



Instituto Andaluz del Patrimonio Histórico
CONSEJERÍA DE CULTURA Y PATRIMONIO HISTÓRICO

*Rellenar la información solicitada entre corchetes:

Document downloaded from the institutional repository of Instituto Andaluz del Patrimonio Histórico: <https://repositorio.iaph.es/>

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article*:

Beltrán Fortes, José; Loza Azuaga, María Luisa. The Capitolium of Baelo Claudia (Bolonía, Tarifa, Spain). New Data from Sculpture Analysis . En: Journal of Roman of Archaeology 2020 n.33 , 383-400

Which has been published in final form at

Available at <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1047759420001075>

This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Cambridge University Press Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.

Copyright © 2020 Cambridge University Press.



This work is licensed under an

Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Not cover (CC BY-NC-SA 3.0)
3.0 International License

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/deed.es>

The *Capitolium* of *Baelo Claudia* (Bolonía, Tarifa, Spain). New Data from Sculpture Analysis

José Beltrán Fortes¹ and María Luisa Loza Azuaga²

Abstract

Ever since Pierre Paris and his team published in 1923 the results of the excavations carried out at *Baelo Claudia* (Bolonía, Tarifa), their interpretation of the three temples that preside over the forum as a *Capitolium* has been controversial and questioned by different authors. The analysis of sculpture pieces recovered from one of the temples - Temple A- in 1967 confirms the existence of a cult statue of Minerva and, consequently, provides a new element for the identification of the complex as a *Capitolium*, albeit with a unique architectural plan.

Key words: Roman Sculpture. *Baetica*. *Iuppiter*. *Iuno*. *Minerva*.

1. The *Capitolium* of *Baelo Claudia*. Review of the interpretations.

The archaeological excavations carried out between 1917-1921 at *Baelo Claudia* (Bolonía, Tarifa, prov. Cádiz)³ were led by Pierre Paris and his team⁴, in co-management with the Anglo-French archaeologist George Bonsor⁵ and the French collaboration of Alfred Laumonier and Robert Ricard, as well as between 1918 - 1919 of the Spaniard Cayetano de Mergelina, as representative of the “Junta de Ampliación de Estudios e Investigaciones Científicas”⁶. Work focused on the northern area of the *forum* where three temples were unearthed. In addition, a minor intervention was carried out in the theatre, as well as more extensive excavations in the fish salting factory area that included two *domus*, and, finally, in the eastern necropolis. The result of all this was the edition of two outstanding memoirs for the time, one on the city⁷ and the other dealing with the necropolis⁸, signed by the aforementioned scholars.

¹ Department of Prehistory and Archeology. University of Seville. C/María de Padilla s/n, 41004 Seville (Spain). E mail: jbeltran@us.es

² Andalusian Institute of Historical Heritage, Junta de Andalucía. Camino de los Descubrimientos, s/n, Seville (Spain). E mail: marial.loza@juntadeandalucia.es

³ P. Sillières, *Baelo Claudia, una ciudad romana de la Bética* (Madrid 1997); J. A. Correa Rodríguez, *Toponimia antigua de Andalucía* (Sevilla 2016) 221-2.

⁴ S. Dardaine, *Belo II. Historique des fouilles* (Madrid 1983) 7-38.

⁵ J. Maier Allende, *Jorge Bonsor (1855-1930). Un académico correspondiente de la Real Academia de la Historia y la Arqueología española* (Madrid 1999); Á. Muñoz Vicente, *Jorge Bonsor y la recuperación de Baelo Claudia (1917-1921)* (Sevilla 2009).

⁶ A. Mederos Martín, “Cayetano de Mergelina, Catedrático de Arqueología y Director del Museo Arqueológico Nacional”, *BSAAValladolid LXXVI* (2010) 179-212, 181.

⁷ P. Paris *et al.* *Fouilles de Belo (Bolonía, province de Cadiz) (1917-1921). La ville et ses dépendances* (Paris 1923).

⁸ P. Paris *et al.* *Fouilles de Belo (Bolonía, province de Cadiz) (1917-1923). La nécropole* (Paris 1926).

The cities' urban layout is arranged in terraces, taking advantage of the land slope that descends from north to south. In the forum area an artificial terrace separates the sanctuary, higher above to the north, from the public zone below (fig. 1). The three tetrasyle and pseudoperipteral temples are arranged in parallel, leaving narrow corridors between them and standing on high molded podiums with frontal staircases. The temples from west to east were called A, B and C by their excavators. In front of Temple B, within the esplanade created by the construction of the upper terrace, is an elongated altar that preserves only two of its original three *pulvini* decorations. A fountain with a curved floor plan, which also allowed collecting water from the upper esplanade, occupies the center of the terrace front and directly below it is the speaker's *tribuna*. On the *forum* square and attached to the terrace front at both ends are two small temples or *sacella*. The southern edge of the square is occupied by the *basilica*, while on the western side various administration buildings (*curia*, *tabularium*, voting room, magistrates' room) are found and lastly, on the east are a series of *tabernae*. A temple dedicated to Isis completed the north-eastern quarter of the *forum* complex, while along the southern strip of this large block, the *macellum* is on the south-western corner and a small square with two unclassified buildings occupy the opposite one. The whole *forum* area described was organized in a large rectangle by means of two *cardines* (C3 and C4) and two *decumani* (D1 and D2) - the southernmost being the *decumanus maximus* -, which gave urban regularity to this complex variety of buildings.

It should be borne in mind that between 1917-1921 only the three temples and part of the front esplanade with the altar and fountain had been excavated, while all the rest of structures and areas were unearthed at a later stage. Furthermore, all of them logically were built during different construction periods⁹.

The early Roman-Republican *Baelo* was located several kilometers inland. This enclave, situated amid the highest elevations between the sierras of La Plata and La Higuera, is also known as “La Silla del Papa” *oppidum*. Excavations carried out in recent years show a relatively important and unique settlement, with partially rock-cut architecture and a necropolis which follows Roman-Italic models¹⁰. The communities' prosperity was linked to the exploitation of salted fish industries located on the coast. This explains not only the urban development of this *oppidum*, but also its early coin issue, probably during the first half of the 1st century BC, with the latinized Phoenician-Punic toponym *Bailo* as legend¹¹, followed by other coins having bilingual legends in Latin and Neopunic script¹².

⁹ P. Sillières supra n. 3, 92-3; J.-N. Bonneville *et al.* *Belo VII. Le Capitole* (Madrid 2000).

¹⁰ P. Moret and F. Prados, “Les deux *Baelo*: du site perché protohistorique au site portuaire romain sur la rive nord du détroit de Gibraltar”, in L. Mercuri, R. González and F. Bertoncello (edd.), *Implantations humaines en milieu littoral méditerranéen* (Antibes 2014) 137-48; P. Moret *et al.*, “La Silla del Papa: hábitat y necrópolis (campanas 2014-2016)”, *MCV* 47 (1) 49-71.

¹¹ J. A. Correa supra n. 3, 221.

¹² M. P. García-Bellido and M. C. Blázquez Cerrato, *Diccionario de cecas y pueblos hispánicos* (Madrid 2001) II, 51-2.

Under Augustus, the community of *Baelo* became a *municipium* with Latin rights, which accounts for its citizen's ascription to the *tribus Galeria*. Around this same time, the inhabitants moved down to the bay near the port where the production facilities (fish salting and pottery workshops) were located. With Augustus the new urban planning is based on an approximately N-S orthogonal street pattern¹³ determined by the topography and layout of the *decumanus maximus*, which corresponds with the urban stretch of the "vía Hercúlea" or coastal road that continued west reaching *Gades* (Cadiz)¹⁴. Under Claudius the city was promoted to *municipium civium romanorum* due to its key importance in the communication with *Mauretania Tingitana*, specifically with *Tingis* (Tangier)¹⁵. Thus, it became known as *municipium Claudium Baelo*¹⁶. At this time, the *forum* complex went through a complete renovation, apparently related to earthquake damage that would have also destroyed the original Augustan sanctuary some authors suggest. Rebuilding continued under Nero with some sections even reaching Vespasian's period.

