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Abstract
Although the best known architectural terracottas from the site of Sant’Omobono belong to the phases of the Archaic temple, the multiple phases of the much larger Republican twin temples of Mater Matuta and Fortuna will have required a many times greater number of such terracottas. These latter are scarcely known, however, for a variety of reasons. In this article, I will offer some gleanings from the excavation archives as well as a number of pieces of architectural terracottas found during a “scavo dentro lo scavo” I conducted in the on-site magazzino at S. Omobono—from which work derive also the fragments published by D. Di Giuliomaria in this volume. Before confronting the S. Omobono materials, however, I briefly consider the state of research on Republican-era architectural terracottas.

Preliminary cautions to the study of the Republican-era architectural terracottas

The architectural terracotta corpus of Italy avanti Cristo has not been synthesized since the still-fundamental work of Andrén 1939-40; nor is it likely to ever again be considered as a whole. Much has been gained in the past three-quarters of a century, but a lack of securely dated archaeological contexts and a consequent reliance on undertheorized stylistic development sequences continue to bedevil the study of Italian clay roofs. Even with well-dated contexts, however, a basic problem arises from the nature of the material: produced to protect the roof of a temple (or other structure), architectural terracottas might not enter the archaeological record in any great quantity until the temple is destroyed or undergoes serious repairs. From the archaeological context of the terracottas alone, there is no way to know how long they might have remained on the roof, whether a day or hundreds of years.

1 I acknowledge the financial support that the Etruscan Foundation and the Fondazione Lemmermann have given during several periods of study of this material.

2 For the earlier Archaic phases, down to about the end of the 6th c. BCE, of course, there is now Winter’s magnum opus, *Symbols of wealth and power: architectural terracotta decoration in Etruria and Central Italy, 640–510 B.C.* (Winter 2009).

3 See e.g. Taylor 2002 for a critique of stylistic dating in the study of terracottas, though he swings the pendulum rather too far in his concluding discussion; Strazzulla 1977; Strazzulla 1987, p. 151.

4 Or even less: it is likely that terracottas sometimes entered the archaeological record before ever having been installed on a roof (I thank Sophie Crawford-Brown for this observation). It is likely that the degree of weathering and preservation of architectural terracottas owes something to the length of time they were in place on a roof, but in practice this may be difficult to distinguish from the effects of the depositional context.
The existence of roof decorations in bronze, sometimes in forms identical to those known in terracotta, introduces further uncertainties. It is an archaeological truism that bronze artifacts are less likely to enter the archaeological record, being highly susceptible to melting down and reuse. The absence of architectural terracottas for a particular building phase is not evidence of absence, if it is at all conceivable that such a phase could have borne versions in bronze. As Harari comments with regard to the temples of Falerii Veteres and their terracottas, “There is now a need to be cautious, in the face of the remarkable fluidity (and sometimes ambiguity) of the documents at our disposal, and an expectation that new information will arise from archival research.”

Given the general scarcity of information by which to date architectural terracottas, there is a natural tendency to want to draw on all possible points of comparison. The preservation of polychromy, for instance, is not infrequently cited as a valid comparandum. As Carlucci has noted, this may have something to do with the composition of the pigments. The variability of preservation of colors on terracottas from the same site, however, suggests that materials and techniques are only part of the explanation; differential weathering and soil conditions surely also contribute.

Gleanings from the Archives

The architectural terracottas (hereafter “ATCs”) available for study that can be associated with the various phases of the twin temples on the Republican podium at S. Omobono are relatively few in number and the majority do not come from secure archaeological contexts. I have traced two dozen fragments in the on-site magazzino among the cassette holding materials from previous work, while a further four were found during investigations by the Sant’Omobono Project between 2010 and 2014. The relative dearth of ATCs discovered during recent work is relatively simple to explain: a majority of the contexts excavated by the Project either predate or long postdate the construction of the Republican temples.

The lack of materials available for study from earlier excavations, however, while owing in part to the same reasons, is likely also due to others. It is known that Republican-era ATCs were encountered during such work. For example, Pisani Sartorio and Virgili report their discovery of “terrecotte architettoniche della decorazione dei templi gemelli crollati in seguito all’incendio del 213 a.C.” in Strato 1 of Settori VII-IX during the excavations of 1977–78. Although other materials from these contexts exist in the on-site magazzino, I was not able to locate these terracottas. It is possible that they were taken off-site for storage or study, and have never been returned; other similar materials may exist in the same location.

