Five Republican monuments. On the supposed building program of *M. Fulvius Flaccus*

Daniel P. Diffendale

It has recently been argued that a group of five monuments at S. Omobono were part of a single building program, attributed to the Roman consul M. Fulvius Flaccus in 264 BCE, a program that also included a monument at Orvieto, loc. Campo della Fiera. The monuments in question include two altars, a circular ‘*donarium*’ and fragments of two bases carrying inscriptions of a *M. Folvios*, all at S. Omobono, and a trachyte *donarium* or altar at Campo della Fiera. Evaluating this suggestion provides an opportunity to re-examine the monuments at S. Omobono individually and on their own terms, before being brought into comparison with the Campo della Fiera monument. The evidence does not support the hypothesis of a single building program for the five Roman monuments as a group nor for the inclusion of the Orvietan monument in such a group.

**Material bases**

The primary material of the five monuments at S. Omobono is usually identified as ‘peperino’. However, as is becoming more widely appreciated in the Roman archaeological community, this term can refer to several geologically-distinct types of stone, and these cannot be securely distinguished by visual inspection alone. ‘Peperino’ is used by modern Romans to refer to well-cemented, lithic-crystal structured tuffs with dark gray lava inclusions, which originate from Tusculum (*tufo di Tuscolo*), Gabii (*lapis gabinus*), Albano (*lapis albanus*) and almost certainly from other locations. The first two are also both commonly called *sperone* without distinction.

Chemical analysis has identified the primary material of the five S. Omobono monuments as *Lapis albanus*. I employ the term ‘peperino’ only for other peperino-presenting stones that have not been subject to chemical analysis. In the case of the two altars and the circular monument, *Lapis albanus* is used for the decorated exterior elements, while the interiors are built up in other tufos. The altars incorporate blocks of *tufo lionato* (*tufo di Aniene and/or Monteverde*), while the molded elements of the circular monument rest on a core built of blocks of gray granular tufo. It is uncertain whether the monument of which the Folvios inscriptions were originally a part incorporated any varieties of tufo other than *Lapis albanus*.

---

1 Frascarelli 2012. I would like to thank H. Becker, M. D’Acri, J. Farr, F. Marra, M. Samori and N. Terrenato for their contributions to the preparation of the present work, and also P. Brocato for the initial impetus to re-examine the S. Omobono monuments.
4 These materials are currently under study by J. Farr and F. Marra.
Fig. 1. Plan of site indicating U-shaped altars, circular monument and tufo lionato pavements (Author).
The pavement(s) with which the monuments are associated are composed of blocks identified as *tufo di Aniene* and/or *tufo di Monteverde*; these are both types of lithoid tufo and, geologically-speaking, both types of *tufo lionato*. Underlying the *tufo lionato* pavement(s) are blocks of ‘cappellaccio’, or gray granular tufo, which is called by geologists *‘tufo del Palatino’* – rather unfortunately for archaeological purposes, as it is found, and was quarried by the Romans, in deposits beyond the Palatine Hill. Furthermore, *tufo del Palatino* exists in a variety of facies, some of which possess rather different resistance to weathering, and which it is useful to distinguish archaeologically. I use the initialism GGT (‘gray granular tufo’) for visually-identified blocks, and retain ‘cappellaccio’ – albeit in inverted commas – only for citations of earlier publications.

The five monuments at S. Omobono, then, cannot safely be related on the basis of material. The evidence for a common *terminus ante quem* is also less than certain. That the circular monument and the *Folvios* inscriptions were dismantled and covered by fill for the laying of a pavement in thin blocks of *tufo lionato* (chemically identified as *tufo di Aniene*) is proven by the excavations of 1961-62. What cannot be proven, however, is whether the trimming of the altars occurred at the same point in time, since both altars were exposed during the clearing of the site in 1936-37, and there is no trace of the thin *tufo lionato* pavement above them. Tool marks from a trimming operation are visible on the top of each altar’s base molding blocks, but this process cannot be dated with confidence.

After her excavations of 1961-62, Mercando dated the dismantling of all five monuments and the laying of the thin *tufo lionato* pavement to reconstructions after the fire of 213 BCE attested by Livy. In fact, Mercando dated this to the early part of the 2nd century BCE: “[…] ammettendo che la ricostruzione non possa essere stata fatta in un solo anno e che il pavimento antistante possa essere posteriore.” A date after 213 was supported by Sommella’s interpretation of two large foundations in *tufo giallo* found north of the five monuments, though he questioned Mercando’s allowance of a decade or more for the reconstruction. It seems likely, at least, that the new pavement was contemporary with or very shortly later than the reconstruction of Temple A in *tufo rosso a scorie nere* (or ‘di Fidene’), given the regular occurrence of a stratum of working chips of that material in the fill beneath the pavement; *tufo di Fidene* is not known to have been used for other monuments in the immediate vicinity. The temple of Mater Matuta – whichever it was – seems in any case to have been open for business by 174 BCE, when the triumphator Ti. Sempronius Gracchus dedicated a *tabula* in the form of Sardinia in it. The three monuments that remain *in situ* all rest at the same elevation on the Republican Podium, and it is probable that the two inscribed *Folvios* monuments were also originally installed on a surface at this elevation.

---

5 Jackson-Marra 2006, p. 420. The results of chemical analysis of blocks from these pavements are currently under study by the author, F. Marra, and J. Farr.

6 Found on the Palatine, on the Capitoline, near the Vatican and north of the city and in antiquity quarried in at least the first two places: Jackson-Marra 2006, p. 420.

7 Mercando 1966.

8 This trimming operation noted by Castagnoli 1962, p. 149.

9 Liv. XXIV, 47, 15; XXV, 7.


11 Sommella 1968, p. 70. The date of these so-called stylobates is under reconsideration: Brocato 2012b, pp. 46-47.

12 Liv. XLI, 28, 8-9. The question of which deity inhabited which temple has not been conclusively resolved.
The twin altars

The two altars were the earliest of the five monuments to be discovered, during the initial *sven-tramento* of 1937\(^{13}\). The western altar was found bisected, possibly by the cutting for the sewer of the medieval Via Buccimazza (fig. 2)\(^{14}\).

The missing central portion was filled in with concrete at some point soon after its excavation\(^{15}\); the concrete reconstruction has itself been restored at least once since then\(^{16}\), and conservation work on both altars has recently been carried out\(^{17}\). The eastern altar was found with the southern two-thirds of its structure missing, evidently removed to make way for the room of a post-Antique structure\(^{18}\). As already noted, both altars were found with the upper surface of their base-molding blocks hacked down and their crown moldings removed\(^{19}\).

\(^{13}\) *Colini* 1938, p. 280: “[...] sono collocate in posizione ugualmente simmetrica due grandi are di peperino di una forma che ricorda strettamente il basamento del *Lapis niger* e con pozzi sacri accanto”. See *Terrenato et alii* 2012 for the general circumstances of the site’s discovery and clearance.

\(^{14}\) M. Ceci, Sovrintendenza Capitolina, personal communication, June 2014.

\(^{15}\) The reconstructed portion is visible already in *Colini* 1938, tav. L.

\(^{16}\) Perhaps in 1968, as a tarp can be seen covering the concrete in an archival photograph from that year.

\(^{17}\) *Terrenato et alii* 2012.

\(^{18}\) Other rooms of this structure are visible in photographs taken prior to the demolition of 1936: ASRCM, S. Omobono, b. 65, 1, cc. 16003, 16005 and 16006. The altar itself can be seen in photographs taken during the subsequent demolition and excavation: ASRCM, S. Omobono, b. 65, 1, cc. 16037, 16052, 16440, 16442 and 16443.

\(^{19}\) That the altars originally had crown moldings, now missing, is asserted on the basis of comparanda at Lavinium, for instance, and now at Fosso dell’Incastro. *Roncalli* 1994, p. 106, hypothesizes that some altars assumed to be missing their crown moldings are, in fact, missing nothing. No trace of any crown molding blocks has been recovered at S. Omobono, but such an absence of evidence can hardly be taken as evidence of absence, especially given that any hypothetical crown moldings must have been removed for the laying of the travertine pavement, if not before.

