclosure, see Coarelli (1977b), 821, n. 34 and (1980), 265, and 303. The form of the monument, however, has been shown to resemble the altar tombs of the late Republic and early Empire and the pulvinus of its altar can also be dated on stylistic grounds to this period. See Boatwright (1985), 485-497 and (1987), 218-230. La Rocca (1984), 87-100 proposes that the structure may by the cenotaph of Agrippa. Richardson (1992), 338, s.v.
“Sabina, Diva, Ara” suggests that it may be the consecration altar of Sabina, but the location of the monument and style of the pulvinus seem to preclude a Hadrianic date.


28. See Boatwright (1985), 495-497, La Rocca (1984), 101-114, Buzzetti (1984), 27-28, and Danti (1993) 75-76. Similar interpretations have also been put forward by Frazer (1968), 209 who suggested that the excavated ustrina were actually the temporary pyres transformed into monuments of divinization, and Frischer (1982-83), 51-86 who interprets these monuments and the columns as commemorative altar-complexes dedicated to the pater patriae erected on the sites of the actual ustrina.

29. For a discussion of the plan of these altars and the decorative marble fragments found in connection with them, including a marble acroterion, see La Rocca (1984), 107-114 and Danti (1993), 75-76. The area that was burned may have been delineated by the outer precinct of cippi connected by a metal grill, similar to the manner by which Augustus’ cremation site was marked off according to Strabo’s description (5.3.8). La Rocca (1984), 105-106 suggests that these consecration altars may be represented on some coin issues in honour of Sabina, Faustina I, Antoninus Pius and Faustina II (Tav. XXII, 1-2 and XXIII, 1-2).

30. During excavations for the construction of the Camera dei Deputati a third complex was discovered directly adjacent to the west wall of the altar attributed to Marcus Aurelius. Remains of a fourth altar are visible beneath the Via della Missione. See Buzzetti (1984) 27-28, La Rocca (1984), 112-114 and Danti (1993), 76. Hadrian may have been responsible for the first ara consecrationis erected in the area, since the relief depicting the apotheosis of Sabina, which may have come from the monument commemorating her consecration, was incorporated into the nearby Arco di Portogallo. Boatwright (1987), 229-230, however, suggests that Hadrian may have also used the pre-existing crematorium of Augustus for Sabina’s consecration, thus associating himself with the first emperor.

31. A somewhat broad and open area, however, would be required for the decursio and the viewing stands that were set up at a safe distance from the pyre. Dio (74.4.4-5) records that after funeral offerings were cast inside the pyre and the bier was placed in it, the emperor ascended a tribunal and the senate wooden stands to watch the magistrates and the equestrians and then the cavalry and infantry performed intricate manoeuvres, both those of peace and war, around the pyre.
32. A similar description of the funeral pyre, which is compared to a lighthouse, is provided by Herodian (4.2.6-11) in connection with his account of the funeral of Severus.

33. BMC V, 120, no. 480, pl. 20.9; RIC IV, 181, no. 660C; Cohen (Pertinax) no. 12. On the obverse is a bust of Pertinax with the legend DIVUS PERT PIUS PATER. The consecration of Pertinax is also commemorated on reverse types depicting an eagle standing on a globe with the legend CONSECRATIO. BMC V, 120, no. 479, pl. 20.8; RIC IV, 660B; Cohen (Pertinax) nos. 8-10.

34. Herodian 4.2.6-7 records that large wooden beams were put together in the form of a large building to create the pyre.

35. See Frazer (1968), 209 and (1975), 53.

36. Dio 74.4.5.

37. 74.4.1: καταστάς δὲ ἐς αὐτὴν [ἡγεμονίαν] ἠρών τῷ Περτῖνακι κατασκεύασε….Dio tends to use ἠρών when he is referring to the sanctuaries which were erected following the consecration of an emperor, in particular the shrine erected to a divus. See Richard (1966), 131 and n. 2. This is the term that he uses to refer to the shrine erected on the spot where Julius Caesar was cremated in the Forum (Dio 47.18.4).

38. The altar complex discovered next to that attributed to Marcus Aurelius appears to be the older, and La Rocca (1984), 112 suggests that it may belong to Lucius Verus or Faustina II, both of whom died before Marcus Aurelius. But, as La Rocca notes, the altar attributed to Marcus Aurelius is actually quite far from his column and there is no definite evidence to attribute these altars to specific members of the Antonine family.

39. It is possible that Pertinax was also re-interred in the Mausoleum of Hadrian at this time, but there is no record of this.

40. Severus died at Eboracum. The HA Severus 24.1-2 gives two versions of the cremation. Either the body was cremated in Britain and the ashes brought to Rome, or the body was brought to Rome for cremation. Herodian states that the ashes were carried to Rome (4.1.3) and that a wax effigy was made for the consecration ceremony (4.2.2).

41. Herodian 4.2.6-11.
Aureus and denarius, BMC V, 424, nos. 26-27, pl. 65.17-18; RIC IV, 239, no. 191F; Cohen nos. 88-89. Sesterius, BMC V, 428, no. 50, pl. 66.7; RIC IV, 292, 490B; Cohen no. 90. The legend reads CONSECRATIO. The obverse depicts a bust of Severus and the legend DIVO SEVERO PIO.

For the suggestion that this area was respected by the Severans and that Severus probably also had his altar in this area, see also La Rocca (1984), 113.

There is some controversy as to whether the Porticus was built by Augustus or his sister. Festus (188L) records that the complex was built by Octavia, and Plutarch (Marcellus 30.6) reports that the library was dedicated by her in memory of her son. The curia and scholae are also called the Opera Octaviae by Pliny, (NH 36.28; 35.114; 36.22). In Suetonius (Augustus 29.4), however, the Porticus Octaviae is listed among the works undertaken by the emperor in the names of relatives. An Augustan attribution is also reported by Dio 49.43.8.

The Temple of Juno was probably built c. 179 B.C., although Morgan (1971), 480-505, especially 500, argues that the Temple of Juno was also contemporary with the portico. According to Velleius Paterculus (1.113-5) the Temple of Jupiter was the first marble temple in Rome, although this has been disputed by Boyd (1953), 152-159. It was built by the Greek architect Hermodoros of Salamis (Vitruvius 3.2.5). In the area between the temples the famous group of the Battle of Granikos by Lysippos, which had been taken as booty by Metellus, was set up and other works by famous artists were displayed in the temples and in the sides of the portico.

The library was dedicated to Marcellus (Plutarch, Marcellus 30.6). For the curia and scholae, see Pliny, NH 36.28; 35.114; 36.22.

For the destruction of the Porticus in the fire, see Dio 66.24.2. No inscriptions or literary source record Domitian’s restoration, but Suetonius Domitian, 20 states that at the beginning of his reign Domitian restored bibliothecas incendio absumptas, which may refer to those of the Porticus Octaviae. The restoration of the Porticus Octaviae in particular is not mentioned in the Chron. a. 354, 146 (ed. Mommsen, 1892), although other buildings which were known to have been destroyed in the fire are listed among Domitian’s work. For the various building phases of the Porticus Octaviae, see Petrignani (1960), 43-52 and Olinder (1974).

Fragment no. 31u, v, z, aa, bb, cc. Carettoni, Colini, Cozza, and Gatti (1960), 91-93, Tav. XXIX; Rodríguez-Almeida (1981), 114, Tav. XXIII.

50. Vitruvius' statement at 3.2.5 that the Temple of Jupiter in the Porticus Metelli was a peripteros temple, although the plan on the Forma Urbis has no rear colonnade, has been a subject of much discussion and has even led to emendations to the text. Gros (1973), 137-161 puts forth the convincing argument that the temple was originally built as a peripteros temple in the Greek manner under the Hellenizing influence of the second century B.C. and that the rear colonnade was removed in the Augustan renovation when the curia was added in the north half of the complex. The plan on the Forma Urbis indicates that the apsidal building was connected directly to the back of the temples and therefore a rear colonnade would be implausible.

51. Lauter (1980-81a), 37-46. The south corner of the porticus was excavated during the isolation of the Theatre of Marcellus in 1938-39.

52. The Porticus Metelli was thus a typical Hellenistic temenos, with closed outer walls and inner naves. The use of exedrae on the outer wall can also be found at Megalopolis, Kalydon, Pleuron, and the Agora of the Italians at Delos. See Lauter (1980-81a), 43, n. 11.

53. This is indicated by the presence of windows in the remains of a high outer wall to the east facing the Temple of Apollo Sosianus. The remains of a cross-wall attached to the south socle also assumes a closed wall. See Lauter (1980-81a), 44.

54. The surviving capitals of these columns are Severan in style. See Cressidi (1954), 144. Lauter (1980-81a), 45, however, suggests that the finely worked bases of the columns of the outer portico may be Domitianic and were possibly reused from the Domitianic building. The extent of the Domitianic rebuilding, however, is difficult to determine and may not have affected the porticus itself. Dio reports that the oikemata (temples?) and their libraries were destroyed by the fire in the time of Titus. Suetonius (Domitian 20) refers only to Domitian's repair of libraries.

55. The Severan rebuilding, however, did see a definite change to the original plan with the addition of a brick wall on the south-east along the line of the original colonnade of the Metellan-Augustan building parallel to the outer colonnade. As this wall has only been preserved on part of the south-east side, it is uncertain whether it ran the full length of the porticus or only served to isolate the outer colonnade at the ends. For the remains of the brick wall, see Cressedi (1954), 144 and Lauter (1980-81a), 45 and Abb. 1.
This structure was exposed when a number of houses in the old Ghetto were demolished at the end of the last century.

For a detailed discussion of the elements and dimensions of the propylon, see Petrignani (1960), 52-56 and figs. 7-27.

The other two columns of the front facade were replaced by a brick arch in the Middle Ages when the propylon was used as the entrance for the church of S. Angelo in Pescheria. Part of the rear facade was closed by the front of this church.

Lauter (1980-81a) 45 suggests that the style does not fit with a date at the beginning of the third century A.D., and proposes that the propylon was a Domitianic structure on which the Severan inscription was added during the later restoration. The extensive use of the drill, however, which can be seen in the definition of the acanthus leaves, especially on the capitals of the antae, speaks for a Severan date. For a Severan date for the column capitals of the propylon, see Palchetti (1965), 311-312 and Tav. CII, 1 and 2 and Petrignani (1960), 52-53. Severan ornament tends to have a more patterned quality as the natural form of the vegetal motifs is broken down into decorative patterns by the light and shadow created by the drill. The carving is also not as precise. For a discussion of this Severan tendency, see Blankenhagen (1940), 90-92.

For example, figured capitals are found in the decoration of the Baths of Caracalla.

Cressidi (1954), 144. See also Palchetti (1965) 312 and Lugli (1946), 562.

Both the composition of the brickwork and module of construction are characteristically Severan. See Lugli (1957) I, 612 and (1975), 298. Reworked architectural fragments are found in the internal part of the pediment, which may either indicate the reuse of materials during the Severan rebuilding or belong to repairs to the structure after earthquake damage in 442. See Coarelli (1980), 277 and Petrignani (1960), 54.

See the study by Palchetti (1965), 310-312. The cold sobriety of the pediment of the Porticus Octaviae is also noted by Brilliant (1967), 83, n. 39.

For the so-called Flavian revival which saw a return to the flamboyant ornamental decoration of the Flavian period, see Blankenhagen (1940), 67-76 and 90-98. This style can also be seen in the Severan architectural fragments found on the Palatine, and the Septizodium, at least as can be gleaned from the Renaissance drawings of the building.
For the various currents of architectural ornament in the Severan period, see Pallottino (1946), Strong (1953), 140 and 147, and Palchetti (1965), 311.

The style, which has its origin in the Forum of Trajan, represents a reaction against the florid decoration of Flavian public buildings and takes its inspiration mainly from the developed Augustan ornament of the Forum of Augustus. See Strong (1953), 119-122, De Fine Licht (1966), 221.

For the use of this style in the decoration of the arch in the Forum, see Strong (1953), 141 and Brilliant (1967), 83.

The neighbouring Porticus Phillipi built by L. Marcius Philippus in 29 B.C., which enclosed the Temple of Hercules Musarum (erected by M. Fulvius Nobilior in 187 B.C.), does not have a monumental entrance and may perhaps reflect the Republican form of the Porticus Metelli. The propylon, however, may have been added during the Augustan rebuilding.

The propylon may have been the only entrance to the complex. The rear of the complex does not survive on the Forma Urbis, and the symmetrical entrance on the north side represented on the restored plans of the Porticus Octavie is only a conjecture.

At least so far as can be ascertained from the poorly preserved capitals of the second and fourth columns of the south-east colonnade. See Petrignani (1960), 55.

See Palchetti and Quilici (1968), 77-88. The columns of the pronaos are found in the courtyard of no. 12 Via S. Angelo in Pescheria and the portions of the cella and pronaos beneath no. 5.

These capitals are very similar to the columns on the arch in the Forum, for which, see Brilliant (1967), 77-78 and pl. 18-20.

The plan of the temple on the Forma Urbis is rather confused, showing an indentation where the corner columns of the pronaos should be. Therefore only four columns are depicted across the front of the temple, and single columns on the sides of the pronaos. The side columns on the pronaos are also not aligned with the corner columns, but jut out. A plan of this type is without analogy and was probably the result of an error in the incising. The three surviving corner columns from the pronaos of the Severan restoration indicate that the temple was actually hexastyle. See Carettoni, Colini, Cozza, and Gatti (1960), 91 and Palchetti and Quilici (1968), 77.
Only remains of part of a foundation wall have been identified. The temple is concealed beneath the church of S. Maria in Campitelli.

See Lauter (1980-81b) 48, Taf. X.2 who dates this fragment on the basis of style to the Severan period. Another relief fragment depicting an eagle seated on a staff and surrounded by a mural crown has been identified by Lauter as belonging to the Augustan phase of the Temple of Jupiter Stator, but recently La Rocca (1993), 83-92, has convincingly argued that this fragment belongs to the Arch of Germanicus, located in front of the Porticus Octaviae.

BMC V, 31, no. 67, pl. 7.5. Also an aureus of this year depicts Jupiter seated holding victory and sceptre, BMC V, 31, no. 68, pl. 7.6; RIC IV, 95, no. 34; Cohen nos. 379-380.

RIC IV, 95, no. 35; Cohen, no. 378.

Sestertius, BMC V, 141, no. 575, pl. 24.10; RIC IV, 187, no. 704; Cohen no. 387. (196), sestertius, RIC IV, 189, no. 722; Cohen no. 410. As, RIC, IV, 188, no. 707, 190, no. 733; Cohen nos. 407, 408, 411. No eagle: sestertius, BMC V, 144, no. 582-583, pl. 24.12 and 25.4. Issues from the Eastern Mint of 194 have the legend IOVI PRAE ORBIS: aureus, BMC V, 94, no. 369, pl. 16.9; denarius, same legend and reverse, BMC V, 98, no. 370, pl.16.10.

Jupiter seated holding victory and sceptre (197): denarius, BMC V, 60, no. 247, pl. 11.10; RIC IV, 104, no. 111A; Cohen no. 236. 198-200, BMC V, 176, nos. 129-131, pl. 29.19; RIC IV, 107, no. 130; Cohen nos. 237-238. Jupiter brandishing thunderbolt (198-200): denarius, BMC V, 176, no. 132, pl. 29.20; RIC IV, 107, no. 131; Cohen no. 243.

Jupiter holding thunderbolt and sceptre, eagle at feet (205): aurei, BMC V, 249, nos. 469-470, pl. 39.16; denarius, same reverse as previous, BMC V, 249-250, no. 471-473, pl. 39.13; RIC IV, 117, no. 196; Cohen nos. 468, 469. Jupiter brandishing thunderbolt (208): denarius, BMC V, 268, nos. 559-561, pl. 42.3; RIC IV, 119, no. 216; Cohen nos. 501-502. Jupiter standing, holding thunderbolt and sceptre, two small figures at bottom extending hands (209): denarius, BMC V, 356, nos.1-2, pl. 53.1; RIC IV, 120, no. 226; Cohen no. 525. Same reverse as previous (210): denarius, BMC V, 360, no. 18, pl. 53.10, 361, no. 25, pl. 53.15; RIC IV, 121, no. 233; Cohen no. 539.

This is a ten denarius piece, the largest silver medallion extant. Grant (1950), 117-118 suggests that it was issued to commemorate the 500th year of the temple of this divinity.

Bartoccini (1931), 96, fig. 64.

This type was first used by Sabina, and was followed by the Antonine empresses Faustina I and II (BMC V, lxxi, n. 3). Legend IUNO, Juno standing wearing stephane, holding patera and sceptre, peacock standing left (196-211): *aureus*, BMC V, 162, no. 37, pl. 27.18, *denarius*, BMC V, 162, nos. 38-41, pl. 27.19, *Silver quinarius*; BMC V, 162, no. 40, pl. 27.20; *RIC IV*, 168, no. 559; Cohen nos. 81-83. Legend IUNO REGINA (193-196): *sestertius*, BMC V, 122, no. 487, pl. 21.1; *RIC IV*, 207, no. 840; Cohen no. 99, *dupondius* or *as*, BMC V, 124, no. 496-497, pl. 21.6. Legend IUNO REGINA (196-211): *denarius*, BMC V, 162, nos. 42-44, pl. 28.1; *RIC IV*, 168, no. 560; Cohen nos. 96-97, *sestertius*, BMC V, 308, no. 769, pl. 46.18; *RIC IV*, 208, no. 856; Cohen no. 98.

Legend IUNONI LUCINAE, Juno seated holding flower and swaddled child (196-211): *sestertius*, BMC V, 308, nos. 770-771, pl. 47.1; *RIC IV*, 208, no. 857; Cohen no. 94. In Africa dedications were made to the empress in the name of Dea Iuno Orbis Terrae and a Cilician inscription refers to her as the new Hera. See Reynolds and Ward Perkins (1952), no. 291. *IGRR III*, 856.

For Julia Domna’s connection to Juno on the arch, see Bartoccini (1931), 80 and Ghedini (1984), 62-63, 80-87 and 125-127.

Townsend (1938), 515-516 proposes that these were the cult statues of the temple of the *gens Septimiana*, located in a prominent position in the Forum Novum. He suggests that the *gens* of the imperial family became closely associated with the Capitoline Triad as the protecting divinity of the Roman state. The sacrifice scene on the Lepcis arch the *domus divina*, as well as showing the piety of the imperial family to the state gods, also depicts them under the protection of the Capitoline deities. See Strocka (1972), 168.

Throughout all of its restorations the complex retained the name that Augustus had given it. See Gros (1976), 81. The “Augustan” sobriety of the Severan decoration of the building may have been intended to reinforce this connection to Augustus.

The Porticus Octaviae is probably the Porticus Severiana recorded in the *Liber Politicus* of Benedetto Canonico, the Porticus Severini in the *Ordo Benedicti* (S. 125, Jordan-Hülser [1871-

90 HA Severus 21.12: Exstat sane Romae Severi porticus gesta eius exprimen a filio quantum plurimi docent structa; Caracalla, 9.6: ... porticum patris nomine quae gesta illius contineret et triumphos et bella.

91 Tortorici (1989-90), 31-34. The location of this porticus is elusive. Domaszewski (1916), 7 in his discussions of the topography of the HA considered it an invention of the author. Lugli (1930-38) III, 121 proposed a location in the Campus Martius, and that it was probably the restoration of an existing portico. See also Robathan (1939), 523, Platner and Ashby (1929), 429, s.v.

“Porticus Severi,” and Benario (1958a), 715. Richardson (1992), 319, s.v. “Porticus Severi,” suggests that it may have been connected to the Thermæ Antoninianæ.

92 As Tortorici (1989-90), 32 notes, the attribution to Caracalla is only hypothetical at HA Severus 21.12: ... quantum plurimi docent. This attribution may also be a later interpolation. See Turcan (1991), 301-302. The name of Severus is somewhat obliterated in the inscription as it survives today, while that of Caracalla is better preserved. The Porticus Octaviae suffered from an earthquake in 442, and perhaps the inscription was damaged at that time. In the Regionary Catalogues neither the Porticus Octaviae nor the Porticus Severi is mentioned, and the ninth century Einsiedeln pilgrim seems to refer to it simply as Porticus. See Petrignani (1960), 50.

93 After his victory over the Parthians Severus is said by Herodian (3.9.12) to have ordered his battles and victories to be portrayed and publicly displayed: τὰς μόχας τε καὶ νίκας δημοσίαις ἀνέθηκε γραφαῖς. Turcan (1991), 302 suggests that the reference in the Historia Augusta to the display of Severus’ exploits in a porticus actually refers to the reliefs on the Arch of Severus, which with its detached columns gives the impression of a false portico. The use of porticoes, however, for the display of works of art, in particular, victory monuments, was very common, and the decoration of a portico with Severus’ triumphi et bella would not be surprising.

94 If the Granikos monuments survived into the third century and was salvaged from the fire, an association between Alexander’s exploits and Severus’ victories could also be exploited. For Severus’ interest in, and desired association with, Alexander, see McCann (1968), 87.

95 Richardson (1976), 57-64, especially 63. Richardson notes that there is inadequate space on the plan for FILIPPI and argues that the two complexes would not be connected in this way.
Acta III.32-37, Pighi (1965), 151. The inscription is very fragmentary at this point, but the porticus is mentioned in connection with the sacrum hostiae praecidaneae of the second night. For the identification of the porticus Marcelli with the Porticus Octaviae, see Pighi (1965), 180. This association of Marcellus with the Porticus Octaviae is further proof of the reading [PORTI]CUS OCTAVIAE ET FIL[II] for the inscription on the Forma Urbis suggested by Richardson (1976), 63 and the continued association of Augustus' nephew with the complex into the third century.

A sellisternia was held for Juno by Julia Domna and the Roman matronae and a supplicatio made before the cella of Juno Regina on the Capitoline was led by Julia Domna. Although no specific mention is made of the Temple of Juno Regina in the Porticus Octaviae in the surviving inscription, it is possible that some ceremony also took place at this temple.

The proposal by G. Cozzo (1936), 233-366 that Severus was responsible for a complete rebuilding of the Pantheon may be rejected. His claim was based on a Severan dating of the brick stamps with DOL ANTEROTIS SEVERI CAESARIS N (811 a-e), which occur very frequently in the masonry of the walls and rotunda of the building, because of the presence of the name Severus. Guey (1936), 198-249 found that other stamps of Anteros (810 a-c) also carry the names of the consuls of the year 123, Paetinus and Apronianus. SEVERI is more likely an abbreviation for Severiani and appears to have been the second name of Anteros. Further, other stamps from the time of Severus never have the title CAESAR, but always DOMINUS N(OSTER), AUGUSTUS N(OSTER), or the name L SEPTIMI SEVERI AUG. The majority of the stamps from the Pantheon date to the time of Hadrian, and it is now generally acknowledged that the present structure was built by him. See also Bloch (1968), 13-19. For a discussion of the architecture of the Hadrianic building, see MacDonald (1976) and (1982), 94-121.

Investigation of the building in the 1930's revealed that the settling of the structure had caused cracks in the masonry of the cylinder and the cupola. These had occurred soon after the building was completed, so that even during the first years of the building some repairs and reinforcements were required. See De Fine Licht (1966), 190. Two Antonine brick stamps (nos. 422 and 617) have been identified, but the nature of his work is unknown. See Bloch (1968), 116. In the HA (Antoninus 8.2) a templum Agrippae is listed among the works of Antoninus, which may refer to completion of the Pantheon during his reign.
For the arch above the entrance, see Guey (1936), 240 and De Fine Licht (1966), 290, n. 46.

Severan brick stamps no. 602 (44) have been found in rib no. 17 and no. 763 (45) in rib no. 18 of the cupola. Also 760 (140). Other stamps (404, 408a, 408e, 424) are dated by Bloch to the time of Caracalla; so the repair may not have been completed until his reign. See Guey (1936), 243 and Bloch (1968), 116.

Van Deman (1912), 426; De Fine Licht (1966), 163. Four Severan stamps have been identified in the first level of brick at the foot of this wall (two examples each of CIL 15.155, 2 and 157, 1). Guey (1936), 240, n. 2. See also Boatwright (1987), 50.

As suggested by Guey (1936), 241.

For the existence of this passageway along the western side of the Pantheon, see De Fine Licht (1966), 236. It may have had the form of a peristyle, which would have balanced the Saepta on the other side. The back wall of the west portico of the Saepta is preserved along the east side of the Pantheon. See Boatwright (1987), 50.

It is generally assumed that the area west of the Pantheon was occupied by the Nemus Thermarum which extended from the Stagnum Agrippae to the Thermae Neronianae. See De Fine Licht (1966), 236 and Richardson (1992), 267, s.v. “Nemus Thermarum” and 285, s.v. “Pantheon.”

DeLaine (1988), 20 reports “The brick stamps of the few remains of the Baths of Agrippa show beyond doubt that they belong to a restoration (otherwise unrecorded!) under Septimius Severus, and of course the surviving plan is of the same date.” Unfortunately, I have been unable to find any further information about this restoration.

This statement led early scholars, who believed that the present building was to be dated to the time of Agrippa and were unaware of the Hadrianic phase, to credit the interior veneer of the building to the restoration recorded in the Severan inscription. Terenzio (1932), 52-57 has shown that there are no traces of any veneer older than that which is *in situ* in the lower stage or that which was removed from the upper stage in 1747, and therefore this decoration belongs to the original Hadrianic construction. It is unlikely that this part of the building would have remained undecorated until the beginning of the third century. See De Fine Licht (1966), 118 and 190.
De Fine Licht (1966), 202 and 290, n. 47. He suggests that Severus reorganized the temple service or added to the statues of the gods.

For the meaning of cultus as architectural decoration or ornament when used in relation to buildings, see the examples in the Thesaurus Linguae Latinae IV, 1326-1327 and 1336-1337. See also the OLD: CIL 8.7989 OBLATIONEM DEN[ARIORUM]. AD CULTUM THE[ATRI], CIL 8.26121 TEMPLUM ... STATUIS OMNIQUE CULTU EXORNAVIT. Also of note is the reference to the repair of the Septizodium at Lambaesis in Algeria ... ET OMNI CULTU VETUSTATE DILAPSUM RESTITUIT (CIL 8.2657 = ILS 5626), which must certainly refer to its decoration.

Thomas and Witschel (1992), 135-177. With the exception of the example from the Pantheon, the city of Rome is excluded from their study.

Thomas and Witschel provide significant evidence that every building inscription should not be taken literally, but it is equally unwise to disregard entirely the reliability of an inscription when complete archaeological information is not available. For a similar conclusion, see the response to Thomas and Witschel by G. Fagan forthcoming in BSR.

Thomas and Witschel (1992), 139. They also note that the damage would have been made invisible by the very act of restoration.

The building was transformed into a church in 608-610 A.D., when the remains of pagan decoration and symbols were probably removed. Under Clement XI (1700-21) the cupola was repaired and recoated with stucco and in 1747 ornamental elements and the marble veneer of the upper zone were removed. The exedrae have also undergone alterations through the addition of altars and placement of tombs. For the fate of the Pantheon after antiquity, see De Fine Licht (1966), 237-251.

This area of the Campus Martius was subject to flooding. See Le Gall (1953), 29-30. Lightning strikes may also have resulted in damage to the external decoration. In 110 A.D. lightning struck the predecessor of Hadrian’s building, and even caused it to burn down (Orosius, 7.12.5). Coarelli, et al. (1981), 48 suggests that the fire of 191/192 may have spread to this area of the Campus Martius, damaging both the Pantheon and the Porticus Octaviae. If fire was the reason for the restoration, the Severan inscription on the Pantheon would probably have recorded this.
Part of the base of the middle acroterion is preserved. From the excavation of the Piazza della Rotunda in the fifteenth century come reports of some remains of bronze figures found at the foot of the front steps which may be connected with the sculpture of the acroterion, or the newly discovered fountains that flanked the pronaos, perhaps belonging to the Agrippan developments. There are also fastening holes on the upper surface of the cornice blocks that probably held bronze attachment pegs for a row of marble palmettes above the sima. On the basis of the pattern of holes in the tympanum, L. Cozza would reconstruct the decoration of the gable as a wreath with Jupiter’s eagle in the centre similar to a relief from Trajan’s Forum and now in the vestibule of the church of SS. Apostoli. See De Fine Licht (1966), 44-46.