The three temples unique arrangement in parallel and closely spaced together led the first excavators to interpret them as a *Capitolium*¹⁷, although with a very particular architectural plan. Instead of the traditional single temple with three *cellae* to house the Capitoline Triad cult statues, these were organized as three independent buildings. Following J. Toutain's opinion¹⁸, P. Paris *et alii* assumed that *Capitolia* had been built not only in *coloniae* but in other cities, therefore the temples of *Baelo* were identified as a *Capitolium* following three main arguments: 1) their dominate position above the *forum*, which was increased by elevated podiums, another architectural characteristic of this type of religious building; 2) the determining discovery of a seated female statue in temple C, identified with Capitoline Triad cult statue of Juno *Regina*¹⁹; 3) a parallel for the unique arrangement of the three temples was found in the *Capitolium* of the *forum* of *Sufetula* (Sbeitla, Tunisia), as there was no doubt at that moment concerning its interpretation; although they were aware of the difference between the central temple of the Tunisian sanctuary, larger than the other two, and *Baelo*, where the central temple is the narrowest of the three²⁰.

¹³ S. Bravo Jiménez, J. Á. Expósito Álvarez and Á. Muñoz Vicente, "Últimas aportaciones al conocimiento del viario de la ciudad hispanorromana de *Baelo Claudia*", *Itálica. Revista de Arqueología Clásica de Andalucía* 01 (2011) 120-43.

¹⁴ R. Corzo Sánchez and M. Toscano San Gil, *Las vías romanas de Andalucía* (Sevilla 1992) 71-87; P. Sillières, *Les voies de communications de l'Hispanie Meridionale* (Paris 1991).

¹⁵ Pointed out by Strabo, *NH* III, 1, 8.

¹⁶ P. Sillières supra n. 3, 9-20.

¹⁷ P. Paris *et al.* supra n. 7, 57 ss.

¹⁸ J. Toutain, *Les cultes païens dans l'Empire romain*, première partie (Paris 1907) I, 187-8.

¹⁹ P. Paris *et al.* supra n. 7, 87: "...cette Junon a du moins celui d'empêcher qu'il reste aucun doute sur l'identification de nos trois sanctuaires avec un Capitole".

²⁰ They indicated that this "anomaly" in Temple B of *Baelo's forum*, despite being that of *Iuppiter Optimus Maximus*, was that "...l'architecte a ajouté au temple en hauteur ce qu'il lui a enlevé en largeur, afin de le détacher plus nettement entre les deus autres. L'architecte de Sbeitla avait pris un autre parti; le temple central était un peu plus haut, mais aussi un peu plus large et un peu plus profond que les temples latéraux, ce qui semble d'ailleurs plus logique et d'un meilleur effet" (P. Paris *et al.* supra n. 7, 73). This argument is followed by J.-N. Bonneville *et al.* supra n. 9, 177, as well as by P. Barresi, "I Capitolia di

The conclusion was evident for P. Paris and his colleagues:

“Mais du moment qu’il n’y a pas d’hésitation possible sur ce fait que les trois temples constituent un Capitolie, il faut admettre que, de même que dans tous les Capitoles le temple A était consacré à Minerve, le temple B, celui du centre, à Jupiter et le temple C à Junon, qui se trouvait ainsi à la gauche de son époux”²¹.

Regarding the statuary, the authors highlight the presence in Temple C of two marble blocks representing a seated woman (figs. 2 and 3.1-3) draped in a tunic knotted under the breasts with a *cingulum* and mantle covering the legs. Although headless and lacking as well the arms and feet, which would have been made in separate pieces and were not recovered during the excavation, it was identified as the cult statue of *Iuno Regina*. The statue would have stood on a square plinth in contact with the back wall of the *cella* and of which only the lower moldings are preserved²² (fig. 4). Both pieces were left at the site as they were too difficult to transport. The part corresponding to the upper torso has disappeared and is only known by a photograph²³ (fig. 2), whereas the lower part, although quite deteriorated, remains *in situ* (fig. 3.1-3).

The authors also refer to the fact that in the *cella* of Temple A: “...nous avons retrouvé les débris d'une statue littéralement brisée en mille morceaux, don ton peut dire seulement que c'était une statue féminine drapée, nous avons été un peu plus heureux en fouillant la *cella* C”²⁴. None of these fragments were catalogued and are since then missing; only a sketch made by George Bonsor shows how they were found together in the central part of the *cella*²⁵. In this case, the plinth of the cult statue is longer than that of Temple C and is also separated from the back wall, creating a narrow corridor of approximately 50-60 cm (cf. fig. 4); moreover, when viewed from the entrance, there is an open space between it and the left wall. It is worth noting that this temple, unlike the other two, has a barrel-vaulted crypt²⁶ with the access located precisely in the NW corner of the *cella*, what would also explain the space left here by the pedestal.

Lastly, no remains of the cult statue of Jupiter were found in the central temple -Temple B -, but only two togate statues without the portrait heads. The largest one, somewhat over life-size, was taken to the National Archaeological Museum in Madrid, where it is currently on display (fig. 5). According to the estimated date of elaboration and placement in the *cella* of the temple, it would have most likely been a representation of

Sufetula e di Baelo Claudia: analisi dei progetti, in S. Camporeale, H. Dessales and A. Pizzo (edd.), *Arqueología de la construcción I. Los procesos constructivos en el mundo romana: Italia y provincias occidentales* (Mérida 2008) 266.

²¹ P. Paris *et al.* supra n. 7, 84.

²² J.-N. Bonneville *et al.* supra n. 9, 109 and figg. 38.1 and 38.5.

²³ P. Paris *et al.* supra n. 7, 86-7, figg. 25-6.

²⁴ P. Paris *et al.* supra n. 7, 85.

²⁵ It was unpublished and has only been released recently: S. Dardaine supra n. 4, 21; J.-N. Bonneville *et al.* supra n. 9, 188, fig. 66.

²⁶ J.-N. Bonneville *et al.* supra n. 9, 106-107 and figg. 36.1-4.

the Emperor Claudius²⁷. The second sculpture, which remained at the site, is also missing with no photographs known of it, but only a schematic drawing that places it on a pedestal next to the aforementioned togate (fig. 6)²⁸. As it was smaller than the former, it could have possibly been a representation a young prince of the *Domus Augusta*, Nero or more likely his natural son Britannicus²⁹. Precisely, a plaque fragment with an honorary inscription dedicated to Britannicus was recovered from the esplanade situated in front of the temples³⁰. It proves that this prince was paid homage in *Baelo Claudia*, probably towards end of his father's reign, and that this plaque might have been placed in the temple next to his statue. It seems significant that the plinth of this *cella* was originally smaller and then lengthened (cf. fig. 4) in order to probably to install the imperial images, or even other imperial representations, next to the cult statue of Jupiter. The introduction of imperial cult is "...not necessarily incompatible with the idea of a *Capitolium*", as J. Q. Quinn and A. Wilson rightly recall³¹.

The conclusions established by P. Paris *et al.* in the 1923 report have been generally accepted, as seen in the studies produced by M. Tod³², P. Gros³³, É. Blutstein-Latrémolière³⁴, P. Sillières³⁵ or S. Keay³⁶, among others; however, some critical opinions have emerged. Thus, I. M. Barton in his overall study raises doubts on the identification of the *Capitolium*³⁷, since it does not fulfill five basic criteria, some more

²⁷ These are the conclusions reached in the remarkable study by W. Trillmich, "Étude du togatus trouvé dans le temple central de Bélo", in J. N. Bonneville *et alii* (edd.), *Belo VII. Le Capitole* (Madrid 2000) 205-10.

²⁸ Paris *et al.* supra n. 7, 73, fig. 19. Described as: "...une autre statue plus petite, de travail franchement mauvais, et non terminée; c'est aussi d'un personnage en costume civil" (ibid., 85). It is not clear that the statue was "unfinished" but, rather there were intentionally untreated parts as in the feet and base area of the other togate. Trillmich suggests that it also may be due to reuse (Trillmich supra n. 27, 209).

