The Ionic temple relief in the Capitoline: the temple of Victory on the Palatine?

Paul Rehak

In recent years the historical reliefs of the empire have been given a much deserved share of attention, and as a result a number of important works have been redated or reidentified.¹ One of the historical reliefs which continues to pose problems of date, interpretation and even attribution to a specific monument is the block in the Capitoline Museum showing portions of a human figure and the façade of a tetrastyle Ionic temple with a sculptured pediment (figs.1a-b).² This note focuses on two related issues: the identification of the pedimental subject, and the identity of the temple. A consideration of related reliefs attributed to the same monument helps to identify the Ionic temple on the Capitoline relief.

History of the relief

The relief was found on the Corso (Via Flaminia) near the Via Lata in 1923,³ among other sculptured and plain blocks of various dates, some of which had been reused as *spolia* in the Arcus Novus of Diocletian.⁴ Our block in particular exhibits physical signs of several phases of use.⁵ Thus, the findspot of the relief cannot be considered to indicate the location of the monument to which it originally belonged. Because the Ionic temple façade possesses several sculptural peculiarities (discussed below), it was identified as belonging to the same monument as 2 other reliefs with the same characteristics, those depicting the façades of the temples of Mars Ultor (figs.2a-b)⁶ and Magna Mater (figs.3a-b).⁷ The original findspot of the 2 reliefs with the façades of identifiable temples is unknown, but they have been immured in the garden façade of the Villa Medici since the late 16th c.⁸

In an influential article published in 1939, R. Bloch argued that all 3 reliefs with temple façades belonged to the Ara Pietatis Augustae, which he believed to be a monumental altar precinct of Claudian date,⁹ resembling the better known Ara Pacis Augustae.¹⁰ This article was reprinted in 1951 in the publication of the sculptures of the Villa Medici.¹¹ Bloch's case was generally accepted without question until

- 1 For relevant bibliography on historical reliefs see especially G. Koeppl, "Official state reliefs of the city of Rome in the imperial age. A bibliography," *ANRW* 2.12.1 (1982) 477-506; id., "Die historischen Reliefs der römischen Kaiserzeit I. Stadtrömische Denkmäler unbekannter Bauzugehörigkeit aus augusteischer und julisch-claudischer Zeit," *BonnJbb* 183 (1983) 61-144 (hereafter Koeppl 1983), and articles by the same author *ibid.* 1984, 1-65; 1985, 143-213; 1986, 1-90; 1987, 101-57, 1988, 97-106.
- 2 Museo Nuovo Capitolino inv.1386. For bibliography see Koeppl 1983 (*supra* n.1) 107-8 no.17; E. Simon, *Augustus. Kunst und Leben um die Zeitenwende* (München 1986) 20 pl.7; P. Zanker, *The power of images in the age of Augustus* (Ann Arbor 1988) 242, fig.187.
- 3 See especially A. Colini, "Indagini sui frontoni dei templi di Roma," *BullCom* 51 (1923) 334 n.2; F. Mancini, "Roma," *NotSc* 1925, 232-34.
- 4 H. Laubscher, "Arcus Novus und Arcus Claudii: zwei Triumphbögen an der Via Lata in Rom," *GöttNachr* 197.3 (1978) 5-44 (69-108); T. Buttrey, "The date of the arches of 'Diocletian' and Constantine," *Historia* 32 (1983) 375ff.
- 5 The top of the block has half an anathyrosis, of which a smooth raised band survives in places along the top of the block at the front. Two long, deep cuttings survive on the top, one near the right end, the other at the back near the left end. Since the preserved width of the block is only 1 m., the size, number and proximity of the cuttings seem too great for the original use of the relief. The back of the block is smooth but not polished; the modern setting of the block precludes its examination.
- 6 Koeppl 1983, 98-101, no.12.
- 7 *Ibid.* 101-3, no.13.
- 8 G. Andres, *The Villa Medici in Rome* (New York and London 1976) 232-33, 250, and n.528, 251-53.
- 9 R. Bloch, "L'Ara Pietatis Augustae," *MEFRA* 56 (1939) 81-120.
- 10 On the Ara Pacis, see especially the articles by Koeppl cited in n.1.
- 11 M. Cagiano de Azevedo, *Le antichità di Villa Medici* (Roma 1951) 3-31.

Fig. 1a. Ionic temple façade (DAI 29.266).

Fig. 1b. Ionic temple pediment (DAI 37.588).

Fig.2a. Mars Ultor Temple façade (cast) (Photo author).

Fig.2b. Mars Ultor Temple pediment (DAI 1931).

Fig.3a. Magna Mater Temple façade (cast) (DAI 77.1750).

Fig.3b. Magna Mater Temple pediment (DAI 1927A).

1982, when G. Koeppel sensibly observed that none of the ancient testimonia adduced in support of the existence of the "Ara Pietatis" actually mentions an altar (ara, βωμός).¹² Moreover, the numismatic representations of a structure labelled "Pietas" are no earlier than the Hadrianic to Antonine periods, and may in fact represent *ustrina* rather than an altar of the imperial cult.¹³ Since the Medici/Capitoline reliefs correspond exactly with the Ara Pacis friezes in terms of height and treatment of the relief slabs,¹⁴ but show a slight advance in the rendering of figures and the handling of space, it seems reasonable to conclude that they decorated another imperial altar of Julio-Claudian date, since the subjects of the scenes are also not appropriate for another type of structure (e.g. triumphal arch).¹⁵ Although the reliefs can no longer be considered to belong to a Claudian "Ara Pietatis", we know in fact of several imperial altars in Rome, such as the Ara Providentiae and the Ara Gentis Iuliae.¹⁶ If the Medici/Capitoline reliefs belonged originally to a known monument, the likeliest candidate on the basis of the iconography of the scenes seems to be the Ara Gentis Iuliae, the altar on the Capitoline hill dedicated to the Julian gens, since several fragments show activities near temples connected specifically with the gods of the Julian family.¹⁷