De Fine Licht (1966), 83. Numerous staple holes give evidence of a veneer over the brickwork at the front. Some of the marble slabs of the side walls are preserved carved with pilasters and friezes.

Holes for the fixing of a marble veneer have been identified only in the lower course of the rotunda above the plinth. No holes have been found at the higher level, but as it is unlikely that the brickwork was left bare it was probably faced with plaster. Supporting this conclusion are small areas of plaster that remain on the underside and corners of the cornices and ledges both of the rotunda and the intermediate block. The plastering was probably done in shallow relief in imitation of ashlar masonry. For the decoration of the rotunda, see De Fine Licht (1966), 105-108, MacDonald (1982), 113-114, and Boatwright (1987), 44-45.

The bronze tiles were removed by Constans II in 663, but the plates around the oculus still remain in situ. Thirty four roof tiles of white marble covering the lowest step at the base of the cupola are preserved on the north and north-west sides. The majority are of Proconnesian marble. See De Fine Licht (1966), 136, MacDonald (1982), 110, Boatwright (1987), 45, and, in particular, Cozza (1983), 109-118. Part of an inscription dated to the Augustan period, which seems to refer to the setting up of a statue to an unknown woman in the Campus Martius, is preserved on the edge of tegula no. 26. Cozza (1983), 109-117 regards this as evidence for the reuse of material during the Hadrianic rebuilding, but it is also possible that the tiles belong to the Severan restoration, when the reuse of marble was much more common. For this conclusion, see Boatwright (1987), 45, n. 35.

See Guey (1936), 246.
In comparison with Hadrian's modest replacement of the Agrippan dedication, the Severan inscription may be viewed as boastful, but any repair to the building seems to have given Severus a traditional right to inscribe his name on the building. For the right of inscription on restored buildings, see Stuart (1905), 427-430 and Thomas and Witschel (1992), 137. Stuart (1905), 445-449 suggests that Hadrian's intention in inscribing only the name of the original builder, Agrippa, on the Pantheon was to rebuke Domitian, whose building he actually replaced.

De Fine Licht (1966), 190 and 290, n. 47, considers the Severan claim of restoration as simply a cynical political act. For the political motivation behind the restoration of Roman buildings, especially by emperors, see also Thomas and Witschel (1992), 164-175.

This concept apparently had its origin in the Hellenistic world where Panthea were dedicated to the twelve gods in connection with the cult of the living sovereign, whose statue was placed inside the building. For examples, see Ziegler (1949), col. 697-747.

Dio 63.27.2-4. The location of the Pantheon in this area of the Campus Martius may have been chosen to exploit an association of this new cult centre for the Augustan family with Romulus, the founder of the city. The apotheosis of Romulus in one tradition is said to have taken place in the Caprae palus on the site of the Stagnum Agrippae south-west of the Pantheon. See Coarelli (1983b), 45.

For the Pantheon's later association with the imperial cult, see De Fine Licht (1966), 191-194 and MacDonald (1982), 119. The Pantheon may also have had a judicial function as Hadrian is said to have held court there (Dio 64.7).

Dio's account seems to indicate that the statues of Agrippa and Augustus still stood in the entrance at the beginning of the third century. He also implies that the present building with the domed interior that he knew was the work of Agrippa. Although Hadrian's rebuilding took place only eighty years before, Dio seems to be unaware of this, and the only association that he makes between this building and Hadrian is the fact that this emperor held court there (64.7). Dio seldom exhibits much interest in architecture, which may explain his ignorance of the fact that the building was entirely rebuilt by Hadrian, or else he may be simply expressing the generally held view of his time. The conclusion of De Fine Licht (1966), 290, n. 47 that Severus' restoration must have been unremarkable because Dio does not make mention of it in his discussion of the Pantheon is unfounded, since this information may have been omitted by Dio's
epitomator Xiphilinus. No other structures built or restored by Severus are recorded, except the large Temple of Hercules and Bacchus.

126. The importance of establishing a link to the Pantheon can perhaps be seen in Hadrian’s immediate undertaking of its rebuilding soon after his ascension as noted by De Fine Licht (1966), 201-202 who also recognizes Severus’ desire to be connected to the building.

127. Just as Severus rebuilt the Porticus Octaviae originally built by Augustus, with his restoration of the Pantheon he also sought to establish a connection with the founder of the Empire.

128. Thomas and Witschel (1992), 147.

129. Dio’s opinion that the name of the Pantheon originated from its circular form which resembled the dome of heaven probably reflects the interpretation of the building current at the beginning of the third century. For a discussion of the astrological meaning of the Pantheon, see De Fine Licht (1966), 198-200 and MacDonald (1982), 120-121. Whether the seven niches of the interior held the seven planetary gods, as suggested by Mommsen, cannot be proved. Granger (1933) 57-61 argues that the Hadrianic Pantheon was essentially a horologe used to keep tract of the hour.

130. The HA (Severus 4.3) claims that during his governorship of Sicily, Severus was charged with consulting seers and astrologers about the imperial position, and that on another occasion he consulted horoscopes in the selection of his second wife (Severus 3.6). According to Dio (76.11.1), the ceilings of part of the imperial palace were painted with his horoscope.

131. Brick stamp no. 602 found in the restoration of the cupola provides a date after 198 for the undertaking of the construction, since it carries the names of two Augusti (ex. pr. Augg. nn.). See Bloch (1968), 116.

132. As suggested by De Fine Licht (1966), 190 and 202, the restoration was probably celebrated with a great ceremony that included the addition of statues of the emperor and his family to this imperial monument.

133. CIL 8.1439 = ILS 1430; CIL 14.54 = ILS 1431. Fuscus seems to have been an imperial freedman who followed his fellow countryman Severus to Rome.

134. The inscriptions list Fuscus as procurator annonae Augg. mm. He was therefore appointed to this post after Geta was declared Augustus in 209, and served as procurator of the theatre.
before this date. The third letter n was erased from the inscriptions after the damnatio of Geta. See Dessau ILS 1430-1431.

135 Lugli (1975), 429 suggests that the scaena was repaired. See also Coarelli (1977b), 844. The procurator, however, may have been responsible for overseeing the contents of the theatre, which also served as an art gallery. This is the view of McKay (1984), 242.

136 There is also evidence of building activity during the reign of Caracalla in the Area Sacra di Largo Argentina, which is adjacent to the Pompeian complex, and which may perhaps be associated with work on the theatre under Severus. A Severan phase among the buildings situated behind and between Temples A, B, and C in this area has been identified from brick stamps dating to the time of Caracalla. See Marchetti-Longhi (1970-71), 37, n. 25, Coarelli, et al. (1981), 24-25, 47, and also M. Steinby, 302 in this same volume.

137 Severan Acta Va.37.44-46; Va.91; VIIIa.2. See Pighi (1965), 270.

138 Ancient structures were originally identified under the palace during excavations carried out in 1883-84 and 1903 by F. de Navenne. Re-excavation and a more systematic analysis of these remains were undertaken by L'Ecole Francaise de Rome in the 1970's. See Broise, et al. (1977), 723-806.

139 A few of the remaining walls date to the late Republic-early Empire, but most of the building appears to belong to a total reconstruction of the area, probably following the fire of 80 A.D. that destroyed a large part of the Campus Martius. For the building phases of the complex, see Broise, et al. (1977), 798.

140 Brick stamps dating to the first years of the third century have been found in situ under the mosaic floor. The style of the marine mosaic also dates it to the beginning of the third century. Broise, et al. (1977), 770 and 795.


142 The location of the Stabula Factionum is known from a toponym and inscriptions found in the area. Rodriguez-Almeida (1970-71), 113-115, and (1981), 149-150 and Tav. XXXIII suggests that fragments no. 272, 275 and 285 of the Forma Urbis also belong to this area of the Campus Martius as one of the streets represented can be reconstructed as vicus stabularius. For the identification of the structure under the Palazzo Farnese as part of the
Stabula Factionum, which may have extended up to the area now occupied by the Palazzo Farnese, see Coarelli (1977b), 845-886.

Coarelli (1977b), 840 would locate the Trigarium along the bank of the Tiber in the area between S. Giovanni dei Fiorentini and S. Maria di Monserrato.

The mosaic, which dates to the mid-imperial phase of the building, depicts four long-haired nude acrobats on horseback. The uniqueness of this depiction, for which no parallel has been found, suggests that it may represent the profession that used this complex. The marine mosaic from the Severan period is typical of its genre, but an eros on horseback is depicted as a desultor, which may also be an allusion to the gymnasts. For a discussion of these mosaics and their meaning, see Broise, et al. (1977), 772-797.

It is possible that the first building phase identified in this complex, represented by the few remaining early imperial walls, may be associated with Agrippa's building in the area for the Secular Games of 17 B.C., at which time the Stabula may have been constructed or reconstructed by him. The late-Flavian phase of the building may also have been connected to Domitian's celebration of the Games in 88 A.D. See Coarelli (1977b), 843.

For a discussion of the meaning of Tarentum and myths involving its origin, see La Rocca (1984) 3-20.

CIL 6.32323 = ILS 5050 (Augustus); CIL 6.32326-32335 = ILS 5050a (Severus). For the discovery of the fragments, see Pighi (1965), 137-139.

For a discussion of the reconstruction of Tarentum, see Romanelli (1931), 331-345, Quilici Gigli (1983), 47-57 and La Rocca (1984), xi-xiv. Its precise limits, however, are unknown.

Coarelli (1968b), 27-37 suggests that there were also temples of Dis and Proserpina in this area, possibly first constructed by Domitian. On Domitian's issues commemorating the Games the sacrifice scene at Tarentum is shown in front of some structures that Coarelli interprets as the temples of these gods. He also identifies their plans on fragment no. 672 of the Forma Urbis where he would read TER[ENTO] instead of the usual TEL[URE] which is the reading based on the drawing of Dosio. Quilici Gigli (1983), 47-49 convincingly refutes Coarelli's proposal, pointing out that the structure on the Domitianic coinage appears to have an upper portico, thus ruling out its identification as a temple. The subterranean nature of the altar to Dis and
Proserpina suggests that there were no temples associated with it and there is no mention in any of the sources of temples dedicated to these divinities located in Tarentum.

The setting up of a record commemorating the Games seems to have been a tradition. A *cippus* inscribed IMP/CAES/AUG/LUD/SAEC appears on *denarii* of L. Mescinius Rufus and may represent the monument set up by Augustus in Tarentum. On *denarii* and *dupondii* of Domitian a *cippus* commemorating the Games of 88 is also depicted. See Hill (1989), 58.

See Romanelli (1931), 340.

Hercules and Liber are shown standing on either side of the column with COS/III/LUD/SAEC/FEC on *asses* issued in 204 of Severus or COS/LUD/SAEC/FEC on those of Caracalla. Severus: *RIC* IV, 195, no. 764A; Cohen no. 106. Caracalla: *BMC* V, 344, no. 846, pl. 51.2; *RIC* IV, 280, no. 420; Cohen no. 49. See also Hill (1989), 58.

These reliefs were initially published by Romanelli (1931), 318-320, but did not receive any further study until La Rocca’s discussion (1984) 71-85. Unfortunately La Rocca was able to recover only the three principal pieces, now in the Antiquarium Comunale. The two fragments of the male torso are known only from the description and photographs in Romanelli, and three other fragments were never adequately published.

For a Severan date, see Romanelli (1931), 318 and La Rocca (1984), 72. The style is very similar to the Palazzo Sacchetti relief, also of Severan date, for which, see Budde (1955).

The slabs of white marble are 35 cm. thick and are preserved to a maximum height of 38 cm. and maximum length of 84 cm. These factors exclude the possibility that the fragments are from a sarcophagus. See Romanelli (1931), 318 and La Rocca (1984), 71 and 77.

Romanelli (1931), 320. This episode is depicted in particular on the Mattei Sarcophagi.


Romanelli (1931), 319 suggested that this object next to the figure was a tree trunk, but Hercules’ lion skin can clearly be seen distinguished on the shoulder of one torso and a club to the left of both figures. See La Rocca (1984), 73-74.
Using the analogy of the scenes depicted on the sarcophagi La Rocca (1984), 74-75, proposes that the relief probably represented the death of Alcestis in the centre, Admetus thanking Hercules for rescuing his wife on the left, and the return from the underworld on the right.

The deposit in which they were found also contained other sculptural pieces of various types, but because of their large size of these pieces and the fact that so many fragments belonging to the same relief were discovered in the same place they probably had not moved far from their original location. See Romanelli (1931), 320 and La Rocca (1984), 72.

Perhaps the presence of Liber and Hercules on the coin issues representing the cippus that commemorated the Games (see n. 152 supra) may be an allusion to this monument in Tarentum.

La Rocca (1984), 84, noting the low viewpoint of the reliefs, suggests that they may have come from a precinct marker commemorating the events of the Games.

Augustan Acta: Ludi Latini held in theatro ligneo quod erat constitutum in Campo secundum Tiberim (Acta 108), in theatro ligneo quod est ad Tiberim (156), in theatro ligneo (161). References to a scaena without seating probably also refer to the same structure: ludique noctu, sacrificio [co]nfecto, sunt commisi in scaena qui o[ne] theatrum adiectum non fuit, nullis positis sedilibus (100-101). See Pighi (1965), 270 and 287-291. The location of this theatre in Tarentum is indicated by its position in the Campus Martius next to the Tiber and its connection to the nocturnal sacrifices which are known to have taken place in this area.

The sacrifices to the Ilithyiae and Terra Mater are represented on dupondii and some rare asses of Domitian. (BMC II, no. 425, pl. 78.7, no. 432, pl. 79.1). In the background of these scenes are depicted two pediments connected by a half circle set upon a portico of five columns, above which is a second row of shorter columns on a horizontal beam. The representation is slightly varied on a second issue. The figure of Tiber reclines in the foreground, thus indicating that the ritual took place near the river. The identification of these structures has been the subject of much debate. Ryberg (1955), 176 suggests a portico. Coarelli (1968b), 27-37 has proposed temples of Dis and Proserpina built by Domitian, but the upper story shown in the structure does not fit with temple architecture, as noted by Quilici Gigli (1983), 47-49. The lack of references to any other buildings located in Tarentum suggests that the wooden theatre erected for the Secular Games is represented, as recognized by Hill (1965), 275-282. See also La Rocca (1984), 50.
Severan Acta: tunc a[d theatrum ligneum in Campo proces]serunt ibique ludi[s interfuerunt (Va.32-33); theatris tribus, ligneo, Pompeiano, Od[i]o spect]acula quae su[mus e]dituri... (Va.37); [processserunt] ad ludos saeculares consummando[s] in theatro ligneo (Va.77); in theatro ligneo lud[is] Latin[is comm]issis (Va.91); Severus m... cui theatrum adiectum] non erat [ ] structi[... (Ill.59); [et ludos perspectaverunt in scaena cui theatrum adiectum] non erat, adscenderunt in Capitolium (IV.3); perfectoque sacrificio, ludos Augg in scaena cui theatrum adiectum non erat perspectaverunt (Va.57-58).

Severus: aureus, RIC IV, 127, no. 293; Cohen no. 623. sestertius, BMC V, 325, no. 811; RIC IV, 202, no. 816A and B; Cohen nos. 624-625. as, RIC IV, 203, no. 826; Cohen no. 626.

Caracalla: sesterius, BMC V, 330, no. 818, pl. 49.10; RIC IV, 288, no. 462; Cohen nos. 555-556.

Geta: sesterius, BMC V, 339; RIC IV, 334, nos. 137-138; Cohen nos. 179-180. dupondius or as, BMC V, 337, no. 836, pl. 50.6; RIC IV, 333, no. 132; Cohen no. 177. These coins were originally issued in 204, but were reissued also in 205 and 207. See Hill (1964), 6, 32, and 34.

Traversari (1956), 21-30. Although variously described by Cohen, Mattingly, and Pighi as a tent or canopy that was set up to protect the sacrificants from the elements, as Traversari notes, its inclusion among the issues commemorating the Games suggests that it was a structure of greater significance. This type of theatre which operated with a raised curtain is clearly shown in a relief from Castel S. Elia (Traversari [1956], Tav. IX.4). For the identification of the structure on the coinage with the wooden theatre, see also Hill (1978), 60-61 and La Rocca (1984), 49-50.

Tarentum does not seem to have been the site of many permanent constructions and the sacrifices conducted there were performed at an ara lignea temporalis. See Pighi (1965), 297-305 for the references to this altar.

Some idea of the manner in which wooden buildings could be decorated may be seen in the wooden theatre buildings constructed in Rome during the Republic. For example, the theatre constructed by the aedile M. Aemilius Scaurus in 58 B.C. is reported to have been decorated with three thousand bronze statues, and to have had a stage with three hundred and sixty columns in three stories, the lowest story in marble, the middle in glass (mosaic?), the uppermost of gilded wood (Pliny, NH 34.36; 36.5, 50, 113-115, and 189). Silver, ivory, and gold were also used to decorate other theatres (Valerius Maximus 2.4.6). Imperial funeral pyres, also temporary structures, were elaborately decorated. See supra 236-237.
These theatres may have been torn down immediately after the event for religious reasons. If this was the case, perhaps the relief with the myth of Alcestis discovered in Via Paola discussed above came from a monument which may have marked the precinct where the theatre had once stood.
IX. REGIO XIV (TRANSTIBERINA) (Figure 14)

The district along the right bank of the Tiber, from the Aurelian Wall to the Porta S. Spirito, was known as Septimianum in the Middle Ages. This designation is found in the names of the churches in this area: S. Iacobi in Septimiano, S. Leonardo in Sitignano, S. Lucia de Septignano. The district may have been given the name Septimianum through some association of Septimius Severus with the district, perhaps because of the existence of a number of monuments or edifices built by the emperor. Severan interest in the Transtiberine area is perhaps also reflected in the form of administrative changes. Severus was responsible for the addition of an *excubitorium* of the *vigiles* in this quarter of the city and may also have increased the number of *vici* in Regio XIV.

Severus seems also to have owned property in this region. The Regionary Catalogues list Horti Getae under Regio XIV. These Horti are thought to be the same *horti spatiosi* which the *Historia Augusta* reports that Severus purchased as a private citizen before he left for his province of Upper Pannonia in 191. They were named either in honour of Severus' son, or possibly his brother. These gardens are thought to have been located somewhere in the area of the west slope of the Janiculum extending to the low ground by the Tiber. The remains of a reservoir uncovered under a wall of the Villa Heyland, and three rooms with elaborate marble paving and a bronze statue of Severus, in particular, discovered in the garden of the Palazzo Corsini, may have been associated with the Horti Getae.
The Porta Septimiana

Severan activity in this area may also be reflected in a Renaissance gateway bearing the name Porta Septimiana located near the Palazzo Corsini on the right bank of the Tiber. This Porta now spans the modern Via della Lungara leading toward the Vatican district. The existing gate was built by Pope Alexander VI in 1498 to replace an earlier structure in the Aurelian Wall. It was also later restored by Pius VI in 1798. Because the Porta Septimiana was entirely rebuilt its earlier history is difficult to determine, but the name Septimiana suggests that the original structure replaced by Pope Alexander may have had a connection to Septimius Severus.

Some scholars, however, have questioned the antiquity of the original structure. The Porta Septimiana was not included among the city gates in the Einsiedeln list. The earliest reference to a Porta Septimiana occurs in a Papal record of 1123 A.D. and it is also included in the fourteenth century Mirabilia. It has therefore been suggested that the gate was a medieval construction built into the Aurelian Wall, deriving its name not from the emperor, but from the surrounding district, which was known as Septimiana in the Middle Ages. Other gates in the Aurelian Wall, however, are also not included in the Einsiedeln List, such as the Portae Chiusa and Ardeatina. The Porta Septimiana may have been closed up at the time when this list was compiled or, as a minor gateway, may have been overlooked. The lack of inclusion of the Porta Septimiana by the Einsiedeln Pilgrim does not necessarily indicate that it was constructed after the Aurelian Wall.

An important piece of evidence for the antiquity of the Porta Septimiana and its connection to Severus is contained in the Historia Augusta at Severus 19.5: ...in
Transtiberina regione ad portam nominis sui. This reference would seem to indicate that at the time of the composition of the Historia Augusta there existed in Regio XIV of the city a gateway named after Severus, and the location of this gate would fit with the site of the Porta Septimiana. The accounts concerning the rebuilding of the Porta Septimiana in 1498 also seem to indicate the existence of a Severan inscription related to the original structure. Andreas Fulvius records that Alexander VI replaced a gate that had collapsed with old age with a new structure, where previously there had been an inscription. Nicholas Audebert also states that when the pope rebuilt the old gateway anew, he set up his own inscription in place of one of Severus.

Unfortunately, neither author gives the text of the Severan inscription, which has raised doubts about its existence. It has been suggested that Fulvius may have invented the inscription on the basis of the reference to a Severan gate in the Historia Augusta and his account was simply followed by Audebert. But, as Richmond notes, the demolition of the gate occurred only twenty nine years before Fulvius wrote his account and it is possible that he may have seen the inscription himself in the original gateway. Audebert’s description of the rebuilding of the gateway is much more detailed than Fulvius’ account and possibly came from another source in which the inscription was also recorded.

The structure replaced by the building of the gate in 1498 was therefore very likely Severan in origin. The form or purpose of the original construction, however, is difficult to determine. R.E.A. Palmer suggests that it was a monumental gateway at the customs boundary. Customs were collected at gates set up on major highways, and as
early as the time of Vespasian there were thirty seven *portae* in the city probably for this purpose. Four inscribed boundary stones, which were set up to define the customs barrier because of disagreements between the tradesmen and customs collectors, survive from the reigns of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus. Severus may also have taken an interest in the customs boundary, perhaps as a continuation of the actions of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus, and may have been responsible for the erection of a *porta* that would have served as a monumental customs gate. The Cellae Vinariae Nova and Arruntiana, imperial warehouses for wine, have been located near the Porta Septimiana on the street along the Tiber. The Porta Septimiana may have been the customs gate for the transportation of wine connected to this magazine. It was later incorporated into the Aurelian Wall which tended to follow the earlier customs boundary.

An analogy for the form and intent of the original Porta Septimiana, however, may perhaps be found in the contemporary Arch of the Argentarii. This structure, with its post and lintel design, has the form of a monumental *porta*. It was dedicated to Severus and the imperial family by the *argentarii et negotiantes boarii*, perhaps because of some economic concessions on the part of the emperor. The purpose of the gateway is unclear, but it seems to have had some connection to the commercial area of the Forum Boarium and perhaps even served as the entrance to the *schola* of these *argentarii* and cattle merchants.

Perhaps the original Porta Septimiana was a similar dedication made by some commercial guild in the Transtiberine region. The Regionary Catalogues record the existence of a Coriaria Septimiana in Regio XIV. Inscriptions relating to the *corpus*
coriariorum have also been found near the Ponte Rotto (Pons Aemilia) and the church of S. Crisogono, and the remains of a tannery have been discovered beneath S. Cecilia.\textsuperscript{24} One inscription in particular refers to rules and regulations promulgated by Severus and Caracalla concerning the restoration and decoration of the insulae of the corpus coriariorum.\textsuperscript{25} Severus may therefore have been involved in some way with the guild of tanners in this area and responsible for restoring their headquarters.\textsuperscript{26} To commemorate this act the coriaria were therefore named Septimiana after the emperor.\textsuperscript{27} This corpus coriariorum may have also dedicated a monumental gateway in honour of Severus, perhaps as an entrance to their commercial area. The Porta Septimiana was located on the route of an important ancient road, probably following the same course as the modern Via della Lungara, that branched to the north-west off the Via Aurelia and provided communication between the Transtiberine region and the Vatican.\textsuperscript{28} The dedication of the porta may have been connected to increased building activity on the part of the emperor in the Transtiberine district.

The Pons Aurelius

Near the Porta Septimiana the modern Ponte Sisto crosses the Tiber River. This bridge was constructed by Pope Sixtus IV between 1473-75 to replace a Roman bridge which had fallen into ruin. The replaced Roman bridge has been identified with the Pons Aurelius listed in the Notitia. This also seems to be the same bridge known as the Pons Antoninus in the medieval Mirabilia. On the basis of its name and the Severan associations of the area, the construction of the Pons Aurelius has been credited to Caracalla.\textsuperscript{29} Considering Severus' interest in the area it is possible that he may have
planned the construction of this bridge, and that it was only completed by Caracalla with whom it became associated.\textsuperscript{30}

Coin issues of the emperor from the year 208 in fact depict an elaborate porticoed bridge with triple bay triumphal arches at each end topped with attic statuary of \textit{quadrigae} flanked by trophies (Plate III.4).\textsuperscript{31} The identity of this bridge has been an enigma. Many scholars have suggested that it was issued in honour of Severus’ departure on his British campaign, and may represent a bridge crossed along his route, perhaps the Milvian just outside Rome, or a military bridge constructed during his campaign in Britain.\textsuperscript{32} The bridge depicted on Severus’ coins, however, seems elaborate for a military construction.

Perhaps the elaborate bridge depicted on Severus’ coinage is the Pons Aurelius which had been planned and probably begun by Severus to join to the Campus Martius that part of the Transtiberine region in which he owned property and where he seems to have been involved in some building activity.\textsuperscript{33} These issues belong to the year 208; so the construction seems to have begun late in Severus’ reign, and thus it is conceivable that it was not finished until the reign of Caracalla.

\textbf{The Thermae Septimianae (?)}

The author of the \textit{Historia Augusta} lists among the extant public works of Severus a project that was located in the Transtiberine region. Unfortunately, the place in the text where this structure is named has suffered from corruption. The text, with the various manuscript forms, is as follows: \textit{opera publica praecipua eius extant Septizodium et Thermae Severianae eiusdemque etiam ianae} (Codex Palatinus Latinus); \textit{iane} (Codex
Several emendations have been proposed. *iani*, which would also require the relative pronoun *quarum* to be changed to the masculine *quorum*, was the choice of Renaissance scholars. Peter in the Teubner edition of 1884 emended the text to *ian<ae*; which would agree with the feminine *quarum* in the manuscripts. Other scholars have suggested readings that deviate farther from the manuscripts. Hirschfeld suggested a change to *aliae* while Becker proposed *balneae*.

The emendation, however, which has won acceptance from topographers is that of Zangemeister, who suggested that *etiam ianae* was a corruption of *<Septim> ianae*. With this emendation the restored text at this point would read: *eiusdemque Septimianae in Transtiberina regione ad portam nominis sui* “and the Septimian Baths of the same (emperor) in the district across the Tiber near the gate called after his name.” The adjective *Septimianae* would thus refer to another set of thermae designated with the same title as the nearby Porta Septimiana identified by the phrase *porta nominis sui*.

On the basis of this reading of the text of the *Historia Augusta* many topographers credit Severus with the construction of a bath complex, which was known as the Thermae Septimianae, in the Transtiberine region near the Porta Septimiana. The ruins of these baths, however, have not as yet been identified within the Transtiberine region and their existence is not recorded in any other ancient source. Neither the *Notitia* nor the *Curiosum* list Thermae Septimianae in Regio XIV. It has been suggested that the
absence of the Thermae Septimianae from the Regionary Catalogues or any other source was the result of their early abandonment, explained by the additional note _quarum forma intercidens statim usum publicum invidit_ that completes the passage of the _Historia Augusta_. Some have translated _forma_ as an aqueduct or water channel which collapsed during construction and immediately stopped the use of the baths. Richmond suggests rather that _forma_ should refer here to the plan of the baths, which was cut through (_intercidens_). He proposes that this disruption occurred when the Aurelian Wall was constructed, thus making the baths immediately obsolete.