²⁹ In fact, Trillmich notes that a statue of a young Nero or, more likely, of Britannicus recovered from the *basilica* of *Velleia* as one of the best stylistic parallels for the larger *Baelo* togate (Trillmich supra n. 27, 208).

³⁰ J.-N. Bonneville, S. Dardaine, S. and P. Le Roux, *Belo V. L'Épigraphie. Les inscriptions romaines de Baelo Claudia* (Madrid 1988), 27-8, n° 5, pl. IV: Ti(berio) Claudio / Caesari[s / Augusti f(ilio) Brita]nnico.

³¹ J. Q. Quinn and A. Wilson, "Capitolia", *JRS* (2013) 103, 117-73. On *Baelo Claudia*, J.-N. Bonneville *et al.* supra n. 9, 191-3.

³² M. Todd, "Forum and Capitolium in the Early Empire", in F.O. Grew and B. Hobley (edd.), *Roman Urban Topography in Britain and the Western Empire* (London 1985) 56-66.

³³ P. Gros, "Sanctuaires traditionnels, capitoles et temples dynastiques: rupture et continuité dans le fonctionnement et l'aménagement des centres religieux urbains", in *Los Asentamientos ibéricos ante la Romanización* (Madrid 1987) 111-21.

³⁴ É. Blutstein-Latrémolière, "Les places capitoline d'Espagne", *MCV* (1991) 27 (1) 43-64. Cf. the devastating criticism of this study in J. Q. Quinn and A. Wilson supra n. 31, 28: "Previous identifications of the temples under discussion as Capitolia are simply accepted, usually on the basis of nothing more than a (definite or supposed) tripartite cella and/or a location on the forum (e.g. Emporiae/Ampurias, Pollentia, Saguntum, Mérida, Corduba, Tarraco, and Italica); and on the basis of this, a whole new category of 'Capitoline fora' is invented, defined by the fact that there is a Capitoline temple on the forum. The circularity of the argument should be obvious".

³⁵ P. Sillières supra n. 3, 87-96.

³⁶ S. Keay, "The development of towns in Early Roman Baetica", in S. Keay (ed.), *The Archaeology of Early Roman Baetica* (Portsmouth 1998) 73.

³⁷ I. M. Barton, "Capitoline Temples in Italy and the provinces (specially Africa)", *ANRW* (1982) 12, 1, 259-342, 267-8, includes the Hispanic examples (*coloniae Augusta Emerita, Urso, Hispalis, Italica, Tarraco y Clunia*, and *municipia Baelo Claudia, Illiberis and Asturica Augusta*), many very dubious and

decisive than others, that would corroborate this: 1. epigraphic dedications to the Capitoline Triad as a whole (*Iuppiter Optimus Maximus, Iuno Regina* and *Minerva/Minerva Augusta*); 2. the presence of three cult statues with Jupiter in the center, Juno on the right and Minerva on the left; 3. a single temple on an elevated podium with a *pronaos* and portico; 4. a tripartite *cella* (not always conclusive); 5. a dominant and central position in the urban layout, like in the middle of a square and not necessarily always on the forum.

According to Barton, although the sanctuary of *Baelo Claudia* met criteria 3, 5 and partially 2, the absence of a single tripartite *cella* temple made it highly improbable; also the lack of inscriptions had to be taken into account making it, as in the case of *Sufetula*, very uncertain. In fact, as the author concludes, if these criteria were strictly applied no *Capitolium* could be duly identified in *Hispania*.

For the specific case at hand, the most critical opinions are found in M. Bendala's 1989-90 study on *Capitolia Hispaniarum*, where he maintains the same denial but based on the following arguments³⁸: 1) the three temples are separate buildings and the only parallel argued, that of *Sufetula*, is also questionable, according to I. M. Barton's study; 2) the central temple is the smallest, when the shrine consecrated to Jupiter should be the largest; 3) the three temples were built over a long time span, between the reign of Claudius and the Flavians, which stands against a uniform construction project; 4) finally, the fact that *Baelo Claudia* was not a *colonia*³⁹.

Having dismissed the last point, as it has already been mentioned that *Capitolia* do exist in unprivileged towns and cities of the provinces, the identification of the complex of *Baelo* was reaffirmed in the monograph written by Bonneville *et alii*⁴⁰, which also incorporates fundamental archaeological aspects. In comparison to other dates proposed previously, it concludes that the time lapse for the construction of the three temples ranged between 40-60 A.D. Temple C would have been built the last, along with the terrace and central fountain, the *tribuna* and the lateral staircases, as well as the triple altar of the upper esplanade, reaching possibly the early years of the reign of Vespasian. However, this time span is "simplement d'un décalage normal entre des opérations successives à l'intérieur d'un même grand chantier"⁴¹, constituting a single construction program. The reconstruction of the *forum* sanctuary during the reigns of Claudius and Nero is significantly interpreted as a "restoration" of the former sanctuary, which had been destroyed by an earthquake, following the same dimensions and layout including those of the three temples⁴². According to these authors, certain elements of the temples,

"of little use for what concerns Hispania as is based on sparse and old publications", according to M. Bendala Galán, "Capitolia Hispaniarum", *Anas* (1989-90) 2-3, 13, n. 4.

³⁸ M. Bendala supra n. 37, 14-7, n° 3.

³⁹ Thus, he recalls that *Baelo Claudia* had been considered by some a Latin *colonia*, for example, E. Hübner o R. Thouvenot, but currently there is no doubt on its municipal status (M. Bendala supra n. 37, 17, n. 20).

⁴⁰ J.-N. Bonneville *et al.* supra n. 9, 179-204.

⁴¹ J.-N. Bonneville *et al.* supra n. 9, 42.

⁴² J.-N. Bonneville *et al.* supra n. 9, 197-203.

such as the podium profiles or the architectural decoration made out of sandstone and covered with painted stucco, would refer formally and stylistically to models dated to Augustus. It is therefore assumed that the Claudio-Neronian restoration included recycled architectural ornamentation elements that had been salvaged from the earthquake, while new components were made following to the previous examples⁴³. It concludes that the Augustan period sanctuary had three temples in alignment and therefore must have originally been a *Capitolium*. Both conclusions have the endorsement of P. Gros when he affirms that,

“...elle postule l’existence d’un premier sanctuaire augustéen, détruit par un tremblement de terre et reconstruit à l’identique avec la réutilisation éventuelle d’éléments provenant de l’édifice antérieur... elle jette aussi une lumière particulièrement vive sur les conditions plutôt limites de la création architecturale dans un secteur aussi sensible que celui des monuments culturels à vocation poliade.

...les observations développées avec rigueur dans le dernier chapitre lèvent définitivement toute ambiguïté quant à la destination du sanctuaire, dont la définition capitoline se trouve désormais pleinement assurée”⁴⁴.

Part of this monograph is also dedicated to explaining the singular alignment of the three temples, concluding that it is an original and unique solution for a *Capitolium*. They consider that the entire expanse north of the terrace that separates the sacred space from the civil zone is in a way a “capitoline area”. In consequence, the three temples really would have been perceived as the tripartite spaces of a *cella*, the expanse north of the terrace would be the *pronaos* of the sanctuary with a triple altar and the two staircases that flank the terrace would be the accesses to the Capitoline area, while the center was occupied by the speech *tribuna*. This last detail brings *Baelo* closer to the *Sufetula* layout, where the front staircase of the central temple is substituted by a *tribuna*, but present in the two temples that flank it⁴⁵. According to these authors, this unique layout is not directly related to the African tripartite sanctuaries⁴⁶ or to any other type of three temple shrines⁴⁷.

⁴³ In a similar nearby geographical area we find that the decoration of the forum temple at *colonia Carteia Libertinorum* (San Roque, Cádiz), of Augustan period and manufactured in an Italian workshop (L. Roldán Gómez *et al. Carteia II* [Madrid 2003] 234-9), constitutes the closest parallel for some of the architectural ornamentation elements of the *Baelo* temples.

⁴⁴ P. Gros, “Préface”, in J.-N. Bonneville *et al., Baelo VII. Le Capitole* (Madrid 2010) 10.