Nevertheless, the Ionic temple on the relief in the Capitoline is problematic. Cagiano de Azevedo considered this and several other reliefs to be from the hand of his "maestro della ricerca spaziale"¹⁸, whereas S. Lattimore has preferred to interpret it as an eclectic neo-attic product, by a craftsman perhaps trained in Tarentum.¹⁹ The pedimental sculptures and architecture have been used to argue for or against several proposed identifications for the temple, including the temple of Apollo Palatinus, the temple to Artemis/Diana at Ephesus (restored by Claudius), Juno Regina on the Aventine, Fides on the Capitoline, or Victory on the Palatine.²⁰ Other scholars have suggested that the relief shows an unspecified building outside Rome, an edifice from the legendary past, or a project which had been vowed and planned but was never completed.²¹ Most recently, E. Simon has advanced the intriguing suggestion that the temple is one of the shrines of Augustus erected on the Palatine after his death.²²

But the sculptured pediment itself has been of little help in the process of identification, since at least 7 interpretations of the subject have been proposed. Of these, 2 are most widely accepted: an Amazono-

- 12 G. Koeppel, "Die 'Ara Pietatis Augustae': ein Geisterbau," *RömMitt* 89 (1982) 453-55; cf. L. Cordischi, "Sul problema dell'Ara Pietatis Augustae e dei rilievi ad essa attribuiti," *ArchCl* 37 (1985) 238-65.
- 13 *BMCE* 3. 363 no.960-61, pl.66.8; no.962, pl.66.9.
- 14 H. 1.55 m.
- 15 The scenes include sacrifices at major Augustan temples in Rome, and attributed fragments depict a *flamen* (perhaps the *Augustalis*) and a boy carrying a *Lar Augusti*.
- 16 On the Ara Providentiae, see R. Scott, "Providentia Aug.," *Historia* 31 (1982) 436-59. A fragment of the *acta fratrum arvalium* establishes definitively that the altar was located in the Campus Agrippae. See J. Scheid and H. Broise, "Deux nouveaux fragments des actes des frères arvaux de l'année 38 ap. J.-C.," *MEFRA* 82 (1980) 215-48. Monumental remains of the altar have not been identified, though E. Simon suggested that the Vicomagistri relief in the Vatican belonged to it (Helbig⁴ 1.203-6, no.258). M. Anderson has suggested a rearrangement of the blocks: "A proposal for a new reconstruction of the Altar of the Vicomagistri," *BullMon Mus e Gallerie Pontificie* 5 (1984) 33-54.
- 17 *CIL* 6. 2035, ll.3-9; diplomata: *CIL* 3.2. 849-51; 3 Suppl. Pt.1, fol.3, 1958-59; 10.1.160, no.1402; 16.196-97.
- 18 Cagiano de Azevedo (supra n.11) 63-64.
- 19 S. Lattimore, "A Greek pediment on a Roman temple," *AJA* 78 (1974) 55-61; id., "Addenda," *AJA* 79 (1975) 375-76.
- 20 Cagiano de Azevedo (supra n.11) 16-17; R. Carpenter, "Vergil" in "Observations on familiar statuary in Rome," *MAAR* 18 (1941) 96; P. Hommel, *Studien zu den römischen Figurengiebeln der Kaiserzeit* (Berlin 1954) 40-41; I. Ryberg, *Rites of the state religion in Roman art* (*MAAR* 22 [1955] 70); Lattimore 1974 (supra n.19) 57 and nn.23, 25, 27; M. Torelli, *Typology and structure of Roman historical reliefs* (Ann Arbor 1982) 80 and n.86.
- 21 Colini (supra n.3) 334 n.2; Bloch in Cagiano de Azevedo (supra n.11) n.81; Lattimore 1974 (supra n.19) 58 and n.39; cf. F. Prayon, "Projektierte Bauten auf römischen Münzen," in *Praestant Interna. Festschrift für U. Hausmann* (Tübingen 1982) 101-9.
- 22 Simon (supra n.2) 19, 20 pl.7 (caption).

machy,²³ and an Iliupersis.²⁴ Bloch could not accept an Amazonomachy, but raised a number of other possibilities: a battle of Greeks and unnamed Orientals, Apollo assisting Augustus at the battle of Actium, a Slaughter of the Niobids, or Apollo's rout of Celtic invaders at Delphi.²⁵ The possibility of a Greek or Roman Celtomachy has been raised recently by Torelli.²⁶ Finally, Lattimore concluded that the pedimental subject, and thus the temple, should remain nameless at present.²⁷ And yet, as F. Albertson has observed, "Background façades such as these are common to a number of historical reliefs. They serve to identify the foreground event, and thus the sculptor was compelled to create within a limited space an instantly recognizable monument."²⁸ Thus, an attempt to identify the temple and the subject of its pedimental subject still seems worthwhile.

The sculptured pediment (fig.1b)

As Lattimore noted, "the costume and especially sex of the combatants should serve as the criterion in distinguishing between these various interpretations or any others which might be proposed."²⁹ Although the same author described the individual figures in some detail, a recapitulation of the most important details is in order here, since some of the figures should be reidentified.

A total of 8 figures survives, all of them worn and partially broken. The 8 figures in the pediment form a complex group of actively interrelated individuals which take up almost all of the available space; in places they even overlap the dentil course beneath the raking cornice. In this respect, they differ markedly from most other pedimental groups depicted on Roman temples, and this led Lattimore to suggest that they would be more in keeping with the composition that one might expect to find on a Greek temple.³⁰

In the central portion of the pediment are 3 pairs, while the corners are occupied by single figures (here all figures are numbered from left to right). In the center is a standing, semi-nude male (5) in a billowing cape, facing in three-quarter profile view to the viewer's left. His left leg is missing, the damaged left arm is bent and the fist held near waist level. The right leg is bent, with the foot pressing against the lower back of a kneeling opponent (4), whose flowing hair he grasps with his right hand.

The kneeling figure (4) to the left of the center of the pediment is also seen in three-quarter profile view facing to the viewer's left; the right arm is raised to the head and the left is damaged. The sex of this figure has been considered problematic: it wears a tunic trailing to below the knees and the hair seems long. Both traits suggest a female. There seems to be a bulge at the genital level typical of a male,³¹ but since the bulge on our figure begins as high as waist level and continues between the legs along with parallel folds of drapery, it is far more likely that the figure is a draped female.

