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INTRODUCTION

Monumental architecture from classical antiquity has always attracted a great deal of attention. By its very nature, it has a better chance of preservation over the centuries, although seldom completely intact, and is obviously far more visible than many other material categories from ancient times. It is one of the more inviting testimonies of ancient culture, since it allows visitors to walk among its remains, directly appealing to people’s senses in a way that shards or other more humble material generally fail to do. Not surprisingly, monumental architecture has also occupied a central place in scholarly research on Roman and Italic culture. Of course, the lion’s share has been directed at the architecture of the city of Rome itself, the baths and fora; in other words the great examples of imperial architecture. But the period prior to this phase of architectural maturity is no less interesting, and especially during the last decades the architecture of the republican period, both in Rome itself and in other regions of Italy, has been given greater prominence. Traditionally the research has been dominated by the study of formal architectural and stylistic characteristics, but increasingly attention is shifting in the direction of contextual analysis of sanctuaries, relating architecture to societal developments instead of studying it as a stand-alone phenomenon. A prominent place within the research of republican architecture is occupied by a group of sanctuaries in Latium, which were built or restructured on a monumental scale between roughly 175 and 50 BC. Imposing building complexes arose on highly visible locations, demonstrating an ability and desire to reshape the natural landscape as a setting for feats of architectural daring.

The fact that the construction of these sanctuaries took place in a relatively limited period of time and that so many of them were located in a relatively limited geographical area, combined with similarities that have been observed in their architectural features, has lead to a perception of these sanctuaries as belonging to a specific and more or less standardised typology. According to this typology, the standard monumental sanctuary was built on one or more artificial terraces, had a centrally placed temple building and a pi-shaped portico surrounding the temple. In addition, a theatrical cavea could be incorporated into the design, and the open court around the temple could be used as a sacred garden. In the second half of the 20th century, this has become the standard image of the late republican Latial monumental sanctuary, repeated, projected and reasserted in many publications about sanctuary complexes in Latium.

A fine example of this tendency can be found in the first publications of the excavation results of the building complex at Colle Noce, near the town of Segni, excavated in the late 1

\footnote{All dates hereafter are BC, unless reference is made to modern excavations and research, or specifically stated in the case of dates in classical antiquity.}
1990s. The complex consisted of a series of terraces and was dated to the late republican period. Anna Maria Reggiani, publishing the first excavation results, immediately concluded that we were dealing with a sanctuary and gave a reconstruction of the complex with a central temple on the highest terrace surrounded by a pi-shaped portico, while the excavation results were far from conclusive regarding the structural remains on this terrace.\(^2\) Indeed, subsequent research brought to light new data which called into question the earlier identification as a sanctuary (although this remains a possibility) and moreover the proposed architectural reconstruction.\(^3\) Clearly, the combination of (artificial) terracing, a date during the late republican period, and the fact that the complex probably had cultic functions for at least some time during the republican period in this case led to an immediate mental parallel with the canonical Latial sanctuary. Architectural features which have become firmly established as an essential feature of such sanctuaries, such as a central temple building and a pi-shaped portico, were used for the reconstruction drawing of the remains at Colle Noce, regardless of the archaeological reality presented by the site.

The described case clearly illustrates that Latial sanctuaries have become part of a standard typology. The typology itself is hardly ever questioned or studied, but used as a benchmark to compare other monuments with, providing a blueprint of characteristic architectural features with which to complete incomplete ground plans. This situation can lead to a false sense of certainty and fast and ready conclusions resulting in stagnation of further relevant research. The present study is aimed at testing and scrutinising the preconceptions and assumptions about Latial sanctuaries by providing a thorough analysis of the monuments. By reconstructing the specific context of each sanctuary, we can perhaps gain a better understanding of the process of monumentalisation. This goal, primarily historiographical in nature, is supplemented with another research question, which can be answered at the same time: why did people invest such incredible amounts of time and resources in the construction of these grand complexes; what was it that they were hoping to gain from this undertaking? By analysing the monumental sanctuaries of Latium, I hope to provide answers to both questions.

The objects of study: definitions

It will be clear by now that the objects central to this study are monumental sanctuaries located in the region of Latium. This raises two very obvious questions. The first is related to the concept of monumental architecture: what exactly do we mean by a ‘monumental sanctuary’ and how can we differentiate such entities from ‘normal’ temple buildings. The second question is related to the geographic delimitation of the subject: what area can we call ‘Latium’ in the late republican period? Below, I will propose definitions for both, and introduce the sanctuaries that fit this particular designation.

---

\(^2\) Reggiani 2000.

\(^3\) Alvino et al. 2003.
What constitutes a ‘monumental sanctuary’?

The first definition that needs to be clarified when discussing the monumentalisation of sanctuaries is what exactly is implied by the term ‘monumental sanctuary’? A cult place does not have to include permanent structures: early cult places were most likely open-air sanctuaries, and buildings were not strictly required for the basic religious purposes of a cult place. Although permanent structures could become necessary as shelters for the cult image, constituting a true house of the gods, structures built at a cult place exceeding the dimensions needed for this specific purpose can be considered an example of monumental architecture, if we consider that “its principal defining feature is that its scale and elaboration exceed the requirements of any practical functions that a building is intended to perform”.4 Other requirements have been formulated to define monumental architecture and to distinguish it from non-monumental architecture, such as permanence (the fact that monumental structures are generally permanent buildings meant to last over generations), centrality (monumental structures are centrally located in a settlement or isolated, away from the residential area), visibility (the fact that one should be able to see monumental buildings from a distance) and ubiquity (in relation to the number of settlements, there should be a relatively low distribution of monumental structures).5

The fact of the matter is that we are dealing with a relative phenomenon; what is considered monumental in a given time depends on other contemporaneous architectural types, and it will be difficult to establish a firm cut-off point to determine what is considered to be monumental and what not. If the main characteristic with which we distinguish monumental architecture in the late republican period is the fact that we are dealing with building complexes, architectural units (although the extent of this unity has yet to be determined) instead of single entities (such as isolated temple buildings), the criteria established by Jerry Moore can be seen as a helpful general guideline. Monumental are those sanctuaries that clearly stand out from their surroundings, and while their numbers increase during the late republican period, the distribution in relation to the number of towns in Latium and the number of ‘regular’ temples is relatively low. Furthermore, they are clearly meant to be seen and either occupy a central (visual) position in the town or are located outside the city walls. In the context of the present study, when I talk about monumentalisation, monumental sanctuaries or the monumental phase of sanctuaries, I will mean the specific late republican construction phase which involves the (re-)structuring of cult places with more or less unified building complexes as a result, while being fully aware that the construction of temples and sanctuaries in previous periods can, by some criteria, just as well be understood as a monumentalisation of sacred space.

4 Trigger 1990, 119.
5 Moore 1996, 139-140. Although writing about the ancient Andes, Jerry Moore’s criteria can be applied here and serve to distinguish, although still somewhat vaguely, ‘true’ monumental structures from more common structures.
What constitutes “Latium”?

The choice for Latium as a test case was determined primarily by the availability of a more or less all-encompassing body of material evidence which can be used to reconstruct the sacred landscape of the area and the fact that it is arguably the first region in Italy to achieve some sort of homogeneity in the period of the Roman conquest of the peninsula, in a political sense at least, which enables comparison of this body of evidence on a roughly level playing field. From a geographical perspective, there is some justification in defining the area of Latium roughly as it is presented here (fig. 1). The area is bounded on the western side by the Tyrrhenian Sea and to the east by the high central Apennine mountain range. The northern side of the area is taken up by the Tiber valley, delimited by the Monti Sabatini, while the lower Liri valley forms its southern border. In short the region consists of a series of coastal plains, the largest of which is the Pontine plain, and an extended fluvial valley system, primarily consisting of the valleys of the rivers Sacco and Liri and the Tiber valley. However, it is highly questionable if this particular geographic area was actually regarded at any point in time as officially constituting ‘Latium’; while natural boundaries must have been important in antiquity, they did not necessarily coincide with political or ethnic ones. Furthermore, familiar concepts, even geographical ones, may be later rationalisations of situations which never properly existed. Knowledge of the spread and eventual extent of Roman control may have had implications for the reconstruction and definition of the area by both ancient and modern scholars. It is fairly certain that at least up to the fourth century, this geographical area did not form a unified political, ethnic, or even cultural whole. In this early period the region known as Latium, area of the Latin people, was much smaller.

It is around the mid-fourth century that the contours of a Latium roughly coinciding with the geographical area indicated above begin to emerge. In 338, Rome won a decisive victory over the Latins, making her not only factual but also formal mistress of Latium. The start of Roman expansion into Etruria ensured Roman effective control over the territory in the north up to the Monti Sabatini in the fourth century, while the founding of a great number of Latin colonies in the southern part of the region under consideration here in the late fourth and early third century established a firm Roman military and political presence in that area. The river Liri is mentioned several times in the literary sources as a boundary line for the sphere of Roman influence in the fourth century; a treaty between Rome and the Samnites, dated to 354, probably indicated this particular river as the dividing line between Roman and Samnite spheres of influence. The founding of the Latin colony of Fregellae in 329, on the left bank of the river and therefore in Samnium agro, set off the Second Samnite War in 327, again underlining the territorial importance of the Liri. Pliny also explicitly mentions the Liri as the southern border of Latium, and in another passage writes that the town of Sinuessa, located some 15 kilometres to the south of Minturnae, was extremum in adiecto Latio, thereby suggesting

---

7 For a detailed discussion of the development of Latium as a (geographical) concept, see Solin 1996.
8 See Salmon 1967, 192-3 for a speculative reconstruction of the terms included in the treaty.
9 Liv. 8.23.6; Dion. Hal. 15.8.5, 15.10.1; Appian. Samn. 1.4
that the entire lower Liri valley was part of Latium.\(^\text{10}\) The fourth and early third centuries BC thus reveal an increasingly secure Roman political presence throughout the area that has earlier been defined here as constituting Latium in geographical terms. This is further illustrated by the fact that Rome embarked on several ambitious infrastructural projects in the area from the late fourth century onwards, such as the network of consular roads begun in 312 with the via Appia, \textit{regina viarum}, surely one of the most potent symbolic statements underlining Rome’s dominant position in the region.\(^\text{11}\)

It is likely that these infrastructural projects, and other actions actually changing the physical fabric of an area such as colonisation and, perhaps to a lesser extent municipilisation, had a considerable impact on the lives of people. It is less clear what the effects were of changes in legal status accompanying Roman expansion. Issues such as exactly what status the land had and in which region you lived according to the central authorities was probably important in matter such as the military levy and certain voting procedures, but did not affect day-to-day life all that much. It is only fair to point out that in religious matters, territorial boundaries were indeed considered important. Distinction was made in the period prior to the Social War between Roman and non-Roman \textit{sacra},\(^\text{12}\) and in prodigies reported inside and outside the \textit{ager}.

---

\(^{10}\) \textit{Plin. Nat. Hist.} 3.56 (Liri), 3.59 (Sinuessa).

\(^{11}\) \textit{Laurence} 1999, 13-19.

\(^{12}\) \textit{De Cazanove} 2000, 71-74.
I am convinced that such territorial distinctions were of minor importance to the everyday functioning of religion and only became an issue in politically charged situations. One of the best examples to illustrate this point is the fact that in 241, the Roman consul Q. Lutatius Cerco wanted to consult the oracle of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste, which the Senate forbade, stating as a reason the alien nature of the cult. However, the material aspects of this and other cults at Praeneste is very similar to what is found in Rome and the rest of Latium, demonstrating the discrepancy between practical and political aspects of cult and religion in Latium.

It is important to keep in mind that in general Latium was not a static, clearly defined geographical area and was probably - though not necessarily consciously or intentionally - continuously and perhaps confusingly redefined in the wake of Roman expansion. It is certainly possible that changes in boundaries had to be accompanied by ritual acts, in any case for such religiously important boundaries as the Roman pomerium. It is not clear whether the extension of the ager Romanus, particularly relevant for Latium, necessitated such acts as well; Filippo Coarelli seems to suggest as much, and indeed confirms that territorial expansion put the religious boundary system to the test, necessitating the creation of new categories. It is probably safe to assume that during the entire period under consideration, even after the great enfranchisement laws of 90 and 89, the situation in Latium was a lot less straightforward, uniform and homogenous than is sometimes suggested. We should therefore keep in mind when interpreting the data that what area we regard as Latium is almost by definition a mental construct, which might not correspond with any real, historic Latium.

Monumental sanctuaries in Latium

The sanctuaries which will be analysed, fitting the conditions of monumentality and location outlined above, are the seven sanctuaries described by Filippo Coarelli in his 1987 publication, at or in the towns of Fregellae, Gabii, Lanuvium, Praeneste, Tibur, Terracina and on the shores of Lake Nemi, and one additional sanctuary at the town of Tusculum that has been analysed in the period after his book was published (fig. 1). While it would have been interesting to include the building complex at Colle Noce (Segni), apart from the reports already mentioned the results of the excavation have not yet been published which unfortunately means that the available data are insufficient for a full analysis. A full publication of the excavations at the complex has been announced for 2010.

I will now provide a brief description of each sanctuary, presenting information about the divinity to which they were dedicated, as well as their location and chronology. In the course of the following chapters, more detailed and precise information will be provided about each of these subjects, including a discussion of the material evidence on which they are based.

---

14 Val. Max. 1.3.2.
16 COARELLI 2000, esp. 289
18 COARELLI 1987.
19 QUILECI/QUILECI GIGLI 1995.
20 A full publication of the excavations at the complex has been announced for 2010.
The first sanctuary to be monumentalised was the sanctuary of Aesculapius at the Latin colony of Fregellae. The building complex is located on a hill just at a short distance from the plateau on which the settlement itself was located and to which it was probably connected by a road. It has been dated to the second quarter of the second century.

The next sanctuary, chronologically, is situated at Gabii, an ancient Latin town close to Rome. The sanctuary was dedicated to the goddess Juno Gabina, and was situated along the via Prenestina, inside the inhabited urban area. It has been dated to the period around the middle of the second century.

The monumental sanctuary that was built on top of Monte S. Angelo at Terracina probably had more than one construction phase. The first of these, which can be connected to the remains of the so-called 'piccolo tempio', has been dated to the second half of the second century, while the second monumental phase can be dated to the second quarter of the first century. The building complex is located just outside the Roman citizen colony of Terracina. The divinity to which the sanctuary was dedicated has traditionally been identified as Jupiter Anxur.

The sanctuary at the town of Tusculum also underwent several construction phases during the late republican period. Although these phases are difficult to date, the sanctuary probably was first monumentalised during the second half of the second century. It was subsequently enlarged in the first half of the first century, and a final monumental phase has been dated to the period around or just after the middle of the first century. The building complex is located outside the urban area, at a short distance from the western town gate. Its main divinity is unknown, but Castor and Pollux, Jupiter or Hercules are the most likely suggestions.

The sanctuary dedicated to the goddess Fortuna Primigenia was located in the Latin city of Praeneste, some 30 km northeast of Rome. By scholarly consensus, the construction of this complex has been dated to the late second century. It is situated on the northern edge of the urban plateau comprising the republican town, against the slope of Monte Ginestro.

On the shores north of Lake Nemi in the area of the Alban Hills, a sanctuary was constructed dedicated to the goddess Diana Nemorensis. Its late republican monumental phase has been dated to the period around 100. Although it is located in the territory of the town of Aricia, the sanctuary is situated several kilometres from the nearest urban centre.

Just south of the urban centre of the Latin city of Tibur, a sanctuary was constructed dedicated to the god Hercules Victor. It is built on top of one of the most important access routes towards the city from Rome, the via Tiburtina. Building activities spanned several decades, and can be dated to the end of the second century and the first quarter of the first century.

Finally, there is the sanctuary dedicated to the goddess Juno Sospita at Lanuvium. The sanctuary belongs to a sacred area occupying the Colle S. Lorenzo in the northern part of the town; the sanctuary of Juno Sospita was constructed on the hill’s southern edge. The late republican monumental building phase has been dated to the second quarter of the first century.

21 Although it did not exist as a town in the republican period, for the sake of brevity and comprehension I will regularly refer to this sanctuary with the toponym Nemi (as in: sanctuary at Nemi) instead of Aricia or Nemus Aricinum, to designate its geographical proximity to this town.
History of research

Some of these sanctuaries have been known and studied for a long time, while others have been discovered more recently. The availability of information is therefore rather disparate. Some sanctuaries, such as Praeneste, have always attracted a lot of attention and inspired a large number of studies, while others are far less well studied. Although the context of certain sanctuaries can therefore be fleshed out more thoroughly and successfully than others, the availability of descriptions of recovered material and plans of the remains for each sanctuary allows us to compare them in some basic ways. In addition, scholarly research has greatly influenced the way in which these sanctuaries are approached in modern publications. I would therefore like to offer a brief history of the study of the monuments. It is by no means intended as an exhaustive account, containing all publications which have appeared until now. Rather, it seeks to outline a general development in scholarly thinking about these monuments, especially as an architectural group. What ideas about the individual building complexes and their shared characteristics have been formed throughout the years, and how does this affect modern research?

Early research: identification, drawing and collecting

Some sanctuaries have always remained visible, at least in part, although the building complex as such was not always recognised as a sanctuary. This was certainly the case for those sanctuaries of which considerable sections of the elevation were preserved: at Gabii, the walls of the cella remained visible; at Praeneste, parts of the sanctuary were used for the construction of new buildings but its remains were never completely obscured nor its classical origin forgotten; at Tibur, the sanctuary of Hercules Victor remained in use over the centuries, its spaces adapted to modern needs; at Terracina, the impressive substructures of the main terrace always remained visible; and at Tusculum, even in its more ruined state, the remains of the monumental temple continued to attract attention.