---

5 Della Seta 1918, p. 120.  
6 Harari 2010, p. 85. See also the cautious expressed by Wikander-Wikander 2006.  
7 E.g., Comella 1993, p. 87; Carlucci 2007, p. 38; Galluccio 2016, p. 250.  
8 E.g., the hanging curtain from the Capitoline, Galluccio 2016, p. 282 (III.3.26a-c). Although Galluccio uses polychromy as a defining characteristic of this phase of the Capitoline terracottas, of the two (joining?) fragments, one preserves most of its pigment and the other almost none. See also the pierced cresting III.3.23, illustrated at Galluccio 2016, p. 279.  
9 Of the four pieces discovered during recent work, two come from excavation (including cat. no. 6 below) while two were surface finds.  
10 Pisani Sartorio-Virgili 1979, p. 41.  
11 Nor was M. D’Acri, who in 2012-13 studied the context materials from Settori VII-IX for his tesi di laurea magistrale (Università della Calabria), able to find them. It is possible that the materials noted by Pisani Sartorio and Virgili were simply rooftiles rather than moldmade decorative elements—but there are not even rooftiles from Strato 1 in the on-site magazzino.  
12 A part of the Archaic architectural terracottas is housed in the storerooms of the Museo della Civiltà Romana, and it has been suggested to me that some Republican-period terracottas may also be kept there.
Among the archival materials for S. Omobono is a note from 1968 that indicates a plan for study and publication of the Republican terracottas. Colini records that no post-Archaic terracottas were found at any depth, being restricted to surface levels; these were to be collected and studied, then published, distinguishing their findspots between temples A and B. This is reminiscent of the roughly coeval publication of the terracottas from Pyrgi—which included plans of the frequency of occurrence of each terracotta type within the excavation area—by Francesca Melis, who, it emerges from the archive, was at least considered for the publication of the S. Omobono terracottas. Accompanying a 1972 list of the inventoried materials from investigations in the western temple (A) is a note that “Vi è ancora una scatola di materiali non inventariati trovati estirpando le erbe nell’area del tempio.”

Catalog of Terracottas from S. Omobono

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. num.</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Base of openwork cresting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inv. num.</td>
<td>SO1227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabric</td>
<td>2.5Y 7/3-7/4 (pale yellow)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provenience</td>
<td>Tempio A, 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>Rome, S. Omobono</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Dimensions| – Preserved height: 11.1 cm  
– Preserved width: 14.2 cm  
– Thickness: 3 cm (tenon); 3.4 cm (plate); 3.6 cm (edge of ribbon) |
| Description| Fragment from the left end of the base of an openwork (pierced) cresting, of the type with figure-eight ribbon elements. The fragment preserves its original bottom and left limits; the left face is flat, without any provision for a pour channel. The base of the fragment is a tenon for inserting into a frontal sima. The plate preserves part of three ribbons in relief, which leave a quadrilateral space with three curved sides. Hanging from the upper ribbon is a three-leafed anthemion (alternatively described as a pistil with three stamens) in relief; the three leaves or stamens hang from a small horizontal pill-like calyx. The plate ground bears a dark paint or slip, over which is applied a light blue paint. The ribbons are light blue with red trim. The anthemion has traces of white or light blue. |
| Date      | 4th–3rd c. BCE |
| Images    | Figs. 1, 2 |

---


14 ASRCM, S. Omobono, b. 28, 16, 3192a. In other notes in the same folder (3193, 3195), however, also undated, the terracotte [sic] architettoniche are assigned to Ioppolo, the terracotte figurate to Colonna; perhaps the Archaic materials are meant.

15 ASRCM, S. Omobono, b. 70, 2, c. 16311a. In the same notebook, the only ATCs listed as originating in the "PULIZIE nell’interno del Tempio prima dell’identificazione degli strati Livello = subito sotto il pav. di signino" (c. 16311 al) are "Inv. 1562-1572. fr. di coppi e tegole" (c. 16311 an). Among the “strati sigillati”, in the “I strato, terra grigia, sotto il livello del pavimento di signino” (16311aa), are "coppi e Tegole inv. 1241-1268” (16311ad). In the “II strato di terra rossa sotto il pav. di signino, sopra il I str. grigio”, “Inv. 1286, fr. di tegola” (16311ae). In the “I strato terra grigia (NON sigillato)”, “inv. 1361-1389 Tegole e coppi”. In the “II strato terra rossa NON sigillato (?! [sic])”, “Inv. 1460–1478 coppi e tegole” (16311ai). And in the “III Strato - terra marrone NON SIGILLATO”, “Inv. 1485-8 fr. di tegola e coppi” (16311ai).

161
Interpretation

This type of openwork cresting is well known and becomes widespread in central Italy from the 4th c. BCE onwards. Unfortunately, no part of the palmettes that would have crowned the cresting has been identified. A simple, painted version of the pendant flower is known from 5th c. Veii–Portonaccio; relief designs in this space are a development of the later 5th or early 4th c. The relief pendant flowers on the S. Omobono crestings find parallels in Falerii–Scasato I and II. Based on the evidence of the more complete Faliscan roof systems, the particular form of the flower is derived from the Italian adaptation of the lesbian cyma. The S. Omobono crestings do not have any special articulation between the tenon and the plate. No date more specific than the 4th or 3rd c. BCE can be offered at this time.

