

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XLIII

HELSINKI 2009

INDEX

EUGENIO AMATO	<i>Note esegetico-testuali a Dione di Prusa V: Sull'abito (or. LXXII)</i>	9
LUIGI ARATA	<i>Breve storia del tecolito, con particolare riferimento alla medicina greca</i>	21
MIKA KAJAVA	<i>A Further Greek Hymn from Signia</i>	31
TUA KORHONEN	<i>Christina of Sweden and Her Knowledge of Greek</i>	41
PETER KRUSCHWITZ & VIRGINIA L. CAMPBELL	<i>What the Pompeians Saw: Representations of Document Types in Pompeian Drawings and Paintings (and their Value for Linguistic Research)</i>	57
LAURA NISSINEN	<i>Cubicula diurna, nocturna – Revisiting Roman cubicula and Sleeping Arrangements</i>	85
JANNE PÖLÖNEN	<i>Hiberus quidam in Dig. 8,2,13 pr: (M. Antonius) Hiberus (PIR² H 168)?</i>	109
OLLI SALOMIES & ZBIGNIEW FIEMA	<i>Latin Inscription from the Ridge Church at Petra</i>	108
KAJ SANDBERG	<i>Isis, the Pomerium and the Augural Topography of the Capitoline Area</i>	141
HEIKKI SOLIN	<i>Analecta epigraphica CCLII-CCLVIII</i>	161
KAIUS TUORI	<i>Dig. 34,2,33: the Return of the Cross-Dressing Senator</i>	191
STEPHEN EVANS	Review Article: <i>Dusting the Mythological Cobwebs</i>	201
	<i>De novis libris iudicia</i>	217
	<i>Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum</i>	313
	<i>Libri nobis missi</i>	319
	<i>Index scriptorum</i>	337

**ISIS CAPITOLINA AND THE *POMERIUM*
NOTES ON THE AUGURAL TOPOGRAPHY
OF THE CAPITOLIUM***

KAJ SANDBERG

In antiquity the urban area of the city of Rome was first and foremost defined by the *pomerium*, rather than by its walls.¹ Due to several more or less passing references in the literary sources, including a more detailed description by Tacitus, and to a series of chance discoveries of pomerial *cippi*, the original course of this sacred city-boundary and the nature of its subsequent extensions are reasonably clear.² Even so, the evidence is still scattered and far from complete, wherefore the path of many individual stretches of this circuit will inevitably – as long as new clues do not surface – remain uncertain or open to different interpretations. For instance, it will be argued here that common, current views of the pomerial demarcation of the city northwards present severe problems, and that an obvious solution to these would solve other problems as well.

The special status of the Capitoline Hill

It is clear from Tacitus' description of the primordial *pomerium* that both the Forum and the Capitolium – two of the most important areas of republican and imperial Rome, at any rate with regard to their civic functions – were not origi-

* I thank professors Eric M. Orlin (University of Puget Sound), Eva Margareta Steinby (emerita, University of Oxford) and Jyri Vaahtera (University of Turku), along with Dr. Miguel John Versluys (Universiteit Leiden) and Mr. Simo Örmä (Institutum Romanum Finlandiae), for their very kind and most valuable help in my work with this paper.

¹ *Cic. nat. deor.* 3,94: *urbis muris, quos vos pontifices sanctos esse dicitis diligentiusque urbem religione quam ipsis moenibus cingitis.*

² For a full inventory of the relevant topographical sources, see G. Lugli et al., *Fontes ad topographiam veteris urbis Romae pertinentes* I, Roma 1952, 125 ff.

nally included within its perimeter.³ Though they are said to have been "added to the city" already by Titus Tatius, it must be considered an interesting piece of information that they are indeed not associated with the founding of Rome. The accuracy of this kind of collective historical memory, preserved also in ritual – that is, in the line of the track run by the *luperci* each *Lupercalia* –,⁴ has been corroborated by toponomastics and etymology. At least as far as the Forum is concerned, it has long been recognized that its very designation most probably is related to the adverb *foris* ("out of doors").⁵ Whereas there is no doubt that the Forum was included within the perimeter of the sacred city-boundary at an early date, opinions diverge as to how the Capitolium related to it.

On the evidence of Tacitus a majority of scholars believe that the hill was indeed included in the regal period,⁶ but some topographers have expressed their doubts. For instance, noting that the Capitolium had no shrine of the *argei*, Lawrence Richardson concludes that the hill "was regarded as special and possibly outside the *pomerium*".⁷ Entering this important discussion I will make no attempt

³ Tac. *ann.* 12,24: *Regum in eo ambitio vel gloria varie vulgata: sed initium condendi, et quod pomerium Romulus posuerit, noscere haud absurdum reor. Igitur a foro boario, ubi aereum tauri simulacrum aspiciamus, quia id genus animalium aratro subditur; sulcus designandi oppidi coeptus ut magnam Herculis aram amplecteretur; inde certis spatiis interiecti lapides per ima montis Palatini ad aram Consi, mox curias veteres, tum ad sacellum Larum, inde forum Romanum; forumque et Capitolium non a Romulo, sed a Tito Tatio additum urbi credidere. Mox pro fortuna pomerium auctum. Et quos tum Claudius terminos posuerit, facile cognitu et publicis actis perscriptum.* Cf. Gell. 13,14,2: *Antiquissimum autem pomerium, quod a Romulo institutum est, Palati montis radicibus terminabatur.* There is an important discussion of Tacitus' account in M. T. Boatwright, "Tacitus on Claudius and the Pomerium, *Annals* 12,23,2–24", *CJ* 80 (1984/1985) 36–43.

⁴ One of the best discussions of the topographical implications of the ceremony is still that of A. K. Michels, "Topography and Interpretation of the *Lupercalia*", *TAPhA* 84 (1953) 35–59.

⁵ E. Forcellini, *Totius Latinitatis lexicon*, editio altera, 527: "Forum ab eodem etymo est a quo *foras, foris* et *fori*." The etymology of the word in ancient writers: Cic. *leg.* 2,61; Varro *ling.* 5,145; Paul. *Fest.* 74 L.

⁶ A. Magdelain, "Le *pomerium* archaïque et le *mundus*", *REL* 54 (1976) 93; M. Andreussi, "Pomerium", *LTUR* IV = E. M. Steinby (a cura di), *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae* IV, Roma 1999, 101.

⁷ L. Richardson, jr, *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, Baltimore 1992, 70 s.v. "Capitolinus Mons". Cf. *ibid.*, 294 s.v. "Pomerium" and 330 s.v. "Regiones quattuor". However, it remains unclear whether or not he thinks that the hill remained on the outside of the pomerial boundary throughout the republican period. The question is not specifically dealt with by Gianluca Tagliamonte, in his entry "Capitolium (fino alla prima età repubblicana)", *LTUR* I (n. 6), Roma 1993, 226–31; however, noting that "il Campidoglio fu a pieno titolo incorporato nella nuova città" (229, emphasis mine) at the end of the conflict with the Sabines, he seems to

at establishing when the hill was first affected by a pomerial extension, but I will argue that there are compelling reasons to believe that a significant part of the Capitolium remained on the outside throughout the Republic and was, functionally and augurally, closely associated with the grounds consecrated to the god Mars.⁸ The Campus Martius, immediately adjacent to the hill, was, as is well known, an area that was used for military drills and exercises by the Roman army. Also the northern part of the Capitolium, overlooking the Campus Martius, was, it must be remembered, the seat of an important military installation.