If these baths were not included in the Regionary Catalogues because they had already been abandoned either immediately after their construction, or according to Richmond, at the time of Aurelian, then it is surprising that they were familiar enough to the author of the _Historia Augusta_, who wrote after the Regionary Catalogues had been compiled, to consider them worthy of inclusion among Severus’ extant _opera publica praecipua_. Rather than referring to the demise of this structure in the Transtiberine region the enigmatic clause in the _Historia Augusta_ may be merely an anecdotal recollection about an accident that caused problems during its construction. The structure, however, was repaired since it was listed here among Severus’ extant works.

A satisfactory explanation of this passage of the _Historia Augusta_ based on Zangemeister’s emendation to _Septimianae_ is therefore elusive, and the existence of these baths in the Transtiberine region, which rests solely on this reading, should perhaps be treated with caution. Some other reading of the _iani_ or _ianuae_ of the manuscript texts should not be ruled out. In fact medieval sources refer to the area as _septem naides_.

---

40 Richmond suggests rather that _forma_ should refer here to the plan of the baths, which was cut through (_intercidens_). He proposes that this disruption occurred when the Aurelian Wall was constructed, thus making the baths immediately obsolete.

41 If these baths were not included in the Regionary Catalogues because they had already been abandoned either immediately after their construction, or according to Richmond, at the time of Aurelian, then it is surprising that they were familiar enough to the author of the _Historia Augusta_, who wrote after the Regionary Catalogues had been compiled, to consider them worthy of inclusion among Severus’ extant _opera publica praecipua_.

42 Rather than referring to the demise of this structure in the Transtiberine region the enigmatic clause in the _Historia Augusta_ may be merely an anecdotal recollection about an accident that caused problems during its construction. The structure, however, was repaired since it was listed here among Severus’ extant works.

43 A satisfactory explanation of this passage of the _Historia Augusta_ based on Zangemeister’s emendation to _Septimianae_ is therefore elusive, and the existence of these baths in the Transtiberine region, which rests solely on this reading, should perhaps be treated with caution. Some other reading of the _iani_ or _ianuae_ of the manuscript texts should not be ruled out. In fact medieval sources refer to the area as _septem naides_.

*iuncte iano.* Iani may even have been related to the construction of the Pons Aurelius. The bridge that appears on Severus' coinage, conjectured to be the Pons Aurelius, is depicted as having porticoes and triumphal arches at its entrances. Perhaps it was the collapse of some arches related to the bridge that hindered it from public use, thus delaying its completion until the time of Caracalla.
For the district, see Jordan-Hülser (1871-1907) 1:3, 656, Platner and Ashby (1929), 471, s.v. “Septimianum” and Richardson (1992), 349 s.v. “Septimianum.”

The excubitorium of the VII Cohort of the vigiles was discovered in 1886 at Monte di Fiore, near the church of S. Crisogono. The remains appear to have been originally a private house of the Hadrianic period which was bought or leased by the Severan administration to house the garrison. A small shrine found in the building can be dated by its decorative brickwork to the time of Severus and one of the cohorts is called Severiana. Numerous inscriptions dating from 215-245 (CIL 6.2993-3091, 32751; ILS 2172, 2174-77) have also been discovered. See Lanciani (1897), 544, Nash (1968) I, 264-267, s.v. “Cohortium Vigilum Stationes,” Rainbird (1986), 154-155, Richardson (1992), 93, s.v. “Cohortes Vigilum, Stationes,” and Ramieri (1993), 293-294. The excubitorium was probably added in response to the fire of 191/192. For the increase in the number of vici, see Homo (1951), 98 and 113.

Nordh (1949), 96.

HA Severus 4.5: proficiscens ad Germanicos exercitus hortos spaciosos comparavit... See Benario (1961), 285.

Severus’ brother Geta was honoured with a statue in the Forum after his death (Dio 76.2.4), and perhaps the horti were named after him.

For the discoveries in this area, see Lanciani (1897), 548, Platner and Ashby (1929), 267, s.v. “Horti Getae,” and Lugli (1975), 583. The bronze statue was discovered at the time of Urban VIII when the new city walls were being constructed. Richardson (1992), 199, s.v. “Horti Getae,” however, sees no reason to locate the gardens in this area.

The rebuilding by Pope Alexander of an original gate collapsed from age is recorded by Andreas Fulvius, Antiquitates Urbis (1527), fol. 11 ff. Sections of the Aurelian Wall are still preserved on either side of the present gateway.

Papal Confirmation of 1123, Cod. Vat. 8951, fol. 26: Iohannis prope portam, S. Silvestri iuxta portam Septimianam; Mirabilia, 4: Porta Septimiana septem Naides iuncte Iano (Jordan-Hülser 1871-1907) II, 608.

Jordan-Hülsen (1871-1907) I:1, 373.

For these gates, whose antiquity has been confirmed, see Richmond (1930), 181-184 and 217-
219, who suggests that they were also not included in the Einsiedeln List because they were probably closed up by the time of its compilation.

11. There is a corruption immediately before the reference to the *porta*, but the reading of this section is clear.


13. fol. 236: “Ceste porte n’est point l’antien bastiment mais est bien en la mesme place, ayant esté toute refaicté de nouveau par le pape Alexandre VI, en forme d’archade de pierre quarree, aussi qu’on le veoit à present. Et au lieu de l’inscription de Septimius, cestecy y est maintenant: ALEXANDER VI PON MAX OB UTILITATEM PUBLICAM CURIAE P Q R A FUNDAMENTIS RESTITUIT.” Cited in Richmond (1930), 223.

14. See Jordan-Hülsern (1871-1907) I:1, 373, n. 46 who completely dismisses the existence of this inscription and an original Severan construction.

15. Richmond (1930), 225.

16. It has been suggested that the original Severan *porta* may have served as the entrance of some complex in the area, perhaps Balneae or Thermae Septimianae, the existence of which has been proposed from the emendation of the corrupt passage in *HA Severus* 19.5. See Lugli (1975), 82. Middleton (1885), 503 proposed that the Porta Septimiana was not included in the Einsiedeln list because it was still part of the enclosure of the Severan Baths and was not one of the exits from the city at that time. For the problems with the emendations, see the discussion of the Thermae Septimianae *infra*.


18. Recorded in Pliny *NH* 3.65-66. The Aurelian Wall has been found to coincide in some places with what is known of the course of the earlier customs barrier. See Richmond (1930), 6.


20. This demarcation of the boundary by Marcus Aurelius and Commodus may be connected to the reform of the urban administration that was undertaken in Commodus' reign and continued into that of Severus. Severus Alexander also confirmed the boundary by placing his name in the
space left by the erasure of Commodus' name on the marker set up on the Via Flaminia, which may be related to his reform of the city administration. He may have been following Severus in this. See Palmer (1980), 218.


23. Palmer (1980), Appendix III, 232, suggests that the phrase in the text at HA Severus, 19.5 *quarum forma intercidens statim usum publicum invidit* refers back to the *porta*, rather than to the structure whose name has suffered from corruption, as is usually thought. He therefore interprets the text to mean that the Aurelian Wall caused the collapse of the original gate built by Severus. The plural relative pronoun *quarum*, however, found in the manuscripts, cannot refer to the singular *porta*.

24. A dedication to Constantine by the *corpus coriariorum magnariorum solatariorum* (CIL 6.1118) was found between the Via in Piscinula and Vicola della Scarpetta. A similar dedication to Diocletian (CIL 6.1117) was found near S. Crisogono. The *corpus piscatorum et urinatorem alvei Tiberis* were also in this area (CIL 6.29702). See Platner and Ashby (1929), 141, s.v. “Coriaria Septimiana” and Jordan-Hülsen (1871-1907) 1:3, 638, especially n. 43, Nash (1968) I. 295-296, Richardson (1992), 100-101, s.v. “Coriaria Septimiana,” and Pronti (1993), 322.


26. Although it cannot be determined whether the Commodan fire extended as far as the Transtiberine region, the restoration of the *insulae* of the *corpus coriariorum* may have been related to damage caused by this fire.

27. Richardson (1992), 100-101, s.v. “Coriaria Septimiana,” suggests that Severus may even have undertaken the construction of extensive tanning works under official control and supervision, but the inscription seems to refer only to some restoration.

It was later restored and dedicated to Valentinianus and Valens, whose triumphal arch decorated the approach from the Campus Martius. The bridge was then known as the Pons Valentinianus. For the identification of the Pons Aurelii with the Ponte Sisto and its original construction by Caracalla, see Jordan-Hülsen (1871-1907) I:1, 417-418, Nash (1968) II, 185-186, s.v. "Pons Aurelii," Lugli (1925), 98 and Richardson (1992), 297, s.v. "Pons Aurelii."

A similar situation seems to have occurred in the case of the Via Nova, see supra 214-216.

On the reverse is depicted a bridge with curved sides and a curved roof carried on four pillars. Three bayed triumphal arches with groups of triumphal statuary above are placed at both ends of the bridge, five figures (statues?) stand on the bridge, and a boat sails underneath. Unfortunately the legend does not identify the bridge, but only reads: P M TR P XVI COS III P P. Aurei: BMC V, 269, §; RIC IV, 120, no. 225; Cohen no. 521. As: BMC V, 350, no. 857, pl. 52.1 (depicted in Plate III.4); RIC IV, 198, no. 786; Cohen no. 523. Issues of Caracalla of 208/209 with the legend TRAJECTUS depict a more annotated representation of a bridge: As, BMC V, 353, †; RIC IV, 284, no. 441; Cohen no. 603.

Hill (1989), 106-107 suggests that this was a special issue in honour of Severus’ departure for Britain in 208, and may represent one of the bridges on the route to Britain, perhaps even the Milvian bridge a short distance north of Rome. Mattingly, BMC V, cclxxiv, proposes that the bridge may refer to special operations against Britain. Oman (1931), 137-146 suggests that these issues mark the passage of the Forth. See also Robertson (1980), 131-139.

McKay (1984), 250 comments that this bridge may be the Pons Aurelii, but suggests that it is more likely the Pons Agrippae which had earlier been restored by Antoninus Pius and would therefore be an appropriate monument for Severan reconditioning.


H. Peter, Scriptores Historiae Augustae, I, (Leipzig 1884), 150. This is the reading also accepted in the 1965 Teubner edition by Hohl.

Hirschfeld and Becker cited in Zangemeister (1884), 635. See also Platner and Ashby (1929), 70, s.v. Balneae Severi."
37. Zangemeister (1884), 635-636.

38. See Platner and Ashby (1929), 532, s.v. “Thermae Septimianae,” Richmond (1992), 226, Lugli (1930-38) III, 650 and Tortorici (1993), 161-164. Some scholars have suggested that the porta named in the passage originally served as an entrance to this bathing establishment, and only later became the Porta Septimiana. See Middleton (1885), 503; Lugli (1975), 82.

39. The only bathing establishment recorded in Regio XIV as worthy of note is a Balneum Ampelidis. The existence of eighty six balneae is also recorded under this Regio (Jordan-Hülsen [1871-1907] II, 564; Nordh [1949], 95-97).

40. Jordan-Hülsen (1871-1907) I:3, 629. This is the translation chosen by D. Magie for the Loeb edition of the Scriptores Historiae Augustae, Volume I, 417. But why could not the aqueduct have been repaired? As Richardson (1992), 49-50, s.v. “Balneae Severi” and 395, s.v. “Thermae Septimianae” notes, the collapse of an aqueduct channel does not seem to have been sufficient cause to hinder the operation of these baths since the proximity of the Aqua Traiana could have supplied an easy substitute. See also Richmond (1930), 226.

41. Richmond (1930), 226. Accepted also by Tortorici (1993), 170, n. 6. The sense of statim, however, does not seem to be met by Richmond’s interpretation.

42. The Notitia dates to 354 and the Curiosum to c. 375, while the HA appears to have been written in the 390’s. For the dating of the Regionary Catalogues, see Jordan-Hülsen (1871-1907) II, 1-236 and Nordh (1949), 16-67. For the late fourth century date of the HA, see Syme (1968) and (1971). For a concise discussion of the debate concerning the authorship and the date of the HA, see Birley (1988), Appendix I, 205-206.

43. The structure in question would thus be archways or doorways located near or even in the porta. Forma could be translated as the frame of the archways which collapsed soon after their construction, hindering their use by the public. Such a reading, however, has been rejected by Richmond (1930), 224-225 on the basis that archways or doorways do not seem to fit under the category of an opus praecipuum, but his objection is not satisfactory. These structures may have had some function in the Porta Septimiana.

44. See the Descriptio plenaria of the twelfth century and the thirteenth century Graphia Aureae. Septem naiides is considered to be a corruption of Septimiana, while iuncte iano a gloss, perhaps for iuxta scimio (i.e. iuxta sanctum Iohannem). See Richmond (1930), 224. The existence of a
ianus in the area, however, remains a possibility in light of the reference in the HA.

45. The erection of arches, sometimes topped with statuary, at the entrances to Roman bridges seems to have been a common practice. See Holland (1961), 286-300 and Kleiner (1991), 188-192. The triumphal arch that was set up to Valentinianus and Valens when the Pons Aurelius was restored may have replaced an earlier Severan one. Ianus can be translated as arched passageway or covered arcade, features of the bridge depicted on the Severan coin. (Cicero, de Natura Deorum 2.67; Ovid, Fasti.1.257; Livy, 2.29.8; Suetonius, Augustus 31.5; ILS 5384. See the OLD and Thesaurus Linguae Latinae 7.1, 138.)
X. THE TEMPLE OF HERCULES AND BACCHUS

The construction of a very large temple to Hercules and Bacchus by Severus is recorded by Dio as an example of what this historian calls the emperor’s wasteful expenditure on repair and new buildings. This is in fact the only mention in Dio of a specific building constructed by Severus, but unfortunately, he does not give any indication of its location. Some scholars have suggested that the temple may not even have been located in Rome. Birley, taking up an earlier suggestion by Hasebroek, proposes that it was built rather at Lepcis Magna and is to be identified with the large temple situated at the south west end of the new Severan Forum and dominating its axis. The dedication of this temple to the Septimian gens, however, has been convincingly demonstrated.

A location in Rome for the temple of Hercules and Bacchus seems more likely. Dio appears to be discussing the emperor’s building programme within Rome when he criticises its construction. Earlier in this same passage he comments that Severus restored a number of ancient buildings, inscribing his own name on them, which clearly is a reference to the restoration carried out by the emperor in the city. Moreover, the construction of a temple to Hercules and Bacchus in Rome would also not be surprising considering that these divinities, as the patron gods of Severus’ native city Lepcis Magna, were officially promoted during his reign.

The promotion of Hercules and Liber/Bacchus, and the dedication of a temple in their honour, may have been one instance where Severus fostered a personal religious interest, but imperial patronage of Hercules and Bacchus was by no means exceptional.
The worship of these two deities had already been fully established in the city of Rome from Republican times, and during the course of the second century A.D. it took on a new function in imperial policy. Under Trajan the divinized hero Hercules was promoted to a more important role within the state religion as the defender of the emperor and the Empire. This connection between Hercules and the emperor was continued under Hadrian and the Antonines. Commodus was represented with the attributes of Hercules in his portraiture both in sculpture and on the coinage. Seeking a complete self-identification with the god, Commodus carried the imperial association with the god even further. Hercules received the epithet Commodianus and the emperor himself took the name Hercules Romanus, and appeared in public in the guise of Hercules. With Hadrian and the Antonine emperors the cult of Bacchus had also seen an expansion, attested by this god’s appearance on special medallions issued by these emperors. Antoninus also was responsible for the restoration of a shrine of Bacchus located on the Via Sacra.

In the promotion of his home town gods, therefore, Severus was also conveniently able to exploit their Antonine associations. From early in the reign Hercules and Liber/Bacchus appear on the Severan coinage as the di auspices and the di patrii of the emperor. Issues were also minted in honour of Liber Pater and Hercules Defensor. In the first part of the reign a direct association between Hercules and the emperor seems to have been solicited. On some obverses Severus is shown wearing the distinctive lion-skin hood of the god, in particular on a medallion of 202. His portraiture also borrows from the iconography of Hercules. These depictions may also have served to connect the emperor with his adoptive brother, although Severus’ association with the god was never
as explicit as Commodus' complete self-identification.\textsuperscript{16}

Hercules and Bacchus, as the \textit{di patrii} of Severus, also appear to have received some special honour in the celebration of the Secular Games of 204. They figure prominently on the coinage issued in connection with the Secular Games, depicted on the reverses standing \textit{en face}, sometimes with a column or \textit{cippus} between them (Plate III.2).\textsuperscript{17} On the issues commemorating the sacrifice to Terra Mater, the emperor is shown conducting the ceremony flanked by Hercules and Liber. While the coin evidence indicates that Hercules and Bacchus were closely associated with the Secular Games, additional sacrifices carried out to Hercules and Bacchus are not recorded in the \textit{Acta}. Severus appears to have been very careful to follow the traditional procedures for the solemn sacrifices and not to disturb the conventions of the established state religion.\textsuperscript{18} In one aspect of the ceremonies, however, the \textit{Carmen Saeculare}, which was sung first on the Palatine and then on the Capitoline, the emperor seems to have been able to honour at least one of his favourite gods in some manner. In the fragmentary remains of the Severan Hymn, preserved in the inscription set up to commemorate the Games, the name of Bacchus appears. Hercules may have also been invoked in a passage now lost.\textsuperscript{19}

Hercules and Bacchus were also utilized in Severus' dynastic plans. From 205 they appear exclusively on the coinage of his sons; Hercules became the special patron of Caracalla and Liber that of Geta.\textsuperscript{20} On the reverses of some issues the brothers are depicted crowned by the two gods.\textsuperscript{21} This special relationship is also represented on the sacrifice relief from the arch at Lepcis where Bacchus and Hercules accompany the two princes.\textsuperscript{22} This dynastic conception, while highlighting the patron gods of Severus'
African origin, was at the same time based upon the traditional Roman pantheon and hierarchy of the gods. Hercules and Bacchus were the offspring of Jupiter, and Severus himself cultivated an association between the emperor and the father of the gods. The representations of Hercules and Bacchus found in the Severan coinage and art work are also entirely conventional. These divinities were not depicted in their African guise of Melqart or Shadrapa, but are shown in their typical Greco-Roman form.\(^{23}\)

Besides their prominence in the coinage and inclusion in the celebration of the Secular Games, there is also other evidence for increased honours to these gods within the city of Rome during Severus' rule in the form of dedications. The Forum Boarium was the site of the Ara Maxima, the oldest and most venerable cult centre of this god. The custom of a dedication at the Ara Maxima by the Urban Prefect at the beginning of his office appears to have begun at this time. This gift was probably in the form of a statue.\(^{24}\) A grant by Severus to the Bacchic Sodales to constructed a shrine to Liber, possibly in the Horti Sallustiani, is recorded in an inscription. This may have been a perpetual land grant by which the emperor encouraged the devotion to one of his \textit{di patrii}.\(^{25}\)

The construction of a temple of Hercules and Bacchus was part of the promotion of these gods. There were already a number of sanctuaries of Hercules in the city, especially between the Circus Maximus, the Forum Boarium, and the north slope of the Aventine.\(^{26}\) Liber was previously worshipped together with Ceres and Libera in a temple on the slope of the Aventine, and he also possessed the shrine restored by Antoninus Pius in the area of the Forum along the Via Sacra.\(^{27}\) The combined worship of Hercules and
Bacchus in a single temple complex at Rome, however, seems to have had no precedent, and the dedication of a temple to both deities appears to be directly tied to their role as the patron gods of the emperor.

The temple may have been erected in gratitude to Hercules and Bacchus for their divine protection during Severus’ military exploits; so it was possibly vowed during the Parthian campaigns, and constructed after the victory. It is also possible that the coins minted between 200-202 and in 204 in honour of Hercules and Bacchus as *di patrii* commemorate its commencement and dedication. Its completion would then have coincided with the Secular Games, in which case the building could have been the site of honours paid to these gods in connection with this celebration.

Dio describes the temple of Hercules and Bacchus as being ὃπερμεγέθης. This impressive temple must have appeared prominently on the Forma Urbis, but no piece of the marble plan has survived on which it can be clearly recognized. The partial plan of a large unidentified temple complex, however, is represented on fragment no. 595. The preserved part of the plan shows the corner of a portico and one side of the building which it surrounded, probably a temple. Between the portico and the columns of the temple is the inscription identifying the structure, but only the letters TEMPL are preserved. The area outside the portico is free of constructions. The large size of this complex, which can be estimated at 100 m. x 65 m., would fit Dio’s comment about Severus’ temple, but unfortunately there is no evidence which can positively assign this fragment and so the identification must remain only a suggestion.

As noted previously, even the location of the Temple of Hercules and Bacchus
within the city of Rome is elusive. Besides Dio’s remark, no other source makes reference to its construction and it does not appear in the lists of the Regionary Catalogues.\textsuperscript{33} Palmer has suggested that it may have been located in the Horti Sallustiani, where Severus encouraged the building of monuments such as the shrine of Liber Pater.\textsuperscript{34}

An interesting suggestion has been recently put forward by R. Santangeli Valenzani, who proposes that Severus’ temple may be identified with the remains of an extensive building that occupied the south-western corner of the Quirinal Hill on the site of the present Palazzo Colonna and Piazza Quirinale (Figure 15).\textsuperscript{35} From drawings and plans that record considerable structures preserved into the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, as well as the few remains still extant in the gardens of the Palazzo Colonna, the extent and basic layout of the complex can be reconstructed.\textsuperscript{36} The temple, which was dodecastyle, was placed within a rectangular enclosure constructed on a largely artificial terrace, approached from the plain of the Campus Martius below by a grand staircase. The complex was very large, covering an area of some 13,230 square metres and the temple was of gigantic proportions, with columns more than 21 m. high and almost 2 m. in diameter. One piece of the pediment that still survives measures 34.27 m. in length and weighs about 100 tons.

The identity of this temple was the subject of much debate between the early topographers Lanciani and Hülsen. Its identification by Lanciani as the Temple of Sol erected by Aurelian, however, has now been rejected by most scholars in favour of Hülsen’s suggestion that the building was the Temple of Serapis cited in the Regionary Catalogue under Regio VI.\textsuperscript{37} This Temple of Serapis was credited to Caracalla because of
an inscription that mentions his construction, or restoration, of an *aedes* of Serapis said to have been discovered in the area of the church of S. Silvestro al Quirinale, and a reference in the Historia Augusta to the construction of splendid temples by Caracalla to the goddess Isis in many places. The construction technique of the remains of the monumental staircase as well as isolated parts of the podium and enclosure wall studied during excavations in 1969, point to a date at the beginning of the third century A.D. for the structure. The style of the architectural fragments still extant also seems to be Severan.

As noted by Santangeli Valenzani, however, there is no conclusive evidence that this structure on the Quirinal was dedicated to Serapis. The suggested affinities between this temple and the Serapaeum at Alexandria are negligible. The passage in the *Historia Augusta* used to support its construction by Caracalla does not refer in any way to an enormous Temple of Serapis. The findspot of Caracalla’s dedication, known only from a note of Pirro Ligorio, is over a hundred metres away behind S. Silvestro. Santangeli Valenzani suggests that the Temple of Serapis referred to in the inscription and cited in the Regionary Catalogues was located rather in the southernmost part of the Quirinal. On the basis of the gigantic proportions of this complex, which is the largest temple in Rome, greater even than that of Venus and Rome, and the lack of any definitive evidence regarding its dedication to Serapis, Santangeli Valenzani instead proposes that it be identified with another Severan structure, the “extremely large” edifice built by Severus in honour of Hercules and Bacchus, cited by Dio.

While Santangeli Valenzani’s proposal for the identification of the Temple of
Hercules and Bacchus is the most promising to date, it cannot be confirmed by any other external evidence. Problematic also with this proposal is the fact that such a temple is not listed among the building of Regio VI in the Regionary Catalogues, although its enormous size surely precludes its omission. Santangeli Valenzani suggests that the temple was not listed because it had been dismantled by the time the Regionary Catalogues were compiled. Since the temple was specifically dedicated to the patron gods of Severus, he suggests that it lost its relevance after the fall of the Severan dynasty and was allowed to fall into ruin.44

Since Severus and the Severan dynasty seem to have enjoyed a prestigious reputation in late antiquity and, as noted above, Hercules and Bacchus were firmly established as gods of the Roman pantheon, it seems unlikely that the temple was purposely neglected.45 Parts of the temple on the Quirinal were also still substantially preserved until the sixteenth century, and therefore the structure cannot have disappeared completely from view by late antiquity. Perhaps more extensive excavations in the area of the Quirinal may someday confirm the identity of this massive complex.46 Another possible locale for Severus' temple of Hercules and Bacchus may be in one of the areas of the city where he was responsible for extensive building, such as Regio I beyond the Porta Capena and near the Porta Septimiana in Regio XIV, or the Forum Boarium or Velebrum where Hercules is known to have been worshipped. Excavations in these areas, however, have not yet produced any remains that can be assigned to the temple.

The Temple of Hercules and Bacchus built by Severus in honour of his patron gods in the city of Rome would have been an impressive new structure in the urban
landscape of Rome. It was imposing enough to elicit the criticism of Dio, who disapproved of its extravagance. With the association cultivated between these two divinities and Severus’ sons, the temple also seems to have become a dynastic monument. The patron gods of the emperor and his family were highlighted, as previous dynasties had done in their constructions. Although these divinities were connected to Severus’ African origins they were part of the Roman pantheon previously honoured in the city of Rome. The legacy of the new dynasty, which promised the renewal of the state under these protective divinities, was therefore framed within Roman tradition.
1 Dio 76.16.3.

2 Birley (1988), 115; Hasebroek (1929), 149-150.

3 Ward-Perkins (1948), 65 and also most recently (1993), 31-54. This temple seems not to have been completed until after Severus death, and was probably dedicated by Caracalla in 216, together with the Basilica. Though the public buildings at Lepcis have been rather extensively excavated no other building has as yet been identified with a large Temple of Hercules and Bacchus. See also Townsend (1938), 512-524.

4 Barnes (1967), 104 convincingly argues from the coin evidence that it was built in Rome. Other scholars who also locate the temple in Rome are Platnauer (1918), 417, Bruhl (1953), 192, Palmer (1978), 1094, and n. 37, Di Vita (1982), 552, n. 85, and Ward-Perkins (1981), 132.

5 For Shadrapa and Melqart in their guise of Hercules and Liber Pater as the patron gods of Lepcis, see Foucher (1978), 698 and Jaczynowska (1981), 640. Temples dedicated to Liber Pater-Shadrapa and Hercules-Melqart respectively were located at the north-east end of the Old Forum at Lepcis. The Temple of Melqart was replaced at the time of Augustus with that of Roma and Augustus, but was rebuilt anew to the east. See Di Vita (1982), 555-557 and (1968), 201-211. The previous existence of these temples at Lepcis would also seem to indicate that Severus constructed his temple at Rome.

6 Although Hercules was very popular during the Republic his official role seems to have been downplayed during the early Empire. Mark Antony had promoted an association with this divinity; so when Augustus came to power Hercules’ role was diminished to the benefit of Mars Ultor. This predilection continued into the period of the Flavians. The interest in Hercules by Trajan may have been connected to his Baetican origin where the sanctuary of Hercules Gaditanus was located. Trajan minted a new type of reverse on aurei of 100 depicting Hercules before an altar, and the god also appears on the arch at Beneventum welcoming the emperor. See Jaczynowska (1981), 631-636.