Fig. 2. Western altar bisected, with pickmarks visible on top surface, during clearance of the site in the 1930s (Archivio Storico Disegni Montemartini, doc. 58197).
Altar nomenclature is not standardized. The type of altar to which the S. Omobono examples belong, which consists of a rectangular central element plus two perpendicular wings or antae (sometimes described in toto as three antae), has taken its name either from the footprint of the monument (‘U-’, ‘C-’, or ‘Π’-shaped’) or from the fact of its having antae (winged, in antis, ad antas). I use ‘U-shaped altar’ as the simplest alternative, and there is moreover no ancient precedent for applying the Latin descriptors to altars. Moving from plan to elevation, I use an Anglicized terminology of altar parts following those illustrated by Cozza 1975, p. 94, fig. 93 (reproduced here, with modifications, as fig. 3).20

Contrary to numerous statements and oft-reprinted plans, the altars are not precisely symmetrically-located on the Republican podium (hereafter ‘RP’).21 The line of the northern edge of the plinth of the eastern altar lies 0.56 m north of the equivalent on the western altar (fig. 1). Nor should we put too much weight on repeated claims of perfect symmetry within the RP as a whole;22 although a general symmetry is evident, judging from the plan of the later church and the preserved parts of its travertine phase, we know very little about the earlier phases of Temple B. The interior western face of the western altar (between the wings) is aligned with the central axis

---

20 Hence I reserve the term ‘platea’ for the raised stone platform immediately surrounding the altar on its plinth, and refer to the large platform of the entire area sacra, which has sometimes been called a ‘platea’, as the Republican podium, or RP.

21 Symmetrical: Colini 1938, p. 279; Coarelli 1973, p. 102, fig. 9; Sommella Mura 1981a, fig. s.n. on p. 115; Pisani Sartorio-Virgili-Ioppolo 1989, p. 14, fig. 1 (reproduced as Pisani Sartorio 1995, fig. 111); Coarelli 1992, p. 235, fig. 48. Not symmetrical: Colini 1940, p. 75, fig. 1; Sommella 1968, p. 64, fig. 2 (reproduced as Coarelli 1992, p. 212, fig. 35).

22 E.g., Ioppolo 1966, p. 90: “la rigida simmetria dei due templi”.

---

Fig. 3. Altar terminology (Cozza 1975, p. 94, fig. 93, with additions).
of Temple A. If we assume that Temples A and B had symmetrical footprints within the RP, then the interior western face of the eastern altar was also aligned with the center line of Temple B. The western edge of the plinth of the western altar aligns with a stub of gray granular tufo blocks on the interior of the south wall of Temple A23.

The western altar is sufficiently well-preserved to allow the taking of measurements, though the general difficulty of working volcanic stone and the vicissitudes evidently undergone by the monument caution against over-precision. The E-W length of the S wing is ca. 2.14 m; the N-S width of the same is ca. 1.18 m. The E-W width of the plinth is ca. 3.20 m. The distance between the wings is ca. 1.73 m. The E-W width of the central block of the base molding is ca. 1.69 m. The E-W width of the plinth block between the wings is ca. 0.45 m. The E-W width of the plinth block to the W is ca. 0.53-0.54 m. Most of the blocks of the eastern altar are missing, but two dimensions that do survive (E-W width of plinth, ca. 3.21 m; E-W width of wing, ca. 2.13 m) indicate that it shared the dimensions of the western altar (fig. 4)24. This is also suggested by the quasi-identical molding profiles of the two monuments25.

Thanks to the work of the post-antique house-builders, we can observe the eastern altar in section (fig. 5), which suggests that it was constructed integrally with the surrounding pavement in blocks of tufo lionato. Framed by the Lapis albanus blocks of the altar’s plinth are three blocks of tufo lionato (identified by Ioppolo as *tufo di Aniene*) that support the altar’s base molding; beneath both these ‘Aniene’ blocks and the blocks of the plinth is a course of five blocks of tufo lionato whose height is less than that of the pavement blocks to the west.

23 The ‘cappellaccio’ blocks are USM 905: Brocato 2012b, p. 44.
24 Contrary to suggestions that its S end was aligned with the S end of the western altar, resulting in a longer altar, such as found in the plan by G. Pisani Sartorio in Vergili 1977, p. 23, fig. 4 – which plan is presumably the basis for the long altar seen in Claridge 2010, p. 251, fig. 117. Shared dimensions are also supported by the preserved length of the altars’ platea blocks, for which, see below.
The usual formal comparanda for the U-shaped altars at S. Omobono are the eponymous monuments of the Sanctuary of the Thirteen Altars (or ‘Madonnella’) at Lavinium, in particular Altar XII, dated to the mid-4th century BCE (fig. 7), and the similar Altar XI. An even closer comparandum in plan, design and profile is the U-shaped altar at Ardea, loc. Fosso dell’Incastro (fig. 7, ‘F. dell’Incastro 1’), which measures ca. 4.20 x 2.28 m, exclusive of platea – dimensions very close to those of the western altar at S. Omobono.

The thirteen altars at Lavinium display two different construction techniques (fig. 8, a and b). In the first, termed ‘a cassa’ or ‘a scatola’ (box-type), the altar’s base molding is composed of worked blocks surrounding a rubble core; the blocks join via anathyrosis. This is the older of the two methods, employed from the mid-6th to the end of the 4th c. BCE. In the second technique, ‘a piattaforma’ (platform-type), the altar’s base molding is composed of narrow blocks laid side to side, worked to join without anathyrosis. This technique was evidently made possible by the use of a harder tufo, quarryable in longer blocks, though less able to take fine details.

The S. Omobono altars do not quite fit either of the systems identified at Lavinium. Like the platform-type, each of the wings is monolithic, but, like the box-type, these join the blocks of the center via anathyrosis, while the center is composed of two worked blocks that leave a core filled with rubble. The original design of the S. Omobono altars can be more clearly seen in the winged altar at Fosso dell’Incastro, which preserves its entire base molding (fig. 8, c). By comparison, the technique of the U-shaped altar in the Lapis niger complex is closer to the Lavinium box-type, though here the wings are built as boxes, while the center is not.

27 Unfortunately, the excavations at Fosso dell’Incastro did not produce any chronologically-relevant material to date the altars. Di Mario dates them generally in the 4th to 3rd centuries BCE on the basis of their material (‘peperino’) and the comparison with both Altar XII at Lavinium (mid-4th century BCE) and the U-shaped altars at S. Omobono, which he follows Pisani Sartorio in attributing to a Camillan phase following the sack of Veii in 396 BCE: Di Mario 2007, pp. 82-85. A 4th-century date is accepted by Torelli 2011c, p. 202.
30 Coarelli 1977, p. 199, fig. 6 and p. 226, assigns this to his fourth phase of the Comitium, ca. 338 BCE. See Shoe 1965, p. 104 and pl. L, 2, for the profile, which she judges closer to the later altars at Lavinium.
Setting lines on the eastern altar

Only one base-molding block of the eastern altar survives. This is broken, particularly at its western end, such that it does not preserve its original dimensions. A combination of setting and weathering lines allow these to be ascertained, however. At least five incised setting lines guided the Roman altar builders; four are visible today (fig. 4), with a fifth visible in a photograph from 1970 (fig. 9). The clearest such incision is found just south of the southeast corner of the base molding block, running E-W (fig. 10). Its preserved length is 0.15 m, with a maximum width of ca. 0.003 m; at its east end it extends slightly beyond the easternmost extent of the base-molding block, while its west end runs into a crack that makes it impossible to say whether it originally extended to the edge of the block. The setting line is deeply cut west of the point where the torus of the base molding meets the platform, and more lightly cut east of that point.