To the left of this central group are 2 more interacting figures (2 and 3) in violent motion. A nude male (2) on the left, with his left arm holding a shield raised over the head and right arm extended horizontally, crouches over a prone figure (3), whose sex has been considered indeterminate.³² The prone

²³ Mancini (supra n.3) 232; L. Morpurgo, "La Pentessilea del Tevere," *BullCom* 56 (1928) 66; D. Mustilli, *Il museo Mussolini* (Roma 1939) 107; Colini (supra n.3) 334, n.2.

²⁴ Hommel (supra n.20) 37-41; Simon in Helbig⁴ 2.527; P. Gros, *Aurea templa. Recherches sur l'architecture religieuse de Rome à l'époque d'Auguste* (BEFAR 231, Roma 1976) 31.

²⁵ Cagian de Azevedo (supra n.11) 16-17; Ryberg (supra n.20) 70; Simon in Helbig⁴ 2.527.

²⁶ Torelli (supra n.20) 80. A relief fragment in Mantua, perhaps from the temple of Castor and Pollux, shows Romans fighting Gauls: A. Levi, *Sculture greche e romane del Palazzo Ducale di Mantova* (Roma 1931) 75-78.

²⁷ Lattimore 1974 (supra n.19) 60 and n.70; cf. Simon in Helbig⁴ 2.527.

²⁸ F. Albertson, "An Augustan Temple represented on a historical relief dating to the time of Claudius," *AJA* 91 (1987) 447; Lattimore 1974 (supra n.19) 58.

²⁹ Lattimore 1974 (supra n.19) 58.

³⁰ Ibid. 57-58.

³¹ Ibid. 59 and n.49. Cf. a nude male captive on the east frieze of the Hephaisteion in Athens: J. Dörig, *La friese est de l'Hephaisteion* (Mainz am Rhein 1985) 6 fig.9, 7 fig.10; figs.94-95.

³² Lattimore ibid. 58 and n.47.

figure is seen in three-quarter frontal view, evidently reclining on the left elbow with the right arm upraised. Its back rests against a rough triangular mass, probably a rock. The worn condition of the figure makes it difficult to determine its costume, but the figure appears draped. More importantly, it has the fleshy thighs characteristic of no.7, which is definitely female because it has pronounced breasts. Thus no.3 should likewise be considered female.³³

In a matching position to the right of the center is another group of 2 figures (6 and 7). That on the left is a nude male (6), seen from the front, crouching with his left foot flat on the ground and his right knee bent and touching the pedimental floor. His right arm is damaged and the head missing; the extended left arm encircles the back of a frontally-posed, squatting female (7), who leans against his shoulder. She is now headless, and rests her damaged left arm diagonally across her torso; the surviving hand is visible on the pedimental shelf, while the legs are pressed together and tucked under her. The curve of female breasts is visible under his tunic, as is the flat triangle of the pubic region.

In each corner is a single figure (1 and 8). That on the left is a nude male in profile facing to the viewer's right. He kneels with lower legs extended, and raises himself up on his outstretched arms, head held high to gaze toward the center of the pediment. On the right, a nude male (8), with a flat chest and prominent genitals, is seen from the front, half reclining but holding himself upright on his straight right arm; the left rests on his thighs. The head is damaged but appears to gaze outward toward the viewer.

It seems worth emphasizing that figures 3, 4 and 7 all appear to be draped and all have fleshy thighs which are quite different from the leaner legs of the figures paired with them (2, 5 and 6), as well as of the corner figures (1 and 8). In addition, the figures with the leaner legs all appear heroically nude (the shield of 2 is armor, not clothing, and the cape of 5 can be considered more an attribute denoting active motion than a garment).³⁴

The presence of female combatants on the pediment (3, 4, 7) indicates conclusively that the composition cannot show a scene involving only males: Apollo's rout of the Gauls at Delphi, or Apollo assisting Augustus at Actium. Since one of each pair of fighters appears to be female, a Roman Celtomachy is impossible too. A battle between Greeks and nameless Orientals seems too vague an identification to be meaningful. Since the central figures are shown in 3 duelling pairs, a Slaughter of the Niobids is not possible; in addition, although the central male (5) could perhaps be Apollo, other key figures are missing.³⁵ Several figures also argue against an Iliupersis. The rocky mass under figure 3 is a landscape element unusual for a Sack of Troy (albeit appropriate for an Athenian Amazonomachy).³⁶ There are no clearly identifying features characteristic of an Iliupersis which would have been included even in a compressed version, such as the altar, a suppliant Priam, or the *palladium* of Athena.³⁷ Consequently, the one solution that best fits 3 pairs of heroically nude, dominant males and clothed female victims is an Amazonomachy.

33 E. Simon agreed (Helbig⁴ 2.526).

34 See discussion of the composition of figures 4 and 5 by Lattimore 1974 (supra n.19) 59-60. A similar flying cloak is worn by the incongruous nude Claudius who defeats Britannia in a related composition from the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias: R. R. R. Smith, "The imperial reliefs from the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias," *JRS* 77 (1987) 88-138.

35 Bloch, who proposed this interpretation, seems to have been inspired by Propertius' description of the reliefs on the doors of the temple of Apollo Palatinus: 2.31.12-14. Hommel (supra n.20) 36 notes this lack of key figures in the pediment of the temple on the relief. A sculptural Slaughter of the Niobids, attributed to Scopas or Praxiteles, was dedicated in the temple of Apollo Sosianus, but Pliny does not indicate the medium of the composition, or state whether the group was pedimental (*NH* 36.4.28). For the pedimental sculptures of that temple, see E. La Rocca, *Amazonomachia. Le sculture frontonali del tempio di Apollo Sosiano* (Roma 1985), and "Le sculture frontonali del tempio di Apollo Sosiano a Roma," in H. Kyrieleis (ed.), *Archaische und klassische griechische Plastik* (Mainz 1986) 51-57.

36 E.g. on the shield of Athena Parthenos: see V. Strocka, "Das Schildrelief — zum Stand der Forschung," *Parthenon-Kongress Basel* (Mainz 1984) 188-96, with references to earlier literature. E. Harrison suggests that the landscape elements on the shield were meant specifically to connote the topography of the Acropolis. Cf. G. Waywell, "The treatment of landscape elements in the sculptures of the Parthenon," *ibid.* 312-16.