I have already elsewhere,⁹ citing the fact that it was not permitted to dispense military orders within the *pomerium*,¹⁰ suggested that parts of the Capitoline area remained outside the pomerial circuit. At least the *Arx*, on account of its military functions, must have been augurally excepted from an area expressly designated for civil life and activities (see *infra*). This kind of special status would seem to accord well with the use of the juxtapositions *Arx et Capitolium* or *Capitolium et Arx* (with variations), which were common designations for the hill.¹¹ Richardson thinks that the phrase is "probably simply tautological, the Capitolium and *Arx* being inseparable".¹² In my opinion, if we are actually dealing with two augurally distinct areas on the hill, such designations make perfect sense.

The notion that the *Arx*, along with the *Auguraculum* (being positioned *in Arce*), was situated outside the *pomerium* is rarely voiced explicitly, but seems

be thinking that it had the same status as any other part of the city. Also the entry by C. Reusser, "Capitolium (Republik und Kaiserzeit)", *ibid.*, 232–3 is lacking considerations *per se* about the hill's relationship to the *pomerium*, but important is the following observation (232): "Der Kapitolsberg gehörte nach den Quellen zu keiner der vier Regionen der Vier-Regionen-Stadt." – A list of the *argeorum sacra* is provided by Varro *ling.* 5,45–54.

⁸ Liv. 2,5,2: *ager Tarquiniorum qui inter urbem ac Tiberim fuit consecratus Marti Martius deinde campus fuit*; Flor. 1,9: *populus Romanus agrum Marti suo consecrat*; Schol. *Iuv.* 1,132: *hic enim ager Tarquini superbi fuit et pro illius fuga Marti consecratus dictus est Martius campus*; Plut. *Popl.* 8: τοῦ δ' Ἀρείου πεδίου τὸ ἥδιστον ἐκέκτητο Ταρκύνιος καὶ τοῦτο τῷ θεῷ καθιέρωσαν.

⁹ See, in particular, K. Sandberg, *Magistrates and Assemblies. A Study of legislative Practice in Republican Rome* (Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae 24), Rome 2001, 140.

¹⁰ Laelius Felix *ap.* Gell. 15,27,5: *exercitum extra urbem imperari oporteat, intra urbem imperari ius non sit.*

¹¹ See, for instance, Cic. *Rab.* 35; Liv. 1,33,2; 2,7,10; 3,18,1; 3,19,7; 3,68,7; 6,11,4; 38,51,8; Val. Max. 3,2,7; Tac. *ann.* 11,23,4 and Gell. 5,12,2. For a full inventory of the ways in which the hill is referred to in ancient sources, see G. Tagliamonte, "Capitolium (fino alla prima età repubblicana)", *LTUR* I (n. 6), Roma 1993, 226 f.

¹² Richardson, *Dictionary* (n. 7) 69.

by no means to be alien to modern scholarship.¹³ I contend that the extrapomerial area on the Capitoline hill extended well beyond the fortifications associated with the *Arx*, since it had to be large enough to accommodate meetings of popular assemblies. There are several references in our sources to tribunes of the plebs assembling the tribes outside the *pomerium* to vote on "extrapomerial matters", such as I have defined them. Such instances are documented in the Campus Martius, and I have argued that also assemblies recorded to have been convened *in Capitolio* belong in the same category. In 196 the tribunes Q. Marcius Ralla and C. Atinius Labeo passed a law on the hill ordaining peace with the Macedonian king Philip V; in 167 the tribune Ti. Sempronius carried a law here granting a triumph to L. Aemilius Paullus and the other victors at Pydna.¹⁴ If at all noted, these particular instances have puzzled modern scholars, who have been at a loss explaining why the assemblies met on the Capitolium. John Briscoe, commenting on the former one, argued that the tribunes may have intended "to restrict attendance in the narrow space available".¹⁵ Such an explanation explains precisely nothing. Why should anyone think that the tribunes would have desired to restrict attendance in any way, in an assembly that they had themselves summoned in order to approve a bill of their own authorship? My explanation is that the assemblies in question had to convene *extra pomerium* when they dealt with matters relating to war and peace, and foreign policy – questions which originally were put before the *comitia centuriata* convening in the Campus Martius. In a reappraisal of the significance of the *pomerium* in Roman public law, I have made a systematic

¹³ See, for instance, G. Giannelli, "Arx", *LTUR* I (n. 6), Roma 1993, 127–9 and F. Coarelli, "Auguraculum", *ibid.*, 142–3. That the position of the equivalent of the *Auguraculum* among the Umbrians was the pomerial line itself is clear from augural provisions contained in the *Tabulae Iguvinae* (VIa). For the interpretation I have followed A. Carandini, "*Auguratorium/Auguraculum, templum in terra e templum in aere*", *Id., Remo e Romolo. Dai rioni dei Quiriti alla città dei Romani (775/750–700/675 a.C.)*, Torino 2006, 425. See also A. Magdelain, "L'*auguraculum* de l'*arx* à Rome et dans d'autres villes", *REL* 47 (1969) 253–69; F. Coarelli, "L'*Arx* e l'*Auguraculum*", *Id., Il Foro Romano. Periodo arcaico*, Roma 1983 (rist. 1992), 97–107; E. De Magistris, *Paestum e Roma quadrata. Ricerche sullo spazio augurale*, Napoli 2007, chapter xii ("*Auguraculum, pomerium* e mura della città").

¹⁴ Liv. 33,25,7: *Ea rogatio in Capitolio ad plebem lata est; omnes quinque et triginta tribus "uti rogas" iusserunt*; 45,36,1: *cum in Capitolio rogationem eam Ti. Sempronius tribunus plebis ferret*. See also Plut. *Aem.* 30,8: καὶ συγκροτήσαντες αὐτοὺς περὶ τὸν ὄρθρον αὐθις καταλαμβάνονται τὸ Καπετώλιον· ἐκεῖ γὰρ οἱ δήμαρχοι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἔμελλον ἄξειν. For tribal assemblies convening in the Campus Martius, in the *prata Flaminia* and in the *circus Flaminius*, see Sandberg, *Magistrates and Assemblies* (n. 9) 139 f.

¹⁵ J. Briscoe, *A Commentary on Livy. Books XXXI–XXXIII*, Oxford 1973, 297.

scrutiny of the primary sources and adduced evidence to demonstrate that the competence of the legislative popular assemblies depended on the situation of their meeting-places with regard to the pomerial circuit.¹⁶

Revisiting the problem of the course of the *pomerium*, with respect to the Capitolium, I will now call attention to the implications of the presence of foreign cults on the hill, focusing in particular on the worship of the exotic goddess Isis. In order to do so, the religious significance of the pomerial circuit must first be dealt with in some detail.

The *pomerium*

The *pomerium*, demarcating augurally a city from its hinterland and the rest of the world, was a line that, on an auspicious day, had been traced by a plough harnessed to a bull and a cow.¹⁷ This ancient ritual, to which was attributed an Etruscan origin, was believed to have been performed by Romulus when he founded his Palatine city.¹⁸ The ceremony was still practised in historical times when cities

¹⁶ For my views of the significance of the *pomerium* in Roman public law, and for my distinction between "intrapomerial" and "extrapomerial" matters, see, in particular, K. Sandberg, "The *concilium plebis* as a Legislative Body during the Republic", in U. Paananen et al., *Senatus populusque Romanus. Studies in Roman Republican Legislation* (Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae 13), Helsinki 1993, 82 and, in particular, Sandberg, *Magistrates and Assemblies* (n. 9) 119 ff., esp. 122.