Two less deeply-cut incisions mark the original location of the southwest corner of the base-molding block. The more southerly of these is today partially obscured by a crack in the stone. An even less-deeply cut incision can be found west of the surviving northwest corner of the block. This is connected to the incision at the southwest by a weathering line that attests the original western extent of the block. An E-W weathering line bears witness to the original northern extent of the block, and runs toward a formerly-visible setting line at the northeast corner of the block (fig. 4).
No traces of setting lines demarcating the eastern extent of the block are visible, nor can they be discerned in the remains of the western altar, perhaps owing to the facts that it is more complete, its core has been reconstructed in concrete, and it is more encumbered by later constructions.

At Lavinium, setting lines appear to be present on the platea blocks of Altars V and VI (and maybe IV)\(^3\), and are present there on the tops of base-molding blocks for the positioning of the crown blocks, for instance on Altars IV (mid-5\(^{\text{th}}\) century BCE)\(^3\), VI and VII (between the mid-5\(^{\text{th}}\) and late 4\(^{\text{th}}\) century)\(^3\). Setting lines were cut into the blocks of earlier altars that were built over, in order to align the base-molding blocks of their replacements, e.g., Altars I and II, rebuilt between the late 4\(^{\text{th}}\) and mid-3\(^{\text{rd}}\) c. BCE\(^3\). The first altar of Temple A at Largo Argentina shows traces of possibly continuous incised setting lines along the N, W and S faces of its base molding\(^3\). Setting lines are also present on a rectangular trachyte monument at Orvieto, Campo della Fiera. These are continuous edge markings, rather than the short corner markings found at S. Omobono.

\(^3\) ‘Appear’, because they are not described in the text, but seem to be represented on Ioppolo’s plan: *Lavinium II*, tav. VII.

\(^3\) Cozza 1975, p. 107.

\(^3\) Cozza 1975, pp. 107, 114, 114, n. 1, tav. VII.

\(^3\) Cozza 1975, pp. 97, 114; Giuliani 1981, pp. 172, 175. Fenelli 1990, p. 489, would raise the end of the sanctuary’s primary use to the 1st half of the 3rd c. BCE. Without autopsy, I cannot rule out the presence of setting lines in the mid-6th century Altars VIII, IX and XIII, nor can I comment on how the attested setting lines compare to those at S. Omobono; they are described simply as ‘linee incise o graffite’: Cozza 1975, p. 90.

\(^3\) The weathering of the pavement blocks (and their absence at the altar’s E end) makes it impossible to say with certainty whether all four sides were delimited with continuous lines; an incised line can be traced for ca. 50 cm along the N edge. I thank M. Ceci, S. Zink and J. Pflug for the opportunity to inspect this altar.
The plateas of the two altars

Immediately to the west of each altar are three rows of pavement slabs in tufo lionato oriented lengthwise N-S. The eastern slabs of these pavements abut their respective altars. These slabs measure 1.24-1.77 m L x 0.75-0.78 m W x 0.10-0.15 m H. These display anathyrosis and rest on a sediment ca. 0.10-0.15 m deep; this sediment in turn rests on the underlying course of GGT. These characteristics contrast with the pavement blocks that abut the altars and their plateas; this surrounding pavement is composed of blocks measuring ca. 0.80-0.85 m L x 0.60-0.65 m W x 0.26-0.31 m H, which have a differently-fashioned anathyrosis, and which bed directly on the underlying GGT (fig. 11).

Lavinium again offers comparanda. Each of the thirteen U-shaped altars there rests on a tufo lionato paved platform – termed platea by Cozza – either individually or as a group, and each altar’s platea extends westward, creating a platform behind the wings (fig. 12). Such a feature could accommodate the sacrificial animal prior to the act as well as serve as a platform for its dismemberment. The thirteen altars were not built in a day, but constructed and reconstructed over the course of two to three centuries. Each was built on a foundation in blocks of ‘cappellaccio’,

---

36 Menichelli 2009, p. 30, considers the U-shaped altar to be the type “prediletto per i sacrifici cruenti”, and suggests that the votive pits adjoining the S. Omobono altars further indicate their role in blood sacrifice. We could compare Pausanias’ admittedly much later (and foreign) description of the ash altar of Zeus at Olympia, which had a lower part (prothysis) for killing the victims and an upper for burning their thighbones: Paus. V, 13, 9. The term ‘prothysis’ is in fact used by Castagnoli 1962 to refer to what I, following Cozza 1975, call a ‘platea’.
and each rested on a small tufo lionato platea, either singly or shared with others\textsuperscript{37}. What began as three separate, freestanding altars in the mid-6\textsuperscript{th} century BCE became four freestanding altars plus four agglomerated altars in the mid-5\textsuperscript{th} century. By the mid-4\textsuperscript{th} century, they were being built on shared plateas, so that by the end of that century twelve altars presented a more or less unified paved platform that had been built piecemeal over hundreds of years\textsuperscript{38}.

\textsuperscript{37} Cozza 1975.
\textsuperscript{38} Cozza 1975; Giuliani 1981, pp. 172, 175.
We can also compare the mid-Republican altars in the sanctuary at Ardea, loc. Fosso dell’Incastro. Although these have not yet received a full publication, the plans and photographs available show each altar surrounded by a small plinth, distinct and slightly raised, but incorporated into the pavement of the wider sanctuary area\(^\text{39}\). This wider pavement is of slabs of tufo on a foundation course of tufo blocks\(^\text{40}\).

**The votive pits**

At this point we need to examine the votive pits flanking the altars and the asymmetric positioning of the altars on the RP (fig. 1). While the head structure of the eastern pit is aligned with the altar and the RP as a whole, the pit itself, rectangular in section, is aligned obliquely, sharing the orientation of the Archaic temple and altar\(^\text{41}\). The head of the western pit is also aligned to the overall podium like its adjoining altar, but the pit itself is circular in plan and hence has no alignment. As illustrated by Ioppolo, the eastern pit communicates with the platform of the Archaic altar\(^\text{42}\), suggesting some kind of continuity of cult\(^\text{43}\). The common alignment of and communication between the eastern pit and the Archaic altar would hardly be possible if the former had not begun to be constructed while the latter was still visible.

The altars have generally been dated in tandem with the surrounding pavement of tufo lionato blocks. Prevailing opinions assign this either to M. Furius Camillus in 395 BCE\(^\text{44}\) or to M. Fulvius Flaccus in 264 BCE\(^\text{45}\). If the altars are considered as of a unit with their adjacent votive pits, however, this would suggest that they date to the initial construction of the RP, in the early 5th century BCE\(^\text{46}\); the differences just described between the altar plateaus and the surrounding tufo lionato pavement suggest that these latter are not contemporary. The alignment of the eastern pit and its north offset (along with the adjacent altar) relative to the western pit strongly suggest that it was constructed simultaneously with the construction of the RP; it seems difficult to account for these characteristics otherwise. Further examination is required to determine whether the pit preserves evidence of more than one phase – that is, whether there are indications that it originally came to a head at the level of the GGT blocks, which would suggest that the latter was an independent pavement, or whether the pit is completely integrated with the tufo lionato pavement, which would indicate that the GGT was only ever intended as a substructure.

Even if the two U-shaped altars are not contemporary with the raising of the RP, we must expect them to have had predecessors that were. The altar was the fundamental element of central Italian sacred space; altars may occur without temples, but not the reverse\(^\text{47}\). Under the platea blocks of the eastern altar, there is a Lapis albanus block of unknown purpose emerging from a gap in the course of GGT (fig. 13), which \textit{could} represent an earlier phase – compare the rebuilt Lavinium Altars I and II –; more work is required.

\(^{39}\) Di Mario 2007, p. 60, fig. 27; pp. 82-83, figg. 38-39; also Torelli 2011c, p. 198, fig. 8; pp. 204-205, figg. 20-22 and Di Mario 2012, pp. 469-471, figg. 2, 4-5.

\(^{40}\) Di Mario 2007, p. 84, fig. 40, tav. XXX, a.

\(^{41}\) Pisani Sartorio 1977, p. 60, n. 17.


\(^{43}\) Coarelli 1992, p. 217, n. 38, seems to admit as much: “In realtà, alla base di tutto è anche la difficoltà soggettiva ad ammettere una (sia pure parziale e limitata) interruzione del culto”.