37 Hommel (supra n.20) 38-39.

The corner figures have been identified as wounded fighters or as personifications of locale.³⁸ Figure 1, a male who clearly directs his attention toward the center of the pediment, could be either. His nudity is consistent with that of other male fighters; his position on hands and knees resembles that of some topographical personifications³⁹ but seems more tense and alert, as if the outcome of the martial action in the scene held a personal significance for him. The frontal pose and outward gaze of figure 8 divorce him from the action in the rest of the composition, but he recalls wounded fighters such as those in the Aegina pediment⁴⁰ and the Dying Trumpeter in the Capitoline.⁴¹ Since the poses of these figures contrast markedly with canonical examples of Greek and Roman topographical personifications,⁴² I conclude that they are, in fact, warriors.

Individual aspects of the 3 pairs of combatants, together and singly, are significant. The grouping into complex interrelated pairs, and the adaptation of pose and height according to the space available within the sloping tympanum, recall the arrangement of figures in a Greek pediment. Lattimore has discussed the possibility that Greek sculptures were imported and reused,⁴³ or that the pediment exhibits Tarentine influence.⁴⁴ Since the practice of reusing Greek pedimental sculptures during the early imperial period is now attested by an actual Amazonomachy in Rome,⁴⁵ the former suggestion should carry more weight. In addition to the Greek appearance of the figures, one should note that the pediment itself is not as steep as most Roman examples, although the architecture of the temple otherwise follows Italic forms.⁴⁶

³⁸ Lattimore 1974 (supra n.19) 58, 60 and id. 1975 (supra n.19) 375-76, mentions both possibilities, but he is more concerned with identifying a source for the figures. E. Simon identified the figures as gods of locale (Helbig⁴ 2.527), and Lattimore tends to agree (1974, 58). Bloch (in Cagianò de Azevedo, supra n.11) 17-18, and Hommel (supra n.20) 39 prefer to call them wounded fighters.

³⁹ Lattimore 1975 (supra n.19) 375-76, 376 n.4, attempted to connect the pose of this figure with that of a 'scopaic' female from an analogous position in the west pediment of the temple of Athena Alea at Tegea. But it should be noted that the identity of that figure has not been established, and the figure is (as Lattimore observed) heavily restored. On the sculptures of the temple, see A. Stewart, *Skopas of Paros* (Park Ridge, NJ 1977).

⁴⁰ A wounded but not moribund warrior, struggling to lift himself on one elbow and looking outward, has been restored to the left corner of the west pediment: R. Lullies and M. Hirmer, *Greek sculpture* (New York 1960) 67-68, pls.74-75. The approaching death of the reclining figures in the east pediment is indicated by the greater lassitude of their poses and downturned gaze: D. Ohly, *Die Aigineten 1, Die Ostgiebelgruppe* (Berlin 1976): Beilage A, figs.XI, VI, pl.64 (fig.XI), pl.39 (fig.VI).

⁴¹ For a recent discussion of this and other Pergamene dedications, see J. J. Pollitt, *Art in the hellenistic age* (Cambridge 1986) 83-97. See also S. Howard, "The dying Gaul, Aigina warriors and Pergamene academicism," *AJA* 87 (1983) 483-87.

⁴² Roman topographical personifications in particular seem to be identified by attributes, such as the corner figures in the gable of the temple of Mars Ultor (supra n.6). La Rocca has identified a figure in the Capitoline Museum as one of the corner personifications from the temple of Mars Ultor: "Roman pedimental sculptures," *AJA* 93 (1989) 276. In Greek pediments, that corner figures representing divinities of locale often seem to lack attributes (as do the figures on our relief) may simply be due to accidents of preservation. The figures of wounded warriors on Greek and Roman pediments usually can be identified both by the presence of equipment (shields, helmets, weapons) or by their poses. But in our pediment as a whole, only figure 2 possesses a shield.

⁴³ Lattimore 1974 (supra n.19) 57, 58. His conclusion that pedimental figures from Greek temples were never reused by the Romans has now proved incorrect: see La Rocca (supra n.35).

⁴⁴ Lattimore 1974 (supra n.19) 60-61 and nn.81-84; id., 1975 (supra n.19) 375-76.

⁴⁵ For the reuse of such figures, see La Rocca (supra n.35). In the light of his work, Zanker has suggested that the *in fastigio signa* of Bupalos and Atenis which were used to decorate the temple of Apollo Palatinus are pedimental rather than acroterial figures. In the case of the Ionic temple relief, Zanker suggests that the pedimental figures could have been originals of the classical period reused on a Roman building (supra n.2, 242 fig.187 caption).

⁴⁶ Physically the building on the relief most closely resembles the so-called Temple of Portunus in the Forum Boarium (variously dated between c.150 and 50 B.C). The building itself, however, lacks any indication that it had a sculptured pediment, and many of the architectural mouldings are different: see A. Colini and C. Buzzetti, "Aedes Portuni in Portu Tiberino," *BullCom* 91 (1986) 7-30.

If the pedimental figures on the Ionic temple are authentic Greek works designed for a tympanum, the relatively small number of participants may indicate either a small building or a reduction of figures by the relief-carver because of considerations of available space. The former possibility seems the more likely, since the actual dimensions of the Ionic temple façade suggest a much smaller building than either the temple of Magna Mater or the temple of Mars Ultor on the reliefs attributed to the same monument.⁴⁷ It is also worth noting that the pedimental compositions on both of these reliefs apparently show all the figures that actually existed as pedimental sculptures,⁴⁸ though in each case some details of the architecture of the building have indeed been simplified.