Interest in the monumental sanctuaries was translated from the 15th century onwards in a great quantity of drawings and sketches made of the monumental remains themselves and possible reconstructions of the original building complexes. The most famous artists and scholars of their time made sketches and reconstruction drawings of probably the most impressive ancient remains of Latium, at Palestrina and Tibur; we find the likes of Giuliano and Antonio da Sangallo, Pirro Ligorio, Pietro da Cortona, Andrea Palladio and Giovanni Battista Piranesi among the names of those who expressed an artistic or scholarly interest in the monumental remains at these two towns. Perhaps because the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia at Palestrina had always been identified as a sanctuary, it was the complex that attracted the most attention and that had the greatest influence on architects of the Renaissance and later periods. Certain architectural features of the sanctuary even ended up in contemporary building designs. The lateral ramps of the Belvedere court at the Vatican

22 GIULIANI 1985, 311. In general, see MERZ 2001 for an overview of especially artistic interest in the remains of the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia.
designed by Donato Bramante, for instance, seem to have been inspired by the great porticated ramps of the sanctuary. However, while these drawings have some scientific merit, it is best to approach them with caution, since a large part of the reconstruction drawings seem to be based on artistic invention. We only need to compare the reconstruction drawings made by Andrea Palladio of the sanctuaries of Hercules Victor and Fortuna Primigenia to note that the two look disconcertingly similar, which seems to suggest pre-conceived ideas about their original appearance or the projection of features of one sanctuary on the other.

In several cases, the structural remains were not identified as a sanctuary until well into the 19th century. The ruins of Tivoli and Tusculum were both interpreted as monumental villas belonging to illustrious figures of the Late Republic or Early Empire. The sanctuary at Tivoli was known as the ‘Villa of Maecenas’, which had later passed into the hands of the emperor Augustus himself. In a similar manner, the ruins located outside the gates of ancient Tusculum had traditionally been taken for the remains of a large villa. Some identified it as the beloved Tuscanian villa of Cicero, and later it was suggested that the villa had perhaps belonged to the emperor Tiberius, an attribution which was strengthened by the recovery of a headless statue of a seated divinity later reconstructed as the emperor in the guise of Jupiter. In the 19th century the architect Luigi Canina, who wrote extensively on ancient architecture, suggested that the monumental remains of the ‘Villa of Maecenas’ belonged to the famous Temple of Hercules, although he considered it to be the lower part of the sanctuary, with a circular temple itself located higher up in the town near the Cathedral of San Lorenzo. Antonio Nibby later argued that the remains near the cathedral and the remains of the so-called Villa of Maecenas should be understood as separate structural entities, and that the latter should probably be identified as the famous Temple of Hercules. However, in his description of the ancient remains in the vicinity of Rome, Thomas Ashby maintained that the sanctuary extended further up the hill and included the remains behind the apse of the cathedral, and Luigi Borsari likewise continued to consider the monumental platform just a part of the temple, clearly demonstrating that Canina’s reconstruction remained influential. It was also Ashby who suggested that the remains at Tusculum probably belonged to a monumental sanctuary.

Archaeological research in the form of excavations seems to have been rather rare until the 19th century, and in general took the form of treasure hunting, locating valuable objects such as sculpture to add to collections, without much interest in the structural features of the ancient remains. The sanctuary of Diana Nemorensis in particular seems to have been a notable source of sculpture. The fact that the excavations and research carried out between the 17th and 19th centuries were conducted by groups of different nationalities and the fact that a lot of objects were sold has the unfortunate consequence that the material from the sanctuary has become scattered; material from Nemi is included in the collections of the Villa Giulia museum in Rome, the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek in Copenhagen, the Castle Museum in
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Nottingham and the University of Pennsylvania Museum in Philadelphia. Although this level of dispersion is exceptional, the fact that non-Italians were active in 19th century excavations ensured that a lot of material disappeared to foreign museums.  

At the beginning of the 20th century, those sanctuaries with structural remains which were still visible at the time had been correctly identified, although in some cases debate about the correct identification of the remains and the construction dates continued. Excavations seem to have become slightly more professional and in the late 19th and early 20th century, the first formal plans of sanctuaries, with varying degrees of accuracy, were published. However, formal comparisons between the various sanctuaries were not yet being made. 

In his famous two-volume publication about Hellenistic architecture in Latium, Richard Delbrueck only mentioned the sanctuaries of Palestrina and Gabii, and did not compare these stylistically or technically to each other, nor to other sanctuary complexes. In his description of the famous sanctuaries of ancient Lazio, Giuseppe Lugli calls attention to the intensity of building activity in the region during the period between the Gracchi and Sulla, resulting in the reconstruction of many old temples and the construction of grand complexes the remains of which were still visible, citing Tivoli, Palestrina and Terracina as examples. While Lugli also describes the sanctuaries of Juno Gabina and Diana Nemorensis, he does not seem to consider them part of the same phenomenon, or at least does not deem it necessary to explicitly comment that they were. 

This perhaps demonstrates that at this time, while several sanctuaries were seen as the result of a period of intense building activities in the late second and early first centuries, these sanctuaries were not yet considered to be part of a single architectural group, and it is likely that this shift in perception happened during the second half of the 20th century.

The canonisation of the Latial monumental sanctuary

One of the most significant developments in the study of late republican monumental sacred architecture was the result of the damage done to Italian towns during World War II. The allied bombings in Italy during 1944 destroyed part of the historic centre of Palestrina, yet offered a unique opportunity for scientific research; the medieval houses that had been built on top of the foundations of the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia were made uninhabitable and could thus be cleared, enabling the systematic investigation of the ancient remains. Published in 1953, the report of the excavation and analysis of the complex by the archaeologist Giorgio Gullini and architect Furio Fasolo marks an important turning point in the study of the monumental sanctuaries of Latium, generating interest and providing new opportunities for comparison. Up to this point, as we have seen, while some considered the sanctuaries as products of a particular historical period, namely the period between the Gracchi and Sulla, the only
generic similarity noted in the form of these sanctuaries was their size. Direct comparisons of architectural elements and the establishment of a formal typology were not made. Fasolo and Gullini take a first step in this direction by a direct stylistic comparison of the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia with other public monuments in Latium, most importantly the sanctuaries of Terracina and Tivoli.34

In the decades after the publication of the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia by Fasolo and Gullini, more detailed and thorough analyses of Latial late republican sanctuaries began to appear, especially from the 70s onwards. The presentation of the architectural remains of the sanctuary of Hercules Victor at Tivoli by Fulvio Cairoli Giuliani in a volume of the Forma Italiae series in 1970 marks the emancipation of that sanctuary, which had up to this point been rather neglected, especially in comparison to the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia.35 The important colloquium Hellenismus in Mittelitalien held at Göttingen and published in 1976 is perhaps symptomatic of the increased interest of the manifestations of Hellenism across the Italian peninsula, and monumental architectural complexes, in Latium but also in other parts of Italy, occupied an important place in the papers presented.36 The focus of attention during this period continued to be the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia and the issue of the correct chronology of the complex, as well as the extent of the sanctuary complex.

The publication in 1982 of the systematic excavations at the sanctuary of Juno Gabina at Gabii, undertaken from 1956 until 1969 by the Escuela Española de Historia y Arqueología en Roma, meant yet another ‘official’ addition to the group of late republican sanctuaries inspired by Hellenistic architectural principles.37 While the sanctuary had always been known and several plans of its remains had been published, this was the first official excavation report with a full analysis of the material found at the site and which explicitly placed the complex in the series of late republican Italic sanctuaries. The complex comprised a centrally placed temple with an altar in front of it, surrounded by a garden and framed by a pi-shaped Doric portico, with tabernae on two of its sides, and with a monumental frontal access, all of which constructed on an artificially created platform, adapted to the topography of the location of the sanctuary while at the same time modifying this topography to achieve a particular effect and creating an architectural landscape, a scenography which underlined the grandiosity and beauty of the complex.38

The discovery of the sanctuary of Aesculapius, excavated during the late 1970s and the early 1980s, and the publication of the excavation results in 1986 served to further entrench the idea of a standard typology in the scientific research of monumental sanctuaries. Although the southwestern part of the sanctuary had been lost because of erosion of the landscape, it was suggested that we were dealing with an axially symmetric complex. Of course, the underlying assumption in this reconstruction is that the sanctuary belonged to the typology of monumental Latial sanctuaries: the sanctuary of Aesculapius was obviously built with its intended scenographical effect in mind, and could be dated in the early second century, thereby
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making it the first example in Latium of this particular type of hellenised building complex.\textsuperscript{39} While it is certainly possible that the complex did display axial symmetry, it is important to keep in mind that the reason for this reconstruction is the perceived inclusion of the sanctuary, based on certain characteristics, in a typology which dictates certain architectural regularities, rather than the actual remains.

In 1987 all Latial monumental sanctuaries known at that time were presented in a single volume. Filippo Coarelli published a survey of seven sanctuaries: Gabii, Fregellae, Palestrina, Tivoli, Terracina, Lanuvium and Nemi.\textsuperscript{40} It was not the first time he had tackled the issue of the monumentalisation of sanctuaries in the late republican period; two articles in particular, published in 1983, already contained important observations about some of the Latial sanctuaries which Coarelli would later repeat and elaborate.\textsuperscript{41} Although he does not offer a synthesis of the phenomenon, Coarelli clearly argues that the monumental sanctuaries are manifestations of the same general phenomenon, and scattered among the descriptions of the individual monuments in his 1987 book and his articles we can observe a sanctuary ‘model’ which is more or less similar to the one presented above for the sanctuary of Gabii. Perhaps not surprisingly, Coarelli has become the standard reference when late republican Latial sanctuaries are mentioned.

It thus seems that the ‘canonisation’ of the late republican sanctuary occurs in the period between 1970-1990, and especially the second decade of that period. The official publication within the span of a few years of two sanctuaries which could be included in the series of late republican monumental building complexes and especially the synthetical treatment of these sanctuaries by Filippo Coarelli, led to their conception as a true group and we can observe the implicit acceptance of this group of sanctuaries as constituent parts of an architectural typology. In its canonical form, a typical late republican sanctuary would consist of a central temple building, surrounded on three sides by a pi-shaped portico (\textit{porticus triplex}), preferably with a theatrical \textit{cavea} in front of it, while the concept of scenography inspired the attention to the relation of the building complex with its environment, sometimes necessitating a transformation of this environment through terracing using extensive substructures. It is striking to see how firmly this basic concept of a standardised sanctuary form has anchored itself in scientific literature. In modern handbooks on Roman architecture, they are invariably presented as a more or less homogenous group. In earlier publications which presented these sanctuaries as examples of the building activities during the Gracchan and Sullan period without referring to specific characteristics apart from perhaps the dimensions of the complexes and the scenographical aspects (sometimes related to the use of substructures), no mention was made of additional features which a sanctuary of this type should have. However, the emphasis in modern publications shifts slightly but noticeably from a descriptive to a prescriptive treatment of the building complexes.

This does not necessarily mean that the standard characteristics of late republican monumental sanctuaries are always repeated in every publication mentioning them. While Pierre Gros mentions the group of sanctuaries in his survey of Roman public architecture,
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he gives descriptions of only three sanctuaries: Gabii, Palestrina and Tivoli. However, by explicitly presenting them as a coherent group, with terracing as a defining characteristic, he implicitly supports the idea of a standard sanctuary typology. In other handbooks, this idea of a standardised typology is even more strongly felt. A survey of ancient architecture published in 2006 by a group of Italian scholars presents Coarelli’s canonical group of seven sanctuaries as a homogenous complex of great Latial sanctuaries, and gives as their defining characteristics the existence of a temenos area, partly provided with porticoes, the presence of a sacred wood or garden, an altar, a temple, a theatrical cavea, a possible oracular function of the sanctuary and the vertical development of the sanctuary on several levels through terracing. Although some of the characteristics mentioned are rather generic, we can clearly observe that virtually all the characteristics attributed to the sanctuary at Gabii by the Spanish excavators are apparently valid for and applicable to the entire group of monuments.

One of the most explicit references to the existence of a standard typology for late republican monumental sanctuaries is found in a contribution by Pia Guldager Bilde to an exhibition catalogue about the sanctuary of Diana Nemorensis. Although she admits that there are differences between the building complexes, she goes on to enumerate the many similarities, highlighting the dominant position in the landscape and the fact that the building complexes imply a subjugation of nature by man and culture; the fact that the entire complex is an organised project comprising many different structural elements in a single whole; the use of modulation or geometric figures to structure the relationship between the different components of the structure; the principles of axiality, symmetry and frontality holding together the design. She also refers to the importance of porticoes in the creation of space in these sanctuaries; while often in the form of a porticus triplex, it is also possible that stairs or a temple were placed in the middle of the portico. A theatre is also often present inside the sanctuary. These are all elements which we have encountered elsewhere, but Guldager Bilde goes one step further, suggesting that there are similarities between the dimensions of sanctuaries, with 200 feet being a theoretical basis for several different sanctuaries in Central Italy, not just Latium. Guldager Bilde argues that on closer examination, it appears that the architects were in possession of a particular ‘sanctuary-module’, which clearly indicates a supposed element of standardisation in sanctuary design in the late republican period.

The implications of the fact that we are apparently dealing with a more or less standardised architectural category become apparent in several modern publications dealing with late republican sanctuaries and architectural remains the function of which has not yet been established with certainty. At the most basic level, this leads to a functional imposition of the sanctuary typology. This is clearly visible in the case of the vast substructures located in the Colli Albani called the Barco Borghese. It consists of a giant platform of 219 x 245 m, dated
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to the middle or the second half of the first century; an artificial terrace formed by extensive substructures dated to the late republican period (or possibly the early imperial period). It has traditionally been interpreted as the platform on which a monumental villa complex was built. And yet, because of the date and the fact that we are dealing with a platform intended to sustain a building complex of monumental proportions, the option is kept open that it was a sanctuary complex. Thus, in this case, the similarity of chronological and technical characteristics of this complex to the Latial sanctuary typology leads to the suggestion that we are dealing with a religious complex even though no material has been found sustaining this suggestion, nor have structural remains been unearthed which strengthen the hypothesis.

While the example given above may seem harmless enough, since it keeps an option open on the basis of certain characteristic which are actually attested, it is another matter when the sanctuary typology is used to supplement the reconstruction of excavated remains, which in this case implies the architectural imposition of the sanctuary typology. I have already given the example of the architectural remains of Colle Noce in the vicinity of Segni, where the application of the standard sanctuary scheme by Reggiani is among the most obvious examples. As indicated above, in this case the fact that excavations revealed terracing that could probably be dated to the late republican period led to a proposed reconstruction of a sanctuary with a centrally placed temple and a surrounding pi-shaped portico; the projection of elements of the ‘typical’ Latial sanctuary, as exemplified by the sanctuaries of Gabii and Tivoli, onto the excavated remains.

The extra-urban sanctuary at Tusculum provides another case where assumptions about what a late republican monumental sanctuary in Latium should look like seem to influence descriptions of the remains. In 1995, Lorenzo Quilici and Stefania Quilici Gigli published a detailed architectural analysis of the remains of the extra-urban sanctuary of Tusculum. After Ashby’s identification of the remains as a sanctuary, it had been largely ignored by scholars. It is interesting to note that Quilici and Quilici Gigli refrain from overt generalisations and do not immediately include the building complex in the series of sanctuaries described by Coarelli. The only comparisons that are made are with the sanctuaries of Hercules Victor at Tivoli and the sanctuary on Monte S. Angelo at Terracina, since they consider the architectural characteristics of these sanctuaries in particular to be the closest parallels to the building complex at Tusculum. However, we do notice implicit assumptions about the sanctuary’s architectural characteristics; on the platform containing the remains of the temple, no other structural remains have been found, yet all descriptions of the building complex, including the otherwise careful architectural analysis by Quilici and Quilici-Gigli, suggest the possibility of a portico surrounding the terrace. While Luigi Canina, who led excavations of the monument from 1830 until 1834, recognised the remains of an ample peristyle on this level, we do not know on which observations his assertion was based. Bearing in mind his reconstruction of the sanctuary of Hercules Victor, and the fact that at this time the remains were still considered
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to have formed part of a villa, it is certainly possible that the suggestion was not based on the encountered remains but on presumptions about the function of the terrace. It therefore seems that the modern insistence on the possible reconstruction of a portico is not so much grounded in fact as in standard assumptions. This is perfectly reflected in a publication by Giuseppina Ghini, who describes an upper terrace with colonnades surrounding the temple on three sides, going on to mention that only scarce remains of the temple were found and none of possible colonnades, only to conclude with the statement that the plan of the entire sanctuary closely recalls those of contemporaneous complexes in Latium, in particular those of Hercules Victor at Tivoli and Jupiter Anxur or Feronia at Terracina, above all for the presence of colonnades and impressive substructures.

Although not always explicitly, it is clear that the eight sanctuaries under discussion here are generally grouped. While this is certainly justified in the sense that we are dealing with a phenomenon of monumentalisation in a limited chronological and geographical framework, the habit of grouping these sanctuaries becomes counterproductive when it implies the automatic assumption of a set of standard architectural characteristics which are then used to complete plans by extrapolating those features which are considered standard without sufficient critical reflection and without a factual basis provided by the recovered remains. While it is certainly possible that the sanctuaries in question did have these architectural features, it is important to be aware of the mechanisms by which such conclusions are reached in many modern publications and the level of generalisation that they imply. In my opinion, the cases presented above are perfect examples of the circular reasoning often encountered in descriptions of late republican monumental sanctuaries; a monument is included in the typology on the basis of chronology and certain characteristics, the typology is then used to complete or strengthen a proposed reconstruction, which in turn is used to justify inclusion of the monument in the typology and to underline the standard elements of the typology.