⁴⁵ J.-N. Bonneville *et al. supra n. 9*, 187-90. He also refers to more distant temple parallels like 2nd – 1st century BC Latium sanctuaries with Greco-Hellenistic backgrounds. One of the most singular designs, the temple found in *Fortuna Primigenia* of *Praeneste* (Palestrina) would become the model followed in *Baetica* during the Flavian period, as in the case of the terraced sanctuary of *Munigua* (Mulva, Villanueva del Río y Minas, Seville) cf., T. G. Schattner, *Munigua. Un recorrido por la arqueología del Municipium Flavium Muniguense* (Sevilla 2019) 62-76.

⁴⁶ J.-N. Bonneville *et al. supra n. 9*, 183-4. Especially because the three North African temples are located at a plaza with a pórtico, which generally is not situated in the center of the city but even in the periphery, and set high following Phoenician-Punic tradition.

⁴⁷ J.-N. Bonneville *et al. supra n. 9*, 184-7.

Conversely, in two recent studies M. Bendala defends the links between the North African triple temple sanctuaries of Phoenician-Punic tradition and *Baelo Claudia*⁴⁸. Although, he interprets the Early Empire community of *Baelo* in a more general context, as a community in a Punic city framework and not Roman but, at the most, Romanized, using arguments inferred from the Punic characteristics of the eastern necropolis⁴⁹. To the reasons already put forward - such as, it is not a single temple with three *cellae*, there is no architectural or chronological unity or that the central temple is narrower-, he adds the absence of a common portico, the lack of assurance that the fragments identified by P. Paris and his team in Temple A corresponded to a female statue - and therefore Minerva-, or the fact that in Temple B two togate statues were found, one of them of Claudius divinized, that would make it an imperial cult temple. In conclusion, there is a sum of “almost insurmountable difficulties”⁵⁰ in identifying this complex as a *Capitolium*. Following this “Punic view”, M. Bendala proposes that the seated female statue of Temple C is an image of *Iuno Caelestis*, a Roman deity that syncretized the ancient Phoenician-Punic cult of *Tinnit*⁵¹. In the same vein and considering the importance of *Gades* (Cádiz) and the sanctuary of Hercules *Gaditanus* – a continuation of the Phoenician cult of *Melkart* - he suggests that Temple B would be dedicated to the cult of *Melkart*, while Temple A would have held an unknown deity, perhaps *Eschmun*⁵². However, the analysis of the cult statue of Temple A, as we will see later, invalidates this proposal⁵³.

J. Q. Quinn and A. Wilson in their fundamental review on *Capitolia* give little significance to all these issues. Instead, they evaluate the previous approaches of other authors and establish a list of Capitoline sanctuaries concentrated in Italy and, especially, in North Africa during the 2nd century A.D.⁵⁴. Regarding *Baelo Claudia* they clearly raise doubts on its identification:

⁴⁸ M. Bendala Galán, “Continuidad y renovación en los centros sacros de las ciudades hispanorromanas”, in P. Mateos *et alii* (edd.), *Santuarios, oppida y ciudades: arquitectura sacra en el origen y desarrollo urbano del Mediterráneo occidental* (Madrid 2009) 345-70, 352-7; id., “Baelo Claudia y su personalidad ciudadana y urbana: dialogo desde el estudio y la amistad”, *Pallas* 82 (2010) 471-8.

⁴⁹ Not everyone accepts this predominant Punic component, especially manifest in the so-called “muñecos” (schematic antropomorphic busts) placed by the tombs. On the contrary, other authors find a more decisive Roman-Italic origin for these representations, according to D. Vaquerizo Gil, “Figurative imagery of the decesses in the Eastern Necropolis of *Baelo Claudia*”, in E. La Rocca, P. León and C. Parisi Presice (edd.), *Le due patrie acquisite. Studi di archeologia dedicati a W. Trillmich* (Roma 2008) 419-34, and his synthesis study, id. *Necrópolis urbanas en Baetica* (Tarragona 2010) 173-93.

⁵⁰ Bendala *supra* n. 48 (2009) 352.

⁵¹ In *Baetica* we can cite the suburban sanctuary of Torreparedones (Baena, prov. Córdoba), dedicated to *Dea Caelestis* and in use between 2nd/1st centuries B.C. and 1st A.D. (J. A. Morena López, “El santuario ibero-romano”, in C. Márquez *et alii* [edd.] *Torreparedones -Baena, Córdoba-. Investigaciones arqueológicas (2006-2012)* [Córdoba 2014] 46-55). There is also a unique temple of *Dea Caelestis* within the amphitheater of *Italica* (Santiponce), built probably in mid-second half 2nd century AD by remodeling various rooms of this building; cf. J. Beltrán Fortes and J. M. Rodríguez Hidalgo, *Italica. Espacios de culto en el anfiteatro* (Sevilla 2004).

⁵² M. Bendala *supra* n. 50, 353-6.

⁵³ The hypothesis was considered conjectural by J. Q. Quinn and A. Wilson *supra* n. 31, 28, n. 143.

⁵⁴ J. Q. Quinn and A. Wilson *supra* n. 31.

“...triple temple structures on the forum need not form a Capitolium; they are rare and we know of no cases in which they definitely do. At Baelo the Eastern most of the three temples contained a statue of a seated goddess, which may be Juno; fragments of statuary in the western temple also indicate a female deity, unidentifiable; but togate statues were added to the statue plinth in the central temple which apparently represent imperial portraits and thus suggest an admixture of imperial cult -again, not necessarily incompatible with the idea of a Capitolium. Perhaps the strongest argument in favor of the possible interpretation of the temples at Baelo as a Capitolium complex is the altar arrangement on the esplanade in front of the three temples; a single base seems to have supported three stone altars (two of which were actually discovered) in front of the central temple, and this may imply a common ritual of sacrifice to all three divinities in the temples -but even if so, that would not necessarily imply that they were the Capitoline Triad”⁵⁵.

In general, they pose that the aforementioned criteria established by Barton, “however require some qualification”⁵⁶, like the appearance of inscriptions dedicated to the Capitoline Triad and not to just one of the deities, or, likewise, of several statues of the triad and not just one. Thus, it would be debatable to accept the inscriptions documented in *Baetica* and dedicated solely to *Iuppiter (Optimus Maximus)*, *Iuno* or *Minerva* as *Capitolium* dedications or, likewise, sculptures of any of these deities that appear alone, especially, when they lack archaeological context⁵⁷. The authors conclude that only *Tarraco* and *Hispalis*⁵⁸ can be considered Hispanic *Capitolia*, when the aforementioned criteria are strictly applied, excluding complexes that Barton had already found questionable like *Augusta Emerita*, *Barcino*, *Saguntum*, *Italica*⁵⁹, *Carteia* and *Baelo Claudia*⁶⁰. However, there is reasonable doubt regarding the *Capitolium* of *Hispalis* (Seville) as this case is based on a poorly preserved Roman inscription that was seen and interpreted exclusively by the scholar Rodrigo Caro at the beginning of the 17th century, casting a considerable amount of doubt on the accuracy of the reading⁶¹. It

⁵⁵ J. Q. Quinn and A. Wilson supra n. 31, 26-7, fig. 8.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Cf., for example, J. Rodríguez Cortés, *Sociedad y religión clásica en la Bética romana* (Salamanca 1991), 24-38; J. A. Delgado, “El culto a Júpiter, Juno y Minerva entre las elites béticas durante el alto Imperio Romano”, *Gerión* 11 (1993) 337-63.

⁵⁸ Fig. 4 in J. Q. Quinn and A. Wilson supra n. 31, mislocates the North African city of *Vcubi* (Tunisia), in *Africa Proconsularis*, placing it in *Baetica*, where there is a city with the same name: *Vcubi*, Espejo, prov. Córdoba.

⁵⁹ Identified by M. Bendala supra n. 37, 17-20, but the revision of the pottery remains recovered at the site dates the building to preRoman times, possible 4th century BC.; cf. M. Pellicer Catalán, “Los cortes estratigráficos de Itálica y su contribución al estudio de la dinámica histórico-cultural del yacimiento”, *Boletín de Bellas Artes* 26 (1998) 143-86; J. Ruiz de Arbulo, “Arquitectura sacra y fundaciones urbanas en las Hispanias tardo-republicanas. Corrientes culturales, modelos edilicios y balance de novedades durante el siglo II a.C.”, in S. Camporeale, H. Dessales and A. Pizzo (edd.), *Arqueología de la construcción I. Los procesos constructivos en el mundo romana: Italia y provincias occidentales* (Mérida 2009) 269.