Cat. num. 2
Name Two joining fragments from base of openwork cresting
Inv. num. SO1228 a, b
Fabric 2.5Y 7/3-7/4 (pale yellow)
Provenience (fr. a) "Ottobre 1968. Materiale proveniente dallo scavo presso i gradini delle scalinate del tempio A (chiesa di S. Omobono) lato EST."  
(fr. b) "Scavi 1960 sotto l’abside della chiesa. Materiale sporadico.”
Storage Rome, S. Omobono
Dimensions Fr. a:  
– Preserved height: 4.3 cm
– Preserved width: 9 cm
– Thickness: 3.1–3.3 cm
Fr. b:  
– Preserved height: 7.8 cm
– Preserved width: 12.8 cm
– Thickness: 2.9–3.6 cm
Description Two joining fragments from the base of an openwork cresting, of the same type as Cat. 1. The fragments preserve the tenon, part of three ribbons from figure-eight patterns, and a pendant anthemion in relief. The three leaves or stamens of the latter hang from a small horizontal pill-like calyx. The plate ground bears a dark paint or slip, over which are traces of a light blue paint. The ribbons are light blue with red trim. The anthemion has traces of white or light blue.
Date 4th–3rd c. BCE
Images Figs. 1, 3

Consideration and interpretation

The provenience of these two fragments is somewhat confused as recorded. Fragment ‘b’, at least, is relatively straightforward: a stray find during excavation below the apse of the church in 1960. This excavation is otherwise unknown, however. Fragment ‘a’ is recorded as coming from excavation just

---

16 Strazzulla 1987, pp. 141-3, tab. V.
17 Stefani 1953, pp. 58-59, fig. 33b; Carlucci 2007, pp. 38, 40.
18 Scasato I (late 4th/early 3rd c.): Cemella 1993, pp. 43-4 (A 1); Scasato II (early 4th c.): Carlucci 2013, p. 164.
19 Similar crestings without articulation are found on the Scasato I and II temples (see n. 18) and at Portonaccio (Stefani 1953, pp. 58-9, fig. 33b). Crestings that have a ribbon in relief in this location are found on the Capitoline (Galluccio 2016, pp. 279-81, III.3.23a). Crestings with a fascia are found at Segni (Andrén 1939-1940, pl. 125.440, III:5) and Lanuvium (Andrén 1939-1940, pl. 133.467, III:9). Crestings that have a simple torus molding come from the Capitoline (Galluccio 2016, pp. 279-81, III.3.23s), the Palatine (Pensabene 2001, fig. 16; late 4th/early 3rd c.), and Praeneste (Vaglieri 1907, p. 687, fig. 6).
20 A second tag reads: “Materiale proveniente di un saggio di scavo eseguito a ridosso della gradinata del tempio A il giorno 11-X-’68.” Both descriptions are transcribed from tags found in the bags in which the fragments are stored.
in front of the stairs of Temple A [sic], apparently equated with the church of S. Omobono: thus it appears that the eastern temple—usually called Temple B—is meant. This would make more sense, given that the fragments join. Excavations are known to have been undertaken at the site on 11 October 1968, but no more specific details are preserved. The staircase in question should be that in travertine slabs, preserved at the southeast corner of Temple B, corresponding with the “Lato EST” of the tag. Cat. 7 was also found during this excavation.

For the interpretation see the remarks under Cat. 1 above.

Cat. num. 3
Name Cavetto from sima with palmettes
Inv. num. SO1235
Fabric 2.5 Y 7/3-7/4 (pale yellow)
Provenience Area F, Saggio 23, US 1130.
Storage Rome, S. Omobono
Dimensions
- Preserved height: 10.1 cm
- Preserved width: 15.1 cm
- Thickness: 8.4 cm
Description Fragment from near the top of a revetment plaque, evidently a sima, given the presence of a channel along the top for the insertion of another element, probably an openwork cresting. The front face preserves a deep cavetto. In relief on the cavetto are parts of two palmettes. Only the tip of one petal of the left-hand palmette remains; the right-hand palmette preserves most of two petals. The petals are lanceolate, and each includes a central rib raised in low relief; the edges of the central petal in particular are stepped from the mold. Above the two preserved petals of the right palmette is a relief boss (/button/berry/hemisphere). The face of the fragment bears traces of a white slip which continues over the palmettes, while the boss is painted red. The top of the fragment has a wide channel. It is unclear how the front of the fragment above the cavetto should be reconstructed.