**Nature and structure of the study**

During the last decades relatively little scholarly attention has been paid to explanations for the genesis and development of monumental sanctuaries in Latium. It seems as if these sanctuaries simply are, and have become a standard with which to compare existing and newly discovered building complexes. This study will evaluate this standard by analysing the monumentalisation of sanctuaries in Latium. In order to answer these questions, I have formulated two main research questions: (1) how can we explain the monumentalisation of Latial sanctuaries in the late republican period; and (2) what are the specific choices being made during the monumentalisation process with regard to architecture and ornamentation? It is emphatically not a presentation of new material, but rather a fresh appraisal of existing material, a deconstruction of sorts of the typology of the Latial monumental sanctuary. The starting point for the analysis of this group of building complexes in this study will therefore always be the individual monuments, yet these will be continually confronted with possible patterns emerging for the group of monuments as a whole. By this process of informational feedback I will take care to avoid relativistic interpretations of single monuments, while at the same time testing the internal consistency of the monuments as a group.
The study moves from general frameworks to more detailed analysis. In Chapter One, I will try to reconstruct the religious context of the Latial monumental sanctuaries. Since so much attention is given to the architecture of these complexes, we perhaps tend to forget that what we are dealing with is functioning religious sites. People came to these places to worship divinities and dedicate objects. It therefore stands to reason that this study starts out by examining how the process of monumentalisation is related to developments in religion. Changes can be observed in the ways in which the gods were approached in the late republican period; the question is how these changes can be explained. Since religious developments are often interpreted as reflecting or being affected by societal developments, explanations will be discussed offering cultural and socio-economic models accounting for religious change. In order to assess their validity, and in order to perhaps offer new insights into the development of cult places in the late republican period, a reconstruction of the sacred landscape of Latium will be presented, based on the archaeological evidence of recovered votive material. This will give us a per-century picture of the spatial distribution of cult places; where are they located, and is there a pattern to change and continuity within this sacred landscape? And, most importantly, how is this landscape of devotion related to the construction of sacred structures, including monumental sanctuaries? It might be possible that the monumentalisation of sanctuaries is influenced by their popularity among worshippers. I will try to establish if the scale of sanctuaries reflects the level of attendance, by comparing the distribution and chronology of building activities at sanctuaries with the votive material found there.

In Chapter Two, the focus is shifted from the religious context to the socio-political context. Besides being cult places with a religious function, these sanctuaries were built by the leading political elite of the time; religious architecture had always been used for representational ends, and the late republican sanctuaries of Latium are no exception. The question is who the people are who wanted to represent themselves through this type of architecture, and what this says about the monuments themselves and the patrons commissioning them. Since the monumentalisation process in Latium is part of a phenomenon also affecting other areas of the Italian peninsula, it is interesting to see what explanations have been offered for this process in other regions, and to investigate the possibilities of applying these to the monumentalisation process in Latium. The central question thus becomes if a similar phenomenon, extensive building activities at sanctuaries producing large building complexes, can be explained in a similar way in the whole of Italy, or if we should pursue region-specific interpretations of the process. This of course depends on the desires and perspectives of those responsible for the construction of the sanctuaries. If we accept the fact that temples and sanctuaries are built by a competitive aristocracy, we need to establish with whom they were competing and how the identity of those competing affected the means that were chosen to compete with. If monumental sanctuaries were considered to be an effective investment of resources that could have been used in different ways, it is necessary to ascertain what their added value was with respect to, say, regular temples. Apparently, the specific context of aristocratic competition in Latium made the construction of monumental sanctuaries both possible and desirable. This chapter will explore those specific characteristic of competition and building policies.

After having studied the religious and socio-political context of the monumentalisation process and hopefully having gained some insights into the reasons and modalities of this
process, it is time to consider the sanctuaries themselves in more detail. Although some aspects of individual sanctuaries will inevitably have to be discussed earlier, the final chapter is devoted entirely to an analysis of the architectural and decorative aspects of Latial monumental sanctuaries. In Chapter Three, I will study the way in which they were perceived, presenting the sanctuaries as coherent visual systems. Given the fact that we are dealing with a construction phase which produced such large building complexes, it will be interesting to see what choices were made during the monumentalisation of sanctuaries. Did earlier building phases play a role in the genesis of the new design, and did these earlier phases perhaps even remain visible in the new design? Earlier phases of each sanctuary will be investigated to establish the appearance of the sanctuary before the late republican monumental phase, and an attempt will be made to establish what the effects were of these earlier phases and of the surroundings on the design of the sanctuaries. Subsequently, some architectural elements which have often been connected to Latial monumental sanctuaries will be studied. Since these are the elements on which the establishment of a standard typology of the Latial monumental sanctuary is based, this will give us some idea about the validity of this typology. Finally, the decorative categories of the sanctuaries will be discussed, both the decoration which formed an integral part of the structure itself (architectural terracotta decoration and wall decoration) and sculpture set up in the sanctuary precinct. The relationship between the ornamentation of the sanctuaries and their architectural characteristics will be examined, and compared to general developments in Rome and the rest of Italy.

The principal aim of this study is to provide an analysis of the reasons and different manifestations of the monumentalisation process in Latium without immediately taking recourse to the established image that is so often encountered in the scientific literature. By studying the monuments individually and as a group simultaneously, the possible errors inherent in such generalisations will hopefully become clear. It is not my wish to propose corrections of the standard image so often repeated, since I question the usefulness of the standard type to begin with. With this study, I would like to underline the need to continually question assumptions, especially since these can generate a false sense of security. By continually referring to a standard typology and applying its supposed standard elements on monuments which are considered to be similar, it is suggested that we have a thorough, even complete knowledge of these building complexes. I wish to point out that by assuming imperfect knowledge and searching afresh for similarities and differences, patterns and idiosyncracies, we can actually further our knowledge of these monuments instead of continually referring to the same standard features.

In the field of archaeology, we are always confronted with how little we really know and can know about the objects that we study. The lack of complete data sets may lead to a structural uncertainty, while at the same time it gives us an opportunity to approach our material with various interpretative models which are not wrong or unsuitable beforehand, just different; the archaeologist’s weakness can also be considered a strength, or advantage, since it allows several competing visions or models of the past to exist at the same time, and no vision is necessarily more ‘true’ than the other. This study is therefore also an attempt to see just how much we can say on the basis of the little concrete evidence we do have, and what models, theories and assumptions this evidence can bear.
Chapter One

THE RELIGIOUS CONTEXT OF MONUMENTAL SANCTUARIES IN LATIUM

This first chapter will explore the monumentalisation process of Latial sanctuaries in a religious context. The monumental sanctuaries were places of worship in the first place, and it is possible, or perhaps even likely, that religion played an important role in the structural changes which can be observed at these sanctuaries in the late republican period. They did not develop or function in a vacuum. Other, often more modest cult places, sometimes without any architectural features at all, existed alongside these more impressive architectural complexes and attracted the faithful. The monumental sanctuaries formed part of a sacred landscape: a complex network of cult places, each with specific characteristics and functions. In order to gain a better understanding of the monumentalisation process and the religious factors which could have influenced it, we must therefore try to reconstruct the sacred landscape of Latium, so that we can see how monumental sanctuaries were related to other sanctuaries, and what (religious) changes affected cult places in general. Interpreting similarities and differences between cult places, we can perhaps gain insights into the question why some sanctuaries were monumentalised while others were not. In order to assess in what way sanctuaries reacted to changes in their surroundings, we must have an idea about how they were organised; who were responsible for the sanctuary and on what factors did the continued existence of a sanctuary depend? Next, we need to look at what was probably the 'core business' of cult places, namely votive religion, and the ways in which the votive practices which took place inside sanctuaries are represented in the archaeological record. Traditional explanations for changes in votive practices will be discussed, before turning to the reconstruction of the sacred landscape based on the votive material recovered at Latial cult places. The spatial and chronological patterns that emerge will then be interpreted using existing and new models explaining religious change. The latter part of the chapter will focus on a question which is especially relevant to the goals of this study, namely in what way building practices and especially monumentalisation can be related to this changing sacred landscape. Can the architectural development of religious structures perhaps be interpreted as a reflection of developments in the functioning of religion in this period?

Cult places: organisation and religious function

To understand the religious context of the monumental sanctuaries of Latium, we first need to understand how cult places in general functioned. How were they organised, what was the nature of the rituals that were performed there, and how did these two aspects change over time? Information in the literary sources about the organisation and administration of cult
places is at best fragmentary and generally limited to the city of Rome. Turning to archaeological evidence, we find that it too has its disadvantages. We can often determine whether cult places were used during certain periods on the basis of votive material found at those sites, but this leaves open the question of who was using the cult place, which introduces a whole new range of questions, as we shall see. In addition, we can establish if and possibly when restructuring activities took place using stratigraphic excavations. Building inscriptions can sometimes tell us who were responsible for such building activities and sometimes we can establish somewhat firmer chronological ranges on the basis of epigraphic evidence. In the next sections, I will try to reconstruct the organisational structure of cult places in Latium and the religious activities taking place there, before turning to the spatial distribution of cult places.

The organisation of cult places

Regarding the origin of many cult places, the general idea is that they sprang up ‘spontaneously’ at locations where the presence of the divine was felt to be especially strong, such as caves, mountain tops, ancient forests and lakes. Such areas were singled out as holy and sometimes, but not always, marked by a permanent object such as an altar. Subsequently, there are two ways in which a sanctuary can continue to exist. On the one hand, it can remain in use as a ‘natural’ cult place, existing solely by the grace of people going there and making offerings. These cult places most likely ceased to exist as recognisable cult places the moment people stopped coming there to make offerings. Needless to say, the recovery of archaeological material which is recognizably religious in function is essential for the identification of such cult places.

On the other hand, cult places can become more or less ‘institutionalised’, either located within urban areas or with ties to nearby urban centres and administered by magistrates or priests. The sanctuaries may have had extra-religious responsibilities of their own, and became an essential part of the urban framework. In general, it is assumed that the fact that the vast majority of sanctuaries were administered by civic authorities means that sanctuaries had only limited autonomy. It has been pointed out that there were certain sanctuaries with a ‘federal’ character without ties to any single community, perhaps remaining outside the jurisdiction of cities, which would imply that sanctuaries could operate as separate, independent (legal) entities. In those cases where the sanctuary did fall within the jurisdiction of a nearby urban centre, the administration of the sanctuary was normally the responsibility of public urban magistrates, who kept track of the sanctuaries’ treasuries (arca) and were bound to use the funds contained therein for the benefit of the sanctuaries. Some sanctuaries at least must have had some personnel that resided on-site with the responsibility for the daily maintenance of the sanctuary. Several sanctuaries include structures that have been or can be interpreted as
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residences for a permanently present college of priests or other attendants, although Gabriela Bodei Giglioni claims that Italic sanctuaries did not have extensive crews of temple personnel, and it is archaeologically impossible to deduce permanent occupation simply from the existence of structures. It may have been true for most cult places, especially those of modest size, that personnel did not permanently reside on or near the premises, although in recent literature the significant size of temple personnel has been stressed, which must have included priests, archivists, visitors’ guides, gardeners, night-watchmen, slaves and craftsmen.

The fact that some sanctuaries were not directly tied to nearby urban centres and that most sanctuaries, perhaps in their own right, ‘employed’ people makes it difficult to fully appreciate the administrative status of cult places and the role civic magistrates played in the management of cult places. Sometimes cult places thrive even after the town they supposedly belonged to had declined in importance or vanished altogether. It is even possible that some of the administrative functions previously located in the town itself were relocated to the sanctuary in such cases, which thus developed into the actual central place of the community. In Latium, this phenomenon can perhaps be observed in the case of Gabii. When the sanctuary of Juno Gabina was monumentalised in the second century, the town itself had decreased greatly in size, and the remaining inhabited core of the settlement was centred on the sanctuary. This suggests that it was possible for sanctuaries to function more or less independently from urban centres. Indeed, the fact that sanctuaries in Italy could sometimes actually replace civic structures as (administrative) central places seems to suggest at least the possibility of some form of prior autonomy. Archaeological and literary evidence thus both support and partly contradict the traditional image of sanctuaries administered and monitored by towns and magistrates. We should therefore at least consider the possibility of a more heterogeneous system in which some sanctuaries enjoyed rather more autonomy than others.

Regardless of the question of administration and the (lack of) independence of sanctuaries, the sources inform us that many of them possessed ample material and monetary resources. Appian informs us that after the Battle of Philippi in 42 both Marc Anthony and Octavian turned to several Latial sanctuaries for loans because they needed money and land to pay their troops and reward their veterans, suggesting that at least some of these sanctuaries had these no doubt considerable sums of money at their disposal. Among the temples with the most abundant resources at the time mentioned by Appian are, probably, three monumental Latial sanctuaries, namely the temple of Lanuvium (arguably the sanctuary of Juno Sospita), Nemus (the sanctuary of Diana) and Tibur (probably the sanctuary of Hercules Victor). Considering the material evidence documenting the area or other sacred funds, we often find references to the use of sacred resources by civic magistrates, which would support the idea of strong and indissoluble links between civic and religious administrative structures. Clearly,
sacred resources were meant to be spent for the benefit of the sanctuary, but management of the funds was in the hands of civic magistrates. There is relatively little evidence which we can use to reconstruct the way in which these resources accrued. Bodei Giglioni considers the absence of landed property a characteristic of Latial and Italic sanctuaries, although land could apparently be consecrated by the state to gods or priestly colleges. While essentially remaining part of the ager publicus, it is possible that at least some revenues from the exploitation of these lands ended up in the sacred treasuries. We have a famous example of such land consecrated to the gods: in 83 Sulla granted large territories to the sanctuary of Diana Tifatina (fanum Dianae Tifatinae) near Capua. Inscribed boundary stones have been found indicating the limits of the estate with the letters P(raedia) D(ianae) T(ifatinae). There is some additional epigraphical evidence supporting the idea of land ownership by Italic sanctuaries in their own right, although such evidence does not (yet) exist for Latium. The practice may indeed have been the exception rather than the rule in Italy. Richard Duncan-Jones, echoing Bodei Giglioni’s opinion mentioned earlier, states that “ownership of land by temples was widespread in the Greek world, but rare outside the Greek parts of the empire”. Conversely, Jesper Carlsen maintains that “temple estates may have been a more common feature than the evidence suggests, or has commonly been assumed”. We can only hope for more material offering evidence documenting the existence and extent of such temple estates, and their importance in the economic and financial functions of sanctuaries.

A possibility is that some of the funds and objects collected at the sanctuary and contributing to the image of immense wealth attributed to certain sanctuaries derives from their function as places of storage for valuables: at least some of the objects stored at the sanctuary did not actually belong to it, but were given to it for safe-keeping. Such bank functions for sanctuaries are attested for different areas of the Mediterranean, including Italy. The monetary gain for Italic sanctuaries perhaps consisted of donations made by those using the sanctuary as a repository, since it is assumed that Italic sanctuaries did not lend money with interest. Furthermore, it is commonly accepted that many sanctuaries played a role in the economic infrastructure of Italy, primarily as locations for regional markets, and there is strong evidence that some sanctuaries may have had on-site facilities generating economic activities. Although evidence is less clear about this, it is also possible that sanctuaries were actively involved in trade or other economic activities. All of these activities may have been important as sources of income for certain sanctuaries, yet the majority of the funds flowing into the area of most must
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have been the result of payment for the use of the sanctuary’s religious ‘infrastructure’: access to temple grounds, the making of offerings and the consultation of oracles. Furthermore, certain sums were paid for entering the priesthood of a certain cult. Thus, it appears that most Latial sanctuaries were dependent on the financial contributions of the visiting faithful.

It would seem that we are dealing with two more or less distinct categories of cult places. Those where the act of worship, in the form of votive offerings, actually constitutes the cult place, which I shall term ‘natural’ or ‘rural’ for lack of a more appropriate label, and those cult places which were more or less institutionalised, possibly with their own financial and administrative infrastructure but in general – or so it is assumed - administered from nearby towns and often incorporated into the official religious calendars. However, it is important to note that there is a considerable grey area between these two ‘standard’ types of sanctuary, and as I have stated earlier it is probably wiser to leave the question of organisation and dependence somewhat open when interpreting the sacred landscape.

The archaeology of cult

In a majority of cases, lacking architectural remains of a clearly religious nature, the identification of cult places depends on the identification of cult-related material remains, most importantly votive offerings. Although there is some discussion about the precise relationship between man and god in votive religion and what expectations are involved in the act of giving an object to a divinity, it is generally assumed that in the Roman world a votive gift was either offered as a token of gratitude for a divine favour or carried the expectation of a future counter-gift, implying a reciprocal character for the religious act of giving that might even have been contractual in nature. The standard formula used to describe this specific relationship between man and god, which covered the spectrum of private offerings up to official state sacrifices, is that of ‘*do ut des*’. Some have argued that the obligation of a counter-gift implied by this particular formula is too strong and that the reciprocative relationship between man and god was more voluntary, and necessarily more uncertain, in nature.

It is also uncertain whether votive offerings in general are tokens of gratitude for favours already granted or requests for future help. A working definition of a votive offering is a durable offering to the gods which is a manifestation of personal religiosity and meant as an incentive for divine assistance in the future or gratitude for provided assistance in the (recent) past. Some gifts to the gods are relatively easy to recognise (such as figurines or miniature pottery), others derive their interpretation as votive offerings from the context in which they are found (‘regular’ pottery may be votive as well). ‘Basic’ religious activity thus involves the dedication of objects to the gods by people, actual votive material, or material that was used in ritual actions which can be recognised as such, which is not strictly ‘votive’ but is indicative of cult activity.
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75 **Bodei Giglioni** 1977; **Bendlin** 2000, 134.
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Material which can be ascribed to a religious context and can therefore be termed ‘votive’ can be traced back securely to the 8th century in Latium, although some material, such as that recovered from the Laghetto del Monsignore at Campoverde, possibly dates as far back as the 10th or 9th century. The majority of this early material consists of pottery, almost exclusively impasto, sometimes in combination with animal bones. Although the majority of these votive assemblages contain miniature pottery, full-sized vessels interpreted as votives are also found at several sites. Up to the Archaic period, pottery was to remain the most commonly found material which can be interpreted as votive in nature. From the beginning of the sixth century onward, the archaeologically attested votive repertoire seems to diversify somewhat, with the appearance of anthropomorphic and animal figurines (mainly in cast bronze or sheet metal). Pottery continues to form a substantial part of the votive repertoire, although from the late sixth century onwards there is a detectable shift from miniatures towards full-sized vessels. The fifth century has proven to be a problematic period with regard to votive material: the knowledge about the archaeological material from this period, both ordinary pottery and possible votive assemblages, has suffered from limited research and fragmentary publication, making it harder to correctly identify material as votive. This stands in marked contrast with the following period; in the fourth and third century, we witness an explosion of very visible votive assemblages.