¹⁷ For general discussions of the concept of *pomerium*, see A. von Blumenthal, *RE* XXI.2 (1952) coll. 1867–1876 s.v. "Pomerium"; A. Magdelain, "Le *pomerium* archaïque et le *mundus*", *REL* 54 (1976) 71–109; B. Liou-Gille, "Le *pomerium*", *MH* 50 (1993) 94–106; M. Andreussi, "Pomerium", *LTUR* IV (n. 6), Roma 1999, 96–105; A. Simonelli, "Considerazioni sull'origine, la natura e l'evoluzione del *pomerium*", *Aevum* 75 (2001) 119–62 and F. K. Drogula, "Imperium, potestas, and the *pomerium* in the Roman Republic", *Historia* 56 (2007) 419–52. The religious and augural aspects are in the focus of the discussions in P. Catalano, "Aspetti spaziali del sistema giuridico-religioso romano. *Mundus, templum, urbs, ager, Latium, Italia*", *ANRW* II 16.1 (1978) esp. 479 ff., and G. Martorana, *Intra pomerium, extra pomerium*, Palermo 1978, esp. 3–38 and 119–36. For the anthropology of Roman spatial organization, including interesting considerations of parallels among other peoples (in India, Tibet, West Africa, Brasil and North America), see J. Rykwert, *The Idea of a Town. The Anthropology of Urban Form in Rome, Italy and the Ancient World*, Princeton 1976, esp. 163–87.

¹⁸ Varro *ling.* 5,143: *Oppida condebant in Latio Etrusco ritu multi, id est iunctis bobus, tauro et vacca interiore, aratro circumagebant sulcum*; Plut. *Rom.* 11,1: Ὁ δὲ Ῥωμύλος ... ᾧκιζε τὴν πόλιν, ἐκ Τυρρηνίας μεταπεμψάμενος ἄνδρας ἱεροῖς τισι θεσμοῖς καὶ γράμμασιν ὑφηγουμένους ἕκαστα καὶ διδάσκοντας ὥσπερ ἐν τελετῇ. Scholars are still divided as to the veracity of this tradition, connecting the ritual with Etruria; it is accepted by, among others,

were founded,¹⁹ and was presumably repeated (in some more or less symbolic fashion) at each pomerial extension.²⁰ The line of the pomerial perimeter was marked out with *cippi* at fixed intervals.²¹

The formal designation of an urban area, defined by the *pomerium*, was no arbitrary one as it represented a most fundamental partition in terms of how the Romans perceived, organized and used their civic space. It was nothing short of instrumental in many religious and political contexts.²² In augural doctrine the

Catalano (n. 17) 482 and Martorana (n. 17) 44 ff., whereas it has been rejected by J. Le Gall, "À propos de la muraille Servienne et du *pomerium*", *EAC* 2 (1959) 41–54 and R. Antaya, "The Etymology of *pomerium*", *AJPh* 101 (1980) 184–9. However, as has been noted by several scholars (e.g. Catalano [n. 17] 485), the fact that the plough had to be made of bronze (Plut. *Rom.* 11,3; Macr. *Sat.* 5,19) clearly indicates that the ritual was indeed very ancient.

¹⁹ Varro *ling.* 5,143: *ideo coloniae nostrae omnes in litteris antiquis scribuntur urbes, quod item conditae ut Roma; et ideo coloniae et urbes conduntur, quod intra pomerium ponuntur.* It is interesting to note that Varro (*loc. cit.*) connects etymologically the Latin word for "city", *urbs*, with the circuit (*orbis*) the furrow (*fossa* or *sulcus*) described around the city. As for the word *pomerium* itself, he derives it from *post murum* (*postmoerium*), because this line ran along the earthen wall (*murus*) which appeared along the furrow. The etymology of the word *pomerium* is dealt with in Andreussi (n. 6) 96 ff.; see also the earlier discussions by von Blumenthal (n. 17) esp. coll. 1870 f.; Martorana (n. 17) 39 ff. and Antaya, (n. 18) 184–9.

²⁰ Magistrates who had enlarged the Roman territory by conquest of enemy territory were entitled to extend this sacred boundary of the city, see Gell. 13,14,3: *Habebat ... ius proferendi pomerii, qui populum Romanum agro de hostibus capto auxerat*; cf. *Lex de imperio Vespasiani* (*CIL* VI 930 = *ILS* 244), ll. 14 ff. Incidentally, this prerogative is implied also within the context of a pomerial extension, on Claudian *cippi* (e.g. *CIL* VI 31537a, ll. 7–9): *auctis populi Romani finibus pomerium ampliavit terminavitque*. Cf. Liv. 1,44,5; Dion. Hal. *ant.* 4,13,2 f.; Sen. *dial.* 10,13,8; Tac. *ann.* 12,23,2; Hist. Aug. *Aurelian.* 21,10.

²¹ Varro (*ling.* 5.143) mentions very ancient (it would seem) *cippi* surrounding the city of Aricia. The oldest surviving Roman specimens of such boundary stones date from the Sullan period: *CIL* I² 838–839 = *ILS* 8208 = *ILLRP* 485. Other extant *cippi* date from the reigns of Claudius (*CIL* VI 31537a–d, 37023–37024; *NSc.* 1912, 197 and 1913, 68), Vespasian (*CIL* VI 31538a–c; *NSc.* 1933, 241) and Hadrian (*CIL* VI 31539a–c, *NSc.* 1933, 241).

²² Here, writing for a modern readership, I distinguish between religion and politics for the sake of clarity, but it must be stressed that religion was an integrated part of all private and public life in Ancient Rome. A distinction between "political life" and "religious life" is, therefore, altogether arbitrary and purely conventional. However, reflecting the modern separation of religious and secular matters, this kind of distinction lives on, reaffirmed by the organization of a succession of very influential handbooks on Roman antiquities. Already in W. A. Becker's and J. Marquardt's *Handbuch der römischen Alterthümer*, Leipzig 1843–1846, the "Staatsverfassung" was treated separately from the "Gottesdienst". The same is true of its later version, Th. Mommsen's and J. Marquardt's collaboration *Handbuch der römischen Alterthümer*, Leipzig 1871–1888, where "Staatsrecht" is presented apart from "Sacralwesen".

pomerial circuit constituted the line at which the *auspicia urbana* ended.²³ As for the world outside the *pomerium*, it was divided into five *agri*, each corresponding to a certain kind of *auspicia*: *ager Romanus*, *ager Gabinus*, *ager peregrinus*, *ager hosticus* and *ager incertus*.²⁴ There is no doubt that the boundaries between these areas were of great significance in various augural contexts, but the foremost dividing line was the *pomerium* itself.

The line of the *pomerium* separated several opposite realms from each other. First of all, it constituted a boundary between the worlds of the quick and the dead. As is well known, there was already in the Twelve Tables a prohibition against burial and cremation within the urban area.²⁵ Moreover, all of the area *intra pomerium* had to be kept free from the influence of the gods of the nether world.²⁶ In public law it marked the division between *domi* and *militiae* as "Amtsführungen", as Mommsen put it, or as spheres of application of the *imperium* of a magistrate. It is important to stress that these are locative forms denoting geographical expanses, and not temporal ones such as in the current English expression "in (times of) war and peace"; Jörg Rüpke translates them as "daheim und im 'Kriegsrechtsgebiet'".²⁷ This partition between, basically, a civil and a military realm is reflected in the fact that, right down to the early imperial period, all temples and shrines dedicated to the god Mars were situated outside the *pomerium*.²⁸

²³ Gell. 13,14,1: *Pomerium est locus intra agrum effatum per totius urbis circuitum pone muros regionibus certis determinatus, qui facit finem urbani auspicii*; Varro *ling.* 5,143: *qui quod erat post murum, postmoerium dictum, eiusque auspicia urbana finiuntur*; Gran. *Lic.* 28,25: *... quoniam <po>merium finis ess<et ur>banorum auspiciorum*. A recent addition to the scholarly literature on Roman augural space is E. De Magistris, *Paestum e Roma quadrata. Ricerche sullo spazio augurale*, Napoli 2007.