Central figures 4 and 5 command attention by their height, location and active pose. Both are stock figures in Amazonomachies, although by the 1st c. B.C. fighters in this pose have become an artistic cliché for several different situations.⁴⁹ Figures related to ours appear in mirror-image reversal on a block from the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus.⁵⁰ But if these central figures on the Capitoline relief are participants in a specific Amazonomachy, the central male ought to be Hercules or Theseus with Hippolyta/Antiope.⁵¹

Figures 2 and 3 in the left half of the pediment, like the central group, have a parallel in standard Amazonomachy compositions, though they are less common than the central group.⁵² Lattimore suggests that the relatively flat, two-dimensional quality of these figures could even derive from vase painting.⁵³

The quiet poses of figures 6 and 7 in the right half of the pediment are harder to connect with a combat scene. The pose of the male, with the right knee bent under him and the left raised, with foot flat on the ground, occurs with minor variations in the east pediment of the temple of Zeus at Olympia.⁵⁴ There is a considerable amount of torsion in the body of the adjacent semi-reclining female; thus, it would seem that the male pulls the female towards him rather than supporting her in a friendly manner as has been suggested.⁵⁵ Both figures may be wounded, a condition which would account for their less active poses.⁵⁶

Lattimore has noted the eclectic style of the pediment in terms of compositions and poses.⁵⁷ Dating the pediment by the most advanced details of style, notably the torsion in figure 7, the pedimental compos-

47 Note however that there are more figures in this pediment than on either the Mars Ultor or Magna Mater reliefs. In numismatic depictions, 'extra' pedimental figures are sometimes placed atop the gable.

48 Supra n.6 and 7.

49 Lattimore 1974 (supra n.19) 59 and nn.58, 61-64 for parallels. The pose of the kneeling Amazon also recurs in the figure of Diomedes(?) on a 1st-c. B.C. relief from the theater at Delphi: M. Sturgeon, "A new monument to Herakles at Delphi," *AJA* 82 (1978) 229, 231 fig.6, slab 5. The hair-pulling motif occurs a number of times on the Amazonomachy of the Bassae frieze.

50 British Museum block 1009. For illustration see E. Buschor, *Maussollos und Alexander* (Munich 1950) 31, 33, 36-37, figs.44-45, 50. Much the same pose, including the detail of the flying cloak, appears on an allegorical panel from the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias showing Claudius defeating Britannia (supra n.34).

51 Mancini (supra n.3) 233. Theseus appeared carrying off Antiope in the pediment of the temple of Apollo Daphnephoros at Eretria: E. Toloupa, "Die Giebelskulpturen des Apollon Daphnephorostempels in Eretria," in Kyrieleis (ed.) (supra n.35) 143-50, with references. But the rape of Hippolyta may well be a different event from the active combat depicted on the pediment of the Ionic temple on the relief.

52 Lattimore 1974 (supra n.19) 60 and n.67, discusses the group and adduces block no.1014 from the frieze of the Mausoleum as a parallel.

53 Lattimore *ibid.* 60 and n.66.

54 B. Ashmole and N. Yalouris, *Olympia. The sculptures of the temple of Zeus* (London 1967) fig.15: figure E from the east pediment; pls.41-43.

55 Lattimore 1974 (supra n.19) 57 and nn.54, 55a. He raises both possibilities but does not indicate a preference. Bloch identifies the figures as assisting one another (supra n.9, 108; and in Cagianio de Azevedo [supra n.11] 16), while Hommel (supra n.20, pp.37,39) believes that they are opponents.

56 In an Amazonomachy, a pair of figures of opposite sex should be wounded if they are not fighting. The pose of these figures certainly does not suggest the closeness of the pair of figures leaning against one another in the west pediment of the Parthenon (Cecrops and daughter?): F. Brommer, *Die Skulpturen der Parthenon-Giebel* (Mainz 1963) 32-33 figures B, C; pls. 85-87.

57 Lattimore 1974 (supra n.19) 60-61; *id.*, 1975 (supra n.19) 375 and n.1.

ition cannot be earlier than the 4th c.B.C., and the wide variety of apparent influences may suggest that the pediment is a creation of the Augustan period.⁵⁸

Identification of the temple

If the pedimental composition has been correctly identified here as an Amazonomachy, some identifications proposed for the temple must be dismissed. The highly detailed rendition of the relief makes it unlikely that this is a building located outside Rome, an allusion to a legendary structure, or a planned but uncompleted project. Numismatic and literary sources indicate that the temples to Artemis/Diana at Ephesus, and Juno on the Aventine, did not include an Amazonomachy in the decoration of the gables.⁵⁹ The Ephesian building, moreover, was of colossal size,⁶⁰ and it is not clear why a temple outside Rome should be represented on a state relief of the capital. An attractive candidate in the past for the temple on the relief has been the temple of Apollo on the Palatine.⁶¹ But the present *communis opinio* is that a hexastyle Corinthian temple of Apollo on the Palatine, erected by Domitian, replaced a similar temple of the Augustan period,⁶² which cannot be reconciled with a tetrastyle Ionic structure, even allowing for a certain amount of artistic license or a need to abbreviate details. Furthermore, the façades of temples to Magna Mater or Mars Ultor on other reliefs attributed to this monument seem to be relatively accurate reflections of the existing structures.

Torelli interprets the pedimental subject of the Ionic temple as a Celtomachy, and hypothesizes that such a composition might have decorated the Capitoline temple of Fides.⁶³ However, there is no record whether this building had a sculptured pediment, or, if so, the nature of its subject.⁶⁴ Torelli also considered briefly the possibility that the temple on the relief was the Palatine shrine of Victory.⁶⁵

An Amazonomachy in the pediment suggests several possible identifications based on the Greek and Roman use of this motif. An imported Greek pedimental Amazonomachy decorated the Roman temple of

⁵⁸ Lattimore 1974 *ibid.* 60-61; *id.* 1975 375-76 arrives at a similar conclusion about the date from similarities in pose among the figures of the pediment, figures on the friezes of the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus, and the figures on Tarentine reliefs of the 2nd-1st c. B.C.

⁵⁹ Bloch, who first made this suggestion (*supra* n.9, 110-11), also noted the difficulties in reconciling the temple on the relief with coin representations of the Temple of Artemis (in Cagiano de Azevedo [*supra* n.11] 17). The temple and its decoration is too complicated a problem to be dealt with here. On the temple of Juno Regina on the Aventine, see RG 4.19.5; M. Blake, *Ancient Roman construction in Italy from the prehistoric period to Augustus* (Washington 1947) 175 and n.56; Hommel (*supra* n.20) 40-41; F. Coarelli, *Roma. Guide archeologiche Laterza* (Roma/Bari 1980) 245.

Although Bloch notes (*ibid.* 18) that the tiny pedimental compositions on coins often do not agree with actual pediments, because of the vast differences in scale, this does not explain such radical differences as those between the Ionic temple and existing coin types.