While (miniature) pottery continued to be an important, or even the most important, type of votive offering, from the fourth century onwards, terracotta objects have been recovered from religious contexts at a great number of sites and often in great quantities: terracotta figurines, votive heads or half-heads and especially terracotta objects that take the form of (parts of) the human body, such as feet, hands, eyes, limbs or heads, the so-called anatomical terracottas. It is important to note that although they are extremely numerous, fictile ex votos do not represent the only form of votive religion in this period, suggesting the persistence of a strong traditional element in votive practices, such as the continued offering of (miniature) pottery. Even in sanctuaries where a large number of terracotta objects have been found, they do not represent the only type of offerings, and votive deposits largely or exclusively containing them are in fact quite rare. The custom of dedicating terracotta ex votos seems to have started in the last quarter of the sixth century, with the fourth and third centuries as the period in which this type of votive offering ‘comes of age’.

Fictile votive offerings reflect an important shift in the relationship between divinity and dedicant, since these objects on the whole tend to represent the latter rather than the former
and thus seem to signal a certain 'humanisation' of votive practise.\textsuperscript{87} It reflects a specific religious and social attitude and the offering of such objects is probably meant to establish direct contact between the divinity living in the sanctuary and the devout, symbolically present through his votive as an emanation of his person and a manifestation of his \textit{pietas}.\textsuperscript{88} A very interesting feature of the phenomenon is the almost complete absence of a discernable one-to-one relationship between the donated object and the individual characteristics of the divinity worshipped at a sanctuary. It is already very difficult to ascribe votives to any single divinity in earlier periods, since inscriptions specifying the divine recipient of the gift are relatively rare. Paradoxically, votive offerings are often the only indication of the nature of the divinity worshipped at cult places.\textsuperscript{89} An attempt to establish a relationship between votive material and the principal cult at a sanctuary becomes even more difficult if secondary divinities (\textit{dii accensi}) are also worshipped in the same sanctuary. The presence of votives dedicated to different divinities in single votive deposits is attested at numerous sites in Etruria and Latium.\textsuperscript{90} In general, we must assume that votive offerings in Latium tell us more about the person offering the object or the divine favour requested than about the character of the divinity.\textsuperscript{91}

This emphasis on the person making the offering instead on the divinity receiving it is attested by various categories of votive material. A clear example of objects actually representing the dedicant are the countless votive heads or half-heads: none of them can be securely interpreted as representing a divine being. The anatomical terracotta has been interpreted as the material demonstration of a certain preoccupation of worshippers with health and fertility (\textit{sanatio}), and thus illustrates the fact that the desires and wishes of the dedicants are represented by the gifts themselves.\textsuperscript{92} However, concerns for health and fecundity are hardly new and existed before the appearance of the anatomical terracotta, attested by the anatomical votive offerings present in earlier contexts, found in Archaic Italic and Etruscan contexts and made of bronze.\textsuperscript{93} Above all, it is the massive scale on which these votive gifts are found from the fourth century onwards that is remarkable. Rather than as signs of a new concern altogether, anatomical terracottas should be seen as a new, and highly visible, way of expressing these concerns, another illustration of the 'humanisation' of cult practices. No category of votive objects better illustrates the problems of establishing specific features of cults at sanctuaries on the basis of votive material.

The anatomical terracottas are dedicated in a great number of sanctuaries that are dedicated to very diverse divinities, and are found in sanctuaries of divinities that, as far as we can determine on the basis of earlier votive material, do not have a traditional connection with these specific concerns.\textsuperscript{94} While this does not imply that the divinities are exclusively approached for health issues in the mid-republican period, a reasonable assumption is that for some basic human preoccupations the identity and characteristics of a divinity did not seem
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\textsuperscript{93} Turfa 2004, 360; Glinister 2006, 13-14.
\textsuperscript{94} Glinister 2006, 13.
to matter much. It is a distinct possibility that such responsibilities were added to traditional concerns associated with the divinity. It thus seems that divine power in these (and perhaps other) matters was believed to be universal or, in other words, that “healing was regarded indiscriminately as being within divine power”. While there is some speculation that some cult places were specialised in the healing of specific parts of the human anatomy based on the predominance of a certain type of anatomical terracotta, there is little factual evidence for specialised healing sanctuaries apart from these purely statistical observations.

The absence of a direct and obvious relationship between the type of offering and the specific traditional responsibilities of the principal divinity of a sanctuary is perhaps also visible in the last category of votive offerings usually found together with votive heads and anatomicals, namely terracotta figurines. This category of offerings presents its own difficulties of interpretation. There is much discussion about the interpretation of the more ‘generic’ types of figurines, especially regarding the question of who they represent: the giver, either as a personalised ‘portrait’ or as an abstract standardised image, or the divinity? While current research clearly favours an interpretation of the majority of the figurines as representing the dedicant, wholly in line with the cultic developments illustrated by the votive heads and anatomical offerings, some of the figurines can clearly be identified as specific divinities by their attributes. The majority of figurines identified with certainty are depictions of and therefore probably offerings to the main divinity of the sanctuaries, yet there are also figurines that depict other gods not traditionally associated with the principal cult, so-called “visiting gods”. To whom were these figurines dedicated? It is known from the Greek as well as the Italic world that in many sanctuaries secondary divinities were worshipped. For the most part, these secondary divinities are connected in some way to the main divinity of the sanctuary, either by familial ties or legendary associations, but there are also cases in which such associations do not seem to exist at all or seem far-fetched. Figurines representing gods other than the principal cult and associated divinities have been interpreted as offerings to the principal divinity, which is the most common view, or as representations of particular stages in the human life, an interpretations for which some parallels in Greek votive contexts exist, although not necessarily in the form of figurines. However, the option least often encountered, although no less viable, is that these objects are not necessarily gifts to the principal divinity and that the gods represented by the figurines actually received worship, albeit incidental, in a sanctuary where they were not directly associated with the principal cult. Interesting in this respect is a single Caeretan votive deposit, studied and published by Quentin Maule and Henry Smith, which has yielded statuettes representing no fewer than 11 individual deities. In my opinion, Maule and Smith leave open the distinct possibility that some of the deities who were not part of the official cult were worshipped here in their own right. This would mean that a wider range of deities could be worshipped in any single sanctuary than is generally suggested.
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During the late republican period, fictile votive offerings as well as miniature pottery seem to disappear largely from sacred contexts, a fact which presents archaeologists with a serious problem of recognisability. In Jean-Paul Morel’s words, there is a detectable shift in the late republican period from ex-votos *par destination*, objects without practical use which were originally and uniquely conceived as religious offerings, to ex-votos *par transformation*, objects which only become religious offerings through some act of adaptation or transformation.\(^{101}\) Since the visible signs of the transformation inherent in this last category can be small, it can become difficult to distinguish between ordinary pottery and pottery used as religious offerings, or between ‘normal’ and religious uses of any other category of material. The changes in the nature of votive practices in the late republican period continue to be a debated issue without a clear consensus about the precise chronology of the process and its causes. Previous research claimed a continuity of the phenomenon into the first century AD, while current research strongly favours a cessation of the practice in the late republican period.\(^{102}\) Within the range of republican dates there is considerable variation, as well as disagreement about the fact if the change was gradual or abrupt. Some maintain that the phenomenon began to decline from the late second century onwards,\(^{103}\) while others claim that terracotta votive heads and anatomicals did not disappear until the first century,\(^{104}\) perhaps permitting us some chronological leeway and suggesting that the scale and development of the phenomenon was subject to regional variations. In general, securely dating the decline and disappearance of the phenomenon is made more difficult by the very nature of the production process of most of these votive offerings; being mass-produced using moulds, stylistic dating of the pieces does not give us a secure *terminus post quem* for the cessation of production, since we have no way of knowing when these moulds were no longer used. It is possible that fictile objects stylistically dated to the latest period were still offered as gifts to the gods: without stratigraphic evidence linking these objects to others more securely dated, we have no way of knowing for certain when the practice of producing these objects stopped, even though we may be able to establish that no new stylistic types were being produced.

Simultaneous with the decline of fictile votive offerings in the late republican period, an increasing number of inscribed dedications are found. In addition, in several late republican sanctuaries considerable quantities of coins, or *thesauri* which must have contained coins at one point, are found.\(^{105}\) However, without clear dedicatory inscriptions on the coins or *thesauri* it is impossible to tell if monetary gifts are actual votive offerings or payments for either entering the sanctuary or the use of services offered there.\(^{106}\) It is possible that coins found at sanctuaries were indeed offerings, of the ex-voto *par transformation* type, but without visible signs of the
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transformation it is impossible to establish this with certainty. It has been suggested that in the late republican period, instead of terracotta, votive offerings were increasingly made of other, perishable materials, such as wax. Such votive gifts would leave little or no material remains for archaeologists to discover. Although interesting, the suggestion lacks a secure evidential basis, archaeological or philological. In general, votive religion seems to change dramatically in the last century BC, becoming harder to recognise. The matter of decreased recognisability of votive offerings in the archaeological record is obviously an important factor in the process of reconstructing the sacred landscape using such material as the identifying feature, a problem which I shall duly consider below.

Religious change in the republican period

From the overview of the development of the material manifestations of votive religion presented above, it seems that at two important moments during the republican period a change seems to occur in the nature of votive material. The first is the appearance on a large scale of fictile votive offerings in the mid-republican period; the second is the disappearance of this type of offering and the perceived decline in religious activity during the late republican period. These changes undoubtedly influenced the way in which cult places functioned and may have been important for the monumentalisation process in the late republican period. Therefore, in the following pages these changes and traditional explanations given for these changes will be discussed.

Considering the intertwinement of religion and society, religious change is often explained by referring to changes in Roman society as a whole. Religious change has been seen as a reflection of contemporary societal changes, and physical manifestations of religion have therefore often been used as indicators of those changes. Votive practices and its development over time are no exception. In the following section, two influential models explaining religious change will be presented, the first connected to cultural change, interpreting votive material as a reflection of the process of ‘religious romanisation’, a term indicating that parts of Italy supposedly adopted, either voluntarily or coaxed, specifically Roman forms of worship, and the second model connected to changes in settlement patterns and subsistence levels in the late republican period. Both models seek explanations for religious change in societal developments, the difference being that one model emphasises ideological transformation, while the other focuses on socio-economic transformation.

Ideological explanations: ‘religious romanisation’

The factor perhaps mentioned most often when trying to interpret specific changes in the distribution and appearance of cult places and certain religious phenomena in the Roman world

107 Fenelli 1992, 132-133.
is ‘romanisation’. Religion has been interpreted as both an instrument and an indicator of the expansion of Roman power across the Italian peninsula and the rest of the Mediterranean. The spread of the intrinsically Roman cult of the Capitoline triad and the associated temple structure of the Capitolium in both colonies and indigenous communities has been seen as a sign of integration, voluntary or forced, in the Roman state. In general, the foundation of colonies with temples dedicated to divinities belonging to the traditional Roman pantheon, in some cases ostensibly replacing or marginalising traditional indigenous divinities, has been interpreted as the setting up of “religious staging posts of Roman expansion”. Whether as a result of official Roman policy or not, the spread of Roman power across the Italian peninsula and the Mediterranean has often been interpreted as influencing local religious practice. However, these interpretations are often open to criticism on archaeological and ideological grounds, and more importantly, religious romanisation as a model fails to produce a satisfactory explanation for the changes in votive practices in the Late Republic with which we are concerned here.

As far as votive material is concerned, the appearance of the so-called Etrusco-Latial-Campanian type of votive deposit, with its characteristic predominance of fictile votive offerings, is linked by several scholars to the spread of Roman power in the Tyrrhenian coastal area, to be interpreted as a ‘guide fossil’ of Roman influence; the presence of such votive deposits in certain areas would be an indication of their ‘Roman-ness’ and a good example of ‘religious romanisation’. Mario Torelli even goes so far as calling anatomical terracottas “a striking sign of Roman superiority”. Recently objections have been raised against the idea that the spread of these votives coincided chronologically, geographically or ideologically with the extension of Roman political influence from the early fourth century onwards.

The first attestations of types of votive material that were to become two of the three characteristic features of Etrusco-Latial-Campanian votive deposits, terracotta votive heads and statuettes, have been dated to the late sixth or early fifth century, with only the third typifying object, the anatomical votive offering in terracotta, appearing in the fourth century. This means that only the anatomical terracotta can be dated to the period of intensive Roman expansion in peninsular Italy, although offerings in the form of (parts of) the human anatomy, albeit in bronze, are also attested in earlier votive contexts. Fictile votive offerings thus seem

---

108 Critiques, redefinitions of and substitutions for the concept of ‘romanisation’ have been appearing non-stop for the better part of a decade now. Some useful, interesting or important contributions, or a combination thereof, are WEBSTER/COOPER 1996; CURTI 2001; WEBSTER 2001; MATTINGLY 2002; BURGERS 2004 (in Dutch); STEK 2009. In this context, ‘romanisation’ is used to denote the various changes, interactions and reactions associated with the spread of Roman rule throughout the Italian peninsula.

109 BARTON (1982, 261) clearly states that “we cannot properly use the term Capitolium of pre-Roman temples in Italy”. This particular temple type is intrinsically connected to the Roman civic cult and should be seen as an architectural symbol of Roman-ness, perhaps even as the symbol. However, not every Roman temple with three cellae is necessarily a Capitolium, not even in colonial contexts.

110 DE CAZANOVI 2000, 74-75. For the religious aspects of early Roman colonisation, see TORELLI 1999, 14-42.


112 TORELLI 1999, 42.


114 COMELLA 2004, 336 (votive heads), 341 (statuettes).


to appear well before the active spread of Roman influence across Italy. More importantly, the phenomenon originates not in Rome, but in South-Etruria, more precisely Veii.\(^{117}\) In Rome itself, fictile votive offerings, especially votive heads, do not seem to appear before the last decades of the fourth century, demonstrating that this particular votive practice probably developed at a relatively late stage in the city compared to centres in Etruria, Latium and Campania.\(^{118}\) This would mean that, following the logic of the model of religious romanisation, an Etruscan tradition of dedicating fictile votive offerings in sanctuaries was adopted by Rome, arguable after the conquest of Veii in the early fourth century, and subsequently spread to territories under Roman dominion.\(^{119}\)

The fact that Rome apparently did not play a role of importance in the genesis of these particular types of votive offerings of course does not preclude a subsequent leading role of the city and her colonies in their further spread across the peninsula. However, archaeological evidence seems to point towards an already relatively elevated level of diffusion of the phenomenon in the area between South-Etruria and Capua in the course of the sixth and fifth century, clearly before the time when Rome became a dominant presence in the area, thus clearly demonstrating that diffusion of fictile votive objects did not depend solely on Rome as an intermediary.\(^{120}\) Furthermore, the convergence of the spread of the Etrusco-Latial-Campanian type of votive deposit and the spread of Roman political and military influence across the peninsula is perhaps less close than has sometimes been argued: fictile votive offerings appear in regions which were not yet subject to Rome nor especially exposed to so-called ‘staging-posts’ of Roman expansion and cultural influence, such as colonies and roads, traditionally interpreted as important factors in the spread of Roman cultural models.\(^{121}\) In addition, fictile votive objects, especially anatomical terracottas, are notoriously difficult to date accurately, which means that in most cases the archaeological evidence cannot be used to prove whether the appearance of fictile votive objects pre- or postdates colonial foundations in the area,\(^{122}\) further problematizing the use of distribution maps of fictile votive objects to illustrate the spread of Roman influence.

Perhaps even more important than the chronological and geographical objections to a presupposed leading role of Rome in the diffusion of the typical Etrusco-Latial-Campanian votive deposit is the question of the ideological connection between this type of votive deposit and the city of Rome. In order to use these types of votive offerings as reliable indicators of Roman influence, there obviously has to be something intrinsically Roman about them, especially when we recall Torelli’s statement about such votive offerings as striking signs of Roman superiority. When we consider anatomical votive offerings, there is nothing that is specifically Roman about them. The execution of the offerings in terracotta is not typically Roman, nor is the preoccupation with \textit{sanatio} and fecundity they seem to represent.
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a specifically Roman one. Although anatomical votive offerings have been interpreted as an important part of Roman plebeian culture,\textsuperscript{123} in Rome itself relatively few votive deposits have been discovered that fit into the Etrusco-Latial-Campanian typology, since they seem to be missing certain typical elements.\textsuperscript{124} Significantly, the votive deposits that do adhere to the specific typology are mostly found outside the republican wall circuit. This is especially true for those deposits containing votive offerings with a salutary character.\textsuperscript{125} Thus, at Rome the types of votive offerings which in the rest of Italy would signify Roman influence are (intentionally?) marginalised in the suburban area of the city, again underlining the problems inherent in the Roman connotation of these votive offerings which is assumed in the model of religious romanisation.