⁶⁰ Summary table in J. Q. Quinn and A. Wilson supra n. 31, 54.

⁶¹ R. Caro, *Antigüedades y Principado de la Ilustrissima Ciudad de Sevilla y Chorographia de su Convento Iuridico o Antigua Chancilleria* (Sevilla 1634) 21v. E. Hübner (*CIL* II n° 1194) already

should be noted that this author sought to highlight Seville's Roman past and was trying to identify all the aspects and buildings of an ancient city, so he "needed" to identify a *Capitolium* temple⁶². In addition, there is no archaeological evidence to sustain the existence of a *Capitolium* in *Hispalis*⁶³.

On the contrary, there seems to be in the case of *colonia Iulia Genetiva Urso* (Osuna, prov. Sevilla) where a copy of the *lex colonialis* refers to the magistrate's requirement to sacrifice to the Capitoline Triad. Although this is not decisive proof that there was a *Capitolium* in *Urso*, its colonial status and foundation commissioned by Caesar makes it plausible⁶⁴. Also, the discovery of a marble head, that would have worn a metal helmet, interpreted as *Dea Roma* or, more likely, *Minerva* is noteworthy⁶⁵; its quality and dimensions suggest that it could have been a cult statue from a temple dedicated to this goddess. Also, two large female feet with sandals were discovered next to this head, corresponding most probably to two seated female statues⁶⁶. One of them bears the engraved signature of the sculptor on the sole of the sandal⁶⁷.

2. Sanctuaries with three temples in parallel alignment

Special attention must be given to the sanctuaries in this category, which includes the temples of *Baelo Claudia*. To begin with complexes with three temples arranged on a same podium, as the *Capitolium* of Brescia, should be ruled out in order to focus attention on those set on three individual podiums. In principle, only *Sufetula*, already mentioned, and *Nesactium* (Vižiče)⁶⁸ can be referred to in this category. The three temples of *Sufetula* date to Antoninus Pius' time, therefore they could not have been a model for the sanctuary of *Baelo*, but, as P. Barresi suggests, without really entering into this debate⁶⁹, both of these sanctuaries would be *Capitolia*. P. Pensabene is also of the same opinion, albeit in a "forma ibrida"⁷⁰, resulting from the combination of Roman

expressed his doubts: "Non caret suspicione; nec tamen damnavi cum possit subesse titulos sepulcralis". The same opinion is sustained in M. Bendala supra n. 37, 14.

⁶² About the topic, see J. Beltrán Fortes, *Diccionario Biográfico Español de la Real Academia de la Historia*, s.v. "Caro, Rodrigo" (Madrid 2011) XI, 549-52; id., "Historiografía de la Arqueología de *Hispalis*", in J. Beltrán y O. Rodríguez (edd.), *Sevilla Arqueológica. La ciudad en época protohistórica, antigua y andalusí* (Sevilla 2014) 121-2.

⁶³ Cf. J. Beltrán Fortes and O. Rodríguez Gutiérrez, "Hispalis republicana y altoimperial a través de los datos arqueológicos", in J. Beltrán y O. Rodríguez (edd.), *Sevilla arqueológica. La ciudad en época protohistórica, antigua y andalusí* (Sevilla 2014), 151-63.

⁶⁴ On the *lex colonialis* of *Urso* and its founding as a colony after Caesar's death, cf. A. Caballos Rufino, *El nuevo bronce de Osuna y la política colonizadora romana* (Sevilla 2006).

⁶⁵ J. Beltrán Fortes, "Esculturas romanas de *Conobaria* (Las Cabezas de San Juan) y *Vrso* (Osuna). La adopción del mármol en los programas estatuarios de dos ciudades de la *Baetica*", in J. M. Noguera y E. Conde (edd.), *Escultura Romana en Hispania V* (Murcia 2008) 501-43; I. López García, *Osuna (Provincia de Sevilla. Hispania Ulterior Baetica)* (Sevilla-Tarragona 2017), 77-8, nº 72 (dated Late Augustan).

⁶⁶ J. Beltrán supra n. 65; I. López supra n. 65, 81-2, nºs 77-8.

⁶⁷ J. Beltrán Fortes, "Firmas de escultor en dos inscripciones de la *colonia Iulia Genetiva Vrso* (Osuna, Sevilla)", in *Espacios, usos y formas de la Epigrafía hispana en épocas antigua y tardoantigua. Homenaje al Dr. Armin U. Stylow* (Mérida 2009) 27-32. It reads: *Baliar(icus fecit)*.

⁶⁸ J.-N. Bonneville et al. supra n. 3, 184-6.

⁶⁹ P. Barresi supra n. 20.

⁷⁰ P. Pensabene, "Il tempio di Saturno a Dougga", in *L'Africa Romana VII* (Sassari 1990) I, 266-9.

Capitoline architecture and traditional Punic temples with several *cellae*. P. Barresi highlights the parallels between the temple plans of *Baelo* and *Sufetula*, although the first example follows Roman foot measurements, while the Tunisian temple uses the Punic foot unit. There are also some formal differences, such as the existence of arches joining together the back of the podiums in the North African sanctuary, as well as the fact that the central temple is larger than the lateral ones and does not have a frontal staircase but is replaced by a *tribuna*. In conclusion, Barresi establishes that,

“...il progetto di *Baelo*, più antico, è stato probabilmente conosciuto dall’architetto che progettò l’impianto di *Sufetula*; oppure esisteva un altro simile complesso forense, a noi ignoto, che ha ispirato ambedue. In ogni caso, si deve ammettere la circolazione di progetti anche a lunga distanza, sotto forma di schizzi e di indicazioni complete di misure e proporzioni, tali da consentire la progettazione a distanza di tempo e di spazio di due opere tanto simili”⁷¹.

Regarding *Nesactium*, it was thought that the three temples were not contemporary, the central shrine would be earlier and the lateral ones built at a later stage⁷², but recent studies suggest their construction took place at the same time, that is, the first half of the 1st century A.D.⁷³. Likewise, suggestions have been put forward on the probable existence of three temples aligned in parallel on the *forum* of the nearby city of *Pola* (Pula) and dated to Augustus’ time⁷⁴. Therefore, both cases would be contemporary to the dates of *Baelo Claudia*, if we bear in mind the aforementioned hypothesis that the three temples had been constructed under Augustus. The rarity of this design - three temples in parallel within the *forum* space – added to the fact that the few examples documented date to the beginning of the Imperial period and are found in faraway places, as *Baelo Claudia* in the province *Baetica* or *Nesactium* and *Pola* in Istria, seems to reaffirm P. Barresi’s hypothesis of a common project, which would have been taken up again at *Sufetula* in mid- 2nd century A.D.

One last example from the excavations recently carried out in the city of *Regina* (Casas de Reina, Badajoz), a Flavian period Latin *municipum* in the north of *provincia Baetica*, must be brought into this debate⁷⁵. Here, three temples aligned in parallel, having individualized podiums separated by narrow corridors of only 0.60 m, have been

⁷¹ P. Barresi supra n. 20, 268.

⁷² The central temple would be remodeled at the beginning of the 3rd century A.D., according to R. Matijasic, “Breve nota sui templi forensi di Nesazio e Pola”, in *La città nell’Italia settentrionale in età romana* (Trieste-Roma 1990) 635-52 and id. “Foro e campidoglio di *Nesactium* (Nesazio)”, in *Forum et basilica in Aquileia e nella Cisalpina romana* (Udine 1995) 121-39. Cf., J.-N. Bonneville *et al.* supra n. 9, 186.

⁷³ G. Rosada (ed.) *Oppidum Nesactium. Una città istro-romana* (Treviso 1999), esp. 39-90 and 156-65.

⁷⁴ R. Matisajic supra n. 72 (1990) 645-6.