²⁴ Varro *ling.* 5,33: *Ut nostri augures publici disserunt, agrorum sunt genera quinque: Romanus, Gabinus, peregrinus, hosticus, incertus*. Discussion in Catalano (n. 17) 492–8.

²⁵ Cic. *leg.* 2,58 (Tab. X.1): *"hominem mortuum", inquit lex in duodecim, "in urbe ne sepelito neve urito"*. Cf. *CIL* VI 31614, 31615 (a praetorian edict datable to the beginning of the first century BC): *L. Sentius C. f. pr(aetor) / de sen(atu)s sent(entia) loca / terminanda coer(avit), / b(onum) f(actus) ne quis intra / terminos proprius / urbem ustrinam / fecisse velit neve / stercus, cadaver / iniecisse velit*. The rule was also observed in the Roman *coloniae*, see *Lex coloniae Genetivae Iuliae s. Ursonensis* (*CIL* I² 594 = *ILS* 6087 = *RS* 25), chs. lxxiii f. Discussion in M. Beard et al., *Religions of Rome I. A History*, Cambridge 1998, 180.

²⁶ Martorana (n. 17) 71.

²⁷ J. Rüpke, *Domi militiae. Die religiöse Konstruktion des Krieges in Rom*, Stuttgart 1990, 29.

²⁸ Vitruvius 1,7,1: *Martis vero divinitas cum sit extra moenia dedicata, non erit inter cives armigera dissensio, sed ab hostibus ea defensa belli periculo conservabit*. It was only with Augustus that

It is quite clear that, on a cultic level, the pomerial perimeter can largely be perceived as a boundary between domestic and foreign creeds. Alien deities, or, more precisely, such deities whose cults had not been formally introduced into the Roman realm, were worshipped outside the sacred city-boundary.²⁹ True, there were several foreign gods and goddesses with temples at intrapomerial locations, but it is very interesting to note that, in many of these cases it happens to be explicitly attested that the cults in question had been brought to Rome by means of a formal act of introduction. For instance, Castor and Pollux, whose cult was brought to Rome in the very beginning of the Republic, received their temple right at the foot of the Palatine Hill in the Forum. According to tradition the dictator A. Postumius Albinus, leading the Romans against their rebellious Latin allies in the battle of the Lake Regillus in 496 BC, had – in an employment of the typically Roman stratagem of invoking the aid of the divine protectors of the enemies – vowed a shrine to the Dioscuri, who were much venerated at Tusculum and other important Latin cities.³⁰ Another well known case, dating to the last years of the Second Punic War, is Cybele, whose cult was transported all the way from the Anatolian city of Pessinus to the city by the Tiber; here she was worshipped on the Palatine itself, that is, in the very heart of the oldest part of the city of Rome.³¹

all this began to change; in 2 BC did Mars for the first time receive a temple within the *pomerium*, this was the temple of Mars Ultor in the *Forum Augusti*. Discussion in Beard et al (n. 25) 180.

²⁹ Martorana (n. 17) 29: "il pomerio ... rappresenta il segno dialettico per eccellenza, ove una divinità poteva essere inclusa solo se la contingenza storica avesse permesso una giustificazione *intra pomerium*. Nel caso contrario, la collocazione si determina *extra pomerium*. L'*intra pomerium* e l'*extra pomerium* ... rappresentano uno degli elementi dialettici più evidenti di una religione che solo la rivoluzione cristiana potè annullare" Cf. M. Beard et al., *Religions of Rome II. A Sourcebook*, Cambridge 1998, 93. However, see also *infra* p. 157.

³⁰ Liv. 2,20,12; Dion. Hal. *ant.* 6,13. The discovery in 1959, at Lavinium (present-day Pratica di Mare), of a dedication to Castor and Pollux (F. Castagnoli, *Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni* 30 [1959] 109–17 = *CIL* I² 2833), documenting the presence of the cult in Latium at a date around 500 BC confirms the essential soundness of this tradition. Castagnoli's dating rests on palaeographic considerations, more precisely, on close comparison with elements in, respectively, the *cippus* found under the *Lapis Niger* (*CIL* I² 1 = *ILS* 4913) and in an archaic inscription from Tivoli (*CIL* I² 2658 = *ILLRP* 5). The reading, retaining the names of the twin gods in their Greek forms (*Castorei Podlouqueique qurois*), attests to the cult's transmission to Latium directly from the Greek world (Magna Graecia), that is, with no Etruscan intermediation as was formerly thought.

³¹ The well-documented details of this transmission, taking place in the last years of the third century BC, are no doubt fully historical. Alarmed by fearful celestial signs in 205, during an ongoing war, the Senate ordered a consultation of the Sibylline books and, as a result, formally

That the location of a temple was chosen with regard to its relation to the *pomerium* seems certain. For instance, transferring the cult of Diana from Aricia to Rome king Servius Tullius chose to build her temple on the Aventine hill, which remained outside the pomerial perimeter until the reign of Claudius in the middle of the first century AD; thereby he complied with the requirements of a confederal sanctuary which was common to all members of the Latin League.³² Likewise, many of the foreign cults that had been formally brought to Rome were practiced outside the *pomerium* for a reason. It is evident that there were various degrees of inclusion among the divinities which were gradually included in the Roman pantheon. A distinct group within the *sacra peregrina* is clearly constituted by the *di evocati*, gods and goddesses which had been summoned to Rome from an enemy city just before it had been sacked. It has been observed that these always remained ideologically foreign.³³ The most famous example is the cult of Juno Regina which, in connection with the capture of Veii in 396 BC, was brought to Rome. There she received a temple on the Aventine.³⁴ Clifford Ando makes an interesting reflection: "it may be significant that Juno Regina, Vortumnus, and Minerva all received temples on the Aventine, outside the *pomerium*, and so outside the religious boundary of Rome itself – but that was not true of Magna Mater or Ceres or Aesculapius or, for that matter, Juno Curitis."³⁵

resolved to introduce the cult of Magna Mater Idaea to Rome. Following the instructions of the Pergamene king Attalus I, an important ally, a Roman embassy removed Cybele's famous pointed meteoric stone from her Phrygian shrine and brought it to Rome, see Liv. 29,37,2, 36,36,3; *vir. ill.* 46,3; Prudent. *mart. Rom.* 206; Serv. *Aen.* 7,188. There it was first housed in the temple of Victoria, on the Palatine, but in 191 BC the Anatolian goddess received a sanctuary of her own on the same hill. This was dedicated by the praetor M. Junius Brutus on 11th April 191 BC, in connection with the first celebration of the *ludi Megalenses*, see Liv. 36,36,4; *Fast. Praenest.* and *Fast. Ant.* (A. Degrassi, *Inscriptiones Italiae* XIII.2, Rome 1963).

³² An ancient dedicatory inscription, known to Cato, underlines the strong confederal nature of Arician Diana, see Cato *orig. fr.* 62 (Peter, *HRR*): *Lucum Dianum in nemore Aricino Egerius Baebius Tusculanus dedicavit dictator Latinus. Hi populi communiter: Tusculanus, Aricinus, Laurens, Coranus, Tiburtis, Pometius, Ardeatis, Rutulus.*

³³ C. Ando, *The Matter of the Gods. Religion and the Roman Empire*, Berkeley – Los Angeles 2008, 134.