7 Under Hadrian Hercules received the epithet Gaditanus and was portrayed in the sanctuary at Gades with the attributes of this specific deity. The Antonines returned to a more classical portrayal of the god. See Jaczynowska (1981), 638.
For the connection of Hercules with Commodus, see Jaczynowska (1981), 638-639, and in particular Aymard (1936), 350-364 and Gagé (1981), 662-683. Commodus’ title Hercules Romanus and his public appearance as Hercules is reported by Dio 72.15.2-5, Herodian 1.14.8, and HA Commodus 9.6. The title also appears on an inscription of 192 (CIL 14.3449 = ILS 400).

For Liber Pater in Roman religion of the Empire and his increasing role under the Antonines, see Bruhl (1953), 187-192 and Foucher (1978), 684-702. A number of coin issues celebrating the marriage of Marcus Aurelius and Faustina also have Bacchic associations. An issue of 145 depicts Bacchus sitting in a chariot pulled by two centaurs mounted by erotes, while on those of 149 Marcus Aurelius and Faustina are shown driving Bacchus’ chariot.

A fragment of a curved marble entablature bearing an inscription recording a restoration by Antoninus Pius (CIL 6.36920: [AN]TONINUS IMP II [RE]STITUIT) and a relief of a Maenad was discovered in 1899 in front of the Basilica of Maxentius and is thought to belong to this shrine. A medallion of 145 depicting a small round colonnaded temple covered by a cupola with a statue of Dionysos inside may commemorate the restoration. See Richardson (1992), 239, s.v. "Lyaeus."

Commodus had also built a temple to Hercules at Sabratha in which Marcus Aurelius was also venerated. Marcus Aurelius’ apotheosis is depicted on the western apse, while Hercules’ statue was placed in the temple itself. See Ghedini (1984), 72.

Legend DIS AUSPICIB(US) (194): aurei of Severus, BMC V, 29-30, nos. 58, 63, pls. 6.18, 7.3; RIC IV, 94-95, nos. 25, 31; Cohen nos. 114-115; sestertii, BMC V, 127-128, nos. 505-507, pl. 22.1; 181-183, nos. 661, 666, 669; Cohen nos. 116-120; asses, BMC V, 126, no. 501-502, pl. 21.10. Legend DI PATRII: (204): sestertius of Severus, BMC V, 341; RIC IV, 195, no. 762; Cohen no. 112; aureus of Caracalla, BMC V, 248, 3; RIC IV, 224, no. 76; Cohen no. 55; as of Caracalla, BMC V, 344; RIC IV, no. 422; Cohen no. 5; sestertius of Geta, RIC IV, 330, no. 112; Cohen no. 32; dupondius or as of Geta, BMC V, 319, no. 800, pl. 48.3; RIC IV, 331, no. 117; Cohen no. 33. Tocchi (1956), 1-20 suggests that the reverse images of Hercules and Liber represent the two Augusti, Severus and Caracalla.

Legend LIBERO PATRI (194): denarii of Severus, BMC V, 29, no. 60, pl. 6.2, 31, no. 64, 34, no. 81A; RIC IV, 95, nos. 27A, 32, 97, no. 44; Cohen nos. 301-302; (197-98), denarii, BMC V, 56, nos. 222-223, 60, nos. 248-249, pl. 11.11; RIC IV, 103, no. 99, 104, no. 112(a); Cohen nos.
303-305. HERCULI DEFENS(ORI) (196-97): 
*denarii*, *BMC V*, 47, no. 162, pl. 9.12, 113, no. 451, pl. 19.2; *RIC IV*, 100, no. 79, 157, no. 488; Cohen no. 210. (197-198); *denarii*, *BMC V*, 55, nos. 218-220, pl. 10.15; 60, no. 246, pl. 11.9; *RIC IV*, 102, no. 97, 104, no. 111; Cohen nos. 211-214.

14. See *BMC V*, xxxi. For the medallion of 202, see Gnecchi (1912) i, pl. 152.6.

15. For the allusions to Hercules in Severus’ portraiture, see McCann (1968), 55-56 and 87. For the beard of Heracles on some portrait types of Severus, see McCann (1968), 132.

16. Severus also revived the Flamen Herculaneus which had been created by Commodus, but abolished after his death. *HA Commodus* 17.11. Perhaps an association was also sought through Hercules with Alexander the Great, with whom Severus shared the accomplishment of eastern victories. See McCann (1968), 87.

17. Legend COS III LUDOS SAECUL(ARES) FEC(IT): *aureus* of Severus, *BMC V*, 215, no. 314, pl. 35.1; *denarii*, *BMC V*, nos. 315-317, pl. 35.2; *RIC IV*, 123, no. 257; Cohen nos. 108-109; *sesterius*, *BMC V*, 341, *; *RIC IV*, 194, no. 761, 195, 763B; Cohen nos. 105, 110; *as*, *BMC V*, 342, no. 843, pl. 50.12; *RIC IV*, 195, nos. 764A, 765; Cohen no. 106. Legend COS LUDOS SAECUL(ARES) FEC(IT): *aureus* and *denarius* of Caracalla, *RIC IV*, 224, no. 74(a); Cohen nos. 50-51; *denarius*, *BMC V*, 207, no. 275A, pl. 33.18; *sestertius*, *BMC V*, 343, no. 845, pl. 51.3; *RIC IV*, 280, no. 418; Cohen no. 48; *as*, *BMC V*, 344, no. 846, pl. 51.2 (illustrated in Plate III.2); *RIC IV*, 280, nos. 420-421; Cohen nos. 49, 52.

18. See Pighi (1965), 359-365. Mundle (1957), 165 notes that Hercules and Bacchus do not appear on coins with the legend SACRA SAECULARIA which refers to the actual sacrifices, but are depicted on those with LUDOS SAECULARES FECIT which stress the Games themselves.

19. Severan *Acta* Va.65. The flexibility of the Secular Hymn is noted by Mundle (1957), 47-56. The Augustan hymn composed by Horace honoured in particular Augustus' patron god Apollo and his temple on the Palatine. There is no mention of Bacchus in the Augustan prayer, indicating that his inclusion was a particularly Severan choice.

On a sestertius of Geta of 210 the brothers are depicted on the reverse in military dress; Caracalla is crowned by Hercules and Geta by Liber: BMC V, 402, no. 219, pl. 59.4; RIC IV, 337, no. 155 (Liber mistakenly identified as Apollo); Cohen no. 143. Sestertii of 211 from the end of Severus’ reign and perhaps extending into their joint reign depict a similar scene, but with the legend CONCORDIAE AUGG. Caracalla: BMC V, 409, no. 240, pl. 60.9; RIC IV, 287, no. 459, 296, no. 508; Cohen nos. 28-30. Geta: BMC V, 407, no. 232, pl. 60.3. Asses of Caracalla dating to 205-207 depict Hercules seated at a table between Pinarius and Potitius, BMC V, 345, ‡; RIC IV, 283, no. 430; Cohen no. 39.


24. The earliest dedication is that of L. Fabius Cilo (CIL 6.312 = ILS 3403) who was Urban Prefect under Severus from 203/204-211. See Coarelli (1988), 66 and Cressidi (1984), 268 and 284.


26. For the temples and sanctuaries of Hercules in Rome, see Richardson (1992), 185-189. For a discussion of those in the Forum Boarium in particular, see Coarelli (1988), 60-103 and 164-204.

27. For the Temple of Ceres, Liber and Libera, see Bruhl (1953), 197 and Richardson (1992), 80-81, s.v. “Ceres, Liber, Liberaque, Aedes.” For the shrine along the Via Sacra, see Bruhl (1953), 189 and Richardson (1992), 239, s.v. “Lyaeus.”

28. For the connection between the construction of this temple and the Parthian Wars, see Platnauer (1918), 147.

30. See Carettoni, Colini, Cozza, and Gatti (1960), 97-101, and 151, Tav. XXXI and Rodríguez-Almeida (1981), 127-29, Tav. XXVII. The location of this fragment is unassigned by Carettoni, Colini, Cozza, and Gatti (1960), 151.

31. Thirteen columns, with very narrow intercolumniations, from the side of the temple are shown. The portico has a single colonnade on one side and a double colonnade on the other.

32. Rodríguez-Almeida (1981), 127-129 and (1982), 102-106 has suggested that this fragment depicts the Temple of Matidia built by Hadrian. This identification, although accepted by Richardson (1992), 246-247, s.v. “Matidia, Templum” cannot be confirmed as no other secure evidence for the plan of the Temple of Matidia exists. See Boatwright (1987), 58-62.

33. Ward-Perkins, (1981), 132, to account for the omission of this temple in the literary record besides the mention in Dio, suggests that it may have been of a domestic rather than public character. The temple, however, is criticized by Dio as being excessively large, which rather indicates a major construction.

34. Palmer (1978), 1094-1095. An altar of Hercules Primigenius is also known to have existed in this locale.


36. Drawings of the structure known as the Torre Mesa, Torre di Mecanate, or Frontispizio di Nerone, which was destroyed between 1549 and 1630, were made by van Heemskerck and S. du Pérac and a plan was compiled by Palladio. Remains of the set of stairs leading to the temple from the plain below can still be seen in the gardens of the Palazzo Colonna and in the Pontificia Università Gregoriana as well as fragments of the architrave block, parts of the frieze, and the corner block of the pediment. For details about the reconstruction of the temple, see Santangelo (1941), 154-177.

in Capite near Piazza San Silvestro. Santangelo (1941), 154-177, however, sides with Lanciani. See also Osborne (1983), 220-225.


39. Previous excavations were conducted in 1878 and 1939, but the only scientifically documented undertaking was that of 1969. See Lissi Caronna (1979), 306-308, who dates the structures in the area from the first century B.C. to the beginning of the third century A.D. The brickwork of the staircase has been identified as characteristic of the Severan period by Lugli (1957), 611-614. See also Santengeli Valenzani (1991-92), 12. Unfortunately no brick stamps have as yet been identified.

40. Coarelli (1980), 243 suggests an affinity to the decoration of the Porticus Octaviae, and dates the fragments to the Severan period. See also Palchetti (1965), 311 and Ward-Perkins (1981), 134. In Töbelmann (1923), 73-84, the decoration of the pediment is dated to the middle of the second century A.D. The similarity of the decoration to Hadrianic work, however, is not surprising, considering that other Severan decoration borrowed from a number of earlier styles. For the various currents of architectural ornament in the Severan period, see Pallottino (1946), 67, Strong (1953), 140 and 147, and Palchetti (1965), 311. Strong (1953), 139 suggests that although the work is similar to a late Hadrianic style found in other Severan monuments the quality of the carving precludes a date later than 160-170, and proposes that the temple was erected by Marcus Aurelius. There is no reason, however, that this decoration cannot be placed in the Severan period, if one takes into account the date of the building technique of the structures.


42. Ward-Perkins (1981), 134 also questions the alleged Egyptian affinities of the plan and admits that the temple is conventionally classical.

43. See also Richardson (1992), 361, s.v. “Serapis, Aedes,” who suggests that the finds of material and inscriptions related to the cult of Serapis favour a location on the southernmost part of the Quirinal, the Collis Latiaris.


45. The Severan Temple of Hercules and Bacchus does seem, however, to have disappeared by the time of the compilation of the Regionary Catalogues since it is not listed under any region and is
also omitted from the list of imposing extant buildings of Severus noted by the author of the *HA* (*Severus* 19.5).

46. As noted above, the identification of this temple as that of Serapis is in no way confirmed. Recently Richardson (1992), 341, *s.v.* “Salus, Aedes,” on less convincing grounds, has suggested that it may even have been the Temple of Salus, which he believes was restored by Hadrian.
XI. THE FORUM BOARIUM (Figure 16)

The Forum Boarium was significant in the legendary tradition of Rome and was the site of many cult centres.¹ This market place, located on the low ground between the Capitoline, Palatine, and Aventine Hills, had developed at an important cross-roads converging near the Tiber. While the earliest development of the market and the nearby port occurred during the time of the kings, the most intense building took place in the third and second centuries B.C. Much restoration and rebuilding was necessitated by floods and fires, resulting in the construction of magnificent temples and porticoes.² In the imperial period building was concentrated near the port with the construction of a series of warehouses, particularly under Trajan and Hadrian. Various emperors also undertook repairs to the existing structures.³

At the beginning of the third century a new impetus of building activity in the Forum Boarium and the adjacent Velabrum seems to have occurred, which may have been promoted by Severus. Excavations have revealed the remains of a number of brick constructions dating to the first half of the third century throughout this area. Unfortunately, only isolated traces of these structures have been identified, so that it is not possible to reconstruct their plans, but it is likely that they had a commercial purpose related to their location.⁴ It is also difficult to determine the precise period of building, since many of the structures can be dated on the basis of their construction materials only to within the first half of the third century. The discovery of brick stamps from the time of Severus in some of the structures, however, indicates that this redevelopment of the
Forum Boarium had begun during his reign.⁵

A general raising of the level of the Forum Boarium, perhaps as a response to flooding, also seems to have been part of the development of the area. Amid the foundations and subterranean rooms of one of the Severan structures excavated in the Piazza della Bocca della Verità, the remains of an altar to Concordia of the Augustan period was discovered, denoting a marked rise in the floor level of the Forum.⁶ The elevation of the base of the Severan Arch of the Argentarii is reckoned to be 1.55 m. higher than the Augustan level.⁷ A travertine pavement has also been found 1.55 m. above an earlier paving of peperino during excavations on the Lungotevere at the bottom of the slope of Rocca Savella, further indication of the raising of the Forum level.⁸ A date during the reign of Severus, and before 203/204, for this undertaking is provided by the construction of the Arch of the Argentarii.

Severus’ attention to the Forum Boarium may have been related to the extensive worship of his patron god, Hercules, in the area. A series of inscribed dedications made by Urban Prefects at the Ara Maxima indicates that a sacrifice was made here by this official every year, probably on his entry to office, and a gift was offered to Hercules in the form of a statue placed near the sanctuary.⁹ This custom may have begun in connection with the Severan interest in the Forum Boarium, as the earliest recorded dedication is that of Severus’ Urban Prefect, L. Fabius Cilo.¹⁰
The Arch of the Argentarii

The erection of the Arch of the Argentarii by the *argentarii et negotiantes boarii huius loci* in the area of the Forum Boarium to honour Severus and the imperial family may also illustrate the attention that was given to this area by the emperor. The dedication was in the form of a post and lintel monumental gateway, 6.80 m. high, 5.85 m. wide with an opening of 3.30 m. The two rectangular piers have solid travertine bases and an upper structure consisting of a rubble core faced with marble. The horizontal architrave was entirely of marble.

The monument is decorated with elaborate ornament and relief panels. The imperial family is depicted performing sacrifices on the principal panels in the interior of the gateway.¹¹ On the front are single large figures, badly preserved, which have been variously interpreted.¹² On the architrave flanking the inscription are figures of Hercules and the Genius Populi Romani. Soldiers with prisoners are represented on the panels of the surviving outside facade. The other was destroyed when the structure was later incorporated into the campanile of the church of S. Giorgio in Velabro, thus damaging part of the right pier. Various smaller reliefs also depict sacrifice scenes and sacrificial instruments. The rear of the gateway is entirely devoid of any sculptural relief except for a small panel, which is not in its original location, but appears to have been moved from the front pilaster when the adaptation to the church was made.¹³

According to the original inscription the monument was dedicated to the two Augusti, Severus and Caracalla, Geta Caesar, Julia Domna, Caracalla's wife Plautilla, and probably also his father-in-law, the powerful Praetorian Prefect, Plautianus.¹⁴ Statues of
the imperial family were probably placed on the attic. The Arch of the Argentarii, however, is also a record of the vicissitudes of the Severan imperial house, and erasures and changes were made to the inscription and the relief panels after the downfall of Plautianus, the banishment of Plautilla, and the later murder of Geta after the death of Severus.

Although this monument was a private dedication in its size and form, it was significant to the imperial programme. The themes presented in the sculptural relief are in line with those promoted by Severus. The large panel reliefs depicting the entire imperial family in the act of sacrifice have dynastic significance and reflect the pietas of the domus divina. Hercules, one of the Severan di patrii, is present. The prisoner scenes, with their triumphal connotations, refer to the military virtus of the emperor. The monument, therefore, has an official character, which suggests that it was carried out with the approval of the emperor.

The form of the monument also seems to indicate that it was dedicated in honour of an important occasion. Dedications were usually in the form of a single honorary statue and architectural dedications of this elaborate type on the part of colleges are relatively rare. It is possible that the arch was dedicated to Severus by the local merchants in gratitude for his interest in the Forum Boarium that resulted in a development of the area and gave an impetus to the commercial activity. This monument may therefore be viewed as a document of the loyalty of the commercial class to the dynasty and Severus' good relations with them.
The function that the Arch of the Argentarii served within the urban layout of the region, however, is problematic, since the topography of the immediate area is unclear, especially to the north.²¹ There is evidence for a road under the arch intersecting the Vicus Tuscus which passed in front of the monument. The path through the arch probably led to the Vicus Iugarius to the north (See Figure 16).²² Some scholars propose that the Arch of the Argentarii was set up on this thoroughfare as a monumental entrance into the Forum Boarium.²³

There are problems, however, with this proposal. The large monumental arch located nearby, known as the Ianus Quadrifrons, has been identified with the Arcus Constantini, which according to its listing in the Regionary Catalogues, was situated between the Forum Boarium and the Velabrum.²⁴ The quadrifrontal form of this monument seems to indicate that it stood at an important cross-roads and the designation in the Regionary Catalogues suggests that it was located at the boundary of the two districts. If this is the case, the Arch of the Argentarii, which is located north of this boundary, would then have been outside the Forum Boarium, although it is possible that the borders may have been altered by the time the Quadrifrons was built.²⁵

One of the most important elements that precludes the function of the Arch of the Argentarii as an entrance into the Forum Boarium is the design of the arch itself. The northern facade of the monument was completely devoid of sculptural decoration, while the southern was richly decorated and also carried the inscription.²⁶ The front of the monument, therefore, was on the south, indicating that it was intended to be approached from this direction. If it was to serve as an entrance to the Forum Boarium one would
have expected the northern facade to have been emphasized, and not left plain. If the Arch of the Argentarii did indeed serve a public function it may have been rather as an entrance into the Velabrum from the Forum Boarium since it was to be approached from this direction.

Other scholars have proposed that the arch was instead a monumental entrance to a building complex, perhaps of a private nature, and therefore the rear was not intended to be on public view. It may then have served as the monumental entrance to the schola of the argentarii and boarii. The huius loci of the inscription would therefore be a reference to the premises behind the gate. Excavations carried out in the area on the occasion of the restoration of the church of S. Giorgio have revealed the presence of Roman structures in the immediate area, some with the same orientation as the arch, but unfortunately they have not been properly documented or studied and therefore their relationship to the arch cannot be clearly established. There is some question whether the argentarii and negotiantes boarii would have been combined in one schola, but the offices of two corporations may have occupied the same area.

The function of this monument will only be ascertained when the topography of the surrounding area is fully understood. One element that should perhaps be noted about the location of the Arch of the Argentarii is its presence on an important processional route. As events of the Secular Games moved from the Campus Martius to the Palatine and the Circus Maximus the procession would have passed by this monument along the Vicus Tuscus (See Figure 19). The connection of the relief sculpture and the sacrifices of the Secular Games has been noted. The monument was dedicated some time between
the tenth of December 203 and the ninth of December 204, probably in time for the celebration of the Games, or in commemoration of them.
According to tradition the Forum Boarium was the site of Hercules' triumph over Cacus, who attempted to steal the cattle of Geryon. To commemorate this event, either Hercules himself or Evander established his cult and founded the Ara Maxima. For the Ara Maxima and the other sanctuaries of Hercules in the Forum Boarium, see Coarelli (1988), 60-105 and Palmer (1990), 234-240. The cults of Ceres, Liber and Libera, Diana and Mercury were also located in the Forum Boarium. For the topography of the area and the possible location of the various cult centres, see Coarelli (1988), passim. The remains of the temples of Fortuna and Mater Matuta have been identified in the area of the church of S. Omobono and that of Portunus in the rectangular temple previously known as Fortuna Virilis.

For the development of the Forum Boarium, see Coarelli (1988), 312-325, (1995b), 295-297 and Cressidi (1984), 249-296. To this period of development belongs the round temple near the Tiber constructed of Pentelic marble, dedicated to either Hercules Olivarius (Coarelli [1988], 180-204) or, more likely, Hercules Victor (Ziolkowski [1988], 309-333).


The Severan structures that have been excavated in the Forum Boarium have been conveniently compiled by Cressidi (1984), 256-278 and 283-284. Many of these excavations were undertaken early in this century, and in some cases proper plans were never made, making reconstruction even more difficult.

For example, six bipedales with stamps (CIL 15.372), dated by Bloch (1968), 299 to 193-198, were discovered in a large brick wall excavated in Piazza della Bocca della Verità. Cressidi (1988), 271 and 284. Another structure can be definitely dated to the time of Alexander Severus, indicating that the construction continued over some time. See Cressidi (1988), 274.

The Augustan altar was presumably abandoned when the Forum level was raised. See Colini (1970-71), 60 and Cressidi (1984), 272.

The Augustan level has been determined in excavations carried out near the Arch of the Argentarii at the intersection of the modern Via del Velabro and Via dei Cerchi, where part of a complex dating to the late Republic, covered over by an Augustan pavement, has been discovered. See Cressidi (1984), 274-276 and 283.
In the Piazza della Bocca della Verità the discovery of two levels of paving is also reported, one of peperino and another of travertine. The elevation of the Augustan altar is 1.53 m. lower than a pavement discovered under the Piazza della Bocca della Verità which may therefore be the Severan level. See Cressidi (1984), 265, 278 and 283-284.

*CIL* 6.312-319 = *ILS* 3402-3409. These inscriptions were discovered in the vicinity of the round temple dismantled during the pontificate of Sixtus IV located near the church of S. Maria in Cosmedin.

*CIL* 6.312 = *ILS* 3403. These dedications continue through the third century and into the fourth. The latest date is 321 A.D. See Coarelli (1988), 66 and Cressidi (1984), 268 and 284.

On one of the relief panels inside the gateway Julia Domna and Severus appear with another figure, possibly Geta, which has been removed. Caracalla alone remains on the panel on the opposite side, but originally Plautilla and Plautianus were probably also depicted. The figure of Julia Domna on the arch is one of the few representations on a monument in the capital of an Augusta beside her husband, and attests to her public participation in the ceremonies of the reign. See Ghedini (1984), 27-53.

Severus and Caracalla have been proposed by Pallottino (1946), 88-89, De Maria (1988), 308, and Hannestad (1986), 279; P. Septimius Geta and Plautianus, consuls of 203, by Madaule (1924), 142; the patrons of the college by Haynes and Hirst (1939), 27, Franchi (1964), 15, n. 39; and M. Annius Flavius Libo and L. Fabius Cilo, consuls of 204, by Desnier (1993), 590.

For the decoration of the arch, see Pallottino (1946), 73-110, De Maria (1988), 307-308, Kleiner (1992), 334-337, and Diebner (1993), 105-106. The depictions of the imperial family are notable for the frontality of the figures, and are important in the development of the art of the period. See Franchi (1964), 7-19. The pilasters are also covered with elaborate acanthus scrolls and other decorations. For a discussion of the decoration and its baroque qualities, see Pallottino, 57-73. See Tedone (1986) 548-553 and (1987-88), 353-357 for the restoration work recently undertaken on the arch.

*CIL* 6.1035 31232 = *ILS* 426. The inscriptions in its present state reads: IMP CAES L SEPTIMIO SEVERO PIO PERTINACI ARABIC ADIABENIC PARTH MAX FORTISSIMO FELICISSIMO / PONTIF MAX TRIB POTESE XII IMP XI COS III PATRI PATRIAE ET / IMP CAES M AURELIO ANTONINO PIO FELICI AUG TRIB POTESE VII COS I[II P P
PROCOS FORTISSIMO FELICISSIMOQUE PRINCIPI ET / IULIAE AUG MATRI AUG [N] ET CASTRORUM ET [SENIATUS ET PATRIAE ET] IMP CAES M AURELI ANTONINI PII FELICIS AUG / [PARTHICI MAXIMI BRITANNICI MAXIMI] ARGENTARI ET NEGOTIANTES BOARI HUIUS LOCI QUI INVEHENT DEVOTINUMINI EORUM.


16. II P P PROCOS FORTISSIMO FELICISSIMOQUE PRINCIPI in the third line replaced the name and titles of Geta, probably originally ET P SEPTIMIO GETAE NOBILISSIMO CAESARI. In the fourth line Plautilla’s name was replaced by additional titles for Julia Domna: AUG N ET CASTRORUM ET SENATUS ET PATRIAE ET. The original was possibly AUGG ET CASTRORUM ET FULVIAE PLAUTILLAE AUG. The fifth line may originally have contained the name and titles of Plautianus, but was completely erased and replaced by PARTHICI MAXIMI BRITANNICI MAXIMI. For a discussion of the possible form of the original text and the dates of these changes to the inscription, see Haynes and Hirst (1939), 5-6 and Pallottino (1946), 31-33. On the interior reliefs some figures have been removed. Geta probably originally appeared in the sacrifice scene with Severus and Julia Domna, while Plautilla and possibly Plautianus were depicted with Caracalla, although other combinations have been proposed. See Madaule (1924), 130-132, Pallottino (1946), 80-81 and Franchi (1964), 10-11.

17. For a discussion of the meaning of the panel reliefs, see De Maria (1988), 185-89 and Desnier (1993), 578-591.

18. For the few examples of architectural dedications, see Pallottino (1946), 122, n. 129 and Haynes and Hirst (1939), 8.

19. See Cressidi (1984), 284 and Colini (1944), 60, n. 10. It has also been suggested by Haynes and Hirst (1939), 9 that the monument was erected in thanks for an exemption given to the negotiantes boaríi from the munera publica. A fragment of Ulpian records that the suaríi were granted such an exemption under Severus because they assisted the annona. The boaríi may have been included in this as they were also attached to the annona. See Heurgon (1947), 56-57. As noted by Pallottino (1946), 34, while Severus was responsible for a reorganization of the annona and may have given exemption to the boaríi, this does not explain the gratitude of the argentarii, whose name is actually given precedence on the inscription. The circumstances which prompted the dedication must have been broader, perhaps benefits or concessions of some type which led
to the development of the area, including the raising of the level of the Forum Boarium, of which the dedicants were the major beneficiaries. Perhaps some rebuilding was required as a result of the Commodan fire, which may have spread from the Palatine into the area of the Forum Boarium.

20. As noted by Franchi (1964), 7. Severus' interest in the commercial colleges and their buildings may perhaps be seen in legislation relating to the restoration and adornment of the insulae of the corpus coriariorum contained in CIL 6.1682 = ILS 1220 dedicated to Anicius Paulinus, consul ordinarius in 334. See Chapter IX, n. 25. The Porta Septimiana in Transtiberina may have been a similar dedication made by some commercial guild in this region.

21. For the topography of the area, see Cressidi (1984), 249-297.

22. For the major routes in the area of the Forum Boarium, see Coarelli (1988), 34-35.

23. The exact limits of the Forum Boarium, however, are not known. The identification of the Arch of the Argentarii as an entrance to the Forum Boarium was first suggested by Madaule (1924), 122. More recently Coarelli, identifying the boundaries of the Forum Boarium as the carceres of the Circus Maximus to the south-east, an ancient street corresponding to the modern Via della Greca to the south, and the Vicus Tuscus to the north, suggests that the Arch of the Argentarii served as a monumental entrance on this side. See Coarelli (1980) 324 and (1988), 10-12. See also Diebner (1993), 105.


25. This is the solution proposed by Madaule (1924), 122-124 who suggests that between the time of the construction of the two monuments the area of the Forum was slightly reduced on the side of the Velabrum, due to encroachment on the area. He also reconstruits two parallel streets coming from the Vicus Lugarius, one through the Arch of the Argentarii and the other through the Quadrifrons. It seems more likely, however, that if the Arch of the Argentarii was intended as an entrance to the Forum Boarium it would have been placed on the major road, the Vicus Tuscus, on which the Quadrifrons was later constructed rather than the street which intersected it.