⁶⁰ On the architecture of the temple of Ephesus see H. Lauter, *Die Architektur des Hellenismus* (Darmstadt 1986) 181, 259-60; B. Wesenberg, *Beiträge zur Rekonstruktion griechischer Architektur nach literarischen Quellen* (AthMitt Beiheft 9, 1983).

⁶¹ *Supra* n.20.

⁶² The large podium of the temple, of Augustan date, was reused by Domitian, apparently in a rebuilding of the structure after it was damaged by fire in 80.

⁶³ Torelli (*supra* n.20) 80.

⁶⁴ Platner-Ashby, *A topographical dictionary of ancient Rome*, 209 s.v. Fides, Aedes.

⁶⁵ Torelli (*supra* n.26, 80) states that "the aedes Victoriae seems to be excluded from the probably eccentric position of the temple with respect to the procession," based on his conjectural reconstruction of the arrangement of the reliefs rather than on any independent evidence from the relief itself. But the only processional figure surviving on the relief is fragmentary. And, because the topographical references in the relief are so uncertain, the validity of this comment is open to question. Torelli correctly observes that the Ara Gentis Iuliae was located on the Capitoline, but believes that the Ionic temple on the relief might suggest a location there.

Apollo Sosianus,⁶⁶ and the subject recurred in several Hellenic temples connected with the same god.⁶⁷ Greek Amazonomachies appear in connection with the deeds of Herakles, Theseus, and the cults of Athena and Victory.⁶⁸ Some scholars have argued that the Greek Amazonomachy theme alludes to the victory of Hellenic civilization and thought over barbarian forces,⁶⁹ but from the 4th c. onwards, Amazonomachies also became popular on commemorative monuments, often with funerary implications.⁷⁰ In Roman times, a pedimental Amazonomachy of Greek inspiration or manufacture might be an appropriate theme for the decoration of a temple dedicated to Minerva or Victoria, as well as Apollo.⁷¹ The location of Roman temples to these gods may be important in this connection. But on a temple to the deified Augustus we might expect a more 'Roman' theme.⁷²

Ancient authors and inscriptions record the erection of an *aedes Victoriae* in 294 B.C. on the Palatine, an area later developed extensively by Augustus.⁷³ T. P. Wiseman has rebutted the longstanding belief that the inscriptions relating to the temple of Victory were discovered near the northwest of the Palatine, and argued that they were found near the southwest corner of the hill, where the temple of Magna Mater is located.⁷⁴ In addition, ancient sources imply a connection in cult between the temple of Victory and the temple of Magna Mater, which suggests that the two structures were located in close proximity.⁷⁵ The Magna Mater temple is located on the southwest side of the Palatine, close to the house of Augustus (fig.4a).⁷⁶ Next to the temple lie the podia of two small buildings; the one directly adjacent is the structure formerly identified as the Auguratorium, which has been reidentified recently as the temple of Jupiter Victor.⁷⁷ Further to the east is a second podium which contained an inscription to Victory but preserved no superstructure or traces of sculptural decoration: this has now been identified by Wiseman as the site of the temple of Victory.⁷⁸

⁶⁶ La Rocca (supra n.35) 57-73.

⁶⁷ Examples include: 1. Pediment of the temple of Apollo on Aegina (late 6th c. B.C.); 2. Pediment of the temple of Apollo Daphnephoros at Eretria (early 5th c.); 3. Interior frieze of the temple of Apollo at Bassae (c.400); 4. pediment of the temple of Asklepios (son of Apollo) at Epidauros (c.375).

⁶⁸ Examples include: 1. West metopes of the Parthenon; 2. Shield of Athena Parthenos; 3. Metopes of the Athenian treasury at Delphi (c.490); 4. Pediments of the temple of Athena Nike on the Acropolis (conjectured, see G. Despinis, "Τὰ γλυπτὰ τῶν ἀετουμάτων τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς Ἀθῆνας Νίκης," *Deltion* 29 [1974-77] 1-24, 273-75.

⁶⁹ B. S. Ridgway, *The archaic style in Greek sculpture* (Princeton 1978) 238 and n.22.

⁷⁰ Examples include: 1. The Mausoleum at Halicarnassus (*LIMC* 1.1.593 no.102); 2. The Kallithea tomb near Athens (see *AAA* 1 [1968] 35-36 figs.1-3; 4 [1971] 108-9).

⁷¹ E.g. the Amazonomachy of the temple of Apollo Sosianus.

⁷² The first official temple of divus Augustus in Rome was the temple of Mars Ultor, which has a pediment depicting Mars and allegorical figures. Numismatic representations of the *templum novum divi Augusti* which succeeded it show a very similar pedimental composition (e.g. *BMCE* 1.153, nos. 41-43, pl.28.6; 156 no.58, pl.28.9; 157 no.69, pl.29.14).

⁷³ On the temple of Victory see bibliography in Platner-Ashby (supra n.64) 570. Like so many other structures on the Palatine, it is likely to have undergone a restoration in the Augustan period.

⁷⁴ The entire area has recently been excavated by P. Pensabene (infra n.76), and a republican base inscribed to Victory was discovered in Augustan levels. See Torelli (supra n.20) 80 and n.86. T. P. Wiseman, "The temple of Victory on the Palatine," *Antj* 61 (1981) 35-52, reprinted in his *Roman Studies* (Liverpool 1987) 187-204; and id., "Cybele, Virgil and Augustus," in T. Woodman and D. West, edd., *Poetry and politics in the age of Augustus* (Cambridge 1984) 117-28.

⁷⁵ The sacred stone of Magna Mater, imported from Pessinus in 204 B.C., was housed in the temple of Victory on the Palatine until the temple of Magna Mater was completed and dedicated in 191 (Livy 29.14.13). The storage of the cult equipment of Magna Mater in the temple of Victory implies that the two shrines were located close to one another.

⁷⁶ P. Pensabene, "Quinta campagna di scavo nell'area sud-ovest del Palatino," *ArchLaz* 5 (1983) 65-75, with references.