³⁴ A famous passage documenting the idea of *evocatio* is found in Livy, who puts the following words in the mouth of Camillus (Liv. 5,21,2–3): *Pythice Apollo, tuoque numine instinctus pergo ad delendam urbem Veios, tibi que hinc decimam partem praedae voveo. Te simul, Iuno regina, quae nunc Veios colis, precor, ut nos victores in nostram tuamque mox futuram urbem sequare, ubi te dignum amplitudine tua templum accipiat.*

³⁵ Ando (n. 35) 134.

Returning now to the augural status of the Capitolium (or, at least, a significant part thereof), it is most interesting to note that there were several foreign cults which were allocated to the hill. I will here pay particular attention to Isis, whose cult was practiced on the hill already in the republican period. First I will deal with the building associated with her cult, which, if any, has been the focus of a long controversy.

The Capitoline *Iseum*

In the imperial period the principal temple of the Egyptian goddess in Rome was the extensive *Iseum Campense* in the Campus Martius, but her cult on the Capitolium seems to be – as will be shown here – attested from at least the early years of the first century BC. This is a date corresponding closely to the date of the introduction of Isis' cult in Rome, where it was established by the Sullan period at the latest.³⁶

On account of several references in literary sources,³⁷ it has long been known that there was some sort of association between the cult of Isis and the Capitolium. The normal presence of large crowds of followers of Isis on the hill is clearly implied in a famous account of an escape made possible by the abundance of such elements. Suetonius recounts how the young Domitian, on the morning of 19 December of AD 69, flees from the siege of the Capitoline hill (certainly the fortifications of the *Arx*). Donning an Isiac dress he escapes the attention of Vitellius' men and succeeds in disappearing into a throng of devotees termed as *sacrificuli vanae superstitionis*.³⁸ Modern scholars have connected an-

³⁶ *Apul. met.* 11,30,5: *collegii vetustissimi et sub illis Syllae temporibus conditi*. There is a good discussion of this passage in J. G. Griffiths, *The Isis-Book (Apuleius, Metamorphoses, Book XI). Edition with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (EPRO 39), Leiden 1975, 343 f. A reference to a certain *aedes Serapi*, in an inscription from Puteoli dating to 105 BC (*CIL* X 1781 = *CIL* I² 698; the so-called *lex Puteolana*, which is now preserved in the Museo Archeologico Nazionale at Naples), provides the earliest epigraphic evidence for the cult of the Egyptian gods anywhere on Italian soil.

³⁷ There are full inventories and discussions of these passages in F. Mora, *Prosopografia Isiaca* (EPRO 113), Leiden 1990, II 72–91 and in S. A. Takács, *Isis and Sarapis in the Roman World*, Leiden 1995, 56–70.

³⁸ *Suet. Dom.* 1,2: *Bello Vitelliano confugit in Capitolium cum patruo Sabino ac parte praesentium copiarum, sed irrumpentibus adversariis et ardente templo apud aedituum clam pernoctavit, ac mane Isiaci celatus habitu interque sacrificulos vanae superstitionis cum se trans Tiberim ad condiscipuli sui matrem comite uno contulisset, ita latuit, ut scrutantibus qui ves-*

other similar escape to the Capitolium. The story is found in Valerius Maximus and Appian, who (with minor variations) relate how one of the proscribed of 43 BC, the *aedilis plebis* M. Volusius, evades his henchmen in the city disguised as a priest of Isis wearing a linen robe (and, according to Appian, an Anubis head) and ultimately manages to reach Brutus' camp (or, depending on the source, that of Sextus Pompeius).³⁹ That Volusius' escape started at a location on the hill cannot be directly inferred, but the presence of Egyptian cults there in the same period is indeed documented. There is a record of senatorial actions to remove and ban unauthorized altars for Egyptian gods on the hill, in the years 58, 53 and 48 BC.⁴⁰

There is at least one more literary source which unambiguously associates the cult of Isis with the hill. In the Veronese *scholia*, a late source, there is a reference to an *ara Isidis desertae* on the Capitolium, located *post aedem Opis*.⁴¹

In 1884 Georges Lafaye postulated the existence of a temple dedicated to Isis on the Capitolium.⁴² He based himself on the passages presented above, but also cited as evidence the presence of an Egyptian obelisk on the hill, standing until the beginning of the 16th century in the immediate vicinity of the church of

tigia subsecuti erant, deprehendi non potuerit. Also Tacitus (*hist.* 3,74) notes this escape, but says nothing about an Isiac dress; however, as Coarelli points out, the reference to linen is not without significance, see "Isis Capitolina", in F. Coarelli (a cura di), *Divus Vespasianus. Il Bimillenario dei Flavi*, Milano 2009, 223 n. 1. The episode is discussed at length in T. P. Wiseman, "Flavians on the Capitol", *AJAH* 3 (1978) 163–78 and K. Wellesley, "What Happened on the Capitol in December AD 69", *AJAH* 6 (1981) 166–90. Its topographical implications are in the focus of the discussion in F. P. Arata, "Un *sacellum* di età imperiale all'interno del Museo Capitolino: una proposta di identificazione", *BCACR* 98 (1997) 149 ff.

³⁹ Val. Max. 7,3,8: *M. Volusius aedilis pl. proscriptus adsumpto Isiaci habitu per itinera viasque publicas stipem petens quisnam re vera esset occurrentis dinoscere passus non est eoque fallaciae genere tectus in M. Bruti castra pervenit. Quid illa necessitate miserius, quae magistratum populi Romani abiecto honoris praetexto alienigenae religionis obscuratum insignibus per urbem iussit incedere!*; App. *civ.* 4,47: Οὐολούσιος δὲ ἀγορανομῶν προεγράφη καὶ φίλον ὀργιαστὴν τῆς Ἴσιδος ἔχων ἤτησε τὴν στολὴν καὶ τὰς ὀθόνας ἐνέδου τὰς ποδήρεις καὶ τὴν τοῦ κυνὸς κεφαλὴν ἐπέθετο καὶ διήλθεν οὕτως ὀργιάζων αὐτῷ σχήματι ἐς Πομπήιον. See M. J. Versluys (n. 54) 429, with a reference to L. Bricault, "Les Anubophores", *BSEG* 24 (2000/2001) 32 f. (*non vidi*).

⁴⁰ Varro ap. Tertull. *nat.* 1,10 (58 BC, reference to Egyptian gods); Dio 40,47,4 (53 BC, reference to Egyptian gods); Dio 42,26 (48 BC, reference to Isis and Sarapis). For senatorial actions against the cult, see Takács, *Isis and Sarapis* (n. 37) 56–70.

⁴¹ Schol. Veron. *ad Aen.* 2,714.

⁴² G. Lafaye, *Histoire du culte des divinités d'Alexandrie Sérapis, Isis, Harpocrate et Anubis hors de l'Égypte depuis les origines jusqu'à la naissance de l'École néo-platonicienne*, Paris 1884, 216.

S. Maria in Aracoeli.⁴³ Since the late 19th century a host of additional material – attesting a close association between the cult of Isis and the Capitolium – has surfaced, or has otherwise been made more readily available for topographical research. This evidence consists of a series of inscriptions mentioning individuals styled as *sacerdotes Isidis Capitolinae* and, indeed, of dedications to Isis and several *aegyptiaca* recovered on the hill itself.