\(^{44}\) E.g. Pisani Sartorio 1995, p. 283.

\(^{45}\) Coarelli 1992, p. 214, followed by, e.g. Claridge 2010, p. 252.

\(^{46}\) Regoli 2012d, p. 93.

\(^{47}\) Looking in the other direction chronologically, what the sanctuary had for altars after the fire of 213 with its subsequent repaving, and again after the pavement in travertine, is a frustrating question for lack of evidence.
The circular monument (‘donarium’)  

The circular monument at S. Omobono, commonly called a donarium or donario, was excavated by Mercando in the summer of 1961\footnote{Mercando 1966. The excavations that began to expose the monument were carried out 9-15 June, 1961: ASRCM, S. Omobono, b. 29, 6, cc. 3480.5a, b; 3480.6a. See also Cangemi 2012a; 2012b. The monument was cleaned and re-examined by the present author and M. Samori in July 2014.} and carefully described and drawn by Ioppolo\footnote{Ioppolo 1966.} (fig. 14). Around a core of gray granular tufo, the monument is faced with both base and crown moldings, each originally composed of seven blocks of lapis albanus; curiously, the monument was found with the southeastern block of each molding missing, leaving only six blocks per course. Mercando had difficulty finding to find useful comparanda for the monument, which remains something of an unicum. While circular stone bases for the mounting of dedicated statues are common enough\footnote{E.g. Comella 2005. The older (late 6th century BCE) and smaller (0.70 m diam.) Chiusine circular single-piece travertine base in Perugia has proportions and design reminiscent of the S. Omobono monument, mutatis mutandis (Perugia, Museo Nazionale, n. inv. 264 (634); Jannot 1984, pp. 151-153, 221, n. D, I, 14, figs. 519-524).}, the large, multi-piece circular design and decorative scheme are particularly curious.

The core of the circular monument is composed of eight blocks of gray granular tufo (fig. 15). Judging from Ioppolo’s plans, the six blocks of the lower course measure 0.69-0.81 m L x 0.44-0.59 m W x 0.27-0.30 m H. The two blocks of the upper course measure 0.88-0.90 m L x 0.48 m W x 0.12 m H. These dimensions are squarely within the range of other GGT blocks on site. The presence of these blocks in the core of the monument might suggest that its construction coincided with some repaving work, such that blocks of GGT from the underlying foundation or pavement were available for reuse. The use of GGT is not unusual in multi-element molded monuments of the era, however, and, contrary to old orthodoxy, this tufo was used in public building contexts at least as late as the 1st century BCE\footnote{Bernard 2012, p. 9; Giuliani 1996, p. 166.}.

The S. Omobono monument’s construction is similar to that of the circular monument, possibly a puteal, of the Lacus Curtius complex in its second phase (early 1st c. BCE). The latter has a core in rectangular blocks of cappellaccio, a perimeter molding (perhaps in travertine, though this does not survive) supported by blocks of peperino, pryholes for positioning the facing blocks, all resting on an earlier pavement in tufo lionato (though the associated pavement of Phase II was travertine). The earlier lionato pavement (Phase I, early 2nd c. BCE) bears a circular cutting that

\begin{figure}[h]  
\centering  
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig13.png}  
\caption{Fig. 13. Block of unknown purpose below tufo lionato slabs of platea of the eastern altar (ASRCM, 1970, MSA 233).}  
\end{figure}  

\begin{figure}[h]  
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\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig14.png}  
\caption{Fig. 14. Circular monument or ‘donarium’ (Author).}  
\end{figure}
probably attests an earlier circular monument positioned slightly west of the Phase II monument.\(^{52}\)

Parts of the underside of two blocks in the upper course of the S. Omobono circular monument have been cut away, leaving a hollow space beneath.\(^{53}\) Ioppolo reasonably interpreted this space as a *thesauros*, since the GGT blocks below show traces of bronze (for some sort of fitting?), and an illegible bronze coin was found in the interstices of the underlying blocks.\(^{54}\) This hollow lies in the southern side of the monument, perhaps facing visitors if they approached the temples from the south. Curiously, however, there is no aperture for the addition of coins *vel sim.* as one would expect for a *thesauros*; perhaps the hollow was intended to house a permanent votive cache.

The molding and details of the circular monument are also difficult to place.\(^{55}\) Mercando adduced a group of South Italian and Sicilian Italic-Ionic capitals for the form of the *kymation*;\(^{56}\) to these we can add a group of seven limestone capitals from Trevi di Lazio, which offer a both geographically- and formally-closer comparison for the archaistic style of the ovoli, and which should date to the (early?) 3rd century BCE.\(^{57}\) They could even belong to a monument connected with

\(^{52}\) *Giuliani* 1996, pp. 166-167; *Giuliani-Verduchi* 1987, pp. 105-115 (pryholes visible in fig. 142). Giuliani dates Phase I to 184 BCE, Phase II to Aurelius Cotta (78-74 BCE), and Phase III to Augustus.


\(^{54}\) *Ioppolo* 1966, pp. 78-79. One could also term this space a *donarium* in the Servian sense (*Aen.*, II, 269): "donaria, loca in templis in quibus dona ponuntur".

\(^{55}\) *Torelli* 1968, p. 74, compares the form of the circular monument to bases for supporting figures at the tops of bronze candelabra.

\(^{56}\) *Mercando* 1966, p. 50. G. Maetzke, in *Colonna* 1985, p. 45, adduces the S. Omobono circular monument and the sarcophagus of *Larthia Seicanti* as comparanda for the *kymation* of the sandstone *donarium* at Fiesole. The resemblance of the ovoli of both of these monuments to those at Fiesole is, however, slight.

\(^{57}\) *Batino* 2006, p. 85, n. 108; pp. 152, 186-188 and tav. XII, 108: "ovoli del *kyma* ionico, che nella porzione inferiore piegano quasi ad angolo retto".
M. Fulvius Flaccus. Batino, following Coarelli, ascribes the Trevi capitals to a hypothetical shrine connected with the construction of the *Aqua Anio Vetus* after 272 BCE\(^{58}\); Flaccus was one of the *duumviri aquae perducendae* for the completion of the aqueduct, and his colleague died soon after taking office, leaving the *gloria* to Flaccus\(^{59}\). This may be no more than a neat coincidence, and we should resist the temptation to identify a 'Flaccan' style of Ionic *kymation*, especially since there is no definitive evidence to connect the circular monument with Flaccus.

We might also consider the possibility of very local referents for the archaistic style of the *kymation*, since there are a number of Archaic terracotta fragments with Ionic *kymatia* known from the earlier phases of the site\(^{60}\); even these, however, do not display the extreme flattening of the ovuli seen on the circular monument.

Torelli has compared the form of the S. Omobono monument to circular bases with ovuli on Etruscan bronze candelabra. Related forms are found on the rims of certain shapes in *ceramica argentata* and especially on the pedestal bases that sometimes accompany such shapes\(^{61}\), which reproduce vessels in bronze or precious metals. The Ionic *kymation* was evidently easily adapted to circular forms, appearing also, for instance, on the feet of certain Praenestine *cistae*.

### Surfaces, setting lines and pryholes

The circular monument was cut into the pavement on which it rests, in a manner wholly unlike the altars\(^{62}\). As we have seen, the eastern altar has a core and foundation of tufo lionato blocks that rest on the gray granular tufo course below, and the blocks of the surrounding pavement abut it neatly. The circular monument, on the other hand, gives every appearance of having been an addition to the underlying pavement. This pavement slopes very gently down from north to south; in order to provide a horizontal resting surface, the builders of the circular monument chiseled (or hammered) a shallow level circle into the tufo lionato pavement blocks and dressed it carefully (fig. 16)\(^{63}\). The carefully-worked blocks of the monument contrast with the rough appearance of the surrounding pavement, and there is a gap of as much as 0.025 m between the edge of the monument and the undressed pavement surface (fig. 17). This gap occurs primarily along the northern circumference of the monument, and suggests that it was laid out and built from south to north.