26. The relief panel presently on the pylon to the right of the viewer is not in its original location. This panel was moved from the other side of the monument when its pilaster was incorporated into the church. The marble slab with plaited decoration below this relief is also not original, but
dates to the ninth century A.D., and was added as a support when the relief was installed. For a
discussion of the northern facade, see Pallottino (1946), 18-19.

27. The problem with the design of the arch has not been addressed by Coarelli or others who
propose that it was an entrance to the Forum Boarium.

28. As noted by De Maria (1988), 186, the arch was placed along the Vicus Tuscus which led to
the Forum Boarium, but must itself have straddled a route of exit from this area, since it was not
viewed from the back.

29. Although this structure is commonly designated as an arch, it does not have a vault and from a
structural point of view is more like a *porta*. Its form is unusual for Rome and in scheme and
proportions its nearest analogies are the *portae sacrae* often depicted on wall paintings and
funerary monuments from Syria. Pallottino (1946), 48-56 has suggested that the plan of the
monument may be attributed to an oriental architect using a traditional typology combined with
the Roman tradition of monumental arches.

30. See Haynes and Hirst (1939), 11-13. This function is also accepted by Richardson (1992), 29,
*s.v.* “Arcus Septimii Severi (in Foro Boario), Arcus Argentariorum, Monumentum
Argentariorum.”

31. There is evidence that this phrase can refer to a college: *CIL* 6.266, 406 = *ILS* 4316. See
Haynes and Hirst (1939), 13. According to Pallottino (1946), 112-114 the Arch of the Argentarii
may have been the limit of the small “piazza” onto which was later also constructed the Ianus
Quadrifrons. He suggests that the analogy for the Arch of the Argentarii should perhaps be
sought in the arches erected on the lateral streets leading from the Forum Romanum. For
suggestions regarding the meaning of the replacement of *LOCI* at line 6 with *LOCI QUI
INVEHENT LOCI*, see Madaule (1924), 118, Haynes and Hirst (1939), 7, Pallottino (1946), 35,
and Heurgon (1947), 56-57.

32. These structures were recorded by A. Muñoz, *Il restauro della Basilica di S. Giorgio in
Velabro*, (Rome 1926), 34 cited in Pallottino (1946), 19 and Cressidi (1984), 276. At a depth of
20-30 cm. below the present level were discovered walls of the second to third centuries A.D. of
various orientations.

33. They were probably two distinct corporations. The *argentarii* are probably bankers or money
changers whose presence in this region is confirmed by *CIL* 6.9184: *argentarius de Velabro*. The
negotiantes boarii are probably the cattle merchants. For the relationship between these two groups, see Madaule (1924), 116-118, Haynes and Hirst (1939), 7-8 and Pallottino (1946), 34, and 113. Madaule suggests that the cattle market in the Forum Boarium had by this time developed into an exchange rather than an actual market. Richardson (1992), 29, s.v. “Arcus Septimii Severi (in Foro Boario)” and 163, s.v. “Forum Boarium,” proposes that boarii may only be a place-designation and questions whether this area was ever a cattle market.

34. The processional route between the Campus Martius and the Circus Maximus passed along the Vicus Iugarius up to the Forum and then turned along the Vicus Tuscus through the Velabrum and Forum Boarium to the Circus Maximus. This was the itinerary for the propitiatory rites of 207 B.C. as described by Livy 35.11 as well as the triumphal route between the Circus Flaminius and the Circus Maximus. See Coarelli (1968a), 63 and (1988), 367. For the topography of the events of the Secular Games, see Pighi (1965), 269-271. See also Appendix II infra 442-445.

35. See Gagé (1934), 59-65, Pallottino (1946), 102-103, Franchi (1964), 18 and Ghedini (1984) 42. It is difficult to identify what particular sacrifice of the Games is represented on the relief panels. It is likely that the general religio of the celebration was meant to be represented, and not a specific event.
XII. THE CAELIAN (Figure 17)

The Castra of the Equites Singulares

Among the utilitarian buildings of the Severan programme was the construction of additional castra for the *equites singulares* located in the Lateran region of the Caelian hill. Additional space seems to have been required to house the corps of the imperial bodyguard as a result of an increase in their numbers undertaken by Severus, probably in connection with the reconstituting of the praetorian guard from non-Italians on his arrival in Rome in 193.¹

The original camp of the *equites singulares*, constructed under Trajan, was located at the base of the Caelian to the north of the Scala Santa. Excavations carried out in 1885 along the Via Tasso revealed a long wall of a rectangular court, broken by niches, abutted by pilasters and votive altars.² The earlier camp continued in use after the construction of the new barracks.³ Sepulchral inscriptions indicate that the earlier building was known as the Castra Priora while the Severan camp was referred to as the Castra Nova.⁴

The Severan castra was discovered under the church of S. Giovanni in Laterano during excavations carried out in 1934-38 during restoration work on the Basilica.⁵ Suitable space was apparently not available for expansion in the immediate vicinity of the original camp, so the additional barracks were constructed to the south-west. A large private residence was demolished to make way for it, and the lower rooms of the earlier building were filled in to create level ground for the foundations of the castra.⁶
Under the church have been recovered the remains of a large quadrangular building, with a perimeter of 15 x 21 m., consisting of a number of rooms around a central hall or courtyard entered through a portico along its north side. This large courtyard with attendant rooms is typical of the camp headquarters building, or *principia*, located in the centre of legionary fortresses. The room at the back of the courtyard, probably the *tablinum* or *sacrarium*, was approached by a set of steps of green marble. Two rooms opened off each side of the courtyard. At the back of one of the rooms on the north-east side, the walls of which were decorated with red plaster with white geometric designs, was found an altar formed by an overturned capital, with dedicatory inscriptions to the emperor and his family carved on the volutes. This room was probably the *schola collegii* or the *schola curatorum* of the *equites singulares*. There were also underground rooms beneath the courtyard, possibly intended for the safekeeping of valuables.

The barracks flanking the headquarters building have been identified to the west in the form of two long parallel structures each consisting of a double row of rooms with a common rear wall and entrances at opposite ends. Each barrack block was divided into individual rooms measuring 4.6 x 4.2 m. Remains of stairs indicate that there was an upper floor. Black and white mosaics with geometric designs and wall paintings are preserved in many of the rooms. In the apse of the church the remains of the circuit wall, 1.3 m. wide, are preserved to a height of 7.53 m.

Because only a small part of the castra has been excavated, it is difficult to determine the exact layout of the camp. The two parallel buildings located to the west of the *principia* indicate that the barracks on this side were aligned *per strigas* along the Via
A wall has been located on the east side of the headquarters building at the same distance as the first barrack block on the west, suggesting that the barracks were probably laid out in a similar manner on this side. It is unclear what was in front of or behind the headquarters building. The stables have not been identified, but most of the horses may have been housed outside the camp, probably on the flats south of the Caelian. The tribunes’ quarters seem to have been located outside the walls, which is typical of legionary camps of the period. The main gate was probably on the north side towards the city. Some idea of the exterior of the camp can be gleaned from a depiction on a funeral relief of an eques. In the relief the battlements are shown with merlons, the gate tower stands out from the walls, and the gateway is arched and closed by two doors.

Given that the earliest dedication found in the camp dates to January 1, 197, the guards must have been installed in their new castra by this time. Since Severus was involved in the eastern campaigns until 196, the plan for the construction was probably set in motion during his first brief stay in Rome in 193 after assuming power. The construction of the Castra Nova for the equites singulares appears to have been a priority of the emperor, necessitated by his decision to increase the numbers of the corps. It was therefore the first building project undertaken in the city of Rome by Severus, and a very practical one for securing the position of the new regime.

**Other Developments in the Lateran Area**

Construction of the new castra for the equites singulares resulted in a reorganization of the urban layout of this part of the Caelian. The area was extensively
levelled and a large terrace created extending to the south. The camp was also laid out with a different orientation from the earlier structures. The large residence that had been demolished to make way for the new camp had been constructed on a terrace sloping from north-west to south-east and placed parallel to the Via Tuscolana, as were the structures farther to the north-west probably belonging to the Horti Domitiae. The camp was placed rather at an oblique angle to the street, approximately north to south.\(^\text{15}\)

Adjacent to the western circuit wall of the castra, in the triangle created between the camp and the Via Tuscolana as a result of this change in orientation, a new building was constructed. This consisted of a series of rooms around a courtyard, trapezoidal in shape because of the alignment of its western side along the Via Tuscolana. Part of the mosaic pavement of the courtyard is still preserved.\(^\text{16}\) The function of this building is unclear, but it possibly served as lodging for the tribunes of the *equites singulares*.\(^\text{17}\)

A bath complex located on the western side of the camp, and north-west of the trapezoidal building, was also rebuilt at this time. Its remains have been discovered under the Baptistery of the Basilica. This building had been begun during the time of Hadrian and completed under Antoninus, but seems to have collapsed soon after its construction. The rebuilding of this bath building seems to have been undertaken in connection with the construction of the castra, and it may have been intended to service the camp.\(^\text{18}\)

Another bath building was also constructed at the time of Severus at the corner of the Via Tuscolana and the ancient street corresponding to the Via dell’Aamba Aradam. Part of this complex, known by the modern name Thermae Lateranenses, is still preserved above ground. The building was oriented to the north-west and fronted on the Via
Tuscolana. The plan was symmetrical, with a cross vaulted frigidarium, 10 x 12.50 m., and 13.50 m. high. The relation of this bath to the other constructions to the south is not clear. It does not seem to have been a private bath because of its large size and prominent location fronting onto the street. At the intersection of Via dell’Amba Aradam and Via dei Laterani the remains of a large nymphaeum have also been excavated. The original construction was Julio-Claudian, but it was modified and redecorated at the beginning of the third century, possibly in connection with the construction of the baths.

The area to the west of the Via Tuscolana was also developed. Previously the sloping ground in this area had been terraced up to the Valle della Ferratella. Under Severus this terracing was advanced farther to the south-west up to La Marrana by means of massive substructures. This was done in order to create an area for the construction of a large building or group of buildings. Unfortunately, no remains have been excavated in this area to indicate what sort of construction was carried out. The substructures, however, are still preserved, as they were later incorporated into the Aurelian Wall.

To what extent this building activity in the vicinity of the Castra Nova Equitum Singularium was undertaken under the auspices of the emperor is difficult to determine. The redevelopment of this part of the Caelian, however, may have been feasible because much of the area was imperial property. The Lateran region was the site of a number of large residences, which by the end of the second century appear to have come under imperial ownership. Among these were the estates of Plautius Lateranus and Calpurnius Piso, both of which had been confiscated by Nero during the Pisonian conspiracy.
The horti of Domitia Lucilla Minor, where Marcus Aurelius was born, also appears to have been located to the north-west of the Castra at the cross-roads of the Via Tuscolana and Via Caelimontana. Three iron fistulae with the inscription Domitia Lucilla have been discovered in the Piazza S. Giovanni in the area of the Ospedale, as well as the remains of an establishment constructed in opus reticulatum with many restorations and expansions. The Domus of Annius Verus was also located in the area, but its exact position has not been identified. Both the properties of Domitia Lucilla and Annius Verus appear to have passed into the patrimony of the emperor. To the west of the Piazza di S. Giovanni in the area of Corsia Folchi have been discovered a number of kilns constructed at the beginning of the second century, possibly part of the figlinae Domitianae that also became imperial property when they were inherited by Marcus Aurelius. During the Severan period the imperial property in the Lateran seems to have extended on both sides of the Via Tuscolana through the incorporation of more properties.

The Aedes Laterani

According to Aurelius Victor, Severus endowed many of his friends with residences, among which the most exceptional was that of Lateranus: (Severus) in amicos inimicosque pariter vehemens, quippe qui Lateranum, Cilonem, Anullinum, Bassum ceterosque alios ditaret aedibus quoque memoratu dignis, quorum praecipuas videmus Parthorum quae dicuntur ac Laterani. T. Sextius Lateranus had been the commander of an army in the Parthian expedition in 195, and was made consul by Severus in 197. In 1595 three fistulae were discovered in the area of the Basilica, two with the name of
Sextius Lateranus alone and one with those of Sextius Lateranus and Sextius Torquatus, probably the sons of the consul of 197 and inheritors of the property. The aedes of Lateranus therefore seems to have been located somewhere in this area, but unfortunately the findspot of the fistulae was recorded as only prope Ecclesiam.

There have been many proposals for the location of the residence of Sextius Lateranus. Some have suggested that it was built over part of the earlier domus that was demolished on the parcel of land next to the castra, now the site of the Baptistery. This location is based on the identification of the earlier domus as that of Plautius Lateranus, the consul designate for 65 who was executed for complicity in the Pisonian conspiracy, and the suggestion that Sextius Lateranus had some claim to the property because of the similar cognomen. Sextius, however, was from a different gens with no direct hereditary connection. The passage in Aurelius Victor also seems to indicate that the residence of Sextius Lateranus was still standing at the time when he wrote in the fourth century. The existence of the residence at the end of the fourth century is also confirmed by an inscription found in the Catacomb of Praetextatus. Since the Basilica and the Baptistery would have been constructed by this time, the identity of the building under the Baptistery as the aedes of Sextius Lateranus may be ruled out. The proposal by V. Santa Maria Scrinari that the site of the aedes Laterani is to be identified in the structures excavated at the intersection of the Via dei Laterani and Via dell’Amba Aradam on the site of the Instituto Nazionale di Previdenza Sociale building also lacks proof.

Colini proposes that the residence of Sextius Lateranus was located on the west side of the Via Tuscolana south-west of the Basilica. In this location during the Severan
period massive substructures had been laid out for a large construction, which would perhaps accord with a residence as magnificent as that of Lateranus recorded by Aurelius Victor. This area is also still close enough to accord with the discovery of the *fistulae prope Ecclesiam*. No structures that can be attributed to this *domus*, however, have as yet been discovered.
It is often suggested that Severus doubled the numbers of the *equites singulares*. See Durry (1938), 32 and most recently Speidel (1994b), 59-60. Speidel suggests that Severus may have merged the 600 bodyguards that had escorted him from Pannonia with the *equites singulares* already in service to the emperor in order to ensure the loyalty of the corps. Although the continued use of the Castra Priora and the construction of a new camp suggest that more room was required for an increase in troops, there is no evidence to confirm that the numbers were doubled.


Dedications made by veterans on the completion of their service found in the area of the Trajanic camp date from the early Hadrianic period to the middle of the third century (*CIL* 6.31138-31187 / *ILS* 2180-2193). See also Speidel (1994a), 33-73, nos. 1-44. A manuscript of the *Notitia*, the Laurentiana, also records two Castra Equitum Singularium. See Jordan-Hülsen (1871-1907) II, 573 and Nordh (1949), 106.

Castra Priora: *CIL* 6.3183; 3191 (= *ILS* 2205); 3196; 3236 (= *ILS* 2204); 3241; 3279; 3288; 3293; 3300; 32798. Castra Nova: *CIL* 6.3195, 3198 = 32783 (= *ILS* 2207); 3207; 3217; 3254; 3266; 3289; 3297; 9.795 (= *ILS* 2206). A diploma dated to 230 refers to a Castra Nova Severiana (*CIL* 16.144 = *ILS* 2009).


During excavations under the Basilica at a level of 4.68 m. below the pavement of the church, were discovered four rooms in reticulate of the first century A.D. and restorations from successive periods, with some wall paintings and geometric black and white mosaics preserved. At 2 m. were found structures of brickwork datable to the third century. See Colini (1944), 344-352. It has been suggested that this residence may have been the *egregiae aedes Lateranorum* recorded at Juvenal 10.15-18 expropriated by Nero from Plautius Lateranus after the Pisonian conspiracy. See Colini (1944), 372-373, Lugli (1975), 540, Coarelli (1980), 174, and Richardson
"Domus: Laterani."

Although the passage in Juvenal does not give any topographical location, it is generally agreed that the Domus Laterani was located in the district that still bears its name. Two late references suggest that the locale was in the area of the Basilica of S. Giovanni. S. Girolamo (Epist., LXXVII, 4) refers to the site of the Basilica as *quondam Laterani, qui Caesariano truncatus est gladio*, while Prudentius (Contra Symm., 1. 585-86) calls it *aedes magni Laterani.* The magnificence of the house found under the castra would allow an identification as the *egregiae aedes Lateranorum* referred to by Juvenal. With rich decoration of the fourth style, the earliest phase of this building may be dated to the first century, but none of the remains can be definitely associated with Nero's reign. If the camp was built on the site of the *domus* which had been confiscated from Piso, the demolition of the earlier building would have been facilitated by the fact that it was imperial property, but there is no definite proof to confirm this identification. See Liverani (1995b), 127.


8. A dedication was made to Minerva on January 1, 197 PRO SAL(UTE) IMP L SEP SEVERI PERT AUG ET M AUR ANTONINI CAES followed by an erasure, probably either the name of Plautianus or Geta (*AE* [1968] 86) and another on June 10, 203 OB REDIT(UM) AB EXPEDITIONE FELIC(ISSIMA) (*RA*Crist, 1 [1934], 349), probably after the return from Africa. See also Speidel (1994a), 77-79, no. 54 and 83-85, no. 58. Colini (1944), 353 suggests that this room served as the *schola collegii equitum singularium.* For the *schola* of the curatores, see Speidel (1994b), 128.

9. For the various forms of barracks' layout in Roman forts, see Davison (1989), 43-47.

10. See Speidel (1994b), 128. For the difficulties in identifying stables in Roman camps, see Davison (1989), 131-163.

11. The location of the tribunes' quarters outside the camp, identified in the trapezoidal building located to the west, is similar to the Severan legionary camp at Lauriacum, where the officers quarters were also located outside the fortifications. This arrangement is attributed to the changes to the military marriage laws instituted by Severus. See Petrikovits (1975), 67 and 134-135.

12. For an illustration and discussion of this relief, see Speidel (1994a), 326-327, no. 595 and (1994b), 129. It is housed in the Catacombs of Saints Peter and Marcellinus.
13. See supra n. 8. Other inscriptions found in the complex record a dedication made to Hercules Invictus on June 9, 197 PRO SALUTE of the emperors and Plautianus (CIL 6.224 = ILS 2185), a dedication made on April 1, 200 in honour of the victory in the second Parthian War PRO SALUTE ITU REDITU ET VICTORIA of the imperial family (CIL 6.225 = ILS 2186), and another dedication to Hercules Invictus PRO SALUTE of the imperial family on September 13, 202 (CIL 6.226).

14. As noted by Speidel (1994b), 59, since Severus came to power through civil war it was necessary for him to bring in his own men to secure loyalty and therefore the decision to increase the guard and to build the new fort to house the addition was probably undertaken at the outset of his rule.

15. For the orientation of the buildings in the area, see Colini (1944), 370-371 and Liverani (1988), 904.

16. The remains of this building have been discovered behind the apse of the Basilica. Colini (1944), 371 suggests that the courtyard was a remnant of the earlier residence believed to be the domus of Plautius Lateranus. Nash (1976), 1-20 also proposes that the trapezoidal building was originally the site of the aedes Lateranorum. As Liverani (1988), 903-905, notes, since the orientation of the building and its trapezoidal shape were clearly determined by the orientation of the castra, it seems to have been built in connection with the construction of the new camp.

17. See Pelliccioni (1973), 65, and Speidel (1994b), 101 both of whom, however, suggest that it was not a new construction, but part of the earlier domus.

18. See Colini (1944), 359-361, and Richardson (1992), 129-130, s.v. “Domus: Laterani.” The trapezoidal building appears to have been connected to the bath complex by a vaulted passageway. See Liverani (1988), 902.

19. The baths are dated on the basis of brick stamps to the beginning of the third century. For their description, see Colini (1944), 334-339 and Richardson (1992), 393, s.v. “Thermae Lateranenses.”


21. For a discussion of the terracing in this area, see Colini (1944), 370-371. For the Severan structures incorporated into the Aurelian Wall, see Richmond (1930), 15-16.
The domus of Plautius Lateranus may have been located in the area of the Basilica of S. Giovanni, and was possibly the domus over which the castra were built, although there is no definite proof. See supra n. 6. The house of Piso has been identified to the west of the Via Tuscolana, at the beginning of the Via dell’Amba Aradam, on the basis of a fistula discovered in 1873-74 with the inscription L Piso[nis] (CIL 15.7513), which is taken to be L. Calpurnius Piso, the curator aquarum of 60-63 A.D. See Colini (1944), 338. The Thermae Lateraneses built in this area may therefore also have been constructed on imperial property. The identification of L. Piso on the inscription with L. Calpurnius Piso, however, cannot be confirmed. See Liverani (1988), 907 and Eck (1995a), 157.

The findspot of one of the fistulae to the east of the hospital indicates that the property of Domitia Lucilla may have extended to the other side of the Via Tuscolana, thus justifying its designation as horti, a term reserved for extensive properties. See Colini (1944), 329, Santa Maria Scrinari (1968-69), 179-189, Coarelli (1980), 173, and Liverani (1988), 893-894.

According to the HA Marcus 1.8 it was located iuxta aedes Laterani. Santa Maria Scrinari (1968-69), 179-189 has identified part of the domus of Annius Verus in the remains discovered under the Corsia Mazzoni consisting of a series of structures organized around a peristyle, interpreted as an atrium oriented south-east to north-west, and part of a bath complex to the north-west. This identification is based to a large degree on the discovery in the centre of the peristyle of an oval base, possibly decorated with a number of fragments of relief sculpture found in the area depicting a procession of female figures to the temple of Vesta. This base is thought to have served as that of the bronze equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius, known to have originally stood on the Caelian and now housed in the Capitoline Museum. There is no proof, however, that this base was used for Marcus Aurelius’ statue, which seems to have been intended to occupy a more public space than the peristyle of a private house. The identification of this domus with Annius Verus is therefore tenuous. See Liverani, (1988), 895-897 and (1995a), 33, who suggests that these structures probably were rather part of the extensive horti of Domitia Lucilla.


A fistula inscribed with D N IULIAE MAMEAE A[UG] (CIL 15.7336) found in 1890 during the building of a presbytery south-west of the Basilica gives evidence that at least by the time of
Severus Alexander the area on the west side of the Via Tuscolana was Severan property. The site seems to have belonged previously to a L. Lusius Petellinus, whose name was found on a fistula of earlier date discovered in the same area. Perhaps the property passed into imperial possession during Severus’ confiscations. See Liverani (1988), 906-907 and Papi (1995), 48-49.


29. T. Sextius Lateranus: *PIR*¹ S 469.


31. The choice of this area of the Caelian for the residence given to Sextius Lateranus by Severus may perhaps have had some connection to the ancient association of the name Lateranus with this region of the city stemming from the earlier *domus* of Plautius Lateranus, although the familial relationship appears to have been a distant one.

32. See Richardson (1992), 129-130, s.v. “Domus: Laterani” where it is suggested that the western parcel was donated to Sextius, while the eastern part continued to function as a bath building.

33. Sextius belonged to the Sextii, while Plautius was from the Plautii. See Colini (1944), 373 and Liverani (1988), 901.

34. *RACrist* 13 (1936), 17: *Quintius Lactarius ... qui fuit de domum (sic) Laterani.* The inscription is dated to the end of the fourth century.

35. For objections to the identification of the residence of Sextius Lateranus under the Baptistery, see Colini (1944), 372-73 and Liverani (1988), 902-905 and (1995b), 127.

36. Santa Maria Scrinari (1965), 42 and (1991), 44-52 has identified three different building phases on the site. Two nuclei of the first century are recognized as the *domus* of Plautius Lateranus (first phase of the northern complex), and of Piso (first phase of southern complex), which were later joined to become the residence of Sextius Lateranus (second phase dating to the third century). The structures were later incorporated into the imperial palace of Fausta, the wife of Constantine. There is no real evidence, however, to attribute these structures to any of these owners. The fistula with the name of Piso in fact was found 150 m. to the north-east. See Liverani (1988), 909-908 and (1993), 143-152, and Krautheimer, *et al.* (1977), 26.

37. Colini (1944), 371-373. See also Liverani (1988), 908.
XIII. AQUEDUCTS

Severus' building programme of urban renewal also included the assurance of the water supply to the city with the restoration of the Aquae Claudia, Marcia and Anio Novus. Their repairs seem to have been required by the passage of time since the last major restorations were carried out during the reign of Hadrian and very little work on the aqueducts by the Antonine emperors has been identified. The last important period in the building history of the aqueducts of Rome took place during the Severan dynasty. Severus' extensive restoration consisted for the most part of the strengthening and reinforcing of many channels and bridges within the city itself and through the Roman Campagna, but also included the complete rebuilding of some structures. The sole reign of Caracalla saw further constructions, possibly planned during Severus' lifetime, and later Alexander Severus would construct the last of the aqueducts.

The Aqua Claudia

Severan repair of the Aqua Claudia has been identified in places along its route from the source through the countryside to the city of Rome. This repair included the reinforcement of the earlier structures with additional walls or reinforcing arches, as well as the rebuilding or extensive restoration of occasional bridges in order to ensure the supply to the city. In the area of the modern town of Castelmadama, about forty kilometres from Rome, are the remains of bridges of the Aqua Claudia that underwent significant repair during the Severan period. The first was located in a ravine called Fosso della Vallana, near the Anio river, crossing over two converging streams. Part of
the arcade survives over one of the streams, while that over the second has collapsed. Seven arches of brick-faced concrete are preserved between the two streams. The original construction, which had earlier been reinforced during the Flavian period, was restored during the Severan repair by the addition of encasing walls. Buttresses were added at regular intervals to the arches in the area between the two streams, and to the upper section above each arch a pilaster was added between the buttresses, intended to reinforce the walls of the channel as well as to break up the monotonous lines.  

The second bridge was located at Fosso della Noce farther to the north. The original bridge, which had collapsed, was entirely replaced by a Severan construction. Eleven of the lower arches of the approach are still preserved on the north-east bank, but the central portion, which originally consisted of two tiers totalling c. 20 m. in height - probably three arches on the lower level and five above - has now collapsed. A concrete abutment from the Severan rebuilding is preserved on the left bank, while that on the right belongs to the original bridge. Beyond Fosso della Noce, where the aqueduct turns at a right angle along the slope, the side hill channel was also reinforced during the Severan repair by a retaining wall of brick-faced concrete.

As the Aqua Claudia approached Rome it was joined by the Aqua Anio Novus, which rested on the channel of the Claudia and was carried on the same arches. In the area of Porta Furba, south-east of Rome, are the remains of one of the largest segments of this section of the Claudia and Anio Novus. The original stone arches had earlier been strengthened by the addition of concrete arches at the time of Hadrian. Under Severus
reinforcing arches or solid walls with relieving arches inserted at intervals were built beneath the Hadrianic arches. The north side of the arcade was completely encased in Severan construction by buttressing the upper arches with an additional concrete wall, 1.20 m. or more in thickness, united with the new reinforcing walls and arches below. Beyond Porta Furba, along the Via della Mandrione, the aqueduct continues towards Rome, and, as in the previous sector, the original stone arches and their Hadrianic reinforcements were again further strengthened with the addition of encasing walls and reinforcing arches.6

In connection with the expansion of the palace on the south-east corner of the Palatine and the construction of a bath complex Severus also rebuilt and repaired the Arcus Caelimontani, an extension of the Aqua Claudia that supplied the Palatine. This restoration was carried out in 201, as recorded in the following inscription:

IMP CAES DIVI M ANTONINI PII GERM(ANICI) SARM(ATICI) FILIUS / DIVI COMMODI FRATER DIVI ANTONINI PII NEP(OS) DIVI HADRIANI PRONEP(OS) / DIVI TRAIANI PARTHIC(I) ABNEP(OS) DIVI NERVAE ADNEP(OS) / L SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS PIUS PERTINAX AUG ARABIC(US) ADIAB(ENICUS) / PARTHIC(US) MAX PONT MAX TRIB POT VIII IMP XI COS II P P PROCOS ET // IMP CAES L SEPTIMII SEVERI PII PERTINACIS AUG ARABIC(I) ADIAB(ENICI) / PARTHIC(I) MAX FIL DIVI M ANTONINI PII GERM(ANICI) SARM(ATICI) NEP(OS) DIVI ANTONINI PII PRONEP(OS) / DIVI HADRIANI ABNEP(OS) DIVI TRAIANI PARTHIC(I) ET
“Imp. Caes. ... L. Septimius Severus... and M. Aurelius Antoninus ... restored with their own money from the ground up the Arcus Caelimontani which had collapsed and fallen into ruin in many places because of old age.”