A travertine inscription from a Roman funerary monument for thirteen individuals, found in 1720 two miles outside Porta S. Paolo (that is, in the necropolis of Via Ostiensis) and now housed in the Museo Civico at Fiesole, certainly does contain the element *T. Sulpici T. f. Caecili(ani) sac(erdotis) Isid(is) Capitoli(nae)*.⁴⁴ Whether or not the following name, of a female – usually rendered *Porcia T. l. Rufa sac. Sulpici Capitoli.* –, is actually indicated by the same attribute is a question we need not consider here. For the present purposes it does not really matter whether the inscription provides evidence for one or two priests with this particular designation, but it is most important to note the date, which is definitely one prior to about the middle of the first century BC. Proposed dates range from 90 to 48 BC, but Filippo Coarelli has, by means of a thorough examination of the onomastic elements and of the stylistic characteristics featured in the text, narrowed down this time span to the period 90–60 BC. Another epitaph from Rome refers to a certain [*V*]olusius / [*C*]aesario / *sacerdos Isidis / Capitolin(a)e*.⁴⁵ A third inscription attesting the existence of priests of Isis Capitolina, a dedication *pro salute Caesaris* from Portus, was copied hastily (*festinans*) by Rodolfo Lanciani in 1868 before it was lost; this epigraph, containing a reference to *Camurenus Veru(s) sac(erdos) / deae Isidis Cap(itolinae)*, has been largely ignored by topographers and scholars on Isiac matters, but has recently been brought to a wider attention by Coarelli.⁴⁶

⁴³ See *infra*, p. 155 with n. 58.

⁴⁴ *CIL* I² 1263 = VI 2247 = *ILLRP* 159; G. Paci, "Iscrizione tardo-repubblicana di Roma ritrovata al Museo di Fiesole", *Epigraphica* 38 (1976) 120–5; Takács, *Isis and Sarapis* (n. 37) 51–6. The reading of the inscription, with regard to Porcia Rufa, is discussed at length in F. Coarelli, "Iside Capitolina, Clodio e i mercanti di schiavi", in N. Bonacasa – A. di Vita (a cura di), *Alessandria e il mondo ellenistico-romano. Studi in onore di Achille Adriani III*, Roma 1984, 465 f.

⁴⁵ *CIL* VI 2248. Preserved in the Palazzo Tittoni at Manziana, 40 km northwest of Rome, this inscription has reportedly just been stolen. Incidentally, there is a copy of it in the Museo della Civiltà Romana.

⁴⁶ *CIL* XIV 18 = R. Lanciani, "Iscrizioni portuensi", *Bull.Inst.* 1868, 228.

In addition to these inscriptions, there is crucial epigraphic evidence in the form of texts generated within a cultic context on the hill itself. First of all, there is a dedication *Isidi / Frugifer(a)e*, found *in situ* under Santa Maria in Aracoeli.⁴⁷ Secondly, there is a marble slab recording the dedication of a *protomen / Serapis ex / arg(enti) p. x*, found "presso il viadotto che congiungeva il palazzo di Venezia con le fabbriche di Aracoeli", that is, at a location not far from the find spot of the former dedication.⁴⁸ Right in this area has also been found a number of statuettes in Egyptianizing style;⁴⁹ other aegyptiaca recovered from the Capitoline hill include a *naophoros* and a *lucerna* decorated with a Sarapis bust.⁵⁰ It can be added that two Egyptian sphinxes documented by a 16th century fresco to have been on the hill in 1543 (the date of the painting), more precisely, "accovacciate ai lati della rampa centrale del Palazzo Senatorio", have tentatively been associated with an Isiac shrine on the Capitolium.⁵¹

Moreover, also numismatic evidence has been associated with the cult of Isis on the Capitolium. Nilotic themes appearing as control marks on some coins of the republican period, including the head-dress of Isis, have been interpreted as reflecting the Isiac devotions of workers attached to the Capitoline mint, near the temple of Juno Moneta.⁵²

Though it is quite evident that there was worship of Isis on the Capitolium, the existence of an actual temple has met with increasing doubt in the last few decades, ever since Michel Malaise voiced his own disbelief in the early 1970s.⁵³

⁴⁷ *CIL* VI 351 = L. Vidman, *Sylloge inscriptionum religionis Isiacae et Searapiacae*, Berlin 1969, no. 379.

⁴⁸ *CIL* VI 30998. Malaise, *Inventaire préliminaire* (n. 53) 130 f. Coarelli, "Isis Capitolina", in *Divus Vespasianus* (n. 38) 222, referring to the find spot, speaks of "[le] pendici dell'Arx".

⁴⁹ Coarelli, "Isis Capitolina", in *Divus Vespasianus* (n. 38) 222, with a reference to F. Manera – C. Mazza, *Le Collezioni egizie del Museo Nazionale Romano*, Roma 2001, 101–2 nn. 69–70.

⁵⁰ L. Bricault, *Atlas de la diffusion des cultes isiaques (Ive s. av. J.-C.–IVe s. apr. J.-C.)* (MAI n. s. 23), Paris 2001, 165.

⁵¹ O. Lollo Barberi – G. Parola – M. P. Toti, *Le antichità egiziane di Roma imperiale*, Roma 1995, 200–2 no. 47 (Sfingi di Neferite e di Acori). The fresco is a wall painting in the Palazzo Senatorio, in the Sala delle Aquile. That the original Roman location of the sphinxes would have been somewhere on the Capitolium is brought forth only as a possibility (202): "Per quanto riguarda la collocazione sul suolo romano, le sculture potevano trovarsi nell'Iseo capitolino o nel vicino Iseo campense."

⁵² Griffiths, *The Isis-Book* (n. 36) 344. For photographic documentation of such coinage, see A. Alföldi, "Isiskult und Umsturtzbewegung im letzten Jahrhundert der römischen Republik", *Schweizer Münzblätter* 5 (1954) 27 figs. 3–5; H. A. Grueber, *Coins of the Roman Republic in the British Museum* I, London 1910, nos. 1978, 3807 and Takács, *Isis and Sarapis* (n. 37) 34–51.

⁵³ M. Malaise, *Inventaire préliminaire des documents égyptiens découverts en Italie* (EPRO

Scholars such as Marcel Le Glay, Paul Meyboom and Miguel John Versluys have followed suit, proposing that the cult may have been of a private character and (or) associated with a group of altars, rather than with a monumental structure.⁵⁴ No effort will be made here to relate the particulars of the debate that has ensued between, on the one hand, these sceptics, and on the other, the defenders of Lafaye's view. Over the years, its chief champion has been Filippo Coarelli, who has characterized Malaise's rejection of a Capitoline Iseum as an instance of "ipercritica".⁵⁵ However, Coarelli is not alone in resisting such an elimination. Several recent studies of Isis' cult in Rome, such as those by Katja Lembke and Serena Ensoli, conclude that there was indeed an official, monumental sanctuary dedicated to Isis on the Capitolium as early as 100 BC.⁵⁶ Moreover, topographers continue to debate the exact location of such a temple, or its various constituent parts.⁵⁷

21), Leiden 1972, 184–7.

⁵⁴ M. Le Glay, "Sur l'implantation des sanctuaires orientaux à Rome", in *L'Urbs: Espace urbain et histoire (Ier siècle av. J.-C.-IIIe siècle ap. J.-C.)*. Actes du colloque international organisé par le Centre national de la recherche scientifique et l'École française de Rome (Rome, 8–12 mai 1985), Rome 1987, 546 ff. ; P. G. P. Meyboom, *The Nile Mosaic of Palestrina. Early Evidence of Egyptian Religion in Italy*, Leiden 1995, 85; M. J. Versluys, "Isis Capitolina and the Egyptian Cults in Late Republican Rome", in L. Bricault (ed.), *Isis en Occident. Actes du IIème colloque international sur les études isiaques, Lyon III, 16–17 mai 2002*, Lyon 2004, 421–48.