Ioppolo cautiously remarked that “Non si è ancora potuto accertare se il monumento poggiasse su di una fondazione o se sfruttasse a questo fine, la già robusta platea di tufo di Monteverde [...]. Di conseguenza rimane aperta la possibilità che il monumento in questione non sia costruttivamente legato con la platea”\(^{64}\). Given the way that the monument is bedded on the pavement and the position of the GGT blocks of the core, it is highly unlikely, in fact, that it was constructed integrally with the pavement. This is suggested also by the comparison with the Lacus Curtius monument.

---

\(^{58}\) *Batino* 2006, pp. 186-188. S. Quilici Gigli assigns them instead to an important (but unknown) public building of the 3\(^{rd}\) century – or 2\(^{nd}\) century at the latest – BCE: *Quilici Gigli* 1987, p. 141.

\(^{59}\) *Frontin., Aq.*, I, 6.

\(^{60}\) E.g. *Arata* 1990, pp. 121-122, n. 5.1.12. The terracotta capital is at least reminiscent of the form of the circular monument: *Arata* 1990, p. 128, n. 5.1.37.

\(^{61}\) *Gerhard* 1845, p. 239; *Frascarelli* 2012, p. 139; p. 158, fig. 32. It does not matter to the present discussion whether the seated figures are identified as the Tinas Cliniar/Dioscuri, Orestes and Pylades, or some other dynamic duo.

\(^{62}\) *Contra Coarelli* 1979, p. 123, who says that “questa base circolare è inserita nel pavimento [...] certamente c’è un incastro talmente preciso tra pavimento e base circolare che i due sembrano contemporanei”. This was immediately rebutted by *Virgili* 1979, p. 124: “Il donario circolare ’appoggia’ la sua struttura sopra al pavimento a blocchi”.

\(^{63}\) Ioppolo 1966, p. 73 and tav. I, sezione A-B. At Lavinium, the sloping platea south of Altar II *superiore* was cut down to provide a level resting surface for the (now-missing) Altar III (*Cozza* 1975, pp. 103-104).

\(^{64}\) *Ioppolo* 1966, p. 73.
Ioppolo noted incisions on the top surface of the in situ lapis albanus blocks of the S. Omobono monument’s lower course⁶⁵ (fig. 18). These incisions run perpendicular from the outer circumference of the monument toward its center; they are evidently setting lines for the alignment of the blocks of the upper course. Flanking these setting lines are pairs of small pryholes for fitting the blocks into place. Ioppolo confirmed the former’s utility as setting lines by using them to reconstruct the upper course of the monument from the pieces that had been found dismantled immediately adjacent to the lower course. Ioppolo seems to have placed the circular central block by aligning a vertical incision on its outer diameter with the E edge of block I, as well as by noting areas where the anathyrosis had been touched up to follow the actual radius of the adjoining block⁶⁶.

In addition to the setting lines for the second course, there are setting lines incised into the underlying pavement of tufo lionato blocks for the placement of the circular monument’s first course, as well as pryholes for shifting these blocks into place, neither described by Ioppolo. These features are today clearly visible only in the southeastern portion of the monument in the void left by the missing block. A clear, well-incised line runs along the smooth contact surfaces of the anathyrosed southern end of the eastern block of the lower course (fig. 19). Also in evidence in this location are pryholes for shifting the block lengthwise (i.e., circumference-wise) and, apparently, for shifting the block and its now missing neighbor widthwise (i.e., radius-wise)⁶⁷. A similar setting line can be seen marking the eastern end of the southern block of the lower course, along with length- and widthwise pryholes (fig. 20). Since similar widthwise pryholes are visible in the tufo lionato pavement around the monument’s circumference, and given the radial setting lines for each of the second-course blocks, similar radial setting lines and pryholes may lie hidden beneath the monument’s surviving blocks.

The degree of precision evident in a monument constructed in the difficult medium of volcanic stone, and the care taken to align its constituent elements, prompt the question of whether said alignment has any significance. In other words, since the architect or mason went to the trouble of incising setting lines, one wonders whether the choice of where to begin incising them has any significance. Once the first setting line was laid out, the rest would follow the geometry of the monument’s design.

⁶⁵ Ioppolo 1966, pp. 71-72, figg. 3-5.
⁶⁶ Although this anastylosis is to be judged successful, on the whole, since it restored the original form of the monument and neatly avoided any need to store the disassembled pieces, it should be noted that the circular center block, which had been found intact, in fact cracked in half during the reassembly process. Note also that, since the southeastern block of the monument’s first course has never been found, the block that would originally have rested above it had to be shifted counterclockwise, to rest in the void left by the block of the second course that has never been found.
⁶⁷ At each junction, the radial pryholes serve the clockwise block.
The most immediate observation is that the southernmost point of the circle is tangent to the E-W line of pavement blocks; the northernmost point, however, is some 0.1 m south of the closest join (fig. 21). The center point of the monument is aligned with the northern edge of the plinth of the western altar, and with the N-S center line of the RP. Significance in the alignment of the individual blocks is less evident. None of the joins in either of the courses is aligned with the RP (fig. 21)

68 Ioppolo 1966, p. 74. Note that the outer diameter of the blocks of the upper course projects slightly beyond that of the lower blocks, which accounts for the overhang at the southern end of the monument visible in fig. 16.
of the central N-S axis of the RP with a line projected due east from the northern edge of the western altar’s plinth, and left the alignment of its individual blocks to the whims of the craftsmen erecting it.

It is likely that the monument would have been plastered and/or painted originally\(^69\). At Lavinium a base molding block, attributable to the Archaic altar beneath Altar IX, bears traces of red paint, while the one surviving block from the upper course of the trachyte monument at Campo della Fiera preserves traces of plaster\(^70\). If the circular monument were finished with plaster and/or paint, the particular alignment of the blocks would not have been directly visible and their only effect would be on the positioning of the surmounted statues; in so far as it is possible to tell, each of the figures was contained within the bounds of a single block. In its surviving state, there is nothing particularly oriented about the circular monument, aside from the ‘thesauros’ and the footprints of the statues\(^71\).

\(^69\) Vitruvius, 2.7.2; Jackson-Marra 2006, p. 425, n. 89.

\(^70\) Lavinium: Cozza 1975, pp. 90, 133; Campo della Fiera: Frascaroli 2012, p. 132.

\(^71\) Ioppolo 1966, p. 74. I reserve discussion of the latter for a future contribution.
The Folvios inscriptions

Found deposited in conjunction with the dismantled blocks of the circular monument were at least 26 fragments of worked lapis albanus (fig. 15). Of these, nine have similar dimensions and workmanship, and have fittings on their top surfaces for the attachment of small bronze statues. Of this group of nine blocks, six are inscribed (fig. 22)\textsuperscript{72}. Ioppolo reconstructed these as a single, inscribed, square monument with a particular ordering of blocks, presented with which, Degrassi could only identify as an inscription of a M. Fulvius Capitolinus\textsuperscript{73}. Torelli separated the blocks into two distinct, though possibly identical, inscriptions and identified their dedicant as the triumphator over Volsinii in 264 BCE, M. Fulvius (or Folvios, given the cognomen 'Flaccus' in later sources\textsuperscript{74}), a reconstruction that has been widely accepted\textsuperscript{75}. As such, this is a remarkable document; in Fergus Millar's words: 'It is surely worth stressing that M. Fulvius (Flaccus) is in fact the earliest consul in the history of Rome who is recorded as such in contemporary documentary evidence.'\textsuperscript{76}.

\textsuperscript{72} Mercando 1966; Ioppolo 1966.


\textsuperscript{74} In the spirit of Millar 1989, p. 150, who comments that "M. FOLVIO \[…] is the name which he actually used, whatever later tradition was to claim", I use 'Fulvius [Flaccus]' when referring to the historical figure, 'Folvios' for the inscriptions.