Statuettes mostly represent the dedicant and not the divinity to which they were dedicated, thereby making it difficult to prove the presence of typical Roman cults in Italic areas using such objects. The only type of object which does seem to represent a culturally specific religious practice is the votive head. A clear distinction can be made between votive heads with or without \textit{velum}. The earliest examples of votive heads in Etruria are almost exclusively without \textit{velum}, and examples of heads with \textit{velum} from Campania are also rare.\textsuperscript{126} From the end of the fourth century onwards, the \textit{velum} becomes a standard attribute of the votive heads which have been recovered in Roman, Latial or colonial contexts, appearing in Etruscan and Falliscan contexts from the third and second centuries onwards.\textsuperscript{127} The distribution of the different types of votive head thus seems to follow the chronological and geographical characteristics traditionally attributed to the Etrusco-Latial-Campanian deposit in general. It has been argued that the two types reflect two different iconographies of the sacrificant, those without \textit{velum} sacrificing \textit{aperto capite}, according to Greek rites and attributable to the Etruscan cultural context, and those with \textit{velum} sacrificing \textit{velato capite}, according to ancient Roman tradition.\textsuperscript{128} Thus, the two types of heads would represent distinct ideological features of different religious cultures, perhaps making the votive head with \textit{velum} a suitable emblem of \textit{romanitas}. While the votive head as a votive category seems to eschew some of the problems inherent in anatomical votive offerings and statuettes, it is still not ideally suited as an indicator of Roman cultural influence whenever it is found in a votive context. The sacrifice \textit{aperto capite} had also become a fixed feature of certain Roman cults, thereby making the distinction between the two types as representing Roman and non-Roman religious sensibilities problematic. It is a distinct possibility that the presence or absence of the \textit{velum} indicates the nature of the god to whom the dedicant was offering the gift. John Scheid indicates that sacrificing with uncovered head was a feature of certain cults that were part of the official Roman pantheon, such as Hercules, Ceres and Saturn and in some cases even Juno and Jupiter.\textsuperscript{129} Does the

\textsuperscript{123} Söderlind 2005, 362.
\textsuperscript{124} Gentili 2005, 370. Contra: Söderlind 2005, 363, claiming that one third of all votive deposits comprises anatomical votive offerings, which would support the traditional interpretation of the objects as inherently Roman in his view. However, he does not address the dislocation of these deposits noted by Gentili.
\textsuperscript{125} Gentili 2005, 370.
\textsuperscript{126} Comella 2004, 337; Söderlind 2005, 362.
\textsuperscript{127} Comella 2004, 337.
\textsuperscript{128} Comella 2004, 337; Söderlind 2005, 362.
\textsuperscript{129} Scheid 1995, 22-23 (Hercules), 23-24 (Ceres), 24-25 (Saturn), 26-27 (Juno), 27-28 (Jupiter); Glinister 2009, 200 (adding Apollo and Honos but leaving out Jupiter and Juno).
The presence of the *velum* indicate that it is a Roman making the sacrifice, or does it indicate that the specific divinity to which the sacrifice was made required the *velum*? While the latter option may indicate that the sacrifice was an ‘official’ Roman god or goddess, the former option does not preclude the possibility that the divinity was Roman. Scheid concludes that *Graecus ritus* was actually “a Roman ceremony which was slightly modified or completed in some part”. He then goes on to suggest that its origin and development is related to Roman expansion, but, as is often the case, was meant to illustrate in a religious sense the willingness of the Romans to incorporate foreigners into their state by granting them citizenship. Developments in the religious sphere in this case reflected developments in the political sphere.

Rather than seeing the diffusion of specific etrusco-latian-campanian votive deposits as an expression of official Roman imperial religious policy, we should see it as a movement of people, bringing with them their individual religious beliefs. Spontaneous migratory movements associated with colonisation and the opening up of new areas of Italy for economic exploitation, attracting new settlers and traders, are as important as the official act of colonisation initiated by the state. While colonisation and the construction of roads undoubtedly encouraged the movement of people, religious exchange and diffusion already existed between different cultural milieux of Italy before this time, without the official sponsorship or propagation of the state and indicating a high degree of overlap and blurriness in relation to ritual practices of the peoples of Italy, especially in Central Italy. The Etrusco-Latial-Campanian votive deposits, thought to be related to Roman colonisation, were dispersed in areas that were already open to contact and exchange with those parts of Italy that were the source of the specific devotional practices the deposits represent: not just Rome, but the entire central Tyrrhenian coastal area, and they are not necessarily connected with official policy but with the movement of people and their beliefs.

From the remarks above, it should be clear that the use of specific Etrusco-Latial-Campanian votive objects as “*fossili-guida*”, indicating a Roman or Latin cultural presence, is highly problematic. However, even if we accept an important role for Rome and her colonies in the diffusion of the phenomenon, the disappearance of this type of votive deposit is difficult to explain within the same general framework. Keeping in mind the idea of fictile votive offerings as an essentially Roman or Roman-Latin form of worship, the disappearance of the typical deposits would either mean that Roman influence has ceased, or it would have to be interpreted as a sign of successful integration in the Roman state, supposedly making both the specifically ‘Roman’ votive material and the cult places in which they were offered superfluous. Since the start and end of the phenomenon are also observable in the direct vicinity of Rome, happily excluded from any suspicions of ‘romanisation’, I think this suggestion can be safely ruled out. Chronologically and ideologically, it is difficult, if not downright impossible, to connect the

130 Scheid 1995, 28. The same conclusions is reached by Fay Glinister (Glinister 2009, esp. 210-212).
132 Scheid 1995, 30: “[The religious category of the *Graecus ritus* was used to stress the presence of foreigners and of the world inside Roman culture and the city of Rome, in order to legitimate Roman imperialism and the Roman civic model].”
133 Gentili 2005, 372.
134 Gentili 2005, 373.
135 Coarelli 2000, 200.
religious changes in Latium in the late republican period to changing aspects of Roman rule in the region, in the sense of an intensification or completion of cultural integration. If the initial diffusion of the phenomenon was indeed the result of the encounters and actions of people, perhaps its decline and disappearance should be sought in the same sphere.

_Cult places and the changing human landscape_

A different model, which is perhaps complementary to the model of religious romanisation, seeks explanations for religious change not in cultural or ideological developments, but in changes in the socio-economic circumstances of the population. It has been suggested that the disappearance of typical votive material and the abandonment of Etruscan and Italic sanctuaries in the late republican period which has been related to the changes in votive practices, should be seen in relation to the displacement of the free rural population by large estate holders leading to an impoverished lower class falling below subsistence level moving to and living in the towns and the further impoverishment of those already living in the towns, since these cult places were important reference points for plebeian groups. The disappearance of these particular votive practices are thus said to be caused by a free rural population falling on (financial) hardship, no longer able to make votive offerings and migrating towards the urban centres. A first point of criticism, before evaluating the merit of this model in the light of the current state of knowledge of late republican economic circumstances and settlement patterns, is that in their interpretation of the phenomenon, Annamaria Comella and Patrizio Pensabene explicitly connect the abandoned cult places with the lower social strata of the population, thereby seemingly supporting the often repeated notion that terracotta votive offerings are basically the gifts of the poor. This connection between fictile votive offerings and the lower social classes has become something of a commonplace, but has never been convincingly argued. This interpretation also seems to imply that terracotta votives were the only offerings made in a sanctuary, thereby ignoring the possibility that gifts of those of higher social status were simply not preserved because they were made of more precious materials, subsequently smelted down or otherwise lost. The connection of terracotta offerings and the lower social classes is ultimately untestable, since specific epigraphic evidence is lacking, and in my opinion one should be wary of using fictile votives to prove the connection of sanctuaries as a whole with certain social groups. In order to test the validity of the statements about socio-economic development sketched in these models, it is necessary to take a close look at the demography of Italy during the Late Republic.

136 A connection between the end of the phenomenon of typical Etrusco-Latial-Campanian votive depositions and ‘romanisation’ is maintained by Maria Donatella Gentili, claiming that an intensification of unifying policies by Rome in this period contributed to the process (Gentili 2005, 373). However, this idea still assumes an inherent connection between ‘romanisation’ and these votive offerings, which can be contested.

137 Pensabene 1979, 221-222; Pensabene et al. 1980, 51; Comella 2004, 336; Pensabene 2005, 137.

138 Interestingly, both authors seem to suggest that the disappearance of votive material from sites constitutes abandonment of those sites as cult places, perhaps strengthening my own viewpoint that in these cases, absence of evidence does indeed constitute evidence of absence.

139 The connection has been called into question in some recent literature, for instance Glinister 2006, 27-28.

140 For the possibility of metal votive offerings similar in form to those in terracotta, see De Cazanove 1991, 205.
Any attempt to reconstruct the size of the population of Roman Italy and the rest of the empire in the Late Republic is based on less-than-hard evidence. The only official, reliable and quantifiable information at our disposal that covers a more or less complete population over a longer period of time are the census results from Roman Egypt recorded on papyri which date from the first three centuries AD. Similar evidence does not exist for peninsular Italy and quantitative estimates of the size of the population are entirely dependent on literary sources: Polybius’ mention of Roman and allied manpower in 225; the various census figures reported for the Republican period, primarily by Livy; and the census figures for 28 and 8 BC and 14 AD as stated in Augustus’ Res Gestae. Of these, Polybius’ account is highly problematic, especially as a source for population size estimates, and is probably best excluded from the discussion on the subject. Unfortunately, the reconstruction of population size based on the census figures has proved to be no less problematic. With a few exceptions, the figures reported by Livy and other sources for the third and second century onwards seem to exhibit a certain consistency and fall within a rather limited band. The real problems arise with the recorded republican census figures of the first century, which seem to soar compared to the figures of the preceding centuries. Although given the enfranchisement of the former allies after the Social War in 89 and of the Transpadana region in 49 we can certainly expect a major increase in the number of registered citizens, the jump from 910,000 individuals, the total recorded for 70/69, and the first Augustan census figure of 4,063,000 individuals in 28 is so startling that it cannot be explained by simply assuming that more than three million were enfranchised in this period. This leaves us with two options: we should either accept that recording practices were faulty prior to 28 resulting in massive under-registration, or conclude that the figures of the Augustan census are fundamentally different in character from the republican ones. The choice between one of the options above has lead to the formations of two opposing sides in the Roman population size debate: on the on hand proponents of a so-called ‘low’ count, on the other proponents of a ‘high’ count. Although the scholarly debate seems to centre mostly on the population size in the Augustan period, the implications of the positions taken by both sides in the debate have direct consequences for the reconstruction of the late republican population size.

The ‘low’ count scenario is the oldest and by far the most influential, dominating modern scholarship on the subject. Its most prominent exponents are Karl Julius Beloch and later Peter Brunt – hence the frequent reference to the Beloch-Brunt model or scenario as an alternative to ‘low’ count – who opted for the latter of the possible explanations for the first Augustan census figure presented above and advanced the idea that the Augustan census recorded all free-born citizens of the Roman state, in contrast to the republican practice of only recording male citizens aged 17 and over, although such a shift in recording practices has never been explicitly mentioned in the ancient sources. Proponents of the ‘high’ count scenario assume continuity in census practices and therefore interpret the Augustan figure of
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141 Bagnall/Frier 1994.
142 Polyb. 2.24; for the available Roman census figures and the corresponding sources, see Brunt 1971, 13-14.
143 The many problems of Polybius’ text are addressed in several articles by Walter Scheidel (Scheidel 2004, 3-4; Scheidel 2006, 209).
144 Scheidel 2008, 19-21, Fig. 1.
145 Beloch 1886; Brunt 1971, 113-120.
28 as representing only male citizens aged 17 and over.\textsuperscript{146} Taking into account the non-free population not included in the census, the part of the citizen body residing outside Italy and a certain percentage of under-registration, the ‘low’ count scenario hypothesises a population of Augustan Italy of roughly five to six million people. With the same considerations and applying a multiplier to the census figure of adult male citizens to arrive at the total population, the ‘high’ count scenario results in a population size of 12-14 million people, more than twice the figure of the alternative scenario. Needless to say, the choice between either model is not an arbitrary one, but has major consequences for the interpretation of the history and development of the Roman state in the late republican and early Imperial periods, especially regarding questions such as mobilisation and manpower (affecting the number of potential available recruits), economy (affecting the availability of labour in the countryside and the cities and the level of wealth and poverty), and socio-political relations (affecting the degree of urbanisation and thus the number of people available to vote and the relative numbers of elite and masses, slaves and freeborn).\textsuperscript{147} Since we do not have a time machine that enables us to travel back in time to 28 and actually see for ourselves if women and children did or did not turn up for registration, it is unlikely that agreement about the size of the Roman population will be reached based purely on the interpretation and extrapolation of the republican and Augustan census figures. Without new evidence explicitly specifying the nature of the Augustan census, all that remains are arguments \textit{ex silentio}. When it comes to deciding on the significance of the census figures on strictly literary grounds, “the heart of the matter is that none of these claims is ultimately testable: they are a matter of taste”.\textsuperscript{148}

Of course, extra-literary objections have been raised to both models on various grounds. It is safe to say that the various logical assumptions resulting from both scenarios are ultimately largely dependent on which scenario is seen as more \textit{likely} given the account of Roman history and development one is inclined to follow. It is therefore probabilistic in nature, and cannot at this point be scientifically tested for its validity. The fact remains that at present, the ‘low’ count scenario is preferable simply because it provides a coherent and viable empire-wide narrative, something which the ‘high’ count model has failed to do until now.\textsuperscript{149} Since the available data do not conclusively point towards either the ‘low’ or the ‘high’ count, it is at least conceivable that some middle ground exists.\textsuperscript{150} Although this would solve or lessen many of the logical implications of either model, it entails yet another re-interpretation of the infamous census figures, which will undoubtedly provoke attacks from both ‘low’ and ‘high’ counters. It is far beyond the scope of the present study to go into each of the various (logical) problems of the ‘low’ and ‘high’ count scenarios at length, but in order to fully understand

\textsuperscript{146} Frank 1924; Lo Cascio 1994. Lo Cascio can be regarded as one of the staunchest and most prolific defenders of the ‘high’ count scenario.

\textsuperscript{147} Morley 2006, 318.

\textsuperscript{148} Scheidel 2008, 22 n. 9.

\textsuperscript{149} An attempt is made for Italy in Morley 2001. However, the logical implications of Morley’s assumptions for the demography of the entire empire are certainly untenable (Scheidel 2004, 7-9).

\textsuperscript{150} Hin 2008. Saskia Hin ‘solves’ the inconsistency between republican and Augustan census figures by interpreting the former as representing adult male citizens \textit{sui iuris} (legally competent), the latter as representing all citizens \textit{sui iuris} (regardless of age or sex). However, while “the multiplier becomes much more flexible in this scenario”, the share of people \textit{sui iuris} not being determined solely by demographic circumstances, Hin’s interpretation still implies an unrecorded shift in recording practices between the Republican and Augustan census figures, one of the main objections formulated against the ‘low’ count interpretation.
the historical context of and test the validity of the models explaining religious change in Latium and Italy in the Late Republic, it is necessary to briefly discuss the implications of both scenarios for land occupation and use, and urbanisation. It is probable that the two scenarios will paint differing pictures of this landscape, simply because the ‘high’ count scenario has the exact same amount of land to divide among twice as many people: population density will probably provide the clearest contrast between the models and affect the scenarios of land occupation and use the most.

It is assumed in the socio-economic models of religious change that the settlement pattern changed drastically in the late republican period. People moved in large numbers to the towns from the countryside, leaving it deserted. Indeed, the dominant historical scenario assumes the free peasantry of Italy, already diminished in number by the burdens of military service and ravages of the Hannibalic War, to have been displaced from their land by large slave-run estates and to have continued to decline as a result.151 As already indicated above, the perceived decline of the free peasantry is important for the validity of the argument of Comella and Pensabene that economic hardship and displacement of the rural population was the main cause of religious change. The decline of fetiche votive offerings and the related abandonment of rural cult places would in this case mirror the concentration of settlement in urban centres, with the countryside empty of people and cult. However, the chronology of the development of villas, as well as the scale of the slave mode of production, has been called into question. Nicola Terrenato believes that there is little evidence for the existence of slave-run estates on a truly large scale before the beginning of the first century.152 Regarding the scale of slave production, Willem Jongman has demonstrated that far fewer slaves were needed to work vineyards and olive groves than is normally assumed.153 Walter Scheidel presents a reversed view of the villa - rural displacement causality, suggesting that migration towards the cities opened up opportunities for larger-scale agricultural enterprise without “aggressive dispossession of smallholders”.154 The main problem with this ‘doctrine’ of the declining free peasantry thus seems to be a lack of factual evidence, making it one of the most hotly debated subjects of late republican history. Archaeological surveys have shown that the countryside was not nearly as deserted as has sometimes been claimed, thereby also challenging the notion of a massive decline in small-holdings in favour of elite villa-estates.155 Especially in the area around Rome, the so-called *suburbium*, where the villa phenomenon was arguably at its most advanced at an early stage, surveys document an increase rather than a decrease of the number of sites, including small-scale holdings, all through the late republican period to reach its highest value.
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151 Morley 2001, 50. For a brief overview of the use of archaeological evidence in the debate on slave production and the free peasantry, see De Ligt 2006, 597-599.
152 Terrenato 2001, 24. See also Morley 1996, esp. 90, for literary clues to the beginning of the development of extensive villa estates.
155 Important surveys in this respect in Central Italy have been the South Etruria Survey, the survey of the territory of Cosa and the Biferno Valley Survey. Most recently, the Tiber Valley Project has provided important data on the settlement pattern of the northern Roman *suburbium*, re-evaluating the results of the earlier South Etruria Survey. The Pontine Region Project has shown that in the region to the south of the Alban Hills, sizeable residential villa estates are relatively rare and are usually found in areas close to Roman colonies (Attema/De Haas 2005, 109-110).
in the first century AD. Nonetheless, it is likely that there was some regional variation and that certain areas did show signs of population decline, possibly as a result of the development of villa estates.

There is still the possibility that impoverishment of the peasantry without their immediate displacement by large estates was one of the causes of changes in votive practices, as Luuk de Ligt has convincingly argued that an increase of the rural population can be accompanied by or even lead to impoverishment. In the light of the explanations offered by Comella and Pensabene for religious change in the late republican period, de Ligt’s hypothesis may be interpreted as something of a middle ground: it would actually support a growing concentration on urban centres of that part of the rural population that was able to trade without actual displacement or migration, since economic opportunities for those farmers producing surplus must have been rather limited in the countryside; the majority of the people there would have been struggling to make a living, hardly an enticing economic prospect. This would mean that rural cult places were abandoned by a combination of the inability of the traditional clientele to make offerings there caused by displacement and impoverishment, as stipulated by the Comella-Pensabene model, and the conscious choice of those who were economically able to make offerings to no longer do so at certain cult places, possibly taking their religious business elsewhere, a new side of the argument to which we shall return later in this chapter. In any case, the economic fortunes of the rural inhabitants during the late republican period must also have been subject to regional variation, and the one-to-one relationship between impoverishment and the abandonment of cult places seems overly rigid to me.