Date 4th–2nd c. BCE
Images Figs. 1, 4

Considerations and interpretation
This fragment does not find numerous comparanda. An unusual piece from Cerveteri, now or formerly in Berlin, is the closest comparison of which I am aware; Andrén places it among others of the 2nd–1st c. BCE. An example of a non-strigillated sima cavetto is known from Segni. These late structural comparanda notwithstanding, the fabric and the style of the palmettes point to an earlier date. This kind of relief ribbing on petals seems to originate in the early 4th c. BCE on anthemion revetment plaques, a type—possibly first created for the Scasato II temple at Falerii—that becomes ubiquitous over the ensuing centuries. Several versions of the anthemion plaque occur at Orvieto; on some of

---

21 The notebook (ASRCM, S. Omobono, b. 70, 5, 16361/32) records, for October 1968, “Grande pulizia e piccoli scavi fatti a S. Omobono eseguiti dal professore Colini, dalla dottoressa Sartorio... e dal sottoscritto Savino unitamente agli operai dell’impresa Castellane,” followed by a list of dates recording the number of workmen and any further notes; the further notes cease after 9 October. The only record for 11 October is that three workmen were present, like most other days.

22 Andrén 1939-1940, p. 62 (V:6); pl. 68.70.

23 Andrén 1939-1940, p. 405 (II:2), pl. 124.438, dating it to “probably” the 2nd/1st c. BCE.

24 Carlucci 2004, pp. 40-1 (I.a.3); Carlucci 2013, pp. 164-7. Scasato II may simply be the earliest, best preserved example, however.

25 Orvieto: Andrén 1939-1940, II:45, pl. 70.231; Scasato II: Andrén 1939-1940, III:10, pl. 53.172; Carlucci 2013,
these, the central petals of the palmettes are flanked by painted red circles, while on others the red circles have been raised into relief bosses. Bosses can be found on the hanging curtain (nos. 5 and 6) from S. Omobono, as well as on a curtain from 5th c. Falerii and late 4th to 3rd c. Cerveteri and Todi26. I assign a broad date to this piece between the 4th and 2nd c. BCE.

Cat. num. 4
Name Fragment from a sima
Inv. num. SO1233
Provenience S. Omobono, Temple A.
Storage Rome, S. Omobono
Dimensions – Preserved height: 7.6 cm
– Preserved width: 6.5 cm
– Thickness: 2.3 cm (plate), 3.0 cm (calyx)
Description A small fragment from a revetment plaque including part of a flower calyx in relief, the parallels for which allow it to be identified as a sima. The ground of the plaque is painted dark blue or black. The calyx bears a creamy slip, on which remain traces of red and perhaps other colors.
Date 4th–3rd c. BCE
Images Figs. 5, 6, 7
Considerations and interpretation
This fragment was found in the area of the western temple (A), beneath the travertine entablature blocks formerly resting immediately south of the northern stylobate, at some point in the 20th century (Fig. 7)27. For reasons of safety, these blocks were removed by the Sant’Omobono Project in 2010-11 and the sediment below excavated as saggio F1428; unfortunately, these strata are of Imperial or later date and thus do not help in dating the fragment.

This type of frontal sima occurs during the 4th and 3rd centuries BCE. Comparanda are known from Scasato I29; Blera-Selvasecca30; Ardea-Acropolis31, Orvieto-Belvedere32; Tarquinia33; Cosa34; and Tuscania-Campo di Marte/Plastrella35 among others. The exiguity of the S. Omobono fragment prevents a more precise interpretation.

26 See nn. 41, 48, and 49 below.
28 Brocato 2012a, p. 42, fig. 8.
29 Assigned by Comella to a decorative scheme predating the well-known roof (Comella 1993, pp. 203-4, pls. 16, 55b, 56a).
30 Andrén 1969, pp. 65-6, n. 117, fig. 13; Söderling 2006, p. 119 (first half 4th c.).
31 Andrén 1939-1940, p. 441 (II:5); Stefani 1944, p. 96, fig. 19; Ceccarelli 2011, p. 29 (late 4th/early 3rd c. BCE).
33 Andrén 1939-1940, pp. 77-1 (II:6, 9), pl. 22: 76, 78.
34 Brown-Richardson-Richardson 1960, pp. 158-9, n. 4, fig. 3, pl. XVIII, 2; Taylor 2002, p. 79, fig. 26 (3rd c. BCE).
35 Sgubini Moretti-Ricciardi 1993, p. 179, fig. 52.
Cat. num. 5
Name Hanging curtain with palmette and lotus-flowers
Inv. num. SO1217
Fabric 7.5YR 7/3-7/4 (pink)
Provenience Temple A
Storage Rome, S. Omobono
Dimensions – Height: 11 cm
– Preserved width: 14 cm
– Thickness: 2.7 cm (plate); 2.9 cm (central petal of palmette)