Nero had originally constructed this branch of the Aqua Claudia from Ad Spem Veterem near the Porta Maggiore up to the Temple of Claudius along the ridge of the Caelian. Under Domitian this was extended to the Palatine across the valley between the two hills. The high pilasters of the Neronian structures (19.24-22.18 m.) and their wide span (8.02 m.) seem to have required some reinforcement at the end of the Flavian period in the form of counter-pilasters and additional arches beneath. By the third century the Arcus Caelimontani seem to have collapsed in many places requiring restoration a solo, as recorded in the Severan inscription, and the remains confirm that major repair and rebuilding were undertaken at this time.

Much of the surviving arcade of the Arcus Caelimontani across the Caelian has evidence of Severan repair. Five arches entirely of Severan construction, which now span the modern Via Eleniana, south-east of the Porta Maggiore near the junction of this branch with the main line of the Aqua Claudia, indicate that the original structures had to be completely replaced at least at this point along the route. Three of these arches have a
double arcade, while the two that crossed over the major streets leading from the Porta Maggiore to the site of the present S. Croce in Gerusalemme were single arches. The panels where the marble slabs of the inscription quoted above recording the restoration were placed are still visible in the brickwork on both sides of one of these single arches.

Severan repair has also been identified along the route of the aqueduct as it continued to the south-east. Isolated groups of arches from the arcade are found along the Via Statilia, in the area of the Villa Wolkonsky, the Piazza di S. Giovanni in Laterano, and then along the Via di S. Stefano Rotundo. The aqueduct then passed over the Arcus Dolabellae et Silani toward a reservoir by the Temple of Claudius where more arches can now be seen in the garden of the convent of SS. Giovanni e Paolo. During the Severan restoration internal reinforcing arches were added to the original structures which were also encased at certain points with additional concrete for strengthening.\textsuperscript{9} There is evidence that an inscription recording the restoration was set up on one of the aqueduct arches located near S. Giovanni in Laterano, known as the Arcus Iohannis Basillii or Basilidis in medieval times and demolished before 1604, spanning an ancient street leading from the Lateran to the Colosseum (see Figure 16). Copies of this inscription may also have been set up on all of the arches that spanned the principal streets of the Caelian crossed by the aqueduct.\textsuperscript{10}

At the point where the Caelian branch of the Arcus Caelimontani ended near the temple of Claudius, some remains of a Severan construction have been discovered in the garden of the convent of SS. Giovanni e Paolo. This structure may have been a terminal
reservoir rebuilt during the Severan repair, consisting of a series of walls and vaults forming eight rooms, probably originally with an upper row of vaults. From this point water would have been distributed to the Aventine, Palatine, and other minor conduits.

Of the Domitianic extension of the Arcus Caelimontani across the valley from the Caelian to the Palatine only five arches of a double arcade remain on the east slope of the Palatine (see Figure 3). Six other arches, located on the opposite side of the modern Via di S. Gregorio were destroyed in 1596. No structures are extant on the Caelian side. Because of the sparseness of the remains, there is little agreement as to the form of the aqueduct. Lanciani suggested that Domitian had first constructed an inverted siphon to carry the water across the valley between the two hills, but under Severus this arrangement was replaced by a high arcade of four levels, of which the five arches are the remnants, conveying the water by the conventional gravity system. Ashby, however, identified two periods of construction in the remaining arches: the original Domitianic system, which he reconstructs as an inverted siphon carried on two levels of arcades, and a later strengthening of the structure at the time of Severus by filling in both the upper and lower arches. Colini, on the other hand, rejects the theory of only two levels and an inverted siphon, and proposes that Domitian originally constructed an arcade on four levels to cross the valley at a height of 55.50 m, thus providing the necessary pressure to supply the palace at the lower elevation of 49.25 m. The Severan repair consisted of strengthening the arches of the original structure.
Given the uncertainty of the route of the aqueduct on the Palatine itself and the system of distribution, Severan alterations made to accommodate his additions to the palace are difficult to determine. A large water reservoir discovered under the church of S. Bonaventura, on the highest point of the Palatine, has been suggested as the terminal point of Domitian’s aqueduct. Another castellum has been excavated on the southern corner of the hill, near the line of the aqueduct and the bathing establishment which was completed by Severus on the Domitianic substructures. This reservoir probably served the increased water supply demanded by the thermae and the Severan expansion of the palace.

**The Aqua Marcia**

A fragmentary inscription records some repair to the Aqua Marcia:

```
TRIB] POT III [---] AQUAM M[ARCIAM ---] INIURIIS D [---] EXCISIS [ET PERFORATIS MONTIBUS ---] AMPLIA [---] INTEGR [---]
```

*CIL* 6.1247

The text was transcribed by De Rossi from a fragment of a large marble tablet in the Villa Massimo near S. Giovanni in Laterano. The inscription was dated by him to the period of Severus on the basis of the letter style and similarity to the Caracallan text on the Porta Tiburtina (*CIL* 6.1245 = *ILS* 98). De Rossi’s attribution to the Severan period has generally been accepted, and the date of this restoration is usually assigned to 196, the fourth tribunician power of Severus. Murphy, however, places the restoration in 201, the fourth year of Caracalla’s tribunician power, since most of Severus’ building activity
seems to have begun around 200, after the eastern wars were completed. The surviving text, however, is of such a fragmentary nature that the precise date is impossible to determine and since the inscription is now lost even an attribution to the Severan period cannot be confirmed.

Even without the support of the inscription for a Severan restoration of the aqueduct, however, it is quite likely that some repairs were carried out in connection with the construction of the Thermae Severianae in Regio I. The Aqua Marcia would have supplied this region of the city. General maintenance may have been required through the passage of time, since, as in the case of the Claudia, the last major repairs to the Aqua Marcia were carried out at the time of Hadrian. The Aqua Marcia was later restored in 212-213 by Caracalla, who also added the fons Antoninianus and a new branch for the Thermae Antoninianae, but this does not preclude an earlier repair by Severus.

Repairs dating to the early Severan period have been identified in two major aqueduct bridges of the Aqua Marcia in the Roman countryside in the area of Gallicano, south of Tivoli. In the Valle della Mola di S. Gregorio the bridge now called Ponte S. Pietro, originally built in ashlar and later reinforced in concrete under Titus, was strengthened in the Severan period by the addition to the north-western half of the structure of an encasing wall of concrete and buttresses which also reduced the span of the central arch. Above the central span a line of small pilasters was also added in order to lessen the impression of heaviness as well as to strengthen the channel walls. The Ponte Lupo, located in Fosso dell’ Aqua Rossa, was also reinforced with additional
arches and buttresses.\textsuperscript{25} Severan brickwork has also been identified on the western bridgehead of a single arched bridge in Fosso della Pallavicina.\textsuperscript{26} A group of five or six reinforcing arches of Severan construction are also preserved along the Via del Mandrione, near its junction with the Via Labicana, as the Marcia neared Rome.\textsuperscript{27}

**The Aqua Anio Novus**

Severan construction has been identified in a number of places along the course of the Aqua Anio Novus, including the rebuilding of a number of bridges that carried the aqueduct over the Roman countryside. The date of this repair was probably around 201, at the same time as the work was done on the Aqua Claudia.\textsuperscript{28} Two kilometres east of Tivoli, in the Valle degli Arci, an arcade of eight arches and nine piers completely of Severan construction that formed the approach of the bridge and the fragmentary walls of the channel above survive on the upper bank of the stream. On the opposite bank a single arch from this Severan bridge also still stands.\textsuperscript{29} A little farther to the west a seven arch bridge of brick-faced concrete of the early Severan period also spans the ravine at Fosso Arcese.\textsuperscript{30}

To the south of Tivoli, where the aqueduct turns along the slopes of the Colle Ripoli and Monte Arcese, shafts lined with Severan brickwork have been identified at frequent intervals, as well as a Severan bridge now called the Ponte Arcinelli that crossed a shallow ravine.\textsuperscript{31} In the area of Gallicano, the bridge of the Anio Novus, called the Ponte Barucelli or Diruto, crossing the valley of the Acqua Nera was extensively
reinforced with the addition of an encasing wall and buttresses during the Severan repair of the aqueduct.\textsuperscript{32}

Severus' restoration of the city of Rome therefore also included the extensive upkeep of the aqueducts, a responsibility that may have been neglected under the Antonines. Much of the maintenance seems to have consisted of reinforcement and, in some cases, rebuilding. This attention to the water supply seems to have been proudly proclaimed throughout the city. Typically unrestrained Severan inscriptions were set up at prominent points where the arches of the restored aqueducts spanned important streets.\textsuperscript{33}

Some additions to the system may also have been made during the reign in order to increase the supply to new constructions, such as the baths on the Palatine, the large nymphaeum, the Septizodium, and the Thermae Severianae in Regio I. An Aqua Severiana is listed among the aqueducts in the addenda to the \textit{Notitia} and the \textit{Curiosum}.\textsuperscript{34} This seems to have been a branch aqueduct, but its location has not been identified. It may be connected to the construction of the Thermae Severianae and was therefore a branch of the Marcia.\textsuperscript{35}
1. The only Antonine construction identified in any of the aqueducts is the rebuilding of a bridge of the Aqua Claudia, now called Ponte delle Forme Rotte, across the ravine of Mola di S. Gregorio under Antoninus Pius and the building of a branch aqueduct from the Claudia by Commodus to supply the Villa of the Quintilii, which had been confiscated from its owners, located outside Rome on the Via Appia close to mile six. See Van Deman (1934), 18, 220-221 and 261-262; Ashby (1935), 212-13 and 223-224.

2. For the importance of the Severan dynasty to the maintenance of the aqueducts, and especially Severus himself, see Van Deman (1934), 18.

3. The restoration of the course of the Aqua Claudia probably was undertaken in connection with the repair of the Arcus Caelimontani within the city itself in 201 (CIL 6.1259 = ILS 424). See Van Deman (1934), 206. For a discussion of the Aqua Claudia in general, see Pace (1983), 150-175.

4. The encasing walls are 60-70 cm. thick. Farther to the south a small cut-stone bridge, near Sacco Muro, was also replaced by one of concrete. See Van Deman (1934), 262-264; Ashby (1935), 204-205.

5. Van Deman (1934), 262-263; Ashby (1935), 206-207.

6. Van Deman (1934), 247-250 and 262-264; Ashby (1935), 235-238. Murphy (1945), 32, following the provenance given by Ligorius Taur., suggests that CIL 6.1031 records the restoration by Severus in 202 of a castellum of the Aqua Claudia on the Via Latina three miles from Rome. Ligorius' location, however, differs greatly from the others cited for the inscription "a piazza del Melangolo" (Manutius) and in via D. Catharinae (Lipsius), and is rejected by Hülsen (CIL 6, p. 194). The inscription, unfortunately does not refer to the structure which was restored: IMP CAES DIVI M ANTONINI / GERM(ANICI) SARM(ATICI) FIL DIVI COMMODI / FRATER DIVI ANTONINI PII NEPOS DIVI / HADRIANI PRONEPOS DIVI TRAIANI PART(HICI) AB / NEPOS DIVI NERVAE ADNEPOS // L SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS PIUS / PERTINAX AUG ARAB(ICUS) ADIAB(ENICI) PART(HICI) MAX PONT MAX / TRIB POT X IMP XI COS III P P PROCOS ET / IMP CAES IMP L SEPTIMI SEVERI PII / PERTINACIS AUG ARAB(ICI) ADIAB(ENICI) PART(HICI) MAX FIL DIVI // M ANTONINI GERM(ANICI) SARM(ATICI) NEPOS DIVI ANTO / NINI PII PRONEPOS DIVI HADRIANI ABNEPOS DIVI TRAIANI PART(HICI) ET DIVI NERVAE ADNEPOS / M AURELIUS
ANTONINUS PIUS AUG / TRIB POT V COS PROCOS VETUSTATE COLLAPSUM RESTITUERUNT.

7. For Nero’s construction, see Evans (1983), 392-399. For the Neronian and Flavian phases, see Colini (1944), 93-95. Some small repair was done under Hadrian.

8. Thomas and Witschel (1992), 159-164 in their study of rebuilding inscriptions have found that the expression *a solo* was often an exaggeration of the actual work done to a structure and rather had a metaphorical meaning. In this case, however, the archaeological evidence indicates that sections of the arcade of the aqueduct were extensively repaired. Severan work was probably required in those areas that had not been restored under the Flavians. For the Severan repair of the Arcus Caelimontani, see Van Deman (1934), 266-270; Ashby (1935), 244-251; Colini (1944), 6-106; Lugli (1946), 378-379 and (1975), 114-115; Evans (1983), 397.

9. The Severan reinforcing arches are for the most part of two stories with a span of 5.0-5.45 m., thus decreasing the original span of 7.75 m. The encasing walls are 1.5 m. thick. See Van Deman (1934), 269; Ashby (1935), 245. For a detailed analysis of all of the remains of the aqueduct and the various phases, see also Colini (1944), 97-106.

10. Early topographers record the existence of this inscription: *non longe a lateranensi basilica... est lapis marmoreus in aquaeductibus* (Albertini); *iuxta hospitale Lateranense, hic positus est index* (Marliani). See Ashby (1935), 246. Scholars, however, are not in agreement about the number of inscriptions. Henzen, editor of *CIL* 6.1259, considered only the one near Porta Maggiore, De Rossi included that on the Arcus Basilidis, while Lanciani suggested that there was another pair of inscriptions near S. Maria della Navicella. For the major arches of the aqueduct that may have carried the inscription, see Colini (1944), 90-93.

11. These structures are poorly preserved today, but were recorded in reports of the fifteenth century and on a plan by Ligorio. For the identification as the terminal reservoir, see Colini (1944), 103-104. The remains of this reservoir are not discussed by Van Deman, and Ashby (1935), 249 mentions only a note by Cassio (ii. 108) who records the existence of numerous shafts that received water from the Claudia near the garden of SS. Giovanni e Paolo.

12. Nero had extended the Aqua Claudia up to the Temple of Claudius, which was demolished, and constructed a monumental nymphaeum on the eastern side of the terrace and fountains and
gardens on the north slope, some of which were retained when the temple was rebuilt by Vespasian. There must have been some distributing system in this area to supply these water works, as well as the extension of the aqueduct across to the Palatine later constructed by Domitian, to which the Severan remains may have belonged. For the Neronian alteration to the Temple of Claudius, see Coarelli (1980), 165-166 and Richardson (1992), 87-88, s.v. “Claudius, Divus, Templum.” The termination of the aqueduct behind the Temple of Claudius as well as streets and structures in the area are shown on fragment no. 4 of the Forma Urbis with the inscription AQUEDUCTIUM, but the location of the terminal castellum is not evident. See Carettoni, Colini, Cozza, and Gatti (1960), 63, Tav. 17, Rodriguez-Almeida (1981), 26, 63, Tav. 2. See, however, Evans (1983), 396 who suggests that this fragment represents an enlarged drawing of the castellum, given prominence because of the Severan attention to the area.

13 Lanciani (1897), 184-185.
14 Ashby (1935), 249-250 considered the surviving arches of insufficient strength to support two more tiers. He suggests that an arch near the so-called Hippodromos in line with the aqueduct may have served as the upper end of the system. Van Deman (1934), 14 and 267 also suggests that the an inverse siphon ran on the top of these arches.
15 Colini (1944), 105-106.
16 See Lanciani (1897), 185 and Lugli (1946), 527. This reservoir, however, is much farther to the north of the line of the remaining arches on the slope of the Palatine, and in order to join up with the reservoir the aqueduct would have therefore branched to the north after crossing the valley. The course of the aqueduct and the system of distribution on the Palatine is still unclear.
17 Middleton (1885), 132. For a recent re-examination of this castellum, see Lacopi, Tomei and Meogrossi (1986), 498. A sloping water channel leads into a series of large water reservoirs consisting of vaulted rooms arranged at different levels, with communicating openings for overflow from one to the other. Both the water channel and reservoirs are lined with opus signinum.
18 It has been suggested that this sector of the Palatine near the Severan baths, adjacent to the branch of the Aqua Claudia, may have had some function in relation to the familia aquaria
Caesaris that managed the water supply for the palace. See Iacopi, Tomei and Meogrossi (1986), 498, n 1.

19 See Hülsen, CIL 6, p. 269.

20 Hülsen (editor of CIL 6.1247); Lanciani (1897), 49; Platner and Ashby (1929), 25 s.v. “Aqua Marcia;” Van Deman (1934), 68; Ashby (1935), 90; Colini (1944), 85; Richardson (1992), 17, s.v. “Aqua Marcia;” and Cattalini (1993), 68. Lanciani has suggested that amplia in the inscription refers to the addition of fresh springs, perhaps to supply the new bath complex (cited in Ashby [1935], 91). Murphy (1945), 32 proposes a reading: AQUAM MARCIAM / INIURIIS [DEMINUTAM] / EXCISIS [ET PERFORATIS MONTINUS] / AMPLIA [---TO?] / FLUMINE] / INTEGR[AVIT], but without explanation. Colini (1944), 88 suggests that the inscription was placed over a monumental arch crossing a major road in the Lateran region, possibly the Via Merulana or the Via Tuscolana, but no elevated channel in this area now survives.

21 As Murphy (1945), 32-33 notes, Severus’ other building activity known from inscriptions dates to after 200. The Arcus Caelemontani were also restored in 201 (CIL 6.1259 = ILS 424).

22 CIL 6.1245 = ILS 98 on the Porta Tiburtina (S. Lorenzo): IMP CAES M AURELLIUS ANTONINUS PIUS FELIX AUG PARTH MAXIM / BRIT MAXIMUS PONTIFEX MAXIMUS / AQUAM MARCIAM VARIIS KASIBUS IMPEDITAM PURGATO FONTE EXCISIS ET PERFORATIS / MONTIBUS RESTITUTA FORMA ADQUISITO ETIAM FONTE NOVO ANTONINIANO / IN SACRAM URBEM SUAM PERDUCENDAM CURAVIT. For the branch channel of the Aqua Marcia built by Caracalla, see Van Deman (1934), 145-146 and Richardson (1992), 18, s.v. “Aqua Marcia.” The inscription of Caracalla indicates that the restoration of the Aqua Marcia was required because of damage and collapse, and included the clearing of springs and the construction of new tunnels. This is surprising if earlier repair had been undertaken by Severus. Perhaps the repair begun by Severus was completed only under Caracalla who also made some additions of his own. Exaggeration could also take place in restoration inscriptions, as noted by Thomas and Witschel (1992), 135-177.

23 Repair of the Aqua Marcia has been assigned to a period within the early third century on the basis of construction technique, but without more definite dating criteria such as brick stamps, it is difficult to attribute the work to a specific date. Van Deman (1934), 135 attributes most of the repairs to the Marcia to the time of Caracalla, citing CIL 6.1245 = ILS 98.
Van Deman (1934), 92-93 and 135; Ashby (1935), 116. The encasing wall of concrete is 1.20 m. thick, with buttresses 2.0-3.30 m. wide and 1.20-2.0 m. long. The span of the central arch was reduced from 15.50 m. to 11.20 m.

The central stone arches were strengthened by the addition of heavy reinforcing arches, with two openings one above the other, 3.60 m. wide, 5.0 m. high, with side walls 1.90-2.0 m. thick. The upper openings were filled in with brick-faced concrete on the south side. On the upstream side the lower half of the bridge was also strengthened by the addition of a massive reinforcing wall with buttresses, 8.0-15.0 m. thick including the buttresses. This wall, 17.6 m. high, reached up to the springing line of the arches and enclosed the earlier structure. In the centre a massive curved buttress was placed, with abutment walls on the right and left banks of the stream. See Van Deman (1934), 99-100; Ashby (1935), 117-120. Ashby dates the repairs to both the Ponte S. Pietro and Ponte Lupo to the time of Severus, while Van Deman attributes them to Caracalla.

Ashby (1935), 125.

Van Deman (1934), 116; Ashby (1935), 140-141.

Van Deman (1934), 271.

This arch now spans the modern Via Empolitana. Van Deman (1934), 297-298; Ashby (1935), 273-274.

There are also heavy abutments on both banks. The piers are about 4.0 m. square and the span of the arches ranges from 4.20-4.90 m. As on other bridges reconstructed during the period, the superstructure above the arches on both sides of the channel is broken up by a line of small pilasters. Van Deman (1934), 299; Ashby (1935), 275.

This bridge consists of two low arches, 5.0 m. in span, with a pier 7.0 m. thick between them, and heavy substructures at both ends. The total bridge is 61.0 m. long and 5.95 m. wide. Again the superstructure above the arches was strengthened on both sides by a series of small pilasters. Van Deman (1934), 304; Ashby (1935), 279.

The original Claudian cut-stone arches, one in the centre and four smaller arches on the bank, that had earlier been covered in Flavian concrete, were again strengthened with the addition of an encasing wall and buttresses placed at regular intervals along the north side. The encasing wall is
75 cm. thick and the buttresses 1.35 m. in width and 2.35 m. in length. Van Deman (1934), 314-315; Ashby (1935), 290.

33. For example, an inscription recording the restoration of the Arcus Caélimontani (probably CIL 6.1259 = ILS 424) was placed on both sides of the arch crossing one of the major streets coming from the Porta Maggiore to the area of S. Croce in Gerusalemme, as indicated by the now empty frames for the marble slabs. The framing of a now missing inscription is also still visible in the Severan brick facing on the western side of the aqueduct arches above the Arcus Dolabella et Silani. See Colini (1944), 93, fig. 45. Another inscription was probably placed on an aqueduct arch located near S. Giovanni in Laterano, known as the Arcus Iohannis Basilii or Basilidis, which spanned an ancient street leading from the Lateran to the Colosseum.

34. Jordan-Hülsen (1871-1907) I:1, 570 and Nordh (1949), 102. It is also recorded in the catalogue of Polemius Silvius (I.545). See Richardson (1992), 18, s.v. “Aqua Severiana.”

35. See Jordan-Hülsen (1871-1907) I:1, 477 and II, 227; Lanciani (1897), 49 and 58; Ashby (1935), 90, 245, and 250, and Palombi (1993a), 70. Lugli (1975), 118 suggests that the Aqua Severiana is another name for the Aqua Alexandrina, later constructed by Severus Alexander. Since both are listed in the Regionary Catalogues, however, the Severiana may be regarded as a separate structure.
XIV. CONCLUSION

While the construction undertaken by Severus in Rome may not have been as extensive as that of Augustus, or as innovative as that of Trajan or Hadrian, it was of great importance in the context of his reign. The regime promoted a number of themes to exalt the position of the new emperor. Divine providence had foretold Severus' rise to power and assured his victories over both the internal and foreign enemies of Rome. As the rightful heir of the Antonines, Severus restored the prestige of the Empire and its capital by establishing a period of peace and prosperity which would be ensured by the new dynasty. His building activity served to reinforce his image as Restitutor Urbis, and in this sense it may be seen as an organized programme. The Commodan fire was significant in offering the opportunity for extensive rebuilding and renovation. Severus' building activity was also an assertion of imperial identity and authority, essential because of the long absences of the imperial family from Rome. His intention of establishing a new dynasty also required the creation of an architectural presence within the heritage of the imperial city.

The Forum Romanum was one of the most important sites where themes that the regime tried to promote were highlighted. Lack of space arising from centuries of previous construction precluded the construction of a new imperial forum in the central area of the city. Severus instead turned his attention to restoring and embellishing the existing Forum Romanum, and was thus able to take advantage of its historical and cultural associations, combining a respect for tradition with a desire to leave his own
mark on one of Rome’s most venerated areas. His rebuilding of the Aedes Vestae, damaged by fire, and the adjacent Atrium was an important expression of the restoration of the state. The patronage of Julia Domna in this undertaking underlined the importance of the imperial family and especially the eminence of the emperor’s wife. Also at the Forum’s northern end the Temple of Vespasian was restored and by adding his name to the building Severus was able to exploit a connection to the Flavian dynasty.

Severus also erected new monuments in the Forum to commemorate his victories and celebrate the dynasty he wished to create. The erection of a triumphal arch in the north-west corner saw the reappearance in the capital for the first time in nearly two centuries of this type of monument in a setting deeply charged with associations reaching back far into the Rome’s past. The arch was carefully integrated into the layout of the Forum, and was intentionally placed in relation to the earlier Augustan arch. The Severan monument also gave a new focus to the north-western corner, providing both a backdrop when viewed from the south, and a monumental entrance to the Forum from the Clivus Argentarius. While it was ostensibly erected by the senate to honour Severus’ military victories, the triumphal arch also highlighted the establishment of a new dynasty. The Severan monuments in the Forum were carefully placed on the ceremonial route of the *pompa saecularis* from the Palatine to the Capitoline during the Secular Games, one of the most important events of Severus’ reign (see Figure 19). The large equestrian statue of the emperor, set up to commemorate the dream which foretold his imperial destiny, was to be seen in the centre of the Forum area as one proceeded along the Via Sacra. Then one passed through the arch with its raised roadway. Near the arch was the
Umbilicus and the restored Rostra. As the procession turned left along the Clivus Capitolinus the Temple of Vespasian was encountered on the right with the Severan inscription announcing its restoration.

The Templum Pacis, one of the most beautiful complexes of the city, was also restored to its original splendour. The rebuilding gave Severus the occasion to capitalize on the associations of the complex with the cult of Pax. Vespasian's original construction of the Templum Pacis was intended to accentuate the return of peace after the turbulence of civil and external wars. Severus also claimed a similar reinstatement of stability to the Empire at large, appearing as Fundator Pacis on the coinage. In one of the halls beside the central temple a plan of the city carved in marble was set up as a public commemoration of the survey undertaken as a consequence of the Commodan fire. The Forma Urbis was a striking advertisement of the restoration of the city by the emperor.

The catastrophe of the Commodan fire also permitted Severus to show his concern for another traditional centre of the imperial city, the Palatine, which since the time of Augustus had been the official seat of the emperor. Dio records that the destruction of the state records in the palace archives was seen at the time as an evil omen. The rebuilding and repair of the damaged sections of the imperial centre would therefore be viewed as an important step in the restoration of the state. Although fire damage does not seem to have extensively affected the Flavian palace, nevertheless alterations were also made to this complex, especially to the so-called Hippodromos. Redecoration also was probably undertaken, and the state rooms were updated to feature the new emperor and his dynasty, as reflected in the painting of Severus' horoscope on the ceiling recorded by Dio.
Severus also undertook new construction on the Palatine, which had not seen significant building since the Domitianic palace over a century before. The expansion of the palace involved an enlargement of the earlier substructures laid out under Domitian, and new work concentrated on the south-eastern corner, extending to the slope of the hill. Although the substructures now overlooking the Circus Maximus date to the time of Maxentius, there is evidence of an earlier Severan arrangement behind these that would have provided a facade on this side of the Palatine. As well as shaping the appearance of the Palatine, Severus’ attention to its imperial buildings and his project to expand the palace communicated messages of legitimacy and signified the presence of the new dynasty and its presumed continuity.