An important feature of the Late Republic often recounted by various scholars, and one that would seem to strengthen the claims of Comella and Pensabene, is increased urbanisation. Rome probably took the lion’s share of urban population increase during the last centuries of the Republic, with estimates of the city’s freeborn population rising from 150,000 in 200 to 600,000 in 50. The increase of the population size of the *Urbs* must be seen in the light of migratory movements on a larger scale, since according to Walter Scheidel “in the last two centuries BC…one to one and a quarter million [people] moved from the Italian countryside to Rome and over 400 other cities”, while a comparable number of people were resettled in colonies or on viri tanum allotments. This implies a massive - if gradual - demographic shift from the countryside to Rome and the other towns of Latium and Italy. Although the urbanisation rate in late republican Italy is yet another point of debate between ‘low’ and ‘high’ counters, strictly speaking neither option contests the claim of increased urban concentration in the late republican period: both ‘high’ and ‘low’ count scenarios suggest a growth in urban
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156 Carafa 2004, 55.
157 For instance, Graeme Barker notes a 40 % decline in the number of sites in the late republican period (Barker 1995, 224) and Robert Witcher observes a decline in the inland areas of Etruria in the same period (Witcher 2006, 99-106). However, Witcher also notices an increase in the number of sites in the coastal area and the *suburbium* of Rome, thereby illustrating regional differences.
populations without a necessary decrease in rural populations. The only difference is that supporters of the ‘high’ count scenario use the urban population growth as an argument for a larger population size for Italy overall. Supporters of the ‘high’ count scenario have claimed that the urbanisation rate resulting from the ‘low’ count is implausibly or even impossibly high, suggesting that it necessarily implies the desertion of the countryside which archaeological evidence contests, while Scheidel maintains that the high late republican urbanisation rate of the ‘low’ count scenario could have been possible without contraction in the countryside.

Since most of the towns of Latium were so-called ‘agro-towns’, they depended on the surrounding countryside for their immediate food-supply. Growth of these agro-towns therefore implies a growing or intensifying dependence on the countryside, which at the same time constrained expansion to certain margins, thereby perhaps explaining the limited size of Latial towns. While the city of Rome could rely on grain imports from the provinces overseas to feed the city’s populace and was thus able to maintain a large population without a necessarily growing dependence on the surrounding countryside, most other towns of Latium and Italy lacked this possibility and seem to have been of rather limited size, with most estimates ranging from 1,500-2,000 inhabitants for an average town. Other models have been suggested with slightly more differentiated population estimates, with some towns falling in the category of 500-3,000 inhabitants while several others fall within a range of 3,000-10,000 inhabitants. However, all such estimates are highly speculative, in general deduced from indirect evidence. We should see these towns and the surrounding agricultural catchment area as parts of the same interdependent system, albeit systems with a well-defined economic, political and administrative core. The migratory movements, voluntary or state-sponsored, of roughly two and a half million people during the last centuries of the Republic must have had a profound effect on these urban-rural systems, probably resulting in an increased importance of urban centres and closer - economic - links with the surrounding countryside. Effectively, this development entailed a strengthening of the position of Rome and the towns, since voluntary migration caused an increase in population numbers in existing urban centres and thereby in the demand and supply of goods and services there, adding to the already strong ‘pull’ factor of towns, while state-sponsored migration either had the same effect in the cases when colonies or viri tante allotments were added to existing settlements, or created completely new urban centres in certain areas when colonies were founded ex novo. In this sense, mass migration during the Late Republic can be seen as indicative of the position of urban centres as well as strengthening this position. We must keep in mind however, that the strong position of urban centres and townward migration in the late republican period does not automatically lead to an abandoned countryside and its cult places.

Confronting the findings on demography and settlement patterns so far with the explanations for late republican religious change suggested by Comella and Pensabene, we
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164 Gabbà 1972, 77-78, 111; Lo Càscio 1994, 39.
165 Gabbà 1972, 78; Lo Càscio 1994, 39.
167 Witcher 2005, 128, Table 2.
must conclude that it is in the first place the traditional interpretation of late republican socio-economic change that supports their suggestions. Firmly connecting the practice of offering fictile votive objects with the lower social classes - a connection never actually substantiated by firm evidence - it is their economic hardship and migration towards towns (two closely related developments) that explains the disappearance of this typical class-related votive practice and the abandonment of sanctuaries. However, the interpretation of the broad social developments assumed to be affecting these groups in the late republican period is ambiguous, as we have seen, especially with regard to chronology and scale. Evidence for large-scale decline of the free peasantry resulting in impoverishment and townward migration is hardly conclusive, and the subject is still a hotly debated one among ancient historians and archaeologists. However, since several late republican societal developments, such as increased urbanisation, do seem to support the scenario sketched by Comella and Pensabene, it is important to chart the changes in distribution of cult places in the late republican period to see if the patterns that emerge can substantiate their claims.

**The landscape of devotion**

In order to gauge the usefulness or validity of any model of religious change or decline and to assess its possible influences on the process of monumentalisation, it is necessary to attempt a reconstruction of the sacred landscape. Only by studying the spatial and chronological characteristics of that landscape can we hope to detect patterns which may favour one model over the other, or perhaps neither. Establishing the number of cult places and their distribution over the landscape, it is possible to say something about the relationships between cult places remarked upon earlier in this chapter.

Traditionally, the study of cult places, especially in their architecturally enhanced form, has always relied rather heavily on philological analysis. The incomplete nature of the physical evidence, most importantly in Rome, has lead to the regular use of ancient texts to fill in missing information. However, with increasing emphasis being placed on archaeological data as valuable sources of information in their own right, such as field surveys for the reconstruction of settlement patterns and the ancient economy, it is important to develop similar approaches for the study of material religious remains. An exclusively archaeological approach certainly has its drawbacks. For the study of cult places specifically, these are: (1) the impossibility of complete site recovery because of later construction activities on the site and limited research of the countryside; (2) the fact that the minority of information available to us is from undisturbed contexts; (3) the poor publication of excavation results; (4) the loss after recovery of excavated material precluding its restudying; (5) the problem of the identification of a sacred objects or a sacred place as such. Even if these limitations imply that we may not be able to reconstruct the entire religious topography of Latium using
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169 For instance on dedication dates: Coarelli 1976, 21-22. Coarelli states that for the period 218-167 the precise date of construction or restoration for 22 of the 28 temples in total is known exclusively from Livy’s text (books 21-45). For the period 167-68, this figure is even more dramatic: 21 out of 22. Moreover, for the existence of many temples, primarily in Rome itself, we have only textual evidence.

only archaeological evidence, a purely archaeological approach also has benefits. One distinct advantage of using material evidence without automatically supplementing it with literary sources is its relative lack of ambiguity and cultural bias, partly outweighing the problems and limitations of such an approach.\(^{171}\)

There has been a general lack of large-scale analysis of the spatial distribution of cult places and its implications, presumably because of a lack of published material and perhaps because of the limitations outlined above. Research has tended to be either highly localised or primarily concerned with traditional, formal - mostly stylistic - aspects of sanctuaries.\(^{172}\) The publication of such series as the *Corpus delle stipe votive in Italia* should make it easier to compile information for wider regions, making the assessment of the spatial aspects of religious change for a large part of peninsular Italy possible. We are fortunate that for Latium, a more or less all-encompassing catalogue of cult places exists, compiled by Jelle Bouma, on the basis of which it is possible to make a tentative reconstruction of the development of cult places in the region for the period up to the establishment of the Augustan principate.\(^{173}\) On the basis of the data contained in this catalogue we can establish the number of cult places in Latium over the course of eight centuries, as far as votive material is concerned, and six centuries for religious structures.\(^{174}\) Since the changes in religion observed above are in the first place visible in the first category, I shall first offer a reconstruction of the sacred landscape using recovered votive material, assessing the outcome in the light of theories of religious change outlined above and offering an alternative, or perhaps complementary, model that explains certain characteristics of this transformative process.

**Methodological considerations**

Two methodological choices made here need explaining: first, the nature of the data used and the way in which they are presented, and second the distinction between cult places identified on the basis of recovered votive material and those identified on the basis of building remains.\(^{175}\) Regarding the data used, I have ‘corrected’ some of the information provided by Bouma, excluding from the present inquiry any ambiguous information, such as single finds and material mentioned in older texts but without clear indications of the nature of the

\(^{171}\) Furthermore, some recent studies have indicated that the use of literary sources for the reconstruction of the sacred landscape also has its problematic sides. See Dubourdieu 2003 for example, on the limited usefulness of Cicero’s *De Signis* for information on cult places on Sicily.

\(^{172}\) Examples of the latter are too numerous to list. An example for the late republican period is Coarelli 1987. Recent examples of the former are Bruckner 2003 (Setia), Mezzazappa 2003 (Sora), Jala 2004 (Antium) and Livi 2006 (Minturnae), all of which deal with the religious topography of individual towns and their associated territories. An exception to the rule is Rizzello 1980, dealing with a considerably larger area. Classic examples of integrative studies which deal with cult places and their spatial context are Alcock/Osborne 1994 for Greece, and Edlund-Berry 1987 for Etruria and Magna Graecia.

\(^{173}\) Bouma 1996 III.

\(^{174}\) Although a chronological sequence in centuries may seem forced, using the chronologies of the different artefacts would result in a confusing sequence. Besides, most of the objects used for dating purposes can be dated to whole centuries and in some cases even more accurately (for instance, numismatic evidence) while still belonging to the same votive context. Therefore, a century by century approach seems wisest if not completely unproblematic.

\(^{175}\) The categories of material remains included in the terms votive material and building remains as used here are specified below.
material or its context. The find of a single example of votive material does not per definition constitute a functioning cult place, and mentioned but lost and largely badly recorded and unstudied material has been left out because of the fact that it is ultimately unreliable evidence which cannot be restudied.\textsuperscript{176} The inclusion or rejection of single find material in this chapter is based on the consideration of the wider context when known, including the potential votive character of associated pottery. The chronological ranges given by Bouma, both in running text and diagrams, have for the most part been adopted here. These chronological data were in turn adopted by Bouma from the various reports and publications on the individual cult sites. Ultimately then, these are the chronologies attributed to the material by individual excavators or researchers. There are bound to be chronological differences which cannot be resolved. Unfortunately, at this point, all I can do is signal the problem and use the data as prudently as possible.

I have chosen full centuries as the units of chronological measurement. This may seem rather crude, and yet it is the only possible way in which to compare sites with each other without reverting to complicated diagrams of date ranges of all material categories. Unfortunately, we are dealing with different material categories which are all related to votive religion, each with dating possibilities and difficulties. In order to compare sites recognised on the basis of material evidence in a clear and direct way, we need to choose the chronological interval which covers the largest number of categories. Unfortunately, in general this will be the least exact interval. I am aware of the problems this choice entails, giving rather wide chronological intervals which may not reflect the reality of the material evidence at some sites, yet I am convinced that this is the only possible way in which we can compare large numbers of sites without resorting to overly complicated methods.

The data are presented in two sets of bar graphs for each of the categories, one set giving the total number of identified individual sites, to which I will refer as cult places, the other set giving the aggregates per territorial ‘unit’, grouping all cult places within specific (urban) territories, being referred to as cult areas. The aggregate graphs thus show areas with evidence for at least one cult place in every given period: the number of areas in which cult activity, regardless of its intensity, has been attested.\textsuperscript{177} For instance, if a certain site yields 10 cult places in a specific period, this will be counted as one in the aggregate graphs. This is meant as a ‘correction’ on the totals given, to avoid overrepresentation of sites with a disproportionately large number of cult sites, such as Rome, and in a sense giving us a more ‘balanced’ view of the Latial religious topography. The division made in the graphs between ‘urban’ and ‘extra-urban’ is a rather strict one. A cult-place located outside the urban centre is here classified as extra-urban and since the extent of the urban centre is usually (though not exclusively) established by reference to walls it becomes a question of \textit{intra} or \textit{extra moenia}. However, it is possible to - visually - distinguish extra-urban from suburban by using distribution maps. Not

\textsuperscript{176} On the problem of single finds, see \textit{Bouma} 1996 I, 28 (especially note 157). Bouma relates the problem to the fact that “pottery…is generally not considered an \textit{ex voto}, \textit{i.e.} a votive offering proper, indicative of a religious context” (2006 I, 29), thereby suggesting that pottery finds which may very well belong to a religious context are not recognised as such.

\textsuperscript{177} For this process of aggregation, I have followed the attribution of cult places to specific territories as found in \textit{Bouma} 1996 III. I am fully aware that many may disagree with the attribution of certain sites to the territory of this or that urban centre. However, Bouma’s claims on the whole seem reasonable to me.
only are these maps instrumental in showing us the spatial distribution of the cult places in the Latial landscape, an additional useful feature is their limited geographical discrimination. Places that are very close to one another appear on these maps as a single dot. Thus, every dot on these maps may in fact represent several cult places, especially within urban centres, and represent cult places as a single dot which in the graphs appear separately as urban and extra-urban. If the extra-urban cult place is sufficiently close to the urban centre and is thus rather suburban than truly extra-urban or ‘rural’ in nature it will be represented with the same dot as the actual urban cult places (*intra moenia*). Conversely, cult places that are grouped in the aggregate bar graphs because they are in the same territorial unit may very well appear as separate dots on the distribution maps because there is a sufficiently large distance between them. To clarify: if a town ‘X’ has, in a given century, three cult places located within the city walls, one cult place placed just outside the walls (i.e. suburban) and two cult place located at some distance from the urban centre, these would show up as six cult places, of which three urban and three extra-urban in figure 2, as two cult areas, one urban and one extra-urban in figure 3, and as one urban ‘dot’ (comprising the three urban and one suburban cult place) and two extra-urban ‘dots’ on distribution maps, figures 4-6. The same rationale applies to sites with building remains, which will be considered later on. These maps therefore function as an additional filter, and actually show us a situation more or less in between the two types of bar graphs. These different types of data visualisation should give us a relatively clear and comprehensive image of developments and characteristics of the Latial sacred landscape at various points in time.

The distinction between the categories of votive material and building remains creates two separate sets of data, each indicating a subtly different aspect of the development and distribution of cult places in the region. A clear indication that the two phenomena should possibly, or even necessarily, be interpreted as separate phenomena is given by the many sanctuaries that continue to function as a cult place after the permanent structures such as temples associated with the sanctuary have ceased to exist. Cult places functioned before religious architecture developed and so-called ‘natural’ cult places continued to exist alongside cult places with permanent structures. The two phenomena, votive material and sacred structures, are obviously closely related, yet are not necessarily co-dependent. The fact that religious architecture can in some ways be considered a secondary or complimentary development related to the sphere of religion in my opinion argues for a separate treatment of these two phenomena.

Votive material can be used as an indicator of ‘basic’ (and private) religious activity, with the caveat addressed in an earlier section of this chapter. When datable cult-related material is found which can be connected to specific areas, we can be fairly certain that this area was actually used as a cult place during a certain period of time, with the basic chronology of use being given by the chronology of the finds. However, recognition of an archaeological context as ‘sacred’ or ‘votive’ remains problematic; depending on the interpretation of the data, one man’s primary votive deposit may be another’s dump stratum. For our present purposes, the specific interpretation of deposits of cult-related material as either primary votive deposits or dump strata does not matter that much. Assuming votive objects did not lie around for a century before being dedicated, the presence of such material indicates religious activity in
the general area in the period indicated by the chronological range of the material. The only problem is that certain material not easily or immediately recognisable as votive or cult-related may be overlooked and thereby important chronological data missed. A further problem is that certain material which is clearly religious or cult-related in nature cannot be easily assigned to either the sphere of individuals coming to sacrifice at the sanctuary, which would be the category of material indicated by the word votive, or the sphere of more public or communal rituals, which could have resulted in deposited material but cannot properly be called votive. Thus, when constructing an image of the development of cult places in Latium, votive material will be used to show us the places that people actually visited to give offerings, or in this case at least those places that are archaeologically recognisable. In the following sections, we will consider only those cult places which have yielded evidence of votive material, while building remains will be considered in a later section.

**Table 1. Number of cult places in Latium identified based on votive material, total (tot.) and aggregate (agg.).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Century (BC)</th>
<th>8th</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>6th</th>
<th>5th</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>1st</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cult places (tot.) (new)</td>
<td>15 (15)</td>
<td>39 (25)</td>
<td>65 (31)</td>
<td>42 (6)</td>
<td>126 (89)</td>
<td>149 (31)</td>
<td>82 (1)</td>
<td>44 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cult places (agg.) (new)</td>
<td>10 (10)</td>
<td>22 (12)</td>
<td>38 (17)</td>
<td>26 (4)</td>
<td>71 (46)</td>
<td>83 (14)</td>
<td>58 (1)</td>
<td>34 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban cult places (tot.) (new)</td>
<td>5 (5)</td>
<td>16 (12)</td>
<td>31 (16)</td>
<td>20 (3)</td>
<td>48 (30)</td>
<td>62 (14)</td>
<td>35 (0)</td>
<td>21 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban cult places (agg.) (new)</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td>5 (2)</td>
<td>12 (7)</td>
<td>10 (2)</td>
<td>25 (16)</td>
<td>30 (5)</td>
<td>21 (0)</td>
<td>14 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-urban cult places (tot.) (new)</td>
<td>10 (10)</td>
<td>23 (14)</td>
<td>34 (15)</td>
<td>21 (3)</td>
<td>77 (60)</td>
<td>85 (16)</td>
<td>45 (1)</td>
<td>23 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-urban cult places (agg.) (new)</td>
<td>7 (7)</td>
<td>17 (10)</td>
<td>26 (10)</td>
<td>17 (2)</td>
<td>46 (30)</td>
<td>53 (9)</td>
<td>37 (1)</td>
<td>20 (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first table and two sets of bar graphs representing cult places in Latium identified on the basis of votive material give us a general idea about the quantitative development of cult places in the region (tab. 1, figs. 2, 3). What emerges from the figures is a steady rise in the number of cult places up to the fifth century, when the number of cult places identified drops significantly as a result of a very low number of new sites and the discontinuity of about half of the sixth century cult places.178 Considering this fifth century ‘crisis’, the apparent ubiquity of cult places in the following centuries is all the more remarkable. The vast majority of the sites existing in the fifth century continue into the next and there is an extraordinary number of new sites including a considerable number - about one sixth of the number of new sites - of ‘revived’ sites, reoccupied after having been abandoned in the preceding century.179 This

178 Patrizio Pensabene notes the scarcity of fifth century votive material at Rome, and in Latium and the Falliscan area (Pensabene 1982, 90). However, he does not offer an explanation, historical or methodological, for the phenomenon.