\textsuperscript{76} Millar 1989, p. 144.
Ioppolo reconstructed his single inscribed monument as flanking the votive pit next to the western altar, a suggestion that Torelli found rather improbable\(^77\). The latter takes the length of the two uninscribed blocks, 17 and 18, as the original length of each of the elements of the monument, that is, 1.165 m or four Roman feet (of ca. 0.29 m). He also considers most of Ioppolo’s swallowtail clamp marks to be illusory, save for those on blocks 12 and 24. This being the case, the evidence for a square monument as reconstructed by Ioppolo falls away; we are left with a 2.33 m (8 Roman feet) long inscription, and a similarly-worked 1.165 m (4 Roman feet) long uninscribed section\(^78\). There is also a fragment (no. 4) of similar dimensions that Torelli considered part of a second, identical inscription\(^79\).

It is worth noting that Ioppolo recorded a block (no. 16) of workmanship similar to that of the inscribed blocks, worked (though uninscribed) on two faces, hence a corner element, with a pair of metal pins and a pair of holes for pins on its upper surface. This was found in the midst of the other fragments, but of different dimensions, for which reason Ioppolo supposed it to belong to a different monument\(^80\). It is unfortunately illustrated only in plan view, and it has not yet proven possible to locate it in the store-rooms.

It is germane at this point to note the minor mystery of the provenance of a further inscribed block of ‘peperino’, evidently a fragment of a triumphal dedication, which has a hole on its top surface for mounting a dedication\(^81\). This was published by Degrassi as having been excavated at S. Omobono “nei primi mesi del 1962”\(^82\), but the archives preserve a letter from Degrassi to Colini responding to the latter’s inquiry about the inscription; the letter includes two photographs and is dated October 26, 1961\(^83\). This suggests that the fragment could have originated in Mercando’s excavations in the summer of 1961 that began to expose the circular monument, though there is no mention of it in her post-season report to Colini\(^84\). For now, it remains a mystery. This block, though, alongside Ioppolo’s block 16 and other fragments\(^85\), hints at the presence in the precinct of many dedicatory monuments for which we no longer have any evidence\(^86\).

---

\(^{77}\) Torelli 1968, p. 72. Ioppolo’s reconstruction has, however, been continuously reproduced, e.g. as McDonnell 2006, p. 75, figg. 1-2, while Cangemi 2012b speaks of a “square monument”. Frascarelli 2012, p. 140, stresses that Ioppolo’s reconstruction is superseded by Torelli’s, but reproduces it anyhow.

\(^{78}\) Alföldy and Caldelli (see note 74) have to suggest that a further block is missing between 12 and 24; they supplement [dede]d, contra Torelli whom they describe as “inter frg. b et c nihil perisse putans” (CIL VI, 40896).

\(^{79}\) CIL VI, 40896: [M(arcos) Fol]vio(s) [...].

\(^{80}\) Ioppolo 1966, p. 81, n. 5; tav. I, n. 16. It is not mentioned in Torelli 1968.

\(^{81}\) Degrassi 1964: [...]s nomen / [...]s nomen / [...]d aram, 0.18 m H, 0.24 m L, 0.29 m W; CIL I, 2930; AE 1964, 72: [...]s nomen / [...]d aram (2nd century BCE?); Coarelli 1973, p. 104: [...]s nomen / [...]d aram, 0.19 m H, 0.245 m L, 0.296 m W (late 3rd - early 2nd century BCE); Torelli 1968, p. 71.


\(^{83}\) ASRCM, S. Omobono, b. 28, 21, cc. 3323a, b; 3324-3325.

\(^{84}\) ASRCM, S. Omobono, b. 29, 6, cc. 3478-3481. The report was handwritten, as Mercando explains, because there was no typewriter at Phaistos (Crete), where she prepared it.

\(^{85}\) E.g., a fragmentary inscription from S. Omobono, not later than the 2nd c. BCE ( [...]n[... / [...]s n[... / [...]s n[...: Degrassi 1954, pp. 46-47; ILLRP 318a), though often considered among the monuments fallen from the Capitoline. See also Kuttner 2013, esp. pp. 251-259, for the intriguing suggestion that the so-called ‘Bocchus Reliefs’ (plausibly attributed to an Aemilianus/Numidian collaboration post-146) found at S. Omobono might actually have been set up there, rather than the Capitoline. A date after 146 would, however, locate this monument on the thin post-213 pavement, hence requiring its disassembly when the travertine pavement was installed. It seems difficult to account for the survival of the monument nearby in this scenario.

\(^{86}\) Evocatively enumerated in Kuttner 2013, pp. 256-258.
S. Omobono and Campo della Fiera

It has recently been proposed that all five monuments just discussed – altars, circular monument, Folvios inscriptions – were part of a single building project, sponsored by M. Fulvius Flaccus, that also included a trachyte monument at Orvieto, loc. Campo della Fiera – the possible site of the ancient Fanum Voltumnae at Volsinii, the city sacked by Flaccus in 264 BCE. While this is an intriguing hypothesis, presented in a stimulating article, the evidence mustered stops short of convincing. Before considering this evidence, it should be noted at the outset that there is, as yet, nothing to definitively pin ancient Fanum Voltumnae to modern Campo della Fiera, though this is becoming an increasingly-attractive hypothesis.

The chronology at Campo della Fiera has not been fixed with certainty. Based on the available archaeological material, the destruction of Temple C, at least, some ways south of the monument in question, seems to date rather to the very late 4th or earlier 3rd century BCE, during the long string of Roman attacks, rather than to Flaccus’ terminal destruction of Volsinii in 264. Temple A shows evidence of a restructuring with orthostats in trachyte, and the same material was used for the base of the temple’s southern column, for the monument under discussion, and for the threshold of the gate of the second temenos. The excavators have grouped these together as a ‘fase della trachite’; for this phase, ‘Tipotesi più convincente è che tali trasformazioni siano da porre in relazione agli eventi del 264 a.C. che segnano l’inizio degli interventi romani a Campo della Fiera’.

The monument in question is a molded base composed of blocks of trachyte and roughly square in plan. Stopponi first published it as an altar, since it lies on axis with Temple A, shares that structure’s near-alignment to the cardinal points, and has the ‘hourglass’ molding of other monuments interpreted as altars. Having confirmed that another trachyte block found nearby with attachments for statues belongs to the same monument, Frascarelli terms it a donarium. Van der Meer, for his part, considers that the monument was an altar prior to 264 BCE but was converted into a donarium after that date (presumably through the insertion of statues onto its top surface). Since the distinction is not important to the following discussion, I refer to the trachyte altar/donarium as simply the ‘CdF monument’.

Stopponi dates the monument to the mid-3rd century BCE by comparison with the altars and circular monument at S. Omobono, all of which she, following Coarelli, attributes to M. Fulvius Flaccus. She notes that, given the latest ceramic evidence from its context at Campo della Fiera, the trachyte monument “could still be dated to the 4th c. B.C., but it would be more tempting to think that M. Fulvius Flaccus, the conqueror of Orvieto in 264 B.C., could have been the one who commissioned the monument.” This is a risky temptation to give in to.