The impressive Septizodium erected at the foot of the south-east slope acted as a screen to the new constructions on the Palatine, but also served as a prominent dynastic marker. It became the focus for the urban plan of the immediate area, providing a monumental backdrop for the open area in front of it where a number of streets converged. The Septizodium also served as a link to new Severan developments undertaken in the surrounding district. The fragment of the Forma Urbis depicting buildings in the area between the Temple of Claudius and the Porta Capena and bearing the names of Severus and Caracalla suggests that the area to the north-east on the slope of the Caelian was developed at this time. This is confirmed by the few archaeological finds in the area of the Clivus Scauri that date to the beginning of the third century. The structure referred to in this inscription, however, remains enigmatic. Perhaps the reference is to the Severan development of this district in general.
In Regio I along the Via Appia near the Porta Capena, Severus may have constructed or embellished a Severan family tomb, perhaps intending to reinforce the Roman heritage of his family. The Aedes of Honos and Virtus located near the Porta Capena was also restored. Evidence from the Forma Urbis also indicates that along the boundary of Regio I and XII a major new street was constructed, coming from the south and leading toward the Palatine and the Septizodium. This new artery of the city appears to be the Via Nova. Its construction is recorded in conjunction with the Thermae Antoninianae and is credited to Caracalla in the *Historia Augusta*, but it was probably begun during the reign of Severus. Severus also erected a new bath complex somewhere within Regio I. The exact site of the Thermae Severianae is unknown, but it may have been located along this new street. The embellishment of this sector would have been an important element of the renewal and restoration of the imperial city, and the later building of the Thermae Antoninianae, perhaps already planned under Severus, to front the magnificent new street is indicative of the dynastic significance of the area.

Severus had attempted to consolidate his power through adoption into the Antonine family, as well as by establishing links to earlier dynasties. His inscriptions often list his ancestors back to Nerva. It was this desire for an imperial pedigree that also motivated his various endeavours to establish a connection to the imperial heritage in the Campus Martius, where previous emperors had build magnificent complexes to the glory of their families. One of the first constructions of his reign was the elaborate funeral pyre for Pertinax erected in the Campus Martius, by which important associations to the imperial legacy were made. Pertinax’s consecration was possibly also commemorated by
some permanent structure, such as an *ara consecrationis*. In the Campus Martius Severus was also responsible for the restoration of some very notable buildings - the Porticus Octaviae, the Pantheon, and the Theatre of Pompey. The extent of the repair is in some cases difficult to determine, but Severus took pains to record his attention to these buildings through inscriptions which served to connect his name to the dynasties and the institutions represented by them. The rebuilding of these complexes, long established as significant features of the urban landscape of the city, was also an important component of his portrayal as restorer of the capital.

The Porticus Octaviae seems to have been extensively rebuilt and some alterations made to the plan. The propylon, which was the main entrance to the porticus and principal focus of the southern facade, is a completely Severan structure, a fact proudly implied in the inscription recording the restoration displayed on the architrave. The rebuilding of the Porticus Octaviae allowed Severus to connect his name to the complex and to its original builder Augustus, but the prominent placement of his inscription over the main entrance also allowed him in a sense to appropriate the building for himself.

In the restoration of the Pantheon Severus also seems to have desired an association of his name with this important temple and its dynastic significance. The original Pantheon constructed by Agrippa to all the gods appears to have been also a sanctuary of the *gens Julia* and the family of Augustus. Throughout its various rebuildings the temple retained its connection with the first emperor and became the centre of the imperial cult in the city of Rome. Severus announced his restoration of the
building with an extensive inscription placed across the architrave beneath the name of Agrippa. By placing his inscription on this building Severus was likewise establishing a place for the new dynasty at this site of the imperial cult. The repair of the Pantheon itself may actually have been quite modest, consisting merely of some stabilization to the structure and refurbishing of the decoration. On the other hand, the presence of a substantial Severan wall to the west of the Pantheon, and the identification of brick stamps dating to the time of Severus in the remains of the Thermae of Agrippa, hint that Severan activity around the Pantheon may actually have been quite extensive.

The repairs and reconstructions of these prominent buildings of the Campus Martius, which included some repair to the Theatre of Pompey, were completed in time for the celebration of the Secular Games which were in part located here. In the western Campus Martius, near the Tiber in the district called Tarentum, the site of the altar of Dis and Proserpina and the traditional centre of the ritual, a wooden theatre *scaena* was constructed for the *ludi latini*. Although probably a temporary structure, this *scaena* seems to have been an elaborate creation, judging from its representation on the coinage. Monuments also seem to have been set up in this area of the Campus Martius to commemorate the Severan Secular Games, thus providing an opportunity for the new emperor to share in the legacy of previous emperors and offering further proof of his connection to the long sequence of imperial dynasties. A large marble pilaster on which the *Acta* of the Games were carved was set up in the area of Tarentum. Fragments of relief sculpture also discovered in the area could well belong to some sort of monumental edifice constructed in commemoration of the Games.
Severan activity in the Transtiberine region is denoted by the Porta Septimiana and the Coraria Septimiana. Severus may also have been responsible for beginning the Pons Aurelius connecting this region with the Campus Martius. Excavations in the Forum Boarium have revealed an increase in building activity at the beginning of the third century. The dedication of the Arch of the Argentarii may have been prompted by Severus' encouragement to commercial enterprises in the area. Although it was a private dedication, the reliefs on this monument express many of the themes important to the regime, thus indicating the far reaching effects of the official message.

Utilitarian building also was not neglected during the reign. One of the first constructions undertaken by Severus seems to have been the new castra on the Caelian for the enlarged force of the *equites singulares* that ensured the security of Severus' own regime and by extension, the integrity of the Empire at large.\(^4\) Other measures were carried out to accommodate the *vigiles*, at least in the Transtiberine region, where an additional *excubitorium* of the VII Cohort was established, probably in response to the fire of 191/192. The water supply of the city was also assured by the repair and alterations to a number of aqueducts. Some of the work on the aqueducts was related to general maintenance, to be sure, but substantial additions were also made to supply new constructions such as the Septizodium and the bath buildings.

The impact of the Severan programme should therefore not be underestimated. New building or rebuilding affected at least eight regions.\(^5\) The city of Rome had not seen such activity in half a century, as there had only been the bare minimum of building under the Antonines.\(^6\) Since many of the major Severan constructions such as the Septizodium,
much of the expansion on the Palatine, the Temple of Hercules and Bacchus, and the
Thermae are no longer extant, the visual effect of these monuments is now lost, and
cannot be fully appreciated. In their time, however, these structures would have formed
an important feature of the urban landscape of Rome.

The new monuments and rebuilding undertaken throughout the city highlighted
the theme of renewal promoted by the new regime. Severus aspired to fulfil the
restoration of the prestige and harmony of the Roman state, a return to a Golden Age with
renewed public security and prosperity, as continually represented on the coin issues
throughout the reign. The emperor was represented as Fundator Pacis and Restitutor
Urbis. Much of the Severan enhancement and restoration of the city of Rome seems to
have been focused on the celebration of the Secular Games, which heralded this new age
of renewal and restoration. The majority of building was completed by 204 in time for
these Games. The physical embellishment of the urbs sacra - as the imperial city was
now designated - in preparation for this significant event of the reign, underscored the
stability and prosperity brought about by the new regime.

The importance of the restoration of the capital is attested by numerous
inscriptions placed throughout the city on the restored buildings and other structures such
as aqueducts, proudly announcing the attention of the new dynasty. Both Dio and the
author of the Historia Augusta note that Severus was responsible for the restoration of a
number of buildings, but offer conflicting accounts of Severus’ placement of inscriptions
on these restorations. The Historia Augusta, possibly reporting the account of Severus’
building from a pro-Severan source, states that Severus almost never inscribed his own
name and titles on these buildings, but in every instance retained the names of the original builders.\textsuperscript{9} Dio, on the other hand, accuses Severus of inscribing his own name on these buildings as if he had built them anew with his own funds and spending much money uselessly in repair.\textsuperscript{10}

The placement of Severan inscriptions on many of the buildings in Rome without seeming justification has certainly been the object of criticism of some modern observers as well as Dio.\textsuperscript{11} It is not our purpose here to judge Severus, but to understand his motivation. Severus seems to have been very willing to place his name on the buildings that he repaired or restored.\textsuperscript{12} At the same time, he was just as concerned to retain the inscription of the original builder, as on the Temple of Vespasian and the Pantheon. While the propylon of the Porticus Octaviae carried only the Severan inscription, the evidence from the Forma Urbis, where the complex retains the name Porticus Octaviae et Filii, suggests that Severus did not intend the association with the original builder to be forgotten. There is no indication that Severus ever replaced the name of the original builder with his own or that he took sole credit for building a structure that he had merely restored, as Dio implies.\textsuperscript{13} In all of the inscriptions referring to Severan rebuilding that are extant, the verb \textit{restituerunt} is prominently included. The name of the original builder was maintained where possible and necessary. To replace the name of the original builder would in fact have been counter to Severus' purpose, which was to link his name to earlier dynasties, and in doing so to appropriate these buildings for his own ends.\textsuperscript{14} The restoration of an historic building, no matter what the extent of the actual work, was a
politically significant act that recognized the importance of the building and authorized
the continued power and legitimacy of the emperor who restored it.\textsuperscript{15}

Also notable about the Severan building in the city of Rome is its essentially
conservative nature. While the destruction of the Commodan fire must have opened up
areas for new structures in place of the old, there was no demolition and replacement of
pre-existing landmarks. For example, according to Herodian’s account, the Templum
Pacis was extensively damaged by the fire, but instead of rebuilding on the site a
completely new structure of his own, Severus chose to rebuild the Flavian construction
and retain its name. The same is true in the case of the Porticus Octaviae. On the other
hand, lack of funds does not seems to have precluded the building of elaborate new
complexes. The imperial treasury had been revived under Severus by confiscations and
the minting of vast sums of coinage. Large sums were spent on repairing the monuments
of the past, perhaps with some additions and alterations. The importance of preserving the
architectural heritage was linked to Severus’ programme of restoration, as well as a desire
for legitimacy through a connection to previous dynasties.

Severus’ religious building was also traditional, further evidence that the regime
did not openly promote eastern or African deities within the Roman pantheon or
intentionally orientalize the state cults. His conscious conservatism seems to have been
intended to display the imperial family’s religious piety. When the venerated Aedes
Vestae in the Forum was rebuilt, the original form of the building was maintained, with
only the decoration carried out in a contemporary style. The antiquity and sanctity of the
place was respected. The restoration of the temple of Juno Regina in the Porticus
Octaviae was also conservative. The original plan was apparently respected, with only the addition of composite capitals to the decoration. The companion temple of Jupiter Stator was probably also repaired during the rebuilding of the Porticus Octaviae. The opportunity of restoring these twin temples to the father of the gods and his consort within the Porticus Octaviae enabled Severus to exploit associations with these traditional divinities. The significance of Severus' attention to the Pantheon, the centre of the imperial cult, for the legitimacy of his dynasty has already been noted. The ancient Aedes of Honos and Virtus near the Porta Capena was also restored during the reign.

The only new religious building that is known to have been built by Severus is the Temple of Hercules and Bacchus. Its construction is not surprising, since Hercules and Bacchus also played an important role within the Severan ideology and religious policy. Severus seems to have desired this new temple to his patron gods to be an important feature of the renewed Rome, and a permanent symbol of the new dynasty as these divinities were especially associated with his sons.

The construction of a magnificent temple to Severus' patron and home town gods Hercules and Bacchus, however, does not signify the imposition of African gods upon the city of Rome, but rather is consistent with his intention to honour the traditional Roman pantheon in his religious policy. The worship of these two deities was already fully established in the city of Rome, and their associations with the emperor had already been developed in the course of the second century. Dio in his criticism of the construction of the temple does not find fault with the gods who are honoured, but with the size of the temple.16
Severus' building programme does not exhibit an overt promotion of other African gods or the eastern cults. There is no evidence, for example, that he constructed a temple to the Carthaginian goddess Dea Caelestis or to the Egyptian god Serapis in the imperial city. The Syrian god Sol Elagabalus also does not appear to have been given any prominence in official circles and was not endowed with a temple within the pomerium, although Julia Domna was the daughter of the priest of Baal Elagabalus. There is no evidence of a conscious orientalizing of the state religion on the part of Severus himself, and it was left to his successors to construct temples to these eastern and African gods within the city of Rome.

Although scholars have extensively re-evaluated the presence of Punic and eastern elements in Severus' administrative and religious policies, change has been slow in coming to the study of Severan architecture in Rome.\textsuperscript{17} The image of Severus as an African upstart who turned his back on time-honoured Roman traditions can still be found in discussions of his monuments, typically in the oft-repeated assertion that he built the Septizodium merely to impress visitors from Africa.\textsuperscript{18} This close analysis of the building programme, however, has demonstrated that Severus was very much aware of Roman traditions in his approach to urban development in the imperial city. In a practical sense, this was a logical response of an emperor coming to power after civil war. By commemorating in the visible face of the city the portents of his rule and his links with the great emperors of the past, Severus' intention was to portray himself as the restorer of the city and its architectural institutions in order to legitimize his rule and his new dynasty.
1. An analogy may be found in the case of Hadrian who was also absent from the city for long periods during his reign. See Boatwright (1987), 134-136.

2. It is interesting to note that when over a century later Diocletian undertook his building programme, he also returned to the Forum as a central part of his embellishment of the capital.

3. 73.24.2.

4. Not everyone was pleased with these developments. Dio records that the emperor was blamed for the number of troops in the city and for placing his hope of safety in the strength of the army rather than in the goodwill of his associates (74.2.2-4):

   ἐπράττειν, αἰτίαν τε ἐσχεν ἐπὶ τῶν πλήθει στρατιωτῶν ὀχλώδη τὴν πόλιν ποιήσαι καὶ δοκάνη χρημάτων περιττὴ τὸ κοινὸν βαρύναι, καὶ τὸ μέγιστον ὅτι μὴ ἐν τῇ συνόντων οἱ εὐνοιὰς αλλ᾽ ἐν τῇ ἐκείνων ἱσχύ τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς σωτηρίας ἐποιεῖτο.

5. Severan building took place in Regio I (Thermae Severianae); II (Castra Equitum Singularium); IV (Templum Pacis); VIII (Forum Romanum); IX (Pantheon, Porticus Octaviae, Theatre of Pompey); X (Palatine); XI (Forum Boarium); XIV (Porta Septimiana, Pons Aurelius ?, Thermae Septimianae ?).

6. As noted by Ward-Perkins (1981), 124 the Antonines “were content to restrict themselves to the bare minimum consistent with dynastic prudence and the proper maintenance of imperial authority.”

7. I disagree with the conclusion of Stevenson (1889), 688 that the appellation Restitutor Urbis on Severus’ coins does not refer to his rebuilding of Rome. Stevenson argues that this epithet can only have a political interpretation. The rebuilding and embellishment of Rome, however, was very much a political act.

8. See Appendix II infra 442-445.


10. Dio 76.16.3.

11. Especially in the case of the Pantheon, where Severus’ self advertisement stands in sharp contrast to Hadrian who refrained from inscribing his name to record his complete rebuilding of the structure. See, for example, the disapproval of De Fine Licht (1966), 290, n. 47. Stuart (1904), 139-140 also notes that Severus seems to have inscribed his name on buildings that he
had merely repaired, and had not rebuilt; a conclusion reached, however, before many of the buildings had been thoroughly excavated and studied and before the extent of the Severan repairs realized.

12. The right of inscription on restored building is a subject that is little understood, but some discretion on the part of the restorer seems to have been involved. Augustus, the premier restorer of Rome’s buildings, appears to have preserved the name of the original builder where it was politically expedient, as he himself records in his Res Gestae (Mon. Anc. 19-20). In other cases, such as the Porticus Metelli, retaining the name of the original builder was not deemed politically necessary. Although the Augustan structure essentially followed the layout of the original, perhaps with the addition of libraries, it was renamed the Porticus Octaviae. See Stuart (1905), 427-449. As noted by Thomas and Witschel (1992), 150, the designation of a project as a construction or reconstruction depended on the continuing value of the previous building and not necessarily on the extent of the rebuilding.

13. Megalomania does not seem to have been a trait of Severus, at least in matters of building, in contrast to Domitian who, according to Suetonius (Domitian 5), allowed no other name but his own to be inscribed on the many buildings he restored, not even the original builder’s. It may be to the restoration of the Pantheon in particular that Dio is referring in his criticism of Severus for the useless repair of buildings, but Severus took credit only for a restoration, whatever the extent, and did not replace the name of the original builder.

14. There could also be underlying motives in the cases where emperors did not add their own names. For example, Stuart (1905), 441-449 has shown from the inscriptive evidence that in reality Hadrian was not averse to recording his restorations, and the fact that he did not place his name on the Pantheon, but restored that of Agrippa, may have more to do with his desire to obliterate the memory of Domitian’s restoration and his neglect of the original builder, than to assume a modest role in the matter.

15. As noted by Thomas and Witschel (1992), 175.

16. Dio does not seem to have approved of Severus expenditure on building in general.

17. For the re-evaluation of Severus’ policies, see Walser (1973), 104-116 and in particular Hammond (1940), 137-173, Mundle (1961), 228-237 and Barnes (1967), 87-107.
See most recently Stambaugh (1988), 336, n. 18, who suggests that this was a deliberate attempt on the part of the new dynasty to turn its back on the remnants of Republican traditions. Stambaugh also sees the placement of the arch in the Forum as a conscious move to cut off completely the Curia and its Republican traditions from the main area of the Forum.
Figure 2

THE TEMPLUM PACIS
1. Temple of Magna Mater
2. Temple of Apollo Palatinus
3. Bibliothecae
4. Basilica
5. Aula Regia
6. Lararium
7. Triclinium
8. Hippodromos
9. Exedra

Figure 3
THE PALATINE
Figure 4
SEVERAN RESTORATION ON THE NORTH-EAST SLOPE OF THE PALATINE
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Figure 5

SEVERAN EXPANSION ON THE SOUTH-EAST CORNER OF THE PALATINE
THE SEPTIZODIUM AND THE CIRCUS MAXIMUS ON THE FORMA URBIS

(La planta marmorea Tav. XVII)

Figure 6
Figure 7
THE CLIVUS VICTORIAE AND UNIDENTIFIED SEVERAN BUILDING ON THE FORM URBIS

(\textit{La pianta marmorea} Tav. XXXIII)
Figure 8
THE MUTATORIUM, AREA RADICARIA, AND VIA NOVA? ON THE FORMA URBIS

(La pianta marmorea Tav. XV)
Figure 9
THE SEPTIZODIUM, REGIO I AND REGIO XII
(with fragments of the Forma Urbis according to Colini)
Figure 10
REGIO I AND REGIO XII
Buildings Restored by Severus

Figure 11

THE CENTRAL CAMPUS MARTIUS
Figure 12
THE ARAE CONSECRATIONIS OF THE ANTONINES IN THE CAMPUS MARTIUS
Figure 13
FRAGMENT NO. 31 OF THE FORMA URBIS DEPICTING THE PORTICUS OCTAVIAE AND ADJACENT BUILDINGS
(La pianta marmorea Tav. XXIX)
POSSIBLE LOCATION OF THE TEMPLE OF HERCULES AND BACCHUS ON THE QUIRINAL
AREAS WHERE SEVERAN STRUCTURES HAVE BEEN EXCAVATED

Figure 16
THE FORUM BOARIUM
CONSTRUCTIONS AND RENOVATIONS DATING TO THE TIME OF SEVERUS

Figure 17
THE LATERAN AREA OF THE CAELIAN
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Figure 18

PLAN OF THE CENTRAL AREA OF THE FORUM ROMANUM

1 Base of the Equus Constantini?
2 Bases of the Anaglypha Traiani
3 Remains of Intermediate Pavement?
4 Inscription of L. Naevius Surdinus
5 Lacus Curtius
6 Site of Equus Domitiani
7 Concrete Foundation
8a Opus Sectile Pavement
8 Concrete Plinth
9 Brickwork Structure (sacellum?)
10 Base of Equus Severi?
11 Rostra Orientalia Diocletianii
12 Bases of Honorary Columns
13 Column of Phocas
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PLATE I

1. Aureus
   Obverse: Julia Domna
   Reverse: Aedes Vestae

2. Denarius
   Obverse: Julia Domna
   Reverse: Aedes Vestae

3. Denarius
   Obverse: Severus
   Reverse: Triumphal Arch
PLATE II

1. Denarius
   Obverse: Severus
   Reverse: Severus on Horseback

2. Sestertius
   Obverse: Severus
   Reverse: Severus on Horseback

3. Aureus
   Obverse: Severus
   Reverse: Severus on Horseback

4. Aureus
   Obverse: Severus
   Reverse: Severus on Horseback
PLATE III

Sestertius

1. Obverse: Divus Pertinax
   Reverse: Funeral Pyre

2. Obverse: Caracalla
   Reverse: Cippus

3. Obverse: Severus
   Reverse: Theatre

4. Obverse: Severus
   Reverse: Bridge
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Appendix I: The Pavement of the Forum Romanum (Figure 18)

Since Septimius Severus was responsible for some major restorations and building in the Forum Romanum, it might be expected that this activity would affect the area of paving. The extent of the Severan intervention, however, is difficult to determine. One of the greatest problems in the analysis of the pavement, as of other elements of the Forum, is the fact that much of the excavation of the area was undertaken during the nineteenth and early twentieth century. These excavations were never properly documented or published, and in many cases the remains were disturbed. In some areas the pavement was removed and then replaced in a different manner, as, for example, in 1835 in front of the Augustan Rostra. Some elements were even moved to other locations or completely demolished. It is also difficult to reconstruct the relationship of some buildings with the paving of the Forum as some of the slabs have disappeared through time or been removed during excavations, leaving the foundations isolated.\(^1\) Recent work has sought to decipher and re-analyse the evidence from these earlier excavations through studies of diaries and photographs. One of the most intensive studies was carried out by C.F. Giuliani and P. Verduchi, published in a 1980 monograph Foro Romano. L'area centrale, and then in a more comprehensive book, L'area centrale del Foro Romano in 1987.\(^2\) This study concentrated on the central area bordered by the Rostra and Comitium, the Basilica Aemilia, the Temple of Divus Julius, and the Basilica Julia, accounting for the largest expanse of ancient pavement surviving in the Forum proper. As well as a re-examination of the earlier excavations, the study also included remeasurement and reexcavation in certain areas.\(^3\)
The final analysis of the study of Giuliani and Verduchi has resulted in a controversy which must be addressed here, since it concerns Severan activity in the area of the Forum. Giuliani and Verduchi have suggested that the final level of the paving in the central area of the Forum dates to the time of Severus, and that the whole chronology of the paving levels should be revised. Their evidence is problematic, however, and has not met with complete acceptance. The main combatant in the controversy is F. Coarelli, who in his *Foro Romano. Periodo repubblicano e augusto* completely refutes their revised chronology. While an analysis of the material will show that a complete repaving of the Forum was probably not undertaken at the time of Severus, there is evidence that, as one might expect, some areas required repaving during the Severan building.

Earlier scholars considered the final paving of the Forum to be from the late imperial period, most probably from the time of Diocletian, when it was repaired after the fire of 283. In 1900, however, a balloon photograph revealed an inscription laid in the pavement in the area of the Comitium, partly covered over by the Column of Phocas. When the steps of this monument were removed, the text of the inscription, which extended for 12.63 m., could be reconstructed to read: L NAEVIUS [L F SURD]INUS PR(AETOR). *(CIL* 6.37068) (Figure 18, no. 4). The lettering was originally in bronze set into travertine blocks. The inscription is now heavily restored, with the bronze replaced in 1955.

The same name also appears in an inscription on the back of a relief slab discovered in the area of the Lacus Curtius in 1553: L NAEVIUS L F SURDINUS PR(AETOR) INTER CIVIS ET PEREGRINOS *(CIL* 6.1468=31662). A L. Naevius
Surdinus is known to have been *triumvir monetalis* at the time of Augustus, and has been identified as the *praetor peregrinus* of both of these inscriptions. As *praetor peregrinus* Surdinus appears to have been responsible for some building activity in this area of the Forum, restoring the paving and the Lacus Curtius, and possibly the tribunal of the *praetor peregrinus* located nearby. This restoration probably took place after the fire of 14 B.C., which had caused considerable damage to the Forum. The presence of this inscription led scholars to revise their dating of the complete paving of the Forum. An Augustan date was now assigned to the final level of paving, which seemed to accord with other Augustan building in the Forum area.

Excavations have also revealed earlier levels of pavement. At 11.80-11.90 m. above sea level paving in Monteverde tufa has been discovered in the irregularly shaped area between the Vicus Vestae and the precinct of Vesta, near the shrine of Venus Cloacina and at the precinct of Juturna. This was thought to belong to the Sullan systematization of the Forum area and to be the first paving of the central area. At 12.60 m. above sea level in the central area another pavement of travertine has been identified. Below this pavement, and apparently constructed contemporaneously, was a series of subterranean galleries, 2.40 m. high and 1.50 m. wide, with the main artery running south-east to north-west with branch passages opening off at right angles. These passageways were probably used as an underground means of transport for spectacles and gladiatorial contests. Their construction has been attributed by most scholars to the time of Caesar, intended for the gladiatorial contests held in the Forum by Caesar after his triumph of 45 B.C. This date would also provide a *terminus ante quem* for their
completion, since the Forum paving would have to have been in place for the games.\textsuperscript{9}

In their revised chronology, however, Giuliani and Verduchi suggest that Caesar was not responsible for the construction of the galleries and the pavement associated with them, but that they actually date to the time of Sulla.\textsuperscript{10} Part of this redating is based on a passage of Festus (416L) that refers to the moving of the cult of Stata Mater from the Forum in order to avoid the burning of the pavement: *Statæ mater simulacræ in foro colebatur; postquam id collastravit, ne lapides igne corrumpèrentur qui plurimis ibi fiebat nocturno tempore, magna pars populi in suos quique vicícos retulerunt eíus deæ cultum.* Giuliani and Verduchi accept the emendation *Cotta stravit* for *collastravit* proposed by Castagnoli.\textsuperscript{11} According to this reading an individual named Cotta was responsible for some paving of the Forum. Since only the surname is given, the individual is thought to have been well-known, and has been identified as either Gaius Aurelius Cotta, consul in 75 B.C., and praetor c. 78, or his brother Marcus Aurelius Cotta, consul in 74, and praetor in c. 77. The same Cotta was also probably responsible for the construction of the Gradus Aurelii and the Tribunal Aurelium, both in the area of the Comitium.\textsuperscript{12}

A level of travertine paving dating to the time of Sulla has been identified in the area of the Comitium contemporaneous to his rebuilding and enlargement of the Curia.\textsuperscript{13} Giuliani and Verduchi suggest that the Sullan activity in the Comitium area should also include an overall repaving of the Forum carried out by the Aurelius Cotta named in the emended text of Festus, and that the subterranean galleries were also constructed at this time. They argue that there is no external evidence for a Caesarean paving of the Forum,
and although he may have planned a repaving he probably did not have time to carry it out, since Caesar’s building programme was for the most part incomplete at the time of his death. The construction technique in unfaced concrete of the subterranean galleries does not contradict this earlier date. Reticulate work discovered on the wall of one gallery most likely belongs to a later rebuilding. The material discovered within the galleries is also not indicative of the date, since the galleries were cut into by later building.

Giuliani and Verduchi’s Sullan dating of the galleries and pavement is compelling and seems to be further strengthened by a passage in Cicero’s pro Sestio 59.126. At a gladiatorial show in the Forum in 57 B.C., and therefore before the building programme of Caesar, Appius Clodius is said to have used a hidden passage to reach his seat and to have appeared suddenly sub tabulas. This underground route, which, according to Cicero, became known as the Via Appia, seems very likely to have been through the subterranean galleries, thus demonstrating that they are pre-Caesarean in construction. It is therefore possible that the galleries and the pavement at 12.60 m. above sea level date to the Sullan period.