179 Since this phenomenon of revival is mostly limited to the fourth century, I have chosen not to represent this as a separate bar in the graphs.
Fig. 2. Number of cult places in Latium, identified on the basis of votive material. Total number of cult places (top), urban cult places (middle), extra-urban cult places (bottom).
Fig. 3. Aggregate number of cult places in Latium, identified on the basis of votive material. Total number of cult places (top), urban cult places (middle), extra-urban cult places (bottom).
rise in the number of cult places continues in the third century, albeit with a less dramatic increase than from the fifth to the fourth century. The third century represents the absolute peak in both total and aggregate numbers of sacred places. Few sites are lost from the fourth to the third century and there are a considerable number of new sites. The fourth and third centuries thus present a veritable explosion of archaeologically identifiable cult places, both urban and extra-urban; the Latial landscape seems to be filled with cult.

There is a dramatic change in the second century. The number of cult places, both total and aggregate, falls well below the level of the fourth century. Particularly striking is the extremely low number of new cult places, the total number of cult places being determined almost exclusively by the continuity of cult places from earlier periods. Contrary to the ‘crisis’ of the fifth century, which was only a temporary dip in the number of cult places followed by the religiously thriving mid-republican period, the decline of the second century continues into the first century. There is still an almost complete lack of new cult places, the only new cult place recorded for this period being a ‘revival’. Aggregation hardly has a softening effect on the decline visible in the total numbers. In total, more than 70 % of the sites recorded on the basis of votive material for the third century can no longer be identified in the first, while for aggregate numbers this figure is 60 %. The importance of using aggregate data here becomes clear; decline could have been caused by the disappearance of a very limited number of cult areas, each with many cult places. If, for instance, Rome would have been destroyed, we would see a drop in the total number of cult places without a significant effect on aggregate cult areas. The fact that the aggregate data also indicate a decline can be seen as a sign that we are dealing with broader developments.

On the basis of the different ratios resulting from the figures of table 1 some interesting aspects of the different categories of cult places can be established (tab. 2). An interesting observation to start with is that from the eighth to the fifth century, the disparity between the number of extra-urban and urban sites becomes smaller. In the eighth century, extra-urban sites outnumber urban ones by two to one, while in the fifth century there are about the same number of sites of either category. This development is repeated from the fourth to the first century. After aggregation, the ratio of urban to extra-urban is more constant, generally in the range of two extra-urban areas for every urban one, with noticeable exceptions in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Century (BC)</th>
<th>8th</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>6th</th>
<th>5th</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>1st</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban : extra-urban (tot.)</td>
<td>0,50</td>
<td>0,70</td>
<td>0,91</td>
<td>0,95</td>
<td>0,62</td>
<td>0,73</td>
<td>0,78</td>
<td>0,91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban : extra-urban (agg.)</td>
<td>0,43</td>
<td>0,29</td>
<td>0,46</td>
<td>0,59</td>
<td>0,54</td>
<td>0,57</td>
<td>0,57</td>
<td>0,70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate : total (both)</td>
<td>0,67</td>
<td>0,56</td>
<td>0,58</td>
<td>0,64</td>
<td>0,56</td>
<td>0,56</td>
<td>0,71</td>
<td>0,77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate : total (urban)</td>
<td>0,60</td>
<td>0,31</td>
<td>0,39</td>
<td>0,50</td>
<td>0,52</td>
<td>0,48</td>
<td>0,60</td>
<td>0,67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate : total (extra-urban)</td>
<td>0,70</td>
<td>0,74</td>
<td>0,76</td>
<td>0,81</td>
<td>0,60</td>
<td>0,62</td>
<td>0,82</td>
<td>0,87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Ratios on the basis of table 1, total (tot.) and aggregate (agg.).
seventh and first centuries. During these two ‘cycles’ then, the total number of cult sites in urban areas increases faster than in extra-urban areas, since the ratio would have remained constant otherwise. In addition, since the aggregated ratios remain more or less the same, it can be concluded that within urban centres multiple cult places can be identified while in the associated territories of those centres, multiple cult places are becoming a less common phenomenon. If the increase of the number of urban cult places was simply caused by more urban areas having identifiable cult places, the aggregate ratio of urban to extra-urban would have risen as well. Since this does not happen, we must conclude that the number of cult places increases within a limited number of urban areas. In other words, the phenomenon of multiple cult places within the same area is a typically urban one. Even in the first century, when the ratio of aggregate to total reaches the highest value in the entire period considered here, on average there is still one and a half cult place in every urban area. We may therefore say that apart from a decline in the number of cult places overall in the Late Republic, there seems to be a concentration of cult activity in the urban centres.

To see how these observations can be translated to the spatial plane, we must turn to the distribution maps provided for the last three centuries BC (figs. 4–6). The third century has

---

Fig. 4. Distribution of cult places in Latium, identified on the basis of votive material (third century BC).

---

180 The fact that in the seventh century, there are more than three times as many extra-urban aggregate cult areas as urban ones can be attributed to the fact that nine of the 16 non-aggregated cult places are situated in Rome; the result is an extreme effect of aggregation on urban cult places for this period.
been chosen as the chronological starting point of the distribution maps, since the number
of cult places is highest in this century (thus representing the maximum distribution of cult
places), and since it is primarily the late republican period in which we are interested. We can
indeed observe a heavily dotted landscape in the third century (fig. 4), with many cult places,
urban and extra-urban, scattered across the landscape, with a concentration around Rome
and the Alban Hills but without a clear pattern in the rest of the region. We can also observe
that the extra-urban cult places clearly outnumber the urban ones. In line with the statistical
observations above, a lot of dots disappear in the second century and the numerical disparity
between urban and extra-urban cult places seems to diminish (fig. 5). The decline in the number
of cult places is not concentrated in any particular area, although the seemingly least affected
area is that of the Liri river valley to the north of the via Latina. A very clear image emerges
from the distribution map of the first century (fig. 6). Urban cult areas (comprising urban
and sub-urban cult places) actually outnumber extra-urban cult areas in this period and at
least for the western half of Latium there is a clear pattern.\textsuperscript{181} Active extra-urban cult places

\textsuperscript{181} I would like to emphasize that the number of dots on the distribution maps for either category do not necessarily
correspond to the numbers in table 1. As already indicated above, cult places located just outside the city walls
appear as urban cult places on the distribution maps while being counted as extra-urban in table 1 and its
associated bar graphs. As such, black dots on the map may actually signify either fully urban or suburban cult
places. In any case, a very close association with the urban centre is supposed for both.
in this area seem to be largely confined to the area around Rome, concentrated along the important traffic arteries of the via Appia, the via Latina and the via Prenestina. Extra-urban cult places not associated with the road network are rare in western Latium and only seem to exist in the Middle Liri valley. The distribution maps therefore seem to confirm the image presented earlier: the Late Republic as a period of numerical decrease and an increasing urban concentration of cult places.

Analysis and evaluation

Of course, the interpretation of the data above rests on the assumption that the figures represent actual, real changes in the number of cult places. The first objection one might raise against such an assumption is methodological in nature, namely the heterogeneity of the data used, a problem perhaps facing all integrative studies.\textsuperscript{182} The data provided by Bouma are derived from the publications of countless excavations, surveys and fortuitous finds, each

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig6}
\caption{Distribution of cult places in Latium, identified on the basis of votive material (first century BC).}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{182} An example is the recent comparative study by Robert Witcher of different regions of Etruria (\textit{Witcher} 2006). Based on the results of more than thirty surveys, Witcher encounters the same general problem, namely whether the patterns he has detected are genuine or if they reflect changes in the intensity of coverage (\textit{Witcher} 2006, 106-111). Witcher maintains that in spite of this methodological complication the general patterns observed remain valid, albeit possibly with slightly different relative values.
with probably widely differing methodologies and research aims affecting the final results. In addition, the *suburbium* of Rome is traditionally one of the better covered areas as far as archaeological research is concerned, and is therefore perhaps over-represented.\(^\text{183}\) However, there are other areas in Latium that have been relatively well studied, such as the Liri river valley, where a similar general phenomenon is visible. This suggests that at least in broad terms, the data provided by Bouma can be compared in the way done here and the general conclusions drawn from them stand as they are.

Another important, related question we need to ask ourselves is if in this case the absence of evidence (the lack of recovered votive material) indeed constitutes evidence of absence (cessation of cult activities previously indicated by this votive material). I have already mentioned that our knowledge of fifth century material culture is perhaps not ideal, raising the possibility that we somehow fail to identify cult places because we do not know what the material indicators for cult activity in this period are. I will refrain from presenting a full analysis of the 5th century ‘crisis’ here, since we are dealing with a period in which the historical situation and, perhaps more importantly, the cultural and ethnic boundaries in the area are far from clear-cut and the significance of the chronological differences observed in the data is unclear. Perhaps the observed dip in sites identified on the basis of votive material can be connected to the attested presence of Volscians in the Pontine plain in the late sixth century, bringing with them different votive practices which as of yet are not easily recognisable to archaeologists, explaining the fact that sites identified in the sixth century can no longer be traced in the fifth while ‘reappearing’ in the fourth century.\(^\text{184}\) In any case, the subject is too vast to analyse in detail in the context of this study.

For the late republican period, we might be dealing with a similar problem. As mentioned above, there seems to be an important change in the nature of votive material at some point during this period. Categories of clearly recognisable votive gifts, such as feticile objects (anatomical terracottas, terracotta votive heads, and terracotta figurines) and miniature pottery, largely disappear from the material record. Are we then dealing with the simple fact that because votive material can no longer be recognised as such in the first century, cult activity only *seems* to disappear from the countryside? I would like to argue that this is too simple an explanation for at least the late republican period.

There are certainly some sites with material interpreted as being votive in nature dating to the first century, mainly pottery and coins, thereby suggesting that there are possibilities of recovering material manifestations of votive practices in that century. These include the sites appearing as functioning cult sites in the fourth or third centuries, which are arguably the sites being made visible by the recognisable feticile votive objects (*fig. 7*). For instance, we can observe that more than half of the sites still existing in the first century consist of sites appearing as cult places in the archaeological record in the fourth or third century.

Secondly, there are several sites with a continuity of several centuries, with a ‘sudden’ cessation of activity in the first century, which is clearly visible in the graph showing us the number of abandoned cult places with a proportional breakdown into the centuries in which

\(^\text{183}\) For the definition and implications of the concept of a Roman *suburbium*, see CHAMPLIN 1982; MARAZZI 2001 (concentrating on Imperial and later periods); MAYER 2005; WITCHER 2005.

\(^\text{184}\) See GNADE 2002, 140-143, for a discussion of the Volscian presence in Latium.
The fact that archaeologically recognisable cult material has been found at those sites which did not exclusively consist of fictile votive offerings underlines the fact that it is not just those objects that define a cult place. If cult activity did continue in the late republican period at those sites with long cultic histories, or any cult site for that matter, I would expect some small visible sign of it, not even necessarily votive in nature, such as ‘normal’ pottery or coins. I find it hard to believe that people frequented cult places in the first century, arguably performing invisible...
rituals, without leaving any trace of their presence. To me, in these cases at least, the absence of material evidence indeed signals the abandonment of the site as a functioning cult place.

Thirdly, the phenomenon of abandonment and (urban) concentration of cult places is not restricted to this problematic first century. We must keep in mind that at least some of the sites labelled as ‘lost’ in the second century were actually abandoned during the third, and those of the first century during the second. This follows from the fact that cult places cannot be labelled as lost in a century if they have yielded material dated to that century. If, for instance, at a particular site early third century material has been found, it will be labelled as ‘continuous’ in the third century, but as ‘lost’ in the second, while it was perhaps already

---

Fig. 8. Total number of abandoned cult places in Latium, identified on the basis of votive material per century, subdivided into the periods of earliest evidence for cult activity.
abandoned in the period after the early third century. The *terminus post quem* provided by the material is thus somewhat crude, but given the heterogeneity of the votive material and the dating possibilities of each of them already remarked upon, centuries are the only unit of chronological measurement which allows for the comparison of all material categories. It therefore appears that cult places disappear in the third and second centuries, a period in which I think many will agree votive material is still recognisable as such. This would mean that the idea that first century sites are under-represented because of archaeologists’ failure to recognise them as cult places would only have limited implications for the data presented here, namely a possibly higher number of ‘continuous’ and ‘new’ sites (including ‘revivals’), perhaps tempering the image of continuous decline.

I do not contest the fact that the nature of votive religion changes in the last two centuries BC, but I do contest the implication that this change prevents us from making any relevant observations on the basis of the material we have at our disposal. We have to accept that a more profound knowledge of the different forms of votive religion and shifts in the dating of material associated with it could cause shifts in the graphs and distribution maps presented here.\(^{185}\) It remains to be seen if such shifts would be so significant as to fundamentally change the observations made in this chapter. For the moment, I am inclined to assume that the picture painted here is essentially correct, at least in broad outlines, and we should therefore explore the observed peculiarities of the late republican period further.

The prolonged nature of the late republican ‘crisis’, in some ways even deteriorating in the first century, seems to point rather to a steady development than any ‘shock’ occurrences resulting in temporary disruption of cult activity.\(^ {186}\) Single historical events cannot fully account for the image emerging from the analysis of the data, which in my opinion is too consistent both chronologically and geographically. While the Hannibalic War could possibly explain the abandonment of sites, residential and religious, in the late third century, a similar explanation is implausible for the second century. The sites labelled ‘lost’ for the first century were actually abandoned during the second, surely one of the most prosperous periods of the Republic without major military campaigns on Italian soil, thereby practically eliminating armed conflict as a possible cause of abandonment. Although the republican period is certainly characterised by its share of military struggles, both external and internal, much of the Late Republic was also relatively stable and tranquil. Virtually all military operations of the second century took place outside the Italian peninsula. With peace and stability restored and vast amounts of wealth flowing into the peninsula, we would actually expect a revival of sites abandoned during the third century, possibly in response to the Punic invasion, yet we do not see anything of the sort. Instead, we continue to observe a decline in the number of cult places and spatial concentration, without an apparent military reason. Therefore, it is highly unlikely that the developments of cult place distribution can be explained solely by the effects of military interventions. A model should therefore be sought that is compatible with the

\(^{185}\) For instance, it is difficult to date anatomical terracottas in anything other than centuries (Glinister 2006, 20).

\(^{186}\) Which is not to say that such ‘shock’ occurrences did not account for the disappearance of individual cult places or entire urban areas, such as the destruction of Fregellae by the Romans after its insurrection in 125 and the mass suicide and subsequent immolation of Norba in 81. However, these instances account for just a small portion of the total number of cult places and fail to explain the developments observed in the long run.
available evidence and able to explain the demise of cult places in Latium in the Late Republic as the result of long-term developments.

Taking the model proposed by Comella and Pensabene into consideration, we also run into some problems. They seem to place the abandonment of cult places firmly in the first century, while the data presented here suggests an earlier date for the start of this process, namely at some point during the third century. The fact that these early abandoned cult places do not experience a revival in the second century perhaps means that this actually is the start of an ongoing process affecting cult places. This process leads to concentration of cult places in or near urban centres and alongside major traffic arteries. While this process of concentration seems to support the model proposed by Comella and Pensabene, I still question their exclusive connection of these abandoned cult places with the lower social classes. I think that it is possible to construct a different model explaining this concentration of religion, partly incorporating the notions put forward by Comella and Pensabene but more general in character, which shows that the specific changes in the Latial sacred landscape are the result of a number of parallel developments ‘colliding’ in the republican period. The model does not seek to solve the problem of the disappearance of the typical Etrusco-Latial-Campanian votive deposits as such, although it offers some clues about the religious mentality underlying changes in votive practice. It is primarily aimed at explaining the changes in the number and the spatial distribution of cult places without presupposing a displacement of the free rural population, a restriction of the phenomenon to the late second and first century, or an exclusive connection of abandoned cult places to lower social strata.

A different approach to the sacred landscape

Evaluating the analysis of the Latial sacred landscape presented above, we must conclude that based on these figures, it is possible to question some of the models explaining religious change presented earlier in this chapter. It can be argued that the phenomenon starts earlier than is assumed in these models and has geographical characteristics that cannot be easily explained by the aforementioned models. I do think the presented data provide sufficient grounds for a different model, based on economic theory. Using economic theory to describe and explain religious phenomena may seem unorthodox, but I am convinced that there are considerable gains to be made by employing it in the study of religion. Furthermore, this model is able to explain the decline and spatial concentration of Latial cult places in the late republican period more satisfactorily and on a more theoretical level than the models of displacement and impoverishment. A connection between the functioning of cult places and on-site economic activities has been suggested in existing literature on cult places, and the analogy of a religious economy is a concept that has been introduced into the modern study of religion and individual religious activity. Rodney Starke and Roger Finke have formulated a definition of the concept, stating that “a religious economy consists of all of the religious activity going on in any society: a “market” of current and potential adherents, a set of one or

---

more organizations seeking to attract or maintain adherents, and the religious culture offered by the organization(s). For classical times, and in particular the situation in late republican Italy, Andreas Bendlin has stated in a similar manner that a ‘market of small religio-economic entities’ came into being in the late republican period, as a result of religious and non-religious developments. The idea of a religious market model requires us to accept that people displayed a rational attitude with respect to religious choices. Since this may go against intuitive associations with the sphere of religion, I will start by exploring the combination of religion and rationality in the Romano-Italic world, to see if this assumption which is made explicit in the model can pass muster. Next, the principles of the market model based on Central Place Theory will be presented, followed by a discussion of the implication of the model for our view of (late) republican cult places and votive religion.