---

87 Frascarelli 2012, p. 141. The suggestion is present already in Stopponi 2011, p. 27.
88 See, recently, Becker 2013, pp. 364-365; Stopponi 2011, p. 17; Stopponi 2007, p. 503: “Soltanto la scoperta di iscrizioni, eruscan o romane che siano, con il nome del deus Etruriae princeps potrà offrire la definitiva conferma”.
89 Stopponi 2012, p. 32, who nonetheless comments, with a hint of teleology, that “soltanto lo studio di dettaglio delle ceramiche consentirà eventualmente di attribuire la fine dell’edificio agli eventi del 264 a.C.”.
90 Stopponi 2012, p. 23. The use of a common material should not necessarily imply a single construction phase, however.
91 Stopponi 2011, p. 28.
93 Van der Meer 2013, p. 107, n. 9. I am not sure that altar vs. donarium is always a meaningful distinction, since iconography shows that Etruscan altars could have things on top, as, for instance, on the well-known Campana plaque with a burning altar surmounted by a lebes or thymiaterion: Colonna 1985, p. 43, n. 1.30 (also illustrated in Stopponi 2011, p. 38, fig. 49).
94 Stopponi 2011, p. 27. In fact, she also adduces the parallel of Altars VII, XI and XII at Lavinium, which are dated stratigraphically to the 4th century BCE, yet says that “these comparisons place our altar around the mid-3rd c. B.C.”.
95 Stopponi 2011, p. 27. So also Frascarelli 2012, p. 137, n. 50, who notes that a small excavation in connection with the removal of a stone thesaurus adjacent to the donarium revealed a surface of tufarina, beneath which were scarce materials not later than the 4th century BCE.
Temple A, with which the CdF monument shares an alignment and an axis, probably dates to the 4th or 3rd century BCE and survived to be repaved in the mid- to late-1st century BCE. An adjacent small tufo enclosure offers an uninterrupted stratigraphic sequence from perhaps as early as the 5th century BCE down to the 2nd century CE, and its placement seems to respect the CdF monument. There is no firm published evidence for any Flaccan intervention, either destructive or constructive, in the area of the CdF monument. In sum, stratigraphic evidence does not require a date later than the 4th century BCE for the monument; said monument occupies a marked location on axis with the temple which could also date to the 4th century; and the sacred area as a whole shows evidence of continuity from the 5th century BCE to the Roman imperial period.

The only thing drawing the CdF monument into a Flaccan date seems to be the temptation of comparing it with the S. Omobono monuments. Consideration of the elements of comparison will, I believe, lessen such a temptation. While there are similarities between the monuments, these are not unique to them, but are shared by many monuments of broadly Mid-Republican date.

The monuments compared

The hypothesis of a building program has been spelled out in a recent contribution by A. Frascarelli. Presenting the trachyte monument at Campo della Fiera and having considered its comparanda at S. Omobono, she states that "si può concludere che esiste un sistema di strette e puntuali corrispondenze fra il donario di Campo della Fiera e le strutture di S. Omobono, tali di consentire di ipotizzare non solamente una medesima cronologia, ma anche una condivisa progettualità e committenze." In support of this conclusion, Frascarelli asserts similarities between the CdF monument and the circular monument and Folvius inscriptions at S. Omobono in their design (double-cushion, moldings), the treatment of their constituent blocks (anathyrosis, setting lines, clamps), their metrology (0.296 m Roman foot, 2-foot module) and the presence and layout of attachments for statues on their top surfaces.

To date the CdF monument, Frascarelli compares Lavinium Altars XI and XII, the two Fosso dell’Incastro altars, and the S. Omobono altars. Of these six monuments, only those at Lavinium can be dated stratigraphically, to the 4th century BCE. The Fosso dell’Incastro altars have been dated by their excavator in comparison with those at S. Omobono, which he assigns to M. Fulvius Flaccus in 264 BCE. Since this last date is questionable, as we have seen, the best remaining comparanda of those adduced by Frascarelli are the 4th-century Lavinium altars; this would fit with the chronology suggested above. The construction of the CdF monument most closely resembles that of the Lavinium box-type altars discussed above: a series of molded trachyte blocks form a frame, the core of which is filled with roughly-worked tufo blocks.

As for moldings, although both share the same basic sequence of elements (torus, fillet, echinus), the correspondence between the CdF monument and the S. Omobono altars is not particularly marked (fig. 7). The profile of the CdF monument’s echinus is closer to that of the (admittedly rather eroded) altar in the Portonaccio sanctuary at Veii (fig. 7, Portonaccio), dated to the second half of the 5th century. Closer to home, the CdF monument finds parallels within the corpus of what Shoe calls “the profile of the characteristic Orvieto cippus”, especially as adapted

---

97 A pit filled with architectural terracottas of the 6th through 3rd centuries BCE, located some way to the southwest of the primary area under discussion here, could be the result of post-264 cleaning operations: Stopponi 2007, p. 495.
98 Frascarelli 2012, p. 141.
99 In this she follows Stopponi 2011, p. 27, who also includes Lavinium Altar VII, and follows Coarelli in attributing the S. Omobono altars to M. Fulvius Flaccus in 264 BCE.
to monument form at the Belvedere temple (fig. 7, ‘Belvedere’, shown at double scale)\textsuperscript{100}. Note in particular the elongated form of the torus beneath the fillet of the base molding on the Orvietan monuments. This ‘characteristic’ profile appears at Orvieto most commonly in funerary cippi dated as early as the 6\textsuperscript{th}-5\textsuperscript{th} centuries BCE, securely establishing it as a local style\textsuperscript{101}. A broadly similar profile can be seen in other, smaller-scale artifacts from Campo della Fiera, for instance the molded base of a late Archaic terracotta votive head\textsuperscript{102} and the broad echinus of a terracotta statue base, dated to the first half of the 4\textsuperscript{th} century BCE\textsuperscript{103}.

Anathyrosis and setting lines were not rare in molded monuments of the third quarter of the first millennium BCE in central Tyrrenian Italy. Anathyrosis is present, for example, in Lavinium Altars IV, V, VII, the Archaic altar under IX, XI and the plateas under Altars V and IX-XII, as well as in the two altars at Fosso dell’Incastro; as noted above, this is characteristic of the box-type altars at Lavinium. The evidence for setting lines is somewhat more scarce, but this could well be due to their more subtle nature; anathyrosis is easy to recognize if any block edges are exposed, and is not particularly ephemeral, whereas setting lines may be obscured by the superposed blocks they were designed to guide, or be effaced by the sands of time, or go unnoticed by archaeologists, or be noticed but go unremarked-upon. Even so, their presence in so many of the altars at Lavinium makes them unremarkable in monuments of this type.

The execution of the setting lines also differs considerably between the S. Omobono and Campo della Fiera monuments. Those at S. Omobono are restricted to short incisions at the corners and ends of blocks, while those on the CdF monument mark the entirety of the edges they guide. This latter technique is closer to that of Altars VI and VII (dated between the mid-5\textsuperscript{th} and late 4\textsuperscript{th} c. BCE) at Lavinium than to any of the monuments so far known at S. Omobono.

Frascarelli compares the clamps used in the blocks of the Folvis\textsuperscript{104} inscriptions to those used on the trachyte orthostats of Temple A at Campo della Fiera. It is hard to judge this point, since the latter clamps have not been published. It does prompt the observation that clamps are not present in the circular monument or altars at S. Omobono, nor in the CdF monument. If the Folvis\textsuperscript{104} inscriptions and the circular monument are products of the same program, one wonders why clamps are not present in the latter; in the absence of a secure reconstruction of the former, however, it is risky to speculate.

A further point of comparison stressed by Frascarelli is the adherence to a Roman foot of 0.296 m common to all the monuments save the altars, and in particular to the use of a supposed two-foot module\textsuperscript{105}. The circular monument does conform to such a standard, but the metrology

\textsuperscript{100} Shoe 1965, p. 99 and pl. XXVII, 4, who considers this part of a “long rectangular altar”; for the Orvieto cippus profile more generally, Shoe 1965, pls. XV-XVIII. The Belvedere nenfro molding was initially interpreted as an altar by Pernier 1925, p. 157; the subsequent discovery of a joining (?) piece with the same profile caused Minto to reinterpret the two as belonging to the temple podium itself; perhaps in the parapets flanking the steps: Minto 1934, p. 78, fig. 6, and accepted by Castagnoli 1962, p. 165.

\textsuperscript{101} For the date, Castagnoli 1962, p. 164. Shoe believed the form to be characteristically Orvietan (the city’s identity as Volsinii not yet having been established at the time she was writing) – “Regardless of the variations in proportions, character of curve and additional small detail, the main form is always clear and strikingly distinctive of Orvieto” (Shoe 1965, p. 62) – so much so that she posited it as the origin of the double-echinus altar form seen elsewhere, e.g., at Lavinium and S. Omobono (Shoe 1965, pp. 93-94).

\textsuperscript{102} Stopponi 2012, p. 11; tav. VI, 1.