⁷⁵ J. M. Álvarez Martínez, F. G. Rodríguez Martín and T. Nogales Basarrate, “*Regina*: proceso de urbanización de un centro de la Bética”, in T. Nogales and M. J. Pérez (edd.), *Ciudades Romanas de Extremadura* (Mérida 2014) 163-92; Álvarez Martínez, J. M. *et alii*, “El complejo religioso del foro de *Regina*”, in J. M. Álvarez, T. Nogales and I. Rodà (edd.), *Centro y periferia en el mundo clásico* (Actas XVIII CIAC, Mérida, 2014) II, 1639-42; Álvarez Martínez, J. M., *La ciudad romana de Regina* (Badajoz 2018) 41-58.

unearthed in the northwestern quarter of the *forum* (fig. 7). The three temples are tetrastyle - most likely, pseudoperipters -, having low podiums with frontal staircases (fig. 8) and somewhat smaller dimensions than those of *Baelo Claudia* and *Sufetula*. These last would be *Regina*'s closest equivalent, although here the forum and its three temple sanctuary seems to have been constructed under the Flavian dynasty⁷⁶. On the right side of the *forum* complex and presiding over a portico square stands another religious enclosure⁷⁷. In this case, a temple dedicated to the *Pietas Augusta*, according to a monumental inscription commemorating its restoration towards the end of the 2nd or beginning of the 3rd century A.D. However, the original temple must have been built by the Emperor Domitian in memory of his brother Titus shortly after his death⁷⁸. Excavators attenuate the identification of the three temples with a *Capitolium* as "...*Regina* was a *civitas stipendiaria* until Flavian times, when it received municipal status. The city we know today did not begin to be built until Julio-Claudian times; therefore the presence of a *Capitolium* within it seems quite difficult to explain"⁷⁹.

Several marble heads were recovered from the debris filling a well located in front of the three temples: a laurel-wreathed portrait of a Julio-Claudian prince, perhaps Claudius himself but with very youthful features and hardly recognizable; a portrait of Trajan; and a young *Genius* with veiled head⁸⁰, perhaps the *Genius oppidum* as an inscription on a pedestal discovered in the theatre suggests⁸¹.

Even more interesting are two marble blocks representing a seated female figure, currently kept in the Archaeological Museum of Badajoz: the backside of the torso block had been recycled into a coat of arms and taken to the nearby town of Llerena in the 17th century; the other was discovered in 2010 during excavations "in the area immediately behind the forum" of *Regina*⁸². This second piece, which depicts a

⁷⁶ Suggested by an inscription found on a bronze plaque fragment and dedicated to the *Genius Municipii* which would date it to the Flavian period, "es decir, del período al que, con probabilidad, corresponden los templos" (Álvarez, Rodríguez and Nogales supra n. 75, 178). Cf. J. M. Iglesias Gil and J. C. Saquete Chamizo, "Una placa votiva de bronce y el genio municipal de *Regina (Hispania Baetica)*", *ZPE* 192 (2014) 297-300.

⁷⁷ J. M. Álvarez, F. G. Rodríguez and T. Nogales supra n. 76, 176.

⁷⁸ J. M. Álvarez supra n. 75, 36-40. Cf. J. M. Iglesias Gil and J. C. Saquete Chamizo, "La epigrafía de *Regina* en su contexto topográfico: propuestas de interpretación a raíz de las últimas investigaciones arqueológicas", in J. M. Iglesias and A. Ruiz (edd.), *Paisajes epigráficos de la Hispania romana: monumentos, contextos, topografías* (Roma 2013) 101-2: Templum. Pietatis. Aug(ustae) / vetustate conlapsum R(es). P(ublica). R(eginensis) / sumptu suo. refecit curantibus / Q(uinto). F(lavio). Herenniano. et. C(aio). F(lavio). Taurino.

⁷⁹ J. M. Álvarez Martínez et al., "El complejo religioso del foro de *Regina*", in J. M. Álvarez, T. Nogales and I. Rodà (edd.), *Centro y periferia en el mundo clásico* (Mérida 2014) II, 1640-1.

⁸⁰ T. Nogales Basarrate and L. Nobre Da Silva, "Programas estatuarios en el foro de *Regina (Baetica)*: Príncipe julio-claudio, *Genius* y estatua colosal de Trajano. Una primera aproximación", in J. M. Abascal y R. Cebrián (edd.), *Escultura Romana en Hispania, VI. Homenaje a Eva Koppel* (Murcia 2010) 169-98.

⁸¹ CIL II²/7, n° 974; *HEp* 02, n° 30. A. U. Stylow, "Decemviri. Ein Beitrag zur Verwaltung peregriner Gemeiden in der *Hispania Ulterior*", in J. Pérez (ed.), *Ciudad y comunidad cívica en Hispania. Siglos II y III d. C.* (Madrid 1993) 37-46: *Iustus Modesti f(i)lius / Xvir max(imus) / ponendam cu- / ravit*, engraved on a pedestal dated between A.D. 54-74.

⁸² A. F. Silva Cordero, "Posible concordancia entre dos fragmentos escultóricos romanos depositados en el Museo Arqueológico Provincial de Badajoz", *Anas* 24 (2011) Silva 2011, 200. Cf. J. M. Álvarez et al. supra n. 79, 1640; J. M. Álvarez supra n. 75, 56-7.

diademed and veiled head, was made from the same marble block as the torso and dates back to the 2nd century AD⁸³. At first time A. F. Silva links both pieces, made of marble from Estremoz quarries⁸⁴, to the same statue⁸⁵ and suggests that it is a representation of *Iuno Regina* from the *Capitolium* of *Regina*, whose name is also linked to the epithet of the Capitoline deity⁸⁶ (fig. 9.1). Unfortunately, the 17th century reuse eliminated the lateral lower parts of the statue and thus, any possible image of a peacock which would corroborate its identification as *Iuno Regina*. Today, only the right side of the lower part of a throne leg with two moldings at the base can be recognized, whereas a rounded profile of the upper part corresponds with the Modern Age reuse (fig. 9.2). A plinth inscription dedicated to *Iuno* was also recovered from the theatre at *Regina*⁸⁷, although it lacks any epithet accompanying the name of the divinity.

Again, the identification of this sanctuary of *Regina* as a *Capitolium* is uncertain when the criteria established by I. M. Barton or by J. Q. Quinn and A. Wilson is strictly applied⁸⁸, as in the other similar sanctuary complexes found at *Nesactium*, *Pola*, *Sufetula* and *Baelo Claudia*. However, in the latter case we can provide new arguments based on sculpture analysis.

3. The cult statue from Temple A at *Baelo Claudia*: new fragments

It has already been mentioned that the statue fragments documented in Temple A in the excavations 1917-21 were never catalogued, but only described as corresponding to “...une statue féminine drapée”⁸⁹ and now are not missing. On the other hand, Temple A was examined again during the excavation campaign carried out in 1967 by Casa de Velázquez, resulting in the discovery and documentation of a vaulted crypt located below ground level⁹⁰. The excavation report mentions various statue fragments among the materials recovered inside:

“...l’extrémité inférieure d’un petit autel bacchique, de nombreux fragments de deux o trois statues monumentales de marbres (fragments de pieds, bras, drapés) qui avaient été sans doute brisées intentionnellement et

⁸³ It resembles in shape and style the three seated female statues from the *forum* of *Cartima* (Cártama, prov. Málaga). Cf., J. Beltrán Fortes *et al.* 2018. “*Marmora de Cartima* (Cártama, Málaga)”, in J. Beltrán, M. L. Loza and E. Ontiveros (edd.), *Marmora Baeticae. Usos de materiales pétreos en la Bética romana. Estudios arqueológicos y análisis arqueométricos* (Sevilla 2018) 77-9.

⁸⁴ Cf. I. Mañas Romero and A. Fusco, “Canteras de Lusitania. Un análisis arqueológico”, in T. Nogales and J. Beltrán (edd.), *Marmora Hispana. Explotación y uso de los materiales pétreos en la Hispania Romana* (Roma 2008) 419-58.

⁸⁵ Although also the lower part could correspond to Minerva cult statue.