⁵⁵ F. Coarelli, "I monumenti dei culti orientali in Roma. Questioni topografiche e cronologiche", in U. Bianchi – M. J. Vermaseren (a cura di), *La soteriologia dei culti orientali nell'impero romano. Atti del colloquio internazionale su "La soteriologia dei culti orientali nell'impero romano", Roma 24–28 settembre 1979*, Leiden 1982, 59. See also Id., "Isis Capitolina", *LTUR* III (n. 6), Roma 1996, 112–3 and "Isis Capitolina", in F. Coarelli (a cura di), *Divus Vespasianus. Il Bimillenario dei Flavi*, Milano 2009.

⁵⁶ K. Lembke, *Das Iseum Campense in Rom. Studie über den Isiskult unter Domitian*, Heidelberg 1994, 85; S. Ensoli, "I santuari isiaci a Roma e i contesti non culturali: religione pubblica, devozioni private e impiego ideologico del culto", in E. A. Arslan (a cura di), *Iside: il mito, il mistero, la magia*, Milano 1997, 312; Ead., "I santuari di Iside e Serapide a Roma e la resistenza pagana in età tardoantica", in S. Ensoli – E. La Rocca (a cura di), *Aurea Roma. Dalla città pagana alla città cristiana*, Roma 2000, 268. The existence of a temple of Isis is taken for granted also by L. Vidman, "Isis und Sarapis", in M. J. Vermaseren (Hrsg.), *Die orientalischen Religionen im Römerreich*, Leiden 1981, 134. See also Takács, *Isis and Sarapis* (n. 37) 67.

⁵⁷ Arata, "Un sacellum di età imperiale" (n. 38) 129–62 and, above all, Pier Luigi Tucci (see n. 63).

Much of the skepticism and rethinking concerning a Capitoline Iseum has been prompted by a proposed elimination from the hill of the aforementioned obelisk. This obelisk, now in the Villa Celimontana (Via della Navicella) and known as the Obelisco Mattei, is visible in its Capitoline location in some 16th century drawings.⁵⁸ However, it has been questioned as to whether this really was its original Roman location. It has been suggested that the obelisk was originally actually a feature of the *Iseum Campense* and was moved to the Capitolium only in the Middle Ages, either in the 13th century, as a result of a papal commission, or in the middle of the following century during the ascendancy of Cola di Rienzo.⁵⁹ In Versluys' mind this provenance has been convincingly proven,⁶⁰ but Coarelli is clearly right in rejecting the widespread belief that the case is closed. The fragment inserted in one of the buildings surrounding Piazza San Macuto, identified by Iversen as a missing part of the Mattei obelisk, can in fact belong to any of the several obelisks known to have been erected in the area of the Iseum in the Campus Martius.⁶¹ There must indeed be doubts as long as scholars are unable to cite hard evidence for a translocation of the obelisk.⁶²

The scholarly discussion concerning the Capitoline cult of Isis is likely to continue, as there is now new fuel for debate. Pier Luigi Tucci, who has recently made some very important studies analyzing the topographical data pertaining to the hill, boldly identifies existing structures as belonging to an Iseum. A wall found in 1949 close to the lateral entrance to S. Maria in Aracoeli presents certain features, a series of "risalti semicircolari", which according to him correspond closely to specific extant structures in the remains of one of the principal Isiac

⁵⁸ See, in particular, Maarten van Heemskerck's (1498–1574) representation of the ruins of the Forum Romanum against the backdrop of the Capitolium and, for a closer view featuring many details, his representation of the view from the Capitolium towards the Colosseum: Ch. Hülsen – H. Egger, *Die römischen Skizzenbücher von Marten van Heemskerck im königlichen Kupferstichkabinett zu Berlin I. Tafeln*, Berlin 1913, pl. 7 (Fol. 6 r.) and pl. 12 (Fol. 11 r.).

⁵⁹ C. D'Onofrio, *Gli obelischi di Roma*, Roma 1965, 214 f.; K. Noehles, "Die Kunst der Kosmaten und die Idee der *Renovatio Romae*", in G. Fiensch – M. Imdahl (Hrsgg.), *Festschrift Werner Hager*, Recklinghausen 1966, 18 ff.; E. Iversen, *Obelisks in Exile I. The Obelisks of Rome*, Copenhagen 1968, 106–9; A. Roulet, *The Egyptian and Egyptianizing Monuments of Imperial Rome*, Leiden 1972, 9; K. Lembke, *Das Iseum Campense in Rom. Studie über den Isiskult unter Domitian*, Heidelberg 1994, 204–6.

⁶⁰ Versluys (n. 54) 422.

⁶¹ Coarelli, "Isis Capitolina", in *Divus Vespasianus* (n. 38) 222 f.

⁶² J.-C. Grenier, the author of the entry on the obelisc in the standard lexicon on Roman topography, just notes that there are "[d]eux hypothèses sur son emplacement antique", see "Obeliscus Capitolinus", *LTUR* III (n. 6), Roma 1996, 356.



Heemskerck (Hülßen – Egger), Pl. 7 (Fol. 6 r.)

shrines of the Classical World, that is, none other than the temple at Philae in Upper Egypt. According to Tucci the predecessor of the current Aracoeli church has been built right on top of the Iseum, a circumstance which he interprets as a possible instance of conversion of the pagan cult to worship of the Madonna.⁶³ Coarelli, noting that there are many analogous cases of "sovrapposizione" of the cult of Mary on that of Isis, voluntarily embraces Tucci's proposals,⁶⁴ but it remains to be seen what the reactions will be of the scholars who have entertained opposite views.

An alienigena religio practised close to the Arx, and next door to Bellona

For my own agenda in the present paper, it suffices to conclude that there is abundant evidence attesting that the cult of the Egyptian goddess was practiced on the Capitolium and, moreover, that this was done in the immediate vicinity of the *Arx*. Neither this particular location nor its relationship with the *pomerium* has been raised as an issue in the scholarly discussion. Söldner comfortably speaks

⁶³ P. L. Tucci, "L'Arx Capitolina: tra mito e realtà", in L. Haselberger – J. Humphrey (eds.), *Imaging Ancient Rome: Documentation – Visualisation – Imagination. Proceedings of the Third Williams Symposium on Classical Architecture held at the American Academy in Rome, the British School at Rome, and the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Rome, May 20–23 2004* (JRA Suppl. 61), Portsmouth, RI 2006, 66 ff.

⁶⁴ Coarelli, "Isis Capitolina", in *Divus Vespasianus* (n. 38) 223.



Heemskerck (Hülzen – Egger), Pl. 12 (Fol. 11 r.)

of "das innerpomeriale Heiligtum der Isis Capitolina" without noting that there is possibly a problem to be dealt with in this very statement.⁶⁵ That is, if the shrine, whatever it was, really was situated inside the pomerial perimeter. True, the notions originally associated with the *pomerium* were changing by the early imperial period; a temple was dedicated to Mars Ultor in the Forum Augusti in 2 BC. However, if we accept that the cult of Isis Capitolina was established in the early first century BC, then in my opinion we have a real problem to consider.