Description Two joined fragments of a hanging curtain decorated with upright palmettes and hanging lotus flowers. The adhesive joining the fragments is almost certainly modern. The right fragment preserves most of the right face and a small part of the top face. Along the upper edge of the front face is a cavetto projecting 1.2 cm from the plane of the plaque. The bottom face is preserved along the entirety of the two fragments. The top and right faces have channels for somehow joining the curtain to other elements; the top channel is semicircular, the right channel more angular. Midway along the preserved top edge of the fragments are the remains of an obliquely aligned hole for a lead clamp by which to attach the curtain to the eaves tile above. A spattering of lead is visible on the front of the curtain in the immediate surrounds of this hole. The curtain preserves a rich polychromy. The lotus flowers are white on a red ground with black calyx. The palmette leaves are white on a black ground, while the triangular central part of the calyx is red. A berry or button in relief above and to the right of the palmette is also white. S-spirals painted white divide the red and black grounds; their spiral ends are joined each to each by short bars. The lower face of the curtain is painted uniformly red. The rear face is undecorated.

Date 4th–3rd c. BCE
Images Figg. 5, 8
Considerations and interpretation

The stratigraphic provenience of these curtain fragments is, unfortunately, indeterminable. The joined piece is stored among materials that were apparently recovered during the investigations within the western temple (A) in 1969, but I have been unable to find any mention of it among the archival material from that work.36 The fracture between the two fragments originates at the oblique eaves-tile attachment hole; this is a common location for breaks on hanging curtains with this type of attachment. Hanging curtains also not infrequently preserve traces of lead and other metals that served to attach them to the eaves tiles. Unusual, however, is the splatter of lead on the surface of the curtain. As already noted, this is concentrated around the attachment hole, suggesting that the splatter originated from the lead filling that hole, rather than in the top or right attachment channels. This would not have been possible while the curtain was whole, especially since there is splatter on the fracture surface; the splatter must have originated at the moment that the curtain broke. In order for the lead to splatter, it must have been molten. There are two scenarios under which the lead would have been liquid: either during its initial pouring for attachment to the eaves tile, or during a subsequent fire. The former seems more likely. Splattering can result when molten lead comes into contact with moisture and turns it to steam; it could also occur if the pouring of the lead were to trap

36 Brocato notes the ambiguity of some of these materials, wherein investigations that took place in 1967 and 1968 are partially documented by materials bearing a date of 1969; it is thus possible that the curtain fragments were recovered in one of the former years but only systematized in the latter (Brocato, "Tempio Ovest," in Terrenato et alii 2012, http://intarch.ac.uk/journal/issue31/1/3412wtemple.htm).
air within the hole; in either case, the steam or air would expand rapidly, bursting the curtain and splattering the lead. I am not sure that fire-induced liquifying of the lead within the clamp hole would have the same effect. If the hanging curtain broke during its initial installation, it is likely to have been deliberately deposited soon thereafter; the recovery of both fragments—among the more general absence of other terracottas—strongly suggests that they were deposited together. In this scenario, the curtain would have been deposited in a layer more or less contemporary with its manufacture. Such a rapid deposition would help account for the excellent state of preservation of the polychromy; comparison with the following fragment (cat. num. 6)—from the same mold but preserving only scant traces of color on the white slip—indicates that this is not a function of the quality of the pigments or the method of their application. Another ATC fragment (cat. num. 1) also has well-preserved polychromy and shares the “magazzino provenience” of 5; perhaps they were deposited together.

Perhaps more so than other moldmade architectural terracotta types, hanging curtains are known in a bewildering array of varieties, although certain elements of stylistic grammar recur frequently. Chief among these is the upright palmette alternating with hanging lotus blossom; one also finds upright lotus blossom with hanging palmette, upright palmette with hanging anthemion, hanging palmette alternating with disc, and, rarely, hanging palmette with hanging lotus blossom. These elements are almost invariably separated and joined by vertical S-spirals, and the latter are sometimes joined together by short bars. The leaves of the palmettes and anthemia vary along a spectrum between curvilinear and lanceolate. Stylistic developments within this common grammar are difficult if not impossible to identify. Curtains with alternating palmette-disc are generally assigned to the first half of the 5th c. BCE, although there are occasional later examples.

I have not been able to trace any precise parallels for the S. Omobono curtains, although they bear the common upright palmette/S-curve/hanging lotus blossom sequence. The palmette leaves are curvilinear rather than lanceolate, but they are not as robust as those on curtains assigned to the first half of the 5th c. BCE, for example at Pyrgi and Falerii–Sassi Caduti. Palmettes on hanging curtains are usually wider than they are tall, but the palmette on the S. Omobono curtain is taller than it is wide. The palmette leaves are joined by a semicircular element, rather than stemming directly from a triangular calyx as is more common. The palmettes have much in common with those on fragments from the Capitoline that Galluccio identifies as replacements for curtains of the first half of the 5th c. BCE. Another good comparandum for the style of palmette has recently been published from the southwest Palatine.