⁸⁶ A. F. Silva *supra* n. 82, 193-213. A reconstruction also in J. M. Álvarez *supra* n. 75, 57.

⁸⁷ According to the interpretation by A. F. Silva *supra* n. 82, 200, lám. IV, 2. The inscription reads: *Iunoni. sa- / crum. / Terentia. Pue- / lla. testamento / poni. iussit. ex. / argenti. libris / L.*

⁸⁸ Nevertheless, according J. M. Álvarez (*supra* n. 75, 57): “Pensamos, pues, que dos de los edificios situados en este foro pueden relacionarse con Juno y con el Genio del lugar y no necesariamente con la tríada capitolina. En cuanto al tercer edificio, consideramos que pudo estar dedicado al culto relacionado con la *domus Augusta*”.

⁸⁹ P. Paris *et al.* *supra* n. 7, 85

⁹⁰ A. García y Bellido *et al.*, “Les fouilles de la Casa de Velázquez a Belo-Bolonia (Cádiz) en 1967”, *MCV* (1968) 4, 393-406.

jetées là dans l'antiquité... également plusieurs fragments de deux inscriptions dédicatoires"⁹¹.

The two inscriptions are funerary plaques⁹², evidently out of their original context, making it possible that the cylindrical altar, decorated with archaic Bacchic theme bas-reliefs, was also a removed piece. The generic reference of "fragments of pieds, bras, drapes" make these elements more difficult to identify as the majority were not classified nor numbered by their excavators. However, a few marble fragments, kept currently in the museum storerooms of the Archaeological Site of *Baelo Claudia*, show a large red painted acronym T.A, which can be developed as T(emple).A, making it possible to assign them to the 1967 excavation campaign. The collection has remained unpublished until now⁹³, with the exception of fragment n° 3, currently on display in the aforementioned museum.

The majority of the fragments belong to a large cult statue⁹⁴:

- 1) Front view fragment of a draped right leg. Dimensions: 86 cm (height) x 40 cm (width) x 20 cm (width). (fig. 10.1). Joins with the following fragment.
- 2) Right heel fragment with sandal sole. Dimensions: 30 x 33 x 17 cm (fig. 10.2).
- 3) Two front fragments of a right foot wearing sandal⁹⁵ that join together, partially restored with plaster. Although it corresponds to the same foot as the previous fragment, they do not join. Dowel hole in the back to attach it to another statue piece. Dimensions: 15.5 x 17 x 26 cm (fig. 10, 3; fig. 11).
- 4) Fragment with bas-relief representing the head and right wing of an owl; traces of the right eye are visible. Dimensions: 23 x 24 x 15 cm (fig. 10.4; fig. 12.1-2).
- 5) Fragment of a draped right thigh. 39 x 19,5 x 8 cm (fig. 10.5).
- 6) Tunic fragment and central part of the mantle *balteus*. Dimensions: 52 x 20 x 32 cm (fig. 13.1).
- 7) Right elbow fragment. Dimensions: 25.5 x 17 cm (fig. 13.2).
- 8) Left shoulder fragment. Dimensions: 27 x 14.5 x 5 cm (fig. 13.3).
- 9) Left side fragment of draping mantle with two thick *puntelli* that would have joined with the side of the throne. Dimensions: 43.5 x 14 x 11.5 cm (fig. 13.4).

⁹¹ A. García y Bellido *et al.* supra n. 90, 395-6, fig. 1 (the altar).

⁹² J.-N. Bonneville, S. Dardaine and P. Le Roux supra n. 30, 66-67, n^{os} 45-46.

⁹³ The study of the statue remains from Temple A was not included in the monograph dedicated on the *Capitolium* by J.-N. Bonneville *et al.* supra n. 9. They have now been catalogued in the monograph: J. Beltrán Fortes and M. L. Loza Azuaga, *Esculturas Romanas de la Provincia de Cádiz*, CSIR-España, vol. I, 8, forthcoming.

⁹⁴ J. Beltrán y M. L. Loza supra n. 93, n° 175, a-l.

⁹⁵ It is the only fragment that has been mentioned, but was attributed to the missing statue of Jupiter of Temple B: P. Rodríguez Oliva, "La escultura ideal", in P. León (ed.), *Arte Romano de la Bética. Escultura* (Sevilla 2009) 89.

10) Possible fragment of the area where the tunic joins with the *balteus* with opposite folds. Dimensions: 36 x 39 x 13 cm (fig. 13.5).

11) Drapery fragment. Position unknown. Dimensions: 36 x 22 cm (fig. 13.6).

12) Drapery fragment. Position unknown. Dimensions: 20 x 28 cm (fig. 13.7).

No hand fragments have been identified in the collection recovered from the crypt fill, but only two drapery fragments (13 and 14) with the acronym T.A. These are smaller in size than the pieces described above, which would confirm the excavators' impressions that the collection would be consistent with at least two or three different statues. In fact, one of these fragments clearly corresponds to a female statue, representing a robed torso with a belt under the missing breast area⁹⁶. It is possible that this smaller statue could have formed part of the temple's sculptural program and been placed next to the cult statue, as is the case of the two togate statues in Temple B.

The various fragments referred to above allow us to develop a proposal for the reconstruction of the original statue, that is, a female figure seated on a throne draped in a tunic and cloak (fig. 14), wearing high platform-like *crepida* sandals⁹⁷. But, the most significant element is the owl representation on the lower right area of the statue, which clearly identifies it with *Minerva*. The Capitoline Triad sculptural group, recovered from *villa Inviolata* and at display in the Museum of Palestrina, is a noteworthy example of where bird-attributes are placed next to each god⁹⁸. Here, the owl is represented with open wings as in the *Baelo* bas-relief. As to the seated statue of *Iuno*, the damage and deterioration on the lower right side (cf. fig. 3, 3) has erased any traces of the peacock that would have been represented on that side, as with the figure of *Minerva*. Today only the base remains (cf. fig. 3, 1), but, by the presumable size of the original plinth, there would be enough space for *Iuno* to be represented with a peacock on her right.

The reconstructed statue is therefore the cult image of Temple A, dedicated to the worship of *Minerva Augusta* as part of the Capitoline Triad. This would also explain the presence of other figures wearing tunics and cloaks, perhaps female representations of ruling members of the *Domus Augusta*, according to what was said before.

The sculpture of *Minerva* was made during Emperor Claudius' time, possibly at the end of his reign, likewise the statue of *Iuno* and the missing statue of *Iuppiter*, making up the three cult statues of the respective temples. At the moment no petrographic analysis has been carried out on the marble employed, white with reddish veins, but an *ex visu* identification suggests that it comes from the quarries of Almadén de la Plata (prov.

⁹⁶ J. Beltrán y M. L. Loza supra n. 93, n^{os} 176-7.

⁹⁷ These types of sandals are known since the 2nd century B.C.; a similar example is seen on an ivory foot at the Metropolitan Museum of New York; J. L. Sebesta and L. Bonfante, *The World of Roman Costume* (Madison 2001) 114.

⁹⁸ E. Moscetti, "Il rinvenimento del gruppo scultoreo della Triade Capitolina nella villa romana dell'Inviolata (Guidonia Montecelio)", *Atti e Memorie della Società Tiburtina di Storia e Arte*, LXVII (1994) 181-93.

Sevilla)⁹⁹. However, the lower block of the statue of *Iuno* from Temple C has been analyzed, corroborating its origin in Almadén de la Plata¹⁰⁰, possibly from the extraction sites of Pedrera, Higuera or Castillejos¹⁰¹. The stylistic similarity and the material used seem to indicate that they were manufactured during the same time period and the same workshop as a single commission and following uniform statuary program. It seems plausible that this *officina* was located in *Baelo Claudia* itself, where during Claudio-Neronian times an important sculptural production using local marble quarries, as those mentioned belonging to Almadén de la Plata¹⁰² or from Estremoz (Portugal), has been noted.