\textsuperscript{103} Stopponi 2012, pp. 16-17; tav. XI, 1.

\textsuperscript{104} Frascarelli 2012, p. 141.

\textsuperscript{105} Frascarelli 2012, p. 141. Stopponi 2011, p. 27, n. 31, on the contrary, reports the design of the trachyte monument as based on a Roman foot system of 0.294 m, and compares the use of such a system in some of the Lavinium altars; hence, “the base of the altar [sic] would measure 10.5 x 9.5 Roman feet, with a possible deviation of 1.9 cm”. The need to posit such a ‘deviation’ is precisely avoided by using the 0.296 m Roman foot, as Frascarelli does. It is risky to make judgments about ancient metrology on the basis of individual blocks, particularly when the material is not marble, and somewhat less risky to deal with longer distances, across which minor variations may be averaged out.
of the *Folvios* inscriptions is questionable\textsuperscript{106}. Frascarelli accepts Ioppolo’s reconstruction of a molded base for the inscriptions (a reconstruction discarded by Torelli), which gives a height of 0.61 m, or just over two Roman feet. The resultant correspondence in *dimensions* between the various elements is indeed curious, but there is no correspondence between the *forms* of the moldings (fig. 23). The hypothetical nature of Ioppolo’s reconstruction, moreover, makes it an insufficient basis on which to hang a building program. Further, Frascarelli compares the entire two-foot height of the circular monument with the two-foot height of what she calls “la parte più significativa e caratterizzante delle modanature” of the CdF monument, which includes the lower echinus but *not* the plinth, torus, or fillet, plus the neck, upper echinus, and abacus, but *not* the subsequent cavetto\textsuperscript{107}. What is supposed to be significant about this dimensional coincidence is left unclear.

In a different metrological argument, Frascarelli compares the statuary foot-holes on the *Folvios* inscriptions and the pin-holes on the CdF monument, noting that the distance between the left and right holes is similar (ca. 1 palm), as is the distance between the pairs of holes (a bit more than 1 Roman foot)\textsuperscript{108}. Given Torelli’s attribution of these holes to the mounting of two-foot tall statues\textsuperscript{109}, it should not be surprising to find them on multiple monuments.

Frascarelli also argues that the pairs of holes on both the CdF monument and the *Folvios* blocks are not centered with respect to the width of the blocks, but sit closer to the exterior edges, and suggests that this would leave the figures “perfettamente centrata” on the blocks since the pins would have been in their heels. This calls attention to the fact that the attachments differ considerably between the two sites; at S. Omobono there occur foot-hollows plus the remains of pins, while on the CdF monument there are only holes for heel-pins – if, indeed, these can be attributed to fittings for statues\textsuperscript{110}. We have also seen, moreover, that the *Folvios* blocks and the circular monument are not the only evidence for the display of statues *vel sim.* at S. Omobono.

\textsuperscript{106} The dimensions of the circular monument published in Ioppolo 1966 are correct. Only one of the original blocks of the *Folvios* inscriptions, found in two pieces (nos. 17+18), gives an idea of its original length, which Torelli gives as 1.165 m; following the latter’s assertion of a four foot element, this gives a foot measurement of ca. 0.291 m. The U-shaped altars appear to have been designed according to a somewhat shorter foot measure, which I hope to illustrate in a future contribution.

\textsuperscript{107} Frascarelli 2012, p. 141; p. 160, fig. 39.

\textsuperscript{108} Frascarelli 2012, p. 140.

\textsuperscript{109} Torelli 1968, p. 73.

\textsuperscript{110} See Frascarelli 2012, pp. 138-140 for a discussion of alternative possibilities.
The Campo della Fiera monument is an example of a type not uncommon in central Tyrrenian Italy; features widespread among this type are the hourglass/double-cushion design, the use of anathyrosis and setting lines, and the presence of holes for mounting objects. In construction it is like the box-type altars at Lavinium, which also provide the best parallels for the setting lines. Its moldings have good local precedents at Orvieto/Volsinii, while the moldings of the S. Omobono altars group better with the two examples at Fosso dell’Incastro and Lavinium Altars XI and XII.

The attribution of the CdF monument to M. Fulvius Flaccus, then, is unlikely on archaeological and architectural grounds. It is also unlikely on historical grounds. One of the best known aspects of Flaccus’ destruction of Volsinii in 264 BCE is the looting of some 2000 bronze statues from the city\textsuperscript{111}. The implication of the passage of Metrodorus conveyed by Pliny is that greed for precisely such booty drove the siege in the first place. While it is not inconceivable that a victorious general might set up a monument at the site of his victory, to posit that he did so in a form that took such careful account of the architectural and religious traditions of the sacked city is hardly believable.

As I have already argued, the construction of the S. Omobono altars should be decoupled from that of the circular monument and that of the Folvios inscriptions, and hence these monuments should not necessarily be considered part of the same building program. Even if one were to maintain that the S. Omobono monuments belong to a single program, the evidence presented here does not support the inclusion of the trachyte monument at Campo della Fiera (still less an entire ‘trachyte phase’) within such a program, nor does it support an attribution thereof to M. Fulvius Flaccus. Discounting such a link leaves the trachyte monument to be dated most comfortably in the 4\textsuperscript{th} century BCE\textsuperscript{112}.

\textbf{Concluding remarks}

The two altars at S. Omobono cannot be closely linked to the circular monument or the Folvios inscriptions. Like the thirteen altars at Lavinium, the two U-shaped altars at S. Omobono were built with plateas on their western sides; these are distinguished from the abutting tufo lionato pavement by technique and dimensions of blocks. The altars rest on foundations that themselves rest on the underlying blocks of gray granular tufo. This interface between monument and pavement contrasts strongly with that of the circular monument, which rests directly on a leveled surface cut into the tufo lionato pavement blocks.

Both the circular monument and the eastern altar (and almost certainly the western altar) have incised setting lines for positioning at least some of their blocks. Such setting lines are also found in many of the altars at Lavinium, and as such do not necessarily link the altars to the circular monument. The latter is much better-preserved than the battered remains of the former, suggesting, perhaps, that it spent less time exposed to the sorrows of the world. Coupled with the evidence of the differing interfaces and the eastern votive pit, the balance of judgment weighs against the contemporaneous construction of the two altars on the one hand and the Folvios inscriptions and circular monument on the other.

The only certain connection between the Folvios inscriptions and the circular monument is their common dismantling and interment, probably after the fire of 213 BCE. The sanctuary was probably more thickly decorated with dedications than we now have evidence for; an uninscribed block with pin-holes mentioned by Ioppolo and a fragmentary dedicatory inscription with pin-holes published by

\textsuperscript{111} Plin., HN, XXXIV, 34; Torelli 1968, pp. 73-74; Torelli 1973, pp. 100-103.
\textsuperscript{112} S. Stopponi and A. Frascarelli are to be commended for their detailed publications of the CdF monument, without which no stylistic or constructive reanalysis would be possible.
Degrassi point in this direction. The synchronous deposition of the *Folvios* inscriptions and the circular monument does not imply their synchronous construction. While it is certainly possible that the circular monument was sponsored by M. Fulvius Flaccus, this hypothesis cannot be confirmed given the present state of evidence.\(^{113}\)

The hypothesis that the S. Omobono monuments should be included – either singly or as a group – in a building program together with the trachyte *donarium* at Campo della Fiera cannot be supported. The published evidence situates this latter monument most comfortably in the 4th century BCE; the similarities adduced between it and those at S. Omobono are better explained as characteristics common to many monuments of the Mid-Republican period in central Tyrrenian Italy. What remains to be clarified is the exact relationship between the U-shaped altars at S. Omobono and the abutting tufo lionato pavement into which the circular monument was cut, as well as the relationship between these elements and the tufo lionato pavements further north, and, further, the relationship between all of the tufo lionato pavements and the underlying blocks of gray granular tufo.

\(^{113}\) The similarity of the circular monument’s egg-and-dart molding to those on ceramica argentata vessels from Orvieto requires further study.