⁷⁷ On the 'Auguratorium' mentioned by several ancient sources, see Platner-Ashby (supra n.64) 61. See also F. Castagnoli, "Note sulla topografia del Palatino e del Foro Romano," *ArchClass* 16 (1964) 186. Cf. Wiseman 1981 (supra n.74) 46 and nn.97-98 on the temple of Jupiter Victor.

⁷⁸ Supra n.74.

fig.4a. Topography of the Palatine, adapted from T. P. Visman
 MM = Temple of Magna Mater;
 J = Temple of Victoria Palatina; J = Temple of Jupiter
 Victor; + approximate position of spectator of sacrifice.

MAGNA MATER TEMPLE

TEMPLE OF VICTORIA PALATINA

SACRIFICIAL GROUP

**RECONSTRUCTION OF PALATINE SACRIFICE
 NEAR THE HOUSE OF AUGUSTUS**

Fig.4b. Reconstruction drawing of Magna Mater relief and Ionic temple relief (author).

Although evidence of the superstructure is lacking, I suggest that the building on the Capitoline relief depicts the Palatine temple of Victory. Not only would the pedimental Amazonomachy be appropriate as decoration for a temple to Victory, but the small size of the temple on the relief would be consistent with the small podium. More importantly, the building on the relief — if correctly identified here — would have an appropriate ideological connection with the important Augustan theme of Victory and with the cult of Augustus as *divus*, since the *ludi Palatini* were celebrated in honor of the deified emperor in the vicinity, probably beginning in A.D. 15.⁷⁹ Finally, the original dedication date of the temple of Victory on August 1 was highly significant, since it marked the date of Augustus' entry into Alexandria and his triple triumph celebrated in 29 B.C.⁸⁰

The Capitoline relief with the Ionic temple could thus appropriately be associated with the relief attributed to the same monument showing a bull being led to sacrifice near the temple of Magna Mater (fig.3a). The position of the spectator with regard to the Magna Mater relief can be reconstructed in terms of the actual topography of the Palatine: one stands at the southwest corner of the hill, looking toward the northeast (fig.4a). The bull on the Magna Mater relief is moving from left to right, as if advancing in the direction of the house of Augustus, and the presence of a human figure to right of the temple façade further directs attention to the right. I suggest that the Capitoline relief with the Ionic temple of Victory (fig.1a) should be restored to the right of the Magna Mater relief as major elements of a long frieze showing the preparation for a sacrifice in a Palatine setting. The presence of a fragmentary figure on the Capitoline relief, evidently facing left and located at the left edge of the fragment, mirrors the figure facing right at the right edge of the Magna Mater relief. It seems likely that the intervening space between the two temples on the reliefs contained a group of officials including the sacrificant(s), now almost entirely lost (fig.4b, proposed reconstruction).

Topographical evidence of the related reliefs

It is also possible to support the identification of the temple as a construction on the Palatine by turning to broader aspects of the other reliefs attributed to the same monument. The three with architectural façades are similar to one another in all important respects, yet differ consistently from all other Roman architectural depictions: most importantly, the doorways lack carved leaves, the structures are treated as sculptural entities or 'personalities', the pediments are decorated with elaborate groups of sculpture, and each façade is slightly angled with respect to the background. They must belong to a single monument.⁸¹ Because the reliefs agree in scale and treatment of the border mouldings with the exterior figural friezes of the Ara Pacis, it is assumed that they occupied an analogous position on a monument perhaps of similar size (10.655 x 11.625 m.).⁸² Since the Mars Ultor and Magna Mater compositions have preserved widths of 2.46 and 2.30 m., exclusive of additions implied by fragmentary parts of the compositions, they are already too long to have occupied the end panels of a monument the size of the Ara Pacis, which has end panels 2.43 m. wide. Thus, if the Mars Ultor and Magna Mater reliefs belonged to an altar resembling the Ara Pacis, the two temples should probably be assigned to the long sides of the structure. If the monument resembled the Ara Pacis, then the two long friezes would have been 9.45 m. in length.

The nearly frontal façade of the Mars Ultor temple on one fragment, including figures to both left and right of the building, indicates that one long frieze depicts a ceremony in the Forum of Augustus.⁸³ The

79 The *ludi Palatini* were instituted by Livia and Tiberius on Jan.16, A.D.15. The games began with a sacrifice to Augustus, and included various theatrical displays, at one of which Caligula was murdered in 41 (Jos., *Ant.*19.75; Suet., *Calig.*56.2, 58.1-3). The choice of Jan.16 is significant, since Octavian adopted the title Augustus on that day in 27 B.C., and the day was already being celebrated with a *supplicatio* at the time that the *ludi Palatini* were instituted. The succeeding day marked the wedding anniversary of Augustus and Livia in 38 B.C.. In A.D.42 Claudius chose this date for the deification of his grandmother.

80 Platner-Ashby (supra n.64) 570.

81 Cf. J. Maier, *Architektur im römischen Relief* (Bonn 1985), with review in *BonnJbb* 187 (1987) 756-57.

82 E. Buchner, "Solarium Augusti und Ara Pacis," *RömMitt* 83 (1976) 339 fig.8.

83 Supra n.6.

façade of the temple of Magna Mater indicates that the setting of the other long frieze is the Palatine close to the house of Augustus.⁸⁴ In the Mars Ultor scene, the sacrifice of a bovid is taking place,⁸⁵ while in the Magna Mater sacrifice we see an earlier moment when the animal is being led to sacrifice from left to right, along the side of the temple wall.⁸⁶ Since disparate moments in time are being shown in two topographically separate locations, the scenes cannot record the ceremony at the site of the altar for the founding or the dedication, as is usually assumed in the case of the long exterior friezes of the Ara Pacis.⁸⁷ If we assume that only two topographical locations are indicated, assigning the Forum of Augustus to one long side of the monument, and the Palatine hill to the other long side, then the Ionic temple can only be assigned to the Palatine.