The calyx has been reduced to a small triangular element clearly separated from both the palmette and the S-spirals. The S-spirals are joined by short bars which connect them but do not cover them, a feature present on the curtain from the Capitoline assigned by Galluccio to the early 4th c. BCE.

---

37 A seemingly unique type from the Vignale at Falerii bears horizontal S-spirals, above which alternate upright palmettes and lotus blossoms, below hanging lotus blossoms and palmettes (CARLUCCI 2013).

38 Falerii–Scasato I, late 4th/early 3rd c.: COMELLA 1993, pp. 57-58 (though without any trace of attachment to the eaves tile); Capitoline temple, early 4th c. (?); Galluccio 2016, pp. 282-83.

39 Galluccio 2016, pp. 266-7, III.3.10e-g. Galluccio identifies an original series (III.3.10a-c) and a later one (III.3.10e-f), without assigning III.3.10d to either of these groups. If the later curtains e-f are truly calques as Galluccio suggests (p. 267), they must come from curtain d rather than a-c. While admitting that it is risky to apply contemporary stylistic judgments to ancient material (see, for example, the cautions at CRESCENZI 1983, p. 56), I find it difficult to imagine the coexistence of hanging curtain types III.3.9 and III.3.10 in the same phase of a single structure, as the conception of the spirals and the palmettes is completely different between the two; indeed, Galluccio (p. 245) allows for the possibility that they come from different structures. Both types also occur at Segni (CIFARELLI 1997, nos. 9-10).

40 Pensabene 2017, p. 279, n. 400, and Tav. 71. The 2nd c. date assigned to this plaque seems too low; in any case it is an unicum within its catalogue, and the only ATC in the catalogue excavated from Saggio S (excluding n. 383 from SU 0).

41 Galluccio 2016, pp. 282-3. I suspect that this date is rather too high, given the style of the palmettes, and comparanda from Ardea and Segni are generally dated to the 3rd c.: CIFARELLI 2003, pp. 160-1; CRESCENZI 1983, pp. 67-8.
The articulation of the base of the palmette is similar to that on a revetment plaque from Falerii–Sassi Caduti, in that the bases of the petals are joined by a semicircular element and the space below is filled by a triangle with curvilinear edges in relief42. The S. Omobono palmettes are not joined to the S-curves, however, and the triangles do not fill the entire space available to them; they should probably be dated somewhat later than the Sassi Caduti revetment. The hanging lotus blossom is composed of five elements in relief, clearly articulated each from each. The same principle can be seen on curtains from the Acropolis at Ardea, though the latter blossoms splay out much more than do the S. Omobono examples, and the former’s central petals are teardrop- rather than lozenge-shaped43. The conception of the lotus calyx elements finds its closest parallels in the late 4th–3rd and even 2nd centuries BCE, on the Ardea–Acropolis curtain and, for instance, on a revetment plaque type known at both Cosa and Vulci–Ponte Rotto44. It is completely different from the lotus on the Capitoline curtains that have similar palmettes45.

The S. Omobono curtain bears several buttons (berries, bosses, hemispheres) in relief: one between the calyx of the lotus and the joined S-spirals above, and one above and to the right of the palmette; Cat. 6 preserves part of a twin button to the left of the palmette. This type of fill ornament is quite rare on hanging curtains, though the button above the lotus calyx can be compared with a curtain from Segni, assigned by Cifarelli to the 3rd c. BCE46. A triangular button occupies the space above the joined S-spirals above the lotus calyx; this is paralleled—in substance but not in style—on the 5th c. curtains from Pyrgi and the Acropolis temple at Ardea47. I know of no parallels on hanging curtains for the buttons above the palmette, but they do occur on other types of terracotta plaques, as for example on the already mentioned plaque from Sassi Caduti48, a plaque from Cerveteri of the late 4th c. BCE49, and another from Todi dated to the late 4th or 3rd c. BCE50.

Given the wide range of dates for the various elements of comparanda, and in the absence of material sufficient to identify a full roofing system at the site, I would assign a broad 4th–3rd c. BCE date to this curtain. Even a date in the later 5th c. cannot be ruled out, though the form of the lotus seems to exclude an earlier 5th c. date. The fill ornament also looks post-Archaic. Macroscopically, the fabric of Cat. 5 and 6 is similar to many other fragments from the site; this subject requires further study.