That there is an obvious problem with regard to the location of an Isiac shrine on the Capitolium, in the period in question has been recognized also by Versluys. However, he sees no problem in the supposed situation within the *pomerium*, duly referring to Adam Ziolkowski and Eric Orlin, both of whom have questioned the prevailing opinion according to which there was "pomerial rule", which did not permit the introduction of foreign cults inside the *pomerium* before the very end of the Republic. One of his reasons for postulating a private cult, rather than "an impressive public sanctuary for a foreign, exotic goddess like Isis", is the conspicuity afforded by the position on the hill.⁶⁶

In my opinion there are cogent reasons to assume that the cult of Isis Capitolina was practised *extra pomerium* in the republican period. First of all, though

⁶⁵ M. Söldner, "Ägyptische Bildmotive im augusteischen Rom. Ein Phänomen im Spannungsfeld von Politik, Religion und Kunst", in H. Felber – S. Pfisterer-Haas (Hrsg.), *Ägypten – Griechen – Römer. Begegnung der Kulturen* (Kanobos 1), Leipzig 1999, 111.

⁶⁶ Versluys (n. 54) 442 f.; A. Ziolkowski, *The Temples of Mid-Republican Rome and their Historical and Topographical Context*, Rome 1992, 266–79; E. Orlin, "Foreign Cults in Republican Rome: Rethinking the Pomerial Rule", *MAAR* 47 (2002) 1–18.

not having gone through all of the evidence, I suspect that observations which seem to contradict the existence of a "pomerial rule" (as it has been called) partly derive from a failure to securely locate Roman temples in relation to the pomerial boundary. For instance, as we have just seen here, many scholars take for granted that Capitolium was inside the *pomerium*.⁶⁷ Secondly, as has also been shown, there is ample evidence attesting that the Romans did distinguish between domestic and, indeed, foreign creeds. I fully agree with Orlin that the very idea of a "foreign cult" in a Roman context can be problematic, as it is not always clear whether such a term should be used only with regard to cults from outside Italy, from outside Latium, or even all cults from outside Rome herself.⁶⁸ However, even if clear-cut and unequivocal criteria can be hard to define, it suffices to observe and recognize that certain cults were regarded as alien by the Romans.⁶⁹ A cult expressly characterized as "foreign", in a Roman source, was the worship of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste. In 241 BC one of the consuls, Q. Lutatius Cerco, was prohibited by the Senate from consulting the lots of Fortuna at Praeneste, because it was deemed appropriate that the State be administered with ancestral auspices, and not foreign ones.⁷⁰ According to tradition, the cult of Fortuna Primigenia was introduced to Rome already in the regal period, by Servius Tullius.⁷¹ Considering her status, attested explicitly several hundred years later, as a foreign deity, it is interesting to note that her temple was, indeed, situated on the Capitolium.⁷²

It is safe to assume that the Isiac cult was considered foreign enough in the early first century BC, before it at some point was received into the Roman mainstream. Yet, still Valerius Maximus, writing under Tiberius about events that took place in the 50s BC, speaks of an *alienigena religio* referring to the Egyptian creed.⁷³ It should also, with regard to the role of the *pomerium*, be remembered that it is *expressis verbis* documented that Octavian banned Egyptian rites within this boundary in 28 BC. Cassius Dio states that he did not allow them to be cel-

⁶⁷ Söldner (n. 65) 111.

⁶⁸ Orlin (n. 66).

⁶⁹ See Fest. 268 L s.v. *peregrina sacra*.

⁷⁰ Val. Max. 1,3,2.

⁷¹ Plut. *fort. Rom.* 10, *quaest. Rom.* 74.

⁷² See also *CIL* XIV 2852 = *ILS* 3696: *tu, quae Tarpeio coleris vicina Tonanti*. For the recent identification of the Capitoline temple of Fortuna Primigenia, see P. Mazzei, "L'area archeologica della Protomotoca in Campidoglio: ricognizione preliminare e lettura della documentazione attuale come premessa al rilievo delle strutture", *BCAR* 108 (2007) 145–93, esp. 167–70.

⁷³ Val. Max. 7,3,8. The passage is provided *in extenso* above n. 39.

ibrated inside the *pomerium*, but that he did make provision for the temples of the Egyptian deities; those which had been built by private individuals he ordered their sons and descendants, if any survived, to repair, and the rest he restored himself.⁷⁴ In my opinion, this piece of evidence clearly suggests that the processions of the Egyptians gods occasionally had strayed into the city, but that all of their temples were situated outside the pomerial perimeter. Otherwise Octavian would simply not have ordered them to be restored; and there is no allusion to any destruction of temples.

I believe that my hypothesis postulating extrapomerial locations for the practice of the Egyptian cults can be further corroborated by the observation that there is documentation of a shrine of the war-deity Bellona (Ἐννεῖόν τι) in the immediate vicinity of the Capitoline worship place of Isis and Sarapis. Cassius Dio reports that this was unintentionally destroyed by the magistrates who took action against the shrine of the Egyptian deities in 48 BC.⁷⁵ I also note the existence of a funerary inscription, where the deceased, L. Cornelius Ianuarius, is styled as a *fanaticus ab Isis Serapis / ab aedem Bellone Rufiliae*.⁷⁶ Whether or not this is actually a reference to the same, rebuilt shrine, is of course impossible to determine, but I do think it constitutes additional evidence attesting that Isis and Sarapis were worshipped at locations which at least originally were situated outside the *pomerium*. No one would, I believe, think of temples of war-deities as being situated anywhere else than outside the pomerial boundary.

Conclusion

It is customary to think of the Capitoline hill as being included within the perimeter of the *pomerium*, the sacred city-boundary. In this paper arguments have been advanced to suggest that such a view is actually untenable, and that a significant part of the hill was augurally associated with the Campus Martius, grounds which were consecrated to the god Mars.

⁷⁴ Dio 53,2,4: καὶ τὰ μὲν ἱερὰ τὰ Αἰγύπτια οὐκ ἐσεδέξατο εἶσω τοῦ πομηρίου, τῶν δὲ δὴ ναῶν πρόνοιαν ἐποιήσατο, τοὺς μὲν γὰρ ὑπ' ἰδιωτῶν τινῶν γεγενημένους τοῖς τε παισὶν αὐτῶν καὶ τοῖς ἐγγόνοις, εἴγε τινὲς περιήσαν, ἐπισκευάσαι ἐκέλευσε, τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς αὐτὸς ἀνεκτίησατο. See, à propos this measure, E. M. Orlin, "Octavian and Egyptian Cults. Redrawing the Boundaries of Romanness", *AJPh* 129 (2008) 231–53.

⁷⁵ Dio 42,26,2.

⁷⁶ *CIL* VI 2234 = *ILS* 4181a.

The military functions of the *Arx*, the citadel of the city, constitute alone a strong reason for postulating an extra-pomerial location for that particular area. That this area extended well beyond the fortifications of this citadel, and that it was large enough to contain big crowds is suggested by the documentation of popular assemblies convening there. That these were held *extra pomerium* is suggested by the fact that they had been summoned to deal with extra-pomerial matters. To these two arguments, which I have presented also in earlier studies, were added considerations about the implications of the presence of the cult of Isis on the Capitolium. This exotic foreign cult, expressly characterized as *alienigena*, must have been practiced outside the sacred city-boundary. That all the Roman temples of Isis, still in the 20s BC, were situated outside the *pomerium* is clear from an important piece of evidence pertaining to Octavian's religious policy; if the cult of Isis Capitolina was associated with a temple, which must be deemed very probable, it simply had to be on the outside. An extrapomerial location is also evident from its attested close vicinity to the shrine of the goddess Bellona, who was a war-deity. Finally, it was suggested that also the Capitoline temple dedicated to Fortuna Primigenia indicates that parts of the hill were not included within the perimeter of the sacred city-boundary; though having been brought to Rome already in the regal period, the cult of the Praenestine goddess was regarded as foreign still at the end of the Second Punic War.

Åbo Akademi University