Several further aspects of the reliefs support this attribution. First, the spectator sees the temple of Mars Ultor nearly from the front, approximating to the actual view imposed by the physical boundaries of the forum with temple at one end bordered by long parallel colonnades. Thus, no second temple can be inserted without distorting the actual topography of the Forum of Augustus. In addition, the façade of this temple is nearly parallel to the background (fig.2a), unlike the Magna Mater and Ionic temple façades, both of which are angled more sharply with respect to the background. Second, in the Palatine setting, the position of the viewer can also be reconstructed, since one sees both the northwest and southwest sides of the temple of Magna Mater (fig.3a). From this point of view, the animal victims are evidently being led roughly from west to east, in the direction of the houses of Augustus and Livia. A temple standing to the east of the temple of Magna Mater and near the house of the emperor and his wife could also be part of the scene, and the temple of Victory seems to have occupied just such a position. The temple of Apollo Palatinus stands much further to the east, and was probably hexastyle in the Augustan period.⁸⁸ We know of several temples of Augustus on the Palatine, but there is no evidence that any of them stood close to the temple of Magna Mater.⁸⁹

In addition, it is worth noting that the Ionic temple and the Magna Mater façade share certain stylistic characteristics lacking on the Mars Ultor relief: the mouldings around the doors are nearly identical, and both have a raking sima of alternating palmettes and tendrils. While the Ionic temple lacks the masonry with drafted channels between blocks of the other two buildings (both Augustan), this may simply be an indication that the Ionic temple represents a pre-Augustan structure.⁹⁰ Moreover, the Magna Mater façade is angled with respect to the background, being in higher relief at the left and lower relief at the right (fig.3a), while the angling of the façade of the Ionic temple is a mirror-image to this, being in higher relief on the right and lower relief on the left (fig.1a). Taken together, the two Palatine temples would frame a scene depicted as taking place in front of the house of Augustus (fig.4b). Finally, one figure to right of the temple of Magna Mater was recut with a tetrarchic hairstyle, indicating that this was an important figure in both Roman phases of the use of the relief.⁹¹ Both the direction of gaze of

⁸⁴ Supra n.7.

⁸⁵ Although the relief is fragmentary, the *dorsuale* and ornamental band have been removed from the head and back of the bull, and its head is being pulled down. To right, a crouching *victimarius* holds the bull's head, while to the left of the animal is the one preserved hand of a *cultrarius* who is in the act of plunging the sacrificial knife into the animal's neck.

⁸⁶ Here the animal still wears the *dorsuale*, draped with a fillet with hanging ends, and has the ornamental band draped over its back.

⁸⁷ The presence of Agrippa on the Ara Pacis has been used to argue that the scene represents the consecration of the altar in 13 B.C. rather than its dedication in 9 B.C.

⁸⁸ See G. Carettoni, "Le costruzioni di Augusto e il tempio di Apollo sul Palatino," *ArchLaz* 1 (1978) 72-74; id., *Das Haus des Augustus auf dem Palatin* (Mainz 1983); P. Zanker, "Der Apollontempel auf dem Palatin. Ausstattung und politische Sinnbezüge nach der Schlacht von Actium," *AnalRom Suppl.* 10 (1983) 21-40.

⁸⁹ The evidence has been summarized by H. Hähnlein-Schäfer, *Veneratio Augusti. Eine Studie zu den Tempeln des ersten römischen Kaisers* (Roma 1985) 113-28.

⁹⁰ Albertson (supra n.28) 448 n.37.

⁹¹ Koeppl 1983, 103 says that the figure is "einer der vier Tetrarchen ... Diocletian oder Maximian als Augusti bzw. Galerius oder Constantius Chlorus also Caesares". Buttrey (supra n.4) 382 points out that in 293/94 (the

the recut figure, and the direction of the sacrificial group approaching from the left, indicate that there was an altar group further to the right, on a section now missing. Thus, the small altar in front of the Magna Mater temple is not the place where the sacrifice is to be offered. At the left edge of the Ionic temple relief is preserved a portion of a figure which could also be part of this group standing between the 2 temples.

In summary, an identification of the Ionic temple as the temple of Victory on the Palatine, with a sculptural Amazonomachy in the pediment, is consistent with the topographical locations established by the other reliefs from this monument. The temple of Victory is important in its own right for its specifically Augustan associations, but especially because it helped to suggest a Palatine setting for the ceremony. The temples, then, are not depicted as recipients of the sacrifices, but indicate topographical locations particularly associated with Augustus.⁹² Two sacrifices, one on the Palatine, the other in the Forum of Augustus, shown at disparate moments, only make sense if the rites are somehow connected. The sacrifices may be those to the imperial *genius* in the Forum of Augustus and to *divus* Augustus on the Palatine.⁹³ Such scenes would be ideal for the decoration of an altar precinct such as the Ara Gentis Iuliae, honoring Augustus as the founder of the dynasty, and by extension his living successor among the Julio-Claudians.⁹⁴

Loyola University of Chicago⁹⁵

probable date of the arch) Maximian was in Italy but Diocletian was not, and that it is doubtful that Constantius would have been present. Thus a recutting of the heads must have involved the representation of figures not actually attending the *decennalia* celebrations for which the arch was raised.

92 Two other Julio-Claudian reliefs which suggest Palatine settings are the Sorrento base and the Suovetaurilia relief in the Louvre.

93 The animal in both scenes could either be a bull or an ox. In the Forum of Augustus Mars or the imperial *Genius* was offered a bull. But between 14 and 37 *divus* Augustus might be offered an ox there. On the Palatine near the house of Augustus the animal might again be a bull for the *genius* or an ox for the *divus*.

94 Although a Claudian date for the reliefs is generally accepted, it is worth noting that Tiberius established the *sodales Augustales*, a priesthood specifically devoted to Augustus and the Julian *gens*. He also dedicated a shrine to the Julian *gens* and a statue of *divus* Augustus at Bovillae. See S. Weinstock, *Divus Julius* (Oxford 1971) 5-12.

95 This article grew out of my dissertation (1985) at Bryn Mawr College, *Ara Pietatis Augustae or Ara Gentis Iuliae? A study of the reliefs attributed to the Ara Pietatis Augustae and a new attempt at reconstruction and interpretation*. I recall with gratitude the support, advice and criticism given by B. S. Ridgway both then and now. B. J. Ziminski provided useful observations about the relief from an artist's point of view. The referees of JRA made a number of helpful suggestions. Any errors are my own. Warm thanks are due to E. La Rocca for permission to study material in the Capitoline Museum (in 1981-82) and to Dr. Talamo (in 1988). A generous grant from the Faculty Development Fund of the College of Wooster facilitated my travel in 1988.