The variety of hanging curtain types found in roofs that in other respects seem to depend on Falerii–Scasato II (=Fondo Belloni) invites comment, especially as the latter roof has, so far at least, no hanging curtains attributed to it. Carlucci has attributed this circumstance—the lack of hanging curtains for Scasato II—to the unsystematic nature of discovery of the remains. I would like to suggest a hypothetical scenario: perhaps in this case the absence of evidence is in fact evidence of absence, and there were no hanging curtains on the Scasato II roof. This would explain the variety of hanging curtains found elsewhere, even if they are mostly variations on a common theme. There would, on this scenario, have been none to take over from the model roof; each temple would require something ex novo.

42 ANDRÉN 1939-1940, p. 114 (I:16), pl. 41.136 (5th c. BCE); CARLUCCI 2013, p. 159, fig. 33.
43 ARDEA-ACROPOLIS: STEFANI 1944, fig. 24c; MANCA DI MORES 1993, p. 312 assigns these to the late 4th/early 3rd c. BCE.
44 BROWN-RICHARDSON-RICHARDSON 1960, pp. 286-87, pl. I, 2. See TAYLOR 2002 for a date of the early 3rd c. for the structure to which these plaques probably belonged. Vulci: BONAMICI 1992, pl. IV.
45 See n. 39 above.
46 CIFARELLI 2003, p. 160 (III.7). The date is determined by comparison with curtains from Segni; the date stems ultimately from ANDRÉN 1939-1940 and is probably not reliable.
48 See n. 41 above.
49 VIGNA VITALINI: ANDRÉN 1939-1940, p. 59 (IV:10), pl. 19.62; TURFA 2005, pp. 259-60, dating it to the later 4th c. BCE.
50 GUALTERIO 1982, pp. 130, 132 (III.5.7), pl. XIII.
There are no hanging curtains from the later Scasato I roof, which depends on Scasato II. Among the Scasato I material, Comella describes fragments of a type of plaque (her A9) whose dimensions and comparanda suggest a hanging curtain, but she notes that there are no attachment holes attested in either the A9 plaques or the eaves tiles.

### Cat. num. 6

**Name**  
Hanging curtain with palmette and lotus-flowers  

**Inv. num.**  
SO1030  

**Fabric**  
7.5YR 7/3-7/4 (pink)  

**Provenience**  
Unknown  

**Storage**  
Rome, S. Omobono  

**Dimensions**  
- Preserved height: 7.6 cm  
- Preserved width: 5.8 cm  
- Thickness: 2.7 cm (plate); 2.9 cm (central petal of palmette)  

**Description**  
The fragments belong to the same type of hanging curtain as Cat. 5. It preserves the left half of a palmette, the lower portion of a button above and to the left of the palmette, and the middle of an S-spiral. The preserved surface bears white slip. There are traces of red paint along the left side of the S-spiral.  

**Date**  
4th–3rd c. BCE  

**Images**  
Figg. 5, 9  

**Considerations and interpretation**  
This fragment of hanging curtain does not have a known provenience. It is stored in a cassetta labeled “Studio Colonna. 1938/1968/1969,” and hence was presumably discovered during one of those years. The piece is broken in the same location as the left-hand fragment of Cat. 5, see which for discussion. The almost complete absence of preserved paint on this fragment compared with the rich decoration on 5 points up the difficulty in using polychromy as a chronological criterion.

### Cat. num. 7

**Name**  
Fragment of plaque (doorframe?)  

**Inv. num.**  
SO1229  

**Provenience**  
“Materiale proveniente di un saggio di scavo eseguito a ridosso della gradinata del tempio [B] il giorno 11-X-‘68.”  

**Storage**  
Rome, S. Omobono  

**Dimensions**  
- Preserved height: 11.9 cm  
- Preserved width: 6.8 cm  
- Thickness: 1.9–2 cm  

**Description**  
Two joined fragments of a revetment plaque, probably a doorframe, decorated with palmettes, lotus blossoms, and S-spirals. The piece preserves part of the right or left edge of the plaque, probably the right edge. Left of the edge is half of an upright palmette, and to the left of this only the right edge of an upright lotus blossom is preserved. Between palmette and lotus is a nail hole. Below these is a row of horizontal S-spirals, of which most of one and a part of a second are pre-

---

51 Comella 1993, pp. 57-8, pls. 9b, 23a. The lack of holes can also be observed on the eaves tile as installed at the Villa Giulia (see photograph in Comella 1993, pl. 28a). Earlier hanging curtains and eaves tiles with apposite points of attachment are known at Falerii, on the Vignale (after 490 BCE: Carlucci 2013, pp. 147, 149, fig. 18 d–e) and Sassi Caduti (1st half 5th c. BCE: Andrén 1939-1940, pl. 140.131, 133; Carlucci 2013, pp. 157-58, fig. 30) temples.
served. Hanging from the S-spirals is a palmette. The leaves of the palmette are semi-lanceolate but do not come to a point. The piece is rather worn, but partially preserves its white slip, as well as traces of red paint in the field below the right S-spiral.