4. Conclusions

The excavators first identification back in 1923 of the sanctuary complex – temples A, B and C - that presides over the forum of *Baelo Claudia* as a *Capitolium* has generally been accepted, but also criticized by some authors, including those who have written the two most important synthesis on Roman *Capitolia*, I. M. Barton (1982) and J. Q. Quinn and A. Wilson (2013). Likewise, M. Bendala (1989-90) in his synthesis on *Capitolia Hispaniarum* concludes that the sanctuary of *Baelo* should not be identified as such in the absence of reliable epigraphic or sculptural testimonies. Also, the most discordant architectural factor would be the scheme: three temples aligned in parallel on separated podiums and not on just one.

The sculptural fragments that we have identified in this study, belonging to a seated statue of *Minerva*, which would have been the cult statue of its corresponding temple (called Temple A by the excavators), together with the statue of *Iuno* from Temple C, attests that the Capitoline Triad was worshiped in *Baelo Claudia*. This assures its recognition as a *Capitolium*, although with a special architectural plan. In addition, Imperial cult was established here on the evidence of the statues found in the Temple of *Iuppiter*; and possibly in the Temple of *Minerva* as well.

All this invalidates M. Bendala's hypothesis (2009 and 2010) that the cults would have followed Phoenician traditions, proposing in particular the veneration of *Melkart* (Temple B), *Iuno Caelestis* (Temple C) and *Eshmun?* (Temple A). On the contrary, it

⁹⁹ Cf., for example, J. Beltrán Fortes *et al.*, “Las canteras de mármol de Almadén de la Plata”, in V. García-Entero (ed.), *El marmor en Hispania: explotación, uso y difusión en época romana* (Madrid 2012) 253-76; O. Rodríguez Gutiérrez *et al.*, “The quarries of Almadén de la Plata (Seville, Spain): new data from the latest interventions”, in A. Gutiérrez *et al.* (edd.), *Interdisciplinary Studies on Ancient Stone. Proceedings of the IX Asmosia Conference* (Tarragona 2012) 645-50; and especially, R. Taylor, *Las canteras romanas de mármol de Almadén de la Plata (Sevilla, España). Un análisis arqueológico* (Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Seville 2015).

¹⁰⁰ J. Beltrán Fortes *et al.*, “Marmora de procedencia hispana en *Baelo Claudia* (Bolonía, Tarifa Cádiz)”, in J. Beltrán, M. L. Loza and E. Ontiveros (edd.), *Marmora Baeticae. Uso de materiales pétreos en la Bética romana. Estudios arqueológicos y análisis arqueométricos* (Sevilla 2018) 25, nº 22, fig. 33; sample reference is BC-37.

¹⁰¹ R. Taylor *supra* n. 99.

¹⁰² Also the togate torso recovered from the basilica of *Baelo Claudia*, which was later completed with Trajan's portrait, was made with marble from Almadén de la Plata, according to A. Álvarez, M. P. Darblade-Audoin and A. Gutiérrez, “La statue de l'empereur Trajan. Étude pétrographique et stylistique”, in P. Sillières (ed.) *Belo IX. La basilique* (Madrid 2013) 59-72.

reaffirms the proposal made by Bonneville *et alii* (2010) which interprets this northern sector of the forum as “a Capitoline area” where the three temples would have been regarded without doubt as the three classic *cellae* of a *Capitolium*. At least that is how it seems after the evidence on the worship performed here.

The architectural scheme of three temples aligned in parallel and located on forum spaces, as in the case of *Baelo Claudia*, is not related to the North African three temple sanctuaries of Phoenician-Punic tradition. It holds parallels, similar but not exact, with the three temple sanctuaries of *Nesactium* and, probably, *Pola*, of similar dates, as well as with *Sufetula*, dated to the 2nd century A.D. The case of the forum of *Regina* in *Baetica*, where a statue of *Iuno* was recovered can also be cited. The identification of *Baelo*'s complex as a *Capitolium* is perhaps an argument in favor of considering the other examples cited as such.

The exact origin of this architectural scheme of three temples is not known. Although it has been pointed out that there may have been a common model, specifically in the earliest temples constructed under Augustus, that is, if we bear in mind the hypothesis that the Claudian era scheme in *Baelo Claudia* was a reconstruction of an earlier Augustan sanctuary. This original scheme would have been followed in those few cities referred to during the 1st and 2nd centuries A.D., without overlooking the fact that the earliest temples were also known and used as models by the architects who designed the later sanctuaries.

5. Acknowledgements

This work has been carried out within the framework of the I+D+i Project: “Proyecto *Colonia Aelia Augusta Italica* (CAAI). Archaeology of the NE Sector of the *Vetus Urbs* of *Italica* in the framework of the Romanization process in the Lower Guadalquivir” (HAR2017-89004-P), approved and subsidized within the State Plan 2013-2016 Excelencia-Proyectos I+D of the Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad de España, with the support of FEDER Funds. It is also part of the activities of the Research Group “Historiografía y Patrimonio Andaluz” (HUM 402), of the Andalusian Research Plan of the Junta de Andalucía, assigned to the Department of Prehistory and Archaeology of the University of Seville. We thank Mr. Iván García Jiménez, technical archaeologist of the “Conjunto Arqueológico de *Baelo Claudia*”, for his help given to carry out the study and photography of the pieces in the warehouse. Also, to Dr. Daniel Becerra Fernández (University of Seville) for his collaboration with the cataloguing. We also express our gratitude to Dr. Esther Ontiveros Ortega, from the Geology Laboratory of the “Instituto Andaluz del Patrimonio Histórico (Junta de Andalucía)”, for carrying out the stone sample analysis on the lower block from the Juno statue of Temple C in *Baelo*; as well as to the former Director of the “Conjunto Arqueológico de *Baelo Claudia*”, Mr. Ángel Muñoz Vicente, for the authorization to do so. Finally, to Mrs. Elisabet Conlin for the illustrations figs. 10, 13 and 14.

Figure captions

Fig. 1. *Forum* map of *Baelo Claudia* (after Sillières 1997, fig. 32): 1. *Capitolium* temples. 2. Temple of Isis. 5. *Forum* square. 6-9 and 13. Non-religious public buildings. 10. *Basilica*. 11. *Tabernae*. 12. *Macellum*. 14. Square. 15. “SE building”. A. Altar. E. *Sacella*. F. Fountain. T. *Tribuna*.

Fig. 2. Upper part of the statue of *Iuno* from Templo C at *Baelo Claudia*, currently missing (after Paris *et al.* 1923, fig. 26).

Fig. 3. Lower part of the statue of *Iuno* from Templo C at *Baelo Claudia* (photos: J. Beltrán). 1. Front view. 2. Left side. 3. Right side.

Fig. 4. Drawing depicting the podiums of the three *Capitolium* temples of *Baelo Claudia* (after Bonneville *et al.* 2000, fig. 38.1). Above: Temple A; Middle: Temple B; Below: Temple C.

Fig. 5. Togate statue discovered in Temple B at *Baelo Claudia*, most likely, the emperor Claudius. National Archaeological Museum, Madrid (photo: J. Beltrán).

Fig. 6. Drawing by G. Bonsor of the two togate statues from Temple B at *Baelo Claudia* (after Paris *et al.* 1923, fig. 19).

Fig. 7. Map of the urban central area of *Regina* (Casas de Reina, prov. Badajoz) with the three temples in parallel (after Álvarez 2018, 35).

Fig. 8. The three temples of the *forum* of *Regina* in their current state (photo: J. Beltrán).

Fig. 9. Statue of *Iuno*, from the urban central area of *Regina*. 1. Reconstruction (after Álvarez 2018, 57). 2. Lower part of the statue; Archaeological Museum of Badajoz (photo: J. Beltrán).

Fig. 10. Illustrations of the statue of *Minerva* fragments from Temple A at *Baelo Claudia* (author: E. Conlin).

Fig. 11. Left foot of the statue of *Minerva* wearing sandal. Archaeological Site of *Baelo Claudia* (Bolonia, Tarifa, prov. Cádiz) (photo: J. Beltrán).

Fig. 12. Bas-relief owl fragment from the statue of *Minerva* (photos: J. Beltrán). 1. Right side. 2. Front view detail.

13. Illustrations of the statue pieces from the figure of *Minerva* (author: E. Conlin).

14. Reconstruction of the statue of *Minerva* (illustration author: E. Conlin).