More contentious is Giuliani and Verduchi’s claim to have identified at various points within the Forum an intermediate pavement that they believe to be the actual Augustan pavement, ranging between 43 to 80 cm. below the present level. In the north-western corner of the central paving, near the so-called Rostra Vandalica, four paving stones of travertine were discovered where an eighteenth century drain cut into the present level of paving. The lower surface of these slabs was considerably worn,
suggesting that they had been overturned and reused from the earlier paving. Further to the east near the bases of the Anaglypha Traiani (no. 2), in an area where a strip of pavement appears to be missing, Giuliani and Verduchi also identify this earlier level in five large blocks of travertine, very regular in form, c. 27 cm. below the present level and at 13.205-13.328 m. above sea level (no. 3). The level of the surviving cornice of the enclosure of the Lacus Curtius (no. 5) also suggests the presence of a third pavement. This cornice, which originally held a parapet, is actually below the level of the present pavement and is located 20 cm. above the pavement at 12.60 m. (that of Cotta according to Giuliani and Verduchi). The cornice seems therefore to be contemporaneous with an intermediate pavement. Giuliani and Verduchi suggest that when the last pavement was laid, which they date to the time of Severus, a thicker parapet was added to encase the earlier cornice which was then covered by the new level of paving.

The elusiveness of the intermediate Augustan pavement can be explained, according to Giuliani and Verduchi, by the fact that in many cases its paving stones were overturned and reused during the Severan restoration. Also in areas where the level was shallow the Augustan stones were removed where they came into contact with the new Severan level. One important vestige of the Augustan pavement, however, is the inscription of Surdinus (no. 4). While this inscription is generally seen as contemporary with the entire level of the present paving, and as evidence for an Augustan date, Giuliani and Verduchi put forth the hypothesis that this area was only a limited preservation of the Augustan pavement. It was later incorporated within the Severan repaving as an historical reminder of the Augustan period. As evidence for this they note an anomaly in the slope
of the pavement in this area. The band of paving on which the inscription of Surdinus is located follows a different height and slope than the two areas of pavement on either side, where the slope is much more accentuated and follows in different directions.\textsuperscript{23}

Giuliani and Verduchi's Severan date for the final level rests primarily on their identification of two post-Augustan structures at a lower level than the surviving pavement. These structures were discovered during Boni's excavations when part of the pavement was removed in the area to the south of the so-called Equus Domitian. One of these elements is an \textit{opus sectile} pavement (no. 7a), which was laid on an earlier rectangular cement foundation (no. 7).\textsuperscript{24} Another cement plinth (no. 8) was in part covered over and therefore eliminated by the construction of no. 7.\textsuperscript{25} The \textit{opus sectile} pavement had previously been dated by Blake to the Caesarean period, but more recently Morricone has given a later date sometime within the first century A.D.\textsuperscript{26} The geometric design of the pavement is seen to be typical of the ornate pavements of the second half of the first century A.D. and Morricone suggests a date for the \textit{opus sectile} not much before the time of Domitian, and possibly Neronian. Giuliani would then suggest that the foundation (no. 7) and the \textit{opus sectile} (no. 7a) belong to a structure built at some time after the mid- first century at a level lower than the final level of paving.\textsuperscript{27} The second post-Augustan structure noted by Giuliani and Verduchi consists of a square room constructed in brickwork (no. 9). The structure is in a very ruined condition, and now is only a few centimetres in height. From their analysis of the remains, Giuliani and Verduchi have determined that this structure is placed on the intermediate pavement of Surdinus, and was in fact destroyed when the last repaving took place. The construction
technique of this feature indicates that it belongs to the later imperial period, and therefore if its foundation is below the final pavement, then this later level must be post-Augustan.\textsuperscript{28}

One of the more problematic arguments of Giuliani and Verduchi for the late date of the final level of the Forum pavement is the relationship between this final level and a patch of paving stones, 7.80 m. wide and 12.20 m. long, located almost in the centre of the area, which is clearly of a different technique than the surrounding area. This patch (no. 6) covers a mass of concrete that respects the network of underground galleries, and which has been convincingly identified by Giuliani and Verduchi as the site of the Equus Domitiani.\textsuperscript{29} The question is which of the two is earlier; that is, whether the patch indicates that a monument was inserted in an already existing paving, or whether the surrounding pavement was built up to an already existing monument. Giuliani and Verduchi have determined from their analysis of the area that the monument preceded the surrounding pavement which was laid around it.\textsuperscript{30} The monument was later removed, at which time the patching was set into the pavement. According to their scheme, at least part of the Equus Domitiani must have still been standing at the time when the Severan pavement was laid, since it was built up to this monument. They propose that perhaps the whole structure was not destroyed after the \textit{damnatio} in 96, but that, like the Colossus of Nero, the statue was only altered, or alternatively that the base was left in place, and perhaps reused by Severus for his own equestrian statue.

The chronology for the later paving of the Forum according to Giuliani and Verduchi would thus be as follows: the construction of subterranean galleries and a
travertine pavement by Cotta at the time of Sulla; then another level of paving undertaken by Augustus; the erection of the Equus Domitiani on top of the Augustan pavement; the laying of the Severan pavement over the Augustan level and surrounding the remaining base of the Equus Domitiani; the possible reuse of this base by Severus; and later the removal of the Severan statue and the patching of the pavement, perhaps at the time of the Diocletianic renovation of the Forum.

Coarelli, however, challenges Giuliani and Verduchi’s new chronology and maintains the traditional dating of the entire final level of pavement to the time of Augustus. He claims that the anomaly in the slope of the pavement in this area identified by Giuliani and Verduchi’s measurements is not surprising and that the unevenness can simply be accounted for by the natural slope of the terrain, which is generally inclined from west to east and north to south. Coarelli also completely dismisses Giuliani and Verduchi’s identification of an intermediate pavement: “Si tratta di elementi talvolta del tutto evanescenti, talvolta non guidicabili perché non documentati.” Coarelli counters Giuliani and Verduchi’s identification of post-Augustan elements below the final level of paving with a completely different analysis of the evidence. While Giuliani and Verduchi propose that no. 8 is the oldest structure, which was later partly covered over and therefore eliminated by the construction of no. 7, Coarelli argues for a complete reversal. In his examination of the structures, Coarelli contends that no. 7 is actually cut into by no. 8 and is therefore the earlier structure. Since no. 7 is aligned with the subterranean galleries, Coarelli would therefore place it in relation to the corresponding pavement, which he dates to the time of Caesar. He also accepts the Caesarean dating of Blake for
the opus sectile, arguing that its relationship to this level should carry more weight than Morricone’s arguments for a later date on stylistic grounds. He also contends that the level of no. 8 was originally higher and therefore above the level of no. 7, and is actually related to the final level of paving, which he still maintains to be Augustan. Coarelli suggests that these structures are actually two successive phases of the same monument. No. 7 was constructed in relation to the Caesarean pavement, and no. 8 replaced it during the Augustan phase. He suggests that when the Equus Domitiani was built the structures in the vicinity were torn down, including nos. 7 and 8, contrary to Giuliani’s proposal that no. 7 remained standing. Coarelli also argues that the later brick structure located to the south (no. 9) is not necessarily below the final level of paving, but rather that it was constructed on top of the paving.32

Coarelli also counters Giuliani and Verduchi’s interpretation of the relationship of the pavement and the Equus Domitiani. Coarelli argues that although the pavement appears to adhere to the base of the monument, this does not necessarily imply that it was completed later than the base. He proposes rather that since the base was of concrete and therefore cast, the removal of only a small patch of paving in the immediate area where the base was placed would be required. The paving was then replaced up to the monument, and the resulting imperfections at the borders were covered over by the lower moulding of the monument. This would still result in the appearance of the paving adhering to the base. The date of the damnatio of Domitian would consequently provide a terminus post quem non for the general paving of the Forum. The statue must have been removed after the damnatio, and therefore the patching was laid down within an existing
pavement sometime after September 18, 96 A.D. The general paving must therefore be earlier than the statue and the successive patching, which thus supports an Augustan date.33

The most convincing argument of Coarelli against the revised chronology is the relationship between the pavement and the road that leads under the arch of Severus in the north-west corner of the area. Giuliani and Verduchi date this road to the time of Diocletian, but it has been shown that it actually is contemporary with the arch, and therefore Severan. The road, which was bound by a curb, was raised up from the level of the pavement. The difference in level was bridged by means of steps. Coarelli contends that the pavement should therefore be anterior to the construction of the street which is raised upon it, that is earlier than 203.34

The Severan date for the paving in the central area of the Forum proposed by Giuliani and Verduchi therefore remains problematic and their evidence inconclusive. The existence of an intermediate Augustan pavement, as pointed out by Coarelli, remains elusive. Further excavations may clarify the situation. There are also difficulties with Giuliani and Verduchi’s reconstruction of the chronology of the central area of the Forum, especially the relationship between the Equus Domitiani and the surrounding pavement. If the final paving is Severan, this would require the base of the Equus Domitiani to remain standing for more than a hundred years. It is possible that it was reused shortly after the damnatio, but it is more likely that the entire monument was removed.35 According to the Giuliani and Verduchi chronology the road under the Severan arch would also have to be constructed in the later empire. The evidence,
however, seems to indicate that it was contemporary with the arch.

Over the centuries alterations and repair to the Forum pavement were probably required at times because of new constructions. The necessity of an entire repaving during the Severan age, however, is debatable. For example, the fire of 191/192 does not seem to have directly affected the central part of the Forum and there is no evidence of rebuilding among the monuments in the immediate area. The traditional Augustan date of the final level of paving, at least in this central area of the Forum, should probably still be retained, although some repaving was probably required around the new monuments that Severus constructed.\textsuperscript{36} The maintenance of this Augustan area, and the inscription of the \textit{praetor peregrinus} Surdinus, however, is perhaps not without significance. Although Surdinus was probably an obscure individual by the Severan age, the Augustan connection to the inscription may have remained. This penchant for restoration and preservation accords with what we have seen in Severus' treatment of the Forum.\textsuperscript{37}
For a summary of the early excavations and their effect on the Forum paving, see Giuliani and Verduchi (1987), 11-18.

See also most recently Giuliani (1995b), 343-345.

Plans were reconstructed by Giuliani and Verduchi from balloon photographs taken during the excavation in 1906, as well as from new scale drawings incorporating annotations from the earlier excavations. See Giuliani and Verduchi (1987), 124-125, figs. 171-172. Their interpretation however, is difficult, since many of these structures do not survive to any extent in elevation.

Coarelli (1985) 211-233. Unfortunately, Giuliani and Verduchi ignore and fail to address Coarelli’s criticisms in L’area centrale del Foro Romano. They justify their refusal to answer Coarelli in their bibliography, 23: “Le ottiche ed i sistemi di indagine di Filippo Coarelli ed i nostri corrono su binari affatto diversi: ideale e letterario il suo che affronta e risolve problemi assai gravi, però incontrollabili, e pragmatico il nostro.” For a just critique of Giuliani and Verduchi’s negligence in this regard, see also the review of their work by Wiseman (1990), 245-246.

See Lanciani (1897), 252.

Giuliani and Verduchi (1987), 94 place the praetorship of Surdinus in 12 B.C., while Coarelli (1985), 226 would date it to 7 B.C.

The final level of paving ranges from 12.60 to 14.00 m. above sea level. It was at first suggested by Hülsen (1910), 23 that the inscription referred only to the restoration of this portion of the paving, but later this dating was extended by Sogliano (1925), 255 to include the entire paving. The Augustan dating is followed by Platner and Ashby (1929), 234, Blake (1947), 174, Welin (1953), 77-89 and still maintained by Coarelli, see infra.

See Van Deman (1922), 1-31, and Blake (1947), 140-141.

The galleries were excavated by Boni between 1901 and 1904, and later re-examined and their material studied by Carettoni (1956-58), 23-44. Boni first suggested the Caesarean date, which was also maintained by Carettoni. See also Blake (1947), 152, Coarelli (1985), 224-233, and Welch (1994), 71. Access to these galleries was closed by the later repaving, dated to the time of Augustus.

11. See Castagnoli (1964), 192. The text would then read: “The image of Statae Mater used to be worshipped in the Forum; after Cotta paved it (the Forum), lest the paving stones be damaged by fire, which happened many times? there in the night, a great part of the people returned the worship of that goddess each into their respective neighbourhoods.”

12. The Gradus Aurelii are recorded by Cicero as novi, (pro Clu. 93; pro Flacco 28,66), as is the Tribunal Aurelium (pro Sest. 15,34; in Pis. 5,11; de dom. 21,54; post red. ad Quir. 13). Giuliani and Verduchi (1987), 53 consider the Tribunal and Gradus as the same construction, but Coarelli (1985), 190-199 convincingly suggests that they are two distinct structures with complementary functions. Richardson (1992), 400-401, s.v. “Tribunal Aurelium,” however, sees no connection between the construction of the Gradus and the Tribunal.

13. This is the sixth pavement identified by Gjerstad (1941), 117-118 which he attributed to the rebuilding of Faustus Sulla in c. 50 B.C. Coarelli (1985), 131-135, however, convincingly dates this travertine paving to the rebuilding of the Curia by the earlier Sulla, c. 80 B.C., contemporary with a paving of peperino excavated behind the Curia Julia. See Coarelli (1977a), 166-288 and (1983a), 119-160 for his overall discussion of the paving levels of the Comitium.

14. The aggregate is not homogeneous, but consists of travertine in some areas and selce in others. The vaults are generally of tufa and the mortar is greyish-red. Blake (1947), 332 dated the galleries to the time of Caesar on the basis of their aggregate and mortar, following Van Deman’s chronology. Van Deman’s chronology, however, has since been revised, such precise dating from the analysis of aggregate and mortar being now regarded as unreliable.

15. The presence on a tegula of the stamp of L. Sestius Alb. Quirinalis (CIL 15.1445) who was consul in 23 B.C., is also evidence of later repairs.

16. As noted by Wiseman (1990), 245-246 in his review of Giuliani and Verduchi’s L’area centrale del Foro Romano.

17. The Sullan date for the galleries and contemporary pavement is accepted by Richardson (1992), 172-173, s.v. “Forum (Romanum or Magnum).” Coarelli (1985), 224-233 still maintains a Caesarean date, but his evidence with respect to the pavement within the Hemicycle in front of the Temple of Divus Julius does not necessarily confirm this chronology. The fact that an altar
was constructed directly on the pavement in 42 B.C. to commemorate Caesar’s cremation and 
that the podium of the Temple of Divus Julius cuts into it, does not prove that the pavement dates 
to the time of Caesar, but only indicates that it is earlier than the erection of the altar and the 
construction of the temple, and could therefore be Sullan. If this level is Sullan, then the 
Monteverde pavement at 11.80-90 must be of an earlier date, possibly from the early second 
century B.C. There appears to have been a general monumentalization of the Forum area after the 
fire of 210 B.C., which probably included the laying of a pavement. See Richardson (1992), 172, 
s.v. “Forum (Romanum or Magnum)”. Excavations carried out in the area of the Basilica Aemilia 
have revealed a phase of an earlier basilica, constructed after 210 B.C. and apparently 
contemporaneous with the paving level of 11.80. See Coarelli (1985), 136-138, and Richardson 
(1992), 55, s.v. “Basilica Paulli.”

18. Giuliani and Verduchi (1987), 69. These slabs were discovered in part under the base of a late 
imperial monument, which may be the base of the Equus Constantini (no. 1).

19. Giuliani and Verduchi (1987), 82. Giuliani and Verduchi suggest that the slight slope (2.05 %) 
of these slabs is intended for the run-off of rain water and therefore indicates their use in a 
pavement rather than some sort of monument. This slope is said to meet the elevation of the 
inscription of Surdinus. They also have identified marks for clamps on the surface of the slabs 
similar to those noticed on the present pavement.

20. Giuliani and Verduchi (1987), 105-116 and especially fig. 156. Giuliani and Verduchi go so 
far as to suggest that the famous relief depicting Curtius on horse-back, now in the Palazzo dei 
Conservatori, and generally thought to be Republican, may be Severan in date and was used for 
this parapet. It is usually thought that the Curtius relief is the original piece, which was then 
reused for the inscription of Surdinus, but Giuliani and Verduchi suggest that the relief was 
actually the reworked side. They base their proposal on the location of the holes for butterfly 
clamps on the upper surface of the slabs, which indicates that they could have been used only for 
joining the inscription side. When the relief was added to the other side, this edge was cut back, 
making the clamps useless. They also maintain that the border around the relief, which has a 
furrowed surface, was intended to receive a marble veneer, perhaps polychrome, a practice 
common in the later Empire. The style of the relief, unfortunately, is equivocal and dates ranging 
from the first century B.C. to the fourth century A.D have been proposed. Although a Republican 
date is now generally accepted, Giuliani and Verduchi’s arguments, based upon their close
examination of the slab, in favour of an earlier date for the inscription and the reworking of the
relief side (and therefore a date at least after the Augustan inscription) are worthy of
consideration. Whether the relief is actually Severan is impossible to determine.


22. Giuliani and Verduchi (1987), 94. Unfortunately the blocks that carry the inscription are
largely restored, and their relationship to the surrounding pavement is difficult to determine.

23. On the west side of the Surdinus inscription the slope ranges from 1.30% to 3.02% and
inclines to the north while to the east it ranges from 2.16% to 1.28% and declines to the south.
The band of pavement on which the Surdinus inscription is located has a very slight slope from
0.00% to 0.52%. See Giuliani and Verduchi (1987), 46-48, especially figs. 43 and 44. These
three distinct bands indicate to the authors that there was some sort of adaptation.

24. The level of preparation for this opus sectile pavement is now at 12.235 m. The final level of
paving is at 13.197 m. above sea level. No. 7 was partly demolished during the excavations of
Boni when he was isolating what he believed to be the Equus Domitiani (cement plinth no. 8).

25. This plinth, previously identified as the site of the Equus Domitiani, has now been shown to
date from the Caesarean, triumviral, or early Augustan period. The construction of no. 8 cut into
the subterranean galleries and it is therefore later. See Richardson (1992), 144-145, s.v. “Equus
Domitiani.” Because of its close relationship to a block of travertine from the intermediate
pavement at an elevation of 12.527 m. above sea level Giuliani has determined that the
foundation no. 7 probably dated to the Augustan period. See Giuliani and Verduchi (1987), 132,
figs. 182 and 183. Fragments of stucco-decorated bipedales found in the area of the opus sectile
pavement suggest that the room was vaulted, and that some type of elaborately decorated
structure was built upon the earlier Augustan foundation no. 7.

26. Morricone (1970), 91-94. The stucco fragments are unfortunately difficult to date and are as
yet unpublished. The dating determined by Blake (1930), 43-44 is based on Van Deman’s
reading of the area, which placed 7a earlier than 8, as well as a Caesarean date for the
subterranean galleries and paving.

27. Giuliani and Verduchi (1987), 128 and 181. Giuliani and Verduchi suggest that no. 7a was
perhaps contemporary with the construction of the Equus Domitiani and continued to exist even
after the construction of the Equus Domitiani (no. 6) directly to the north. They point out the crowded nature of the Forum and the different conception of space in Roman times to explain the fact that, even though the structures were close together, the statue of Domitian was said to dominate the centre of the Forum.

28. Giuliani and Verduchi (1987), 139-141. The room is 5.55 m. on each side bordered by a rectangle 5.55 x 2.10 m. Spur walls appear to jut out from this, perhaps indicating an *in antit* type of construction. The construction material is large reddish tegulae, similar to the eastern hemicycle of the basilica of the Forum of Trajan.


30. This conclusion is based on their observance that the position of the clamps in the blocks of the surrounding pavement appears to indicate that they were not cut in order to insert a monument. There is also no trace of the placement of a cornice or plinth along all of the perimeter of the area that would have signified that a monument was placed on or inserted into the pavement. See Giuliani and Verduchi (1980), 45-46 and (1987), 118-120.


33. Coarelli (1985), 216-217 also notes the differing orientation of the surrounding pavement and the Domitianic monument. He points out that if the paving was later than the monument, and therefore abutted against it, it should follow the same orientation, which is not the case. The Equus Domitiani is oriented with the Rostra Augusti and the road on the south side of the square, but the surrounding pavement is oriented at a slight angle to the outline of the statue. The base of the Equus, however, need not have been the point of departure for the paving, and it is of course possible that the orientation of the paving was in some ways dictated by the slope of the area. As Coarelli himself points out, the paving has a somewhat fan-like layout to account for the slightly different orientations of the Rostra Augusti and the Rostra on the east side of the Forum.

34. Coarelli (1985), 221-222. It is also possible, however, that the street level was raised up at this point simply to ease the slope under the arch. The pavement could still have been laid first, but only shortly before the construction of the arch, and could still be within the Severan period.
Boni originally proposed that a Trajanic tribunal, decorated with the reliefs known as the Anaglypha Traiani, was constructed on the site of the demolished Equus Domitianus, but these reliefs are now thought to have belonged to the Rostra, perhaps a parapet. See Lugli (1946), 164. Other scholars have suggested that a group of figures on a platform depicted on these reliefs represents a statuary group of Trajan and Italia, erected to commemorate the alimenta, and that this statue was located in the centre of the Forum as a replacement for Domitian’s statue. The location of the statue, however, and even its very existence is still a matter of debate. See Hammond (1953), 129-131, and Boatwright (1987), 183-190.

One area where new Severan construction probably affected the pavement directly was the north-west corner of the Forum, where a Severan level of paving is much better documented. One of these constructions was the triumphal arch. Along its southern flank, in the area between the arch and the Rostra, the Severan paving is evident. The travertine blocks of the foundations of the arch cut into a level of paving contextual with the construction of the Rostra Augusti, that is the Augustan level. On top of the Augustan level was placed a new Severan pavement that covered over both this older level as well as the foundations of the arch. This Severan level is indicated in places by chisel marks found on the earlier level intended for the placing of the paving slab. See Giuliani and Verduchi (1987), 50-51 and fig. 50. Further evidence for Severan repaving related to the construction of the arch is also seen on the north side of the Rostra. Originally the marble socle of the rectangular tribunal of the Rostra rested directly on its contemporary Augustan pavement. During the Severan reconstruction another level of paving was laid down that covered over this socle, so that the decoration of the facade of the Rostra now began with the cornice. See Giuliani and Verduchi (1987), 46 and 50, fig. 48. Restructuring of the pavement levels of the north-west corner of the Forum can also be seen in another Severan monument in the area, the Umbilicus Urbis. The core of the Umbilicus consists of three brick-faced drums. The purpose of these drums was to some extent to join the different levels of pavement that were created by the Severan construction. The top drum, which is the actual base of the monument, extends from the Severan level of pavement that corresponds to the south-west corner of the arch. The lower two drums serve to join the lower, original level of pavement. See Verduchi (1982-84), 337.

Wiseman (1990), 246 points out that members of the Naevii family were still active in the Severan period, and questions why Severus would give credit to a contemporary family. L. Naevius Quadratianus, however, as legate of III Augusta in Numidia in 193 came over to Severus
during the civil war, and was possibly also from Africa. Alfoldy (1968), 118 suggests that he may be from African Mactar. See Birley (1988), 98.
Appendix II: The Severan Building Programme and the Secular Games (Figure 19)

The Secular Games of 204 highlighted the restoration and renewal promised by the new dynasty. The embellishment of the capital in preparation for this celebration was an important aspect of the Severan building programme. Many of the new Severan monuments were set up in locations that were conspicuous during the event and many of the established buildings which were restored were the site of important rituals. The following is a brief list of the areas of the city where events of the Games were held and the Severan buildings and restorations located there.¹

The Forum Romanum:

The Forum Romanum was the site of the *pompa* which proceeded from the Palatine to the Capitoline for the singing of the *Carmen Saeculare*.² The triumphal arch was erected along the Via Sacra, and the procession passed through it before it turned to proceed up to the Capitoline. The Umbilicus, the symbol of the centre of the Empire, was set up next to the arch. Severus’ equestrian statue was placed in the middle of the Forum. The Temple of Vespasian, the Aedes and Atrium Vestae, and the structures on the Via Nova and Clivus Victoriae which overlooked the Forum were restored.

Palatine:

During the third day of the Secular Games the Palatine was the site of sacrifices to Apollo and Diana and the singing of the *Carmen Saeculare*.³ Severus was responsible for restoration of the imperial buildings on the Palatine damaged in the Commodan fire. The final spectacles of the Games were held in the Circus Maximus in the valley below the
Palatine. The new Severan expansion of the palace overlooking the Circus Maximus would have been in full view during this event. The spectacular new nymphaeum, the Septizodium, situated near the entrance to the Circus Maximus, could also be observed by the celebrants.\(^4\)

**Campus Martius:**

During the three nights of the ritual, sacrifices were made to the Moerae, the Ilithyiae and Terra Mater on the banks of the Tiber in the area called Tarentum.\(^5\) In this area Severus constructed a wooden theatre for the presentation of the *ludi Latini*.\(^6\) A large marble and bronze *cippus* was set up inscribed with the *Acta* of the Games.\(^7\) Severus was probably responsible for some other monument, perhaps in honour of Hercules, represented by the relief fragments recovered in the area depicting the Death of Alcestis. The Theatre of Pompey was the site of the *ludi honorarii scaenici*.\(^8\) There is evidence for Severan attention to this building in the appointment of a *procurator operis theatri Pompeiani*, Q. Acilius Fuscus, who probably repaired the building in preparation for the Games.\(^9\) The *sacrum hostiae praecidaneae* which were held on the second night seem to have taken place in the Porticus Octaviae.\(^10\) The Porticus Octaviae was rebuilt by Severus in 203 in time for the Games.

**Processions:**

Many of the buildings that were restored by Severus or new monuments erected in preparation for the Secular Games were located on important processional routes (see Figure 19). The imperial family and the *quindecimviri* moved about the city in order to carry out the various rituals and the *Acta* of the Severan Games document a number of the
processions that took place. For example, to conduct the nocturnal sacrifices to the Moerae, the Ilithyiae and Terra Mater on the banks of the Tiber the imperial entourage is recorded as proceeding *de Palatio in Terentum*. On June 4th, after the three nights and days of sacrifices, there was a progression of *ludi* from the Campus Martius to the Circus Maximus. First, the imperial family and the *quindecimviri* proceeded to the wooden theatre at Tarentum, then crossed over to the Odeum, from where they continued on to the restored Theatre of Pompey and finally the Circus Maximus. As these various processions moved from the Palatine to Tarentum or from the Campus Martius to the Circus Maximus, they would probably have followed the traditional route also used for the triumphal procession between the restored Porticus Octaviae and the Theatre of Marcellus, then along the Vicus Iugarius up to the Forum, through the Velabrum and Forum Boarium along the Vicus Tuscus in front of the Arch of the Argentarii, and then to the Circus Maximus. On June 4th a *pompa omnis sacrificialis* was held around the area of the Circus Maximus in view of the Septizodium and the new Severan structures on the Palatine. The procession of the participants of the *Carmen Saeculare* from the Palatine to the Capitoline moved through the Forum Romanum along the Via Sacra, under the Severan arch and then passed the restored Temple of Vespasian on its way up to the Capitoline.
For the events and topography of the Secular Games, see Pighi (1965), 269-271 and 358-365.


3. *Acta* Va.53; Va.54; Va.58


6. *Acta* III.59; IV.3; Va.32-33; Va.37; Va.57-58; Va.77; Va. 91.

7. *CIL* 6.32326-32335 = *ILS* 5050a


9. *CIL* 8.1439 = *ILS* 1430; *CIL* 14.54 = *ILS* 1431

10. The Porticus Octaviae seems be the *porticus Marcelli* mentioned in the *Acta* III.32-37 in connection with these sacrifices. See Pighi (1965), 270.


13. This was the itinerary for the propitiatory rites of 207 B.C. as described by Livy 35.11 as well as the triumphal route between the Circus Flaminus and the Circus Maximus. See Coarelli (1968a), 63 and (1988), 367. It was probably also used during the Secular Games.

Acta V. 71-75: per [via]m sacram forumque romanu[m] arcum Seve[ri et Antoni]ni Aug[g...].