Date
4th–3rd c. BCE

Images
Figg. 5, 10

Interpretation
This type of revetment plaque, often identified as a doorframe since corner elements are known, is quite widespread. The same scheme is found at Falerii–Scasato I (late 4th–3rd c.), though from a different mold; the leaves of the palmette on the S. Omobono plaque seem less lanceolate than at Scasato I, and the nail holes are in different places. The extreme abrasion on the S. Omobono piece, however, impedes detailed comparison. Similar examples are known from the Temple of Castor and Pollux, Ardea, Bolsena, Cosa, Lavinium, Orvieto, Praeneste, Pyrgi, Tarquinia, and Segni. Of these, the closest parallels come from Scasato I, Ardea, Lavinium, and Pyrgi. The parallels do not allow a date more precise than the 4th or 3rd c. BCE, nor is the limited information regarding the excavation helpful in this regard.

Concluding discussion

The highly fragmentary nature of the Republican-era architectural terracottas from S. Omobono and their general lack of reliable stratigraphic provenience, combined with the overall state of research on these materials in central Italy, make it difficult to draw firm conclusions. Several parallels with the Falerii-Scasato I assemblage suggest a possible date in the late 4th or early 3rd c. BCE for this group (or a part thereof) from S. Omobono. A connection with some intervention by M. Fulvius Flaccus at S. Omobono in 264 BCE is thus possible, though as I have argued elsewhere, there is no compelling link between the Roman consul’s dedication of inscribed statue bases and a reconstruction of the entire sanctuary. A date earlier in the 4th c. BCE is also possible, perhaps especially for

---

52 Scasato I: Comella 1993, pp. 54-57 (type A 8), pl. 9a; Andrén 1939-1940, p. 142, pl. 54.175, 177 (III:13). Nail holes may have been cut after plaques were removed from their molds, however.
53 Grønne 1992, pp. 171–76. Found in the podium fill for the Metellan temple, these have a terminus ante quem of 117 BCE; Grønne entertains a date in the 2nd c. BCE following Richardson’s dating of the Cosa materials, but this is not at all certain.
54 Stefani 1944, p. 101, fig. 27b; Andrén 1939-1940, pl. 136.479 (IV:11).
57 Muzzioli 1981, p. 199, dated to the 3rd c. BCE, presumably on the basis of parallels. Th. 1.2–1.5 cm.
58 Andrén 1939-1940, p. 183 (II:44), pl. 70.230.
59 Sanctuary of Hercules: Gatti 1995, p. 102, fig. 29.3 (4th–3rd c.).
61 Cataldi 1985, p. 74 (4.4 A 4) dated to the first decades of the 4th c. BCE based on the style of the relief sculpture and antefixes of the roof system.
62 Cifarelli 2003, pp. 162–64, figs. 185–6. The mid-Republican terracottas are dated as a system between the 3rd and 2nd centuries BCE: Cifarelli 2003, p. 181.
63 See the discussion above for Cat. 2a, which was found in the same excavation.
64 Diffendale 2016.
the hanging curtains; one could then draw a connection to the (re)dedication of the temple of Mater Matuta attributed by Livy and Plutarch to Camillus following the fall of Veii\(^\text{65}\), but there is no good archaeological evidence for an early 4\(^{\text{th}}\) c. BCE reconstruction of the sanctuary\(^\text{66}\). The possibility of a Faliscan connection via Camillus is intriguing, but probably unreliable\(^\text{67}\). The terracottas published here probably do not date as late as the late 3\(^{\text{rd}}\) c. BCE, when a reconstruction of the twin temples is attested\(^\text{68}\). There is another, equally fragmentary, group of terracottas in a more tile-like fabric that is a better candidate for the roofs of the 212 BCE reconstruction\(^\text{69}\).

\(^{65}\) Liv. 5.19.6; 5.23.7; Plut., Cam. 5.

\(^{66}\) **Diffendale et al.** 2016a, pp. 23-4, 29 n. 94.

\(^{67}\) See Farrell 2014, pp. 222-4 for an appraisal of the ancient traditions about Camillus’ supposed capture of Falerii.

\(^{68}\) Liv. 25.7.5-6; **Diffendale et al.** 2016, pp. 34-7.

\(^{69}\) I am preparing to publish these fragments in the near future.
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Fig. 5. Cat. 4, 5, 6, 7.

Fig. 6. Cat. 4.
Area di S. Omonono - Tempio A, Prusa

Frammento di terracotta architettonica di rivestimento scoperto sotto il blocco grande di travertino ancora in sito a ca. 30 circa dal piano inferiore. Insieme al frammento, anche un altro di ceramica a vernice nera indescendente.

Fig. 7. Cat. 4.
Fig. 8. Cat. 5.

Fig. 9. Cat. 6.

Fig. 10. Cat. 7.