Religion and the concept of rationality

The first question that needs to be answered is: can an element of rationality, or rational choice, be recognised in religious behaviour? The central assumption inherent in the idea of a religious market is that people display a certain degree of rationality in religious matters. The specific form of rationality in this case can be called a means-ends or instrumental rationality, which dictates that every action reflects the most favourable cost/benefit ratio for the agent involved. In the form of rational choice theory, this concept of rationality has been introduced, not without criticism, in the study of modern religions and individual religious behaviour. While many criticisms aimed at rational choice theory may have some justification in the study of modern religious behaviour, I think especially the question of whether instrumental rationality can be reconciled with an idea of personal belief is less pressing for the Romano-Italic situation. In fact, in some fundamental respects it seems to be very different from modern religious experience; while modern religion embraces the idea of faith and belief, this is much harder to demonstrate for Romano-Italic religion, at least with respect to some fundamental aspects we associate with religion. Romano-Italic religion did not offer solace against physical or mental pain, religion as an institution did not concern itself with the afterlife, and it did not concern itself with the mental wellbeing of the citizenry; in other words, belief probably did not affect life choices all that much. Christian faith is based on the immediate belief, without reservation, in a corpus of revealed doctrines, in the entire word, in the letter of the word, and in the articles progressively elaborated by ecclesiastic authorities. This sort of belief did not exist in classical antiquity, as far as we can tell. While the relationship with the gods required a form of belief, it was belief in the effectiveness of ritual and the expectation of the fulfilment of vows by both dedicants and gods if the ritual requirements had been met; gods and men
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188 Stark/Finke 2000, 193.
189 Bendlin 2000, 134.
191 For general introductions of the theory, and evaluations of its validity and usefulness, see Young 1997; Bruce 1999; Stark 1999.
194 Linder/Scheid 1993, 55.
negotiated, like merchants, about the way in which the sacrifice would be performed and the appropriate favour that would be granted in response to the sacrifice.  

Greek and Roman votive religion on the whole clearly indicates the expectation of a counter-gift from the gods. This means that the criticism of rational choice theory that a quid pro quo exchange with a god or gods is not always involved in religious action is not immediately backed up by the material evidence of votive religion. The very fact that votive religion in the Roman world contains the expectation of a counter-gift from the deity, a very obvious form of benefit however one looks at it, would seem to argue against the idea of religion for religion’s sake implied by “value-rationality”. And although it is certainly possible that votive religion contained a sense of responsibility to others, another form of rationally motivated behaviour, we can see that at least in the case of elites, this principle seems to have played a decidedly minor role in religious sentiments, if any role at all. Of course, votive religion is somewhat different, but nonetheless stems from the same overarching religious system. It therefore seems that if we are to adopt a form of rationality to explain religious behaviour, the choice for instrumental rationality can certainly be defended in a Romano-Italic context. In general, “we should accept that the Romans’ religious experience was profoundly different from our own and that it is impossible to postulate what elements it should or should not have contained”. Therefore, an attempt to interpret religious behaviour from a different perspective than the traditional one would seem to be justified. The application of principles of instrumental rationality to the study of votive practices should at least be explored, to see if it offers new and valuable insights; given the incomplete state of our knowledge concerning private religious behaviour during this period, it is as valid an approach as any.

The idea of instrumental rationality and market principles affecting the functioning and distribution of cult places in Latium will be fleshed out in the following section by embedding it in economic anthropological theory about the development and functioning of retail markets and its relationship to rational human behaviour; it is also based on the concept of instrumental rationality and is therefore fully compatible with the idea of a religious market.

The sacred landscape and Central Place Theory

Having decided on the market analogy as an interesting option with which to approach developments of votive religion and the associated sacred landscape, one of the most obvious theoretical starting points would be Central Place Theory (CPT), originally intended by its author, Walter Christaller, as a theory explaining the size, number and distribution of towns. Research carried out since has demonstrated that the theory actually fails to predict the development
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195 Inderscheid 1993, 54.
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203 Christaller 1933 (Christaller 1966: English translation).
of settlements, its use being limited to the development of service or market centres and systems, which still suits our present purpose.\textsuperscript{204} To keep the terminology neutral, specific reference to towns or market places will be avoided in the explanation of notions derived from CPT, instead substituting the more neutral ‘central place’, while keeping in mind that this label may indicate either of these concepts, or indeed other entities such as cult places. Given the specific characteristics of Latium as an urbanised region in the republican period, I think CPT is an appropriate theoretical framework with which to tackle the problem of number and distribution of cult places, since it can conceptually encapsulate both urban centres and cult places as constituent parts of a network of central places and the services on offer there.\textsuperscript{205} From the theoretical framework provided by Christaller, a number of general principles can be distilled which in my opinion are especially pertinent with regard to the development of the Latial sacred landscape during the middle and late republican period. These five principles will be given here first in their most general form, followed by a discussion of their relevance for the situation in Latium:

(1) \textit{The definition of range}.\textsuperscript{206}
The range of a good is the farthest distance the dispersed population is willing to go in order to obtain a good offered at a place. The same good has a different range at every central place, and its range is not the same in all directions from the same central place. It is mainly determined by: (i) the size and importance of the central place and the distribution of population; (ii) the price-willingness of the purchaser; (iii) the subjective economic distance; and (iv) the type, quantity, and the price of the good at the central place. If the distance is too great, the population will not buy the good because it becomes too expensive for them; or they will buy it at another central place from which they can obtain it more cheaply.

(2) \textit{The extent of complimentary regions}.\textsuperscript{207}
Lower and upper limits determine the smallest area and the largest complementary region of a central place in regard to a certain central good. The lower limit denotes a range of x kilometres around the central place with enough participants to support a service, the upper limit a range of x kilometres around the central place beyond which people will no longer travel to the central place to obtain the central good. If the lower limit of the range is very low, then there is the probability that the central good will also be offered at other central places in the region.

(3) \textit{The effects of infrastructural change}.\textsuperscript{208}
Better traffic conditions mean a reduction in the economic distance. An intensification of the demand for and offering of goods is generally to be expected when a new transportation line

\textsuperscript{204} On the limitations of CPT, see Smith 1974, 170-171.
\textsuperscript{205} Furthermore, CPT has been used successfully in archaeology, for instance explaining patterns of urbanisation (Becker-Nielsen 1989) or questions of supply and demand in the countryside (De Ligt 1991, esp. 42-58).
\textsuperscript{206} Christaller 1966, 22, 53-54.
\textsuperscript{207} Christaller 1966, 55, 60, 67.
\textsuperscript{208} Christaller 1966, 47-49.
is created. Furthermore, with cheaper and quicker transportation, more types of goods, which formerly were offered only dispersely or locally, will be centrally offered in all regions.

(4) **Central places and consumption:**

The central place of a higher order directly draws consumers away from the central place of a lower order. This is caused to a great extent by the inherent wish of people to limit the number of trips needed to obtain central goods (i.e. limit the subjective economic distance). The central place which offers the greater advantages in respect to its range widens its complementary region at the expense of the other central place.

(5) **Competition and viability:**

If two central places lie so close together that their lower limits overlap, they must attract inhabitants from distances greater than the lower limit in order to balance the shortage. If this distance exceeds the upper limit, the good cannot be offered there. A shift to the better or cheaper central place might occur, with the possible result that the central place which loses out in the competition can no longer exist.

These notions can also be applied to the sphere of religion. The various aspects of the religious system as it functioned during the later stages of the Republic, although perhaps also before, are here interpreted as being analogous to that of an economic market system, following the definition of Stark and Finke. First of all, religion itself is understood as having a specific range; Christaller himself gave “spiritual offerings” as an example of a central service, but I think we will have to be a bit more specific than that. In this context the actual functioning of religion, made visible through the dedication of votive offerings constitutes this particular service. Our starting point for Latium is thus votive religion as the central good on offer in central places, which are in this case the cult places and towns of Latium. While many of the elements of the first principle, which I shall term the ‘range principle’, are self-explanatory, I think the concepts of price-willingness and the actual price of religion as a central service need some additional comments. The price-willingness of a consumer is the part of income that someone is willing to spend on a particular service, determined by the price of the good itself and the transportation costs of obtaining it. For religion, this price is formed by any actual monetary costs incurred in making a dedication somewhere (admission fees for certain sanctuaries, the costs of the actual votive object) as well as the money value of labour wages foregone in order to make the dedication (the compensation for ‘lost time’). In addition, the costs of transportation including possible lodging should be taken into account. The ‘range principle’ in religious terms thus becomes a question of how far people are willing to travel in
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209 Christaller 1966, 43, 57. This is a variation on Christaller’s assumption mentioned earlier in the text (1966, 40) that “a central place, at which a certain cost-good of a certain quality is offered more cheaply than at neighbouring central places, increases its selling area at the expense of the areas of the neighbouring central places.”

210 Christaller 1966, 55.


212 If the cult places are located within urban centres, the urban centre or town is the actual central place and the cult places located within it can be conceptualised as establishments offering a specific central service or good. CPT does not allow such notions as central places embedded in other central places.
order to perform certain ritual actions or make a dedication to a particular deity at a sanctuary and how much time this would take.

The idea of range is further specified in the second principle, specifying the complimentary region of goods and services. This is the region between lower and upper limits of the range, with the former specifying the minimal number of clients and the latter the maximum. The area within the upper limit of the range thus contains all possible clients for a particular service at a central place. If we combine this principle with our data on the number of cult places, one might conclude that the complimentary region of the entities offering religious services expands during the Late Republic, following from the simple observation that there are fewer entities offering the service with an equal or larger population functioning as possible customers, although it is possible that at least part of this population could no longer afford to ‘consume’ religious services. The third principle, the ‘infrastructure principle’, is directly related to an important feature of the Latial landscape in the middle and late republican period, namely the development of the (consular) road network throughout the region, resulting in a reduction in the temporal distance between places, and therefore also in the economic distance. As a rule, people were able to travel faster and more comfortably because of the construction of these paved roads. Although conclusive evidence to link the two phenomena is not available, it might be possible to suggest that the ‘boom’ in cult places visible in the fourth and third centuries is partly the result of road construction, as suggested by the first part of the infrastructure principle predicting an intensification of demand. However, it is the second part of the principle, the resulting central offering of goods, in which we find the seeds for the eventual demise of a number of cult places. The stimulation of central offering of goods must be interpreted as the offering of those goods in central places actually connected by this road network, in this case by definition the towns of Latium. Since the good in question here, religion, is already being offered in most or all of these central places, the development of the road network will result in an intensification of demand in and towards these places, with market areas or complimentary regions becoming larger.

We must also remember that this affects not just the central good ‘religion’, but other central goods as well, the importance of which will become clear soon enough.

The infrastructure principle directly affects the fourth principle, the ‘principle of attraction’. Central places which have more on offer are more attractive for potential consumers since it allows them to combine activities within the same trip, thereby minimising special travel costs. The principle on infrastructure predicts that a direct effect of the development of the Roman road network is the increase of central offering of goods, thereby increasing the attractiveness of these higher-order central places even more to consumers inclined to make multi-purpose trips. This aspect of the attraction of central places offering diverse goods and services, combined with the first three principles, results in the last principle, the viability principle. Smaller central places may lose clients to other, higher-order places and ultimately cease to exist as a result of competition. This is also true for religion; people who would

216 Christaller 1966, 42-43.
have gone to a different ‘religious firm’ in other circumstances might now go to the one in
the higher-order central place or on the way to the higher-order place, thereby increasing the
complimentary regions of those sanctuaries, a tendency that was probably stimulated by the
fact that rational, risk-averse actors in private religion “tend not to form exclusive attachments
to a single religious firm”\textsuperscript{217}. The CPT-model predicts that people are unwilling to travel to
lower-order places, bypassing it in preference to a more distant centre which is usually larger
and offers a wider range of service and products, thereby creating the opportunity to satisfy
multiple needs with a single trip.\textsuperscript{218} It is above all the functional complexity of these larger
centres enabling multi-purpose shopping which makes them more attractive than smaller
centres, since the range of products and services is more restricted, thus necessitating further
trips to satisfy all consumer needs; the centre which is closest in actual distance may not be
the most attractive option in a functional sense. This would imply that those sanctuaries which
have important extra-religious functions, for instance on the economic or administrative plane,
have a distinct advantage over those who do not have such functions; although probably still
of a lower order than actual towns, these multi-functional cult places can be seen as a higher-
level central place in their own right, and people may not be willing to travel to a lower-order
place if religion is the only need which can be satisfied there.

The market model proposed here can be summarised as follows: votive religion, making
dedications to the gods at cult places, can be seen as a central service offered in central places,
either towns or ‘independent’ cult places. People make rational decisions with regard to
their religious choices, with competition between cult places as a direct result. These rational
decisions can perhaps be reduced to the concept of marginal utility, an economic law that
is probably a “social universal”.\textsuperscript{219} The law states that extra utility is gained by increased
consumption of a specific good or service by an economically rational agent. However, since
this increased consumption will invariably be at the expense of another good or service within
the constraints of a limited income, choices will be made by the agent to maximize utility.
In itself, this fact would not necessarily lead to the demise of cult places. If each cult place
receives a sufficient number of worshippers to continue to exist, competition would not
have an observable impact on the number and distribution of cult places. However, several
developments in the republican period ‘activated’ and fed into this competitive process, in the
first place the growing (economic) concentration on urban centres and the development of the
road network, both strengthening the position of towns as central places. Offering a multitude
of goods and services, the towns of Latium had an attraction most cult places did not have.
Conducting a range of businesses in town, many people would most likely have also fulfilled
their religious needs there. Cult places located in towns or close to the roads connecting the
towns drew away these ‘religious customers’ from sanctuaries located in less advantageous
areas. This resulted in the abandonment of countryside sanctuaries, which may in turn have
further strengthened the ‘competitive edge’ of the sanctuaries which did achieve integration
into the urban network of Latium, attaining an even larger ‘market share’ than before. We can

\textsuperscript{217} \textsc{Iannaccone} 1995b, 285.
\textsuperscript{218} \textsc{Smith} 1974, 172; \textsc{King} 1984, 78.
\textsuperscript{219} \textsc{Davies} 1998, 232.
observe concentration of religious activity at some cult places resulting in the abandonment of others as parts of a self-feeding process.220

Implications of the model for our view of cult places and votive religion

Considering the fact that most Latial sanctuaries were dependent on either monetary contributions by or the simple presence of worshippers for their continued existence, it becomes clear how far-reaching the consequences for most sanctuaries were of a decline of the number of visitors. The possible results are perhaps visible in the complete disappearance from the archaeological record of a large number of ‘natural’ cult places. The effect on and reaction by more institutionalised or diverse cult places is perhaps more difficult to establish. Given their extra-religious functions, many of these institutionalised cult places could be said to have been central places of an order at least higher than those cult places with an exclusive focus on religion, giving them a distinct advantage and offering them the opportunity to remain ‘in business’ or even thrive. Of course, the market model implies certain characteristics of cult places and ritual behaviour that may go against our intuition. Indeed, some may say it takes the cult out of cult places by introducing a rational element into religious proceedings. This is emphatically not the case. The market model provides plenty of opportunity for true individual religiosity, but posits that this religiosity was not necessarily tied to a fixed location.

The market model envisages cult places as ‘general’ religious entities, cultic supermarkets if you will, where people could satisfy their religious needs. It seems to me that the highly standardised votive material of the mid republican period, as well as its focus on the dedicant instead of the divinity, enables us to interpret cult places in this way. We find these objects in a large number of sanctuaries, dedicated to diverse divinities, but the general underlying sentiments are roughly the same. These observations about the nature of votive religion in the cult places of Latium would seem to justify our viewing it as a religious product or service. It did not matter in which sanctuary the gods were approached for specific services since these services were more or less the same everywhere. This may seem an unjustly simplistic interpretation of religious behaviour, but I think it has never been argued that certain gods could only be contacted in certain places. Of course, the presence of the divine was more strongly felt at certain places than others, and one specific deity may have inhabited that particular place, but the consultation of or dedication to other gods is not made impossible by that fact.

It is important to note that the market model does not state that the identity of the principal divinity of a sanctuary did not matter at all. For many rituals, however, the identity of the main divinity undoubtedly mattered greatly and had religious significance. However, this need not have been the case for day-to-day votive practices in that sanctuary. The fact that several cult places were not the exclusive abode of any single deity in the Late Republic,

220 Thus the criticism of rational choice theory that “from the rational choice assumption alone we can derive neither explanations of actual religious phenomena nor predictions about the future state of the religious world” (CHAVES 1995, 99), is simply not true in this case, since the market model does offer explanations about actual religious phenomena, namely the developments visible in votive religion and the effects on cult places, and is derived directly from the rational choice assumption of weighing costs and benefits without combining it with “substantive assumptions about the world” (CHAVES 1995, 101).
in addition to their generalised function in the spheres of health and fecundity, suggests that cult places could, up to a certain point, be seen as ‘brokers’ between the mortal world and the divine, without a specification of exactly which members of those divine world were to be contacted there. In a sense one could speak of different religious layers and should think of a distinction between, or rather coexistence of, a principal cult with associated – perhaps archaeologically untraceable - rituals and a votive practice of which the main divinity could be a possible but not an exclusive recipient. Although a problematic dichotomy in itself, one could use the terms ‘public’ or ‘official’ versus ‘private’ for these religious layers, for lack of a better characterisation.

The market model proposed here for Latium also incorporates certain ideas about the presence of people and associated cult activity, but one of its attractive features is that a declining presence of smallholders in the Latial countryside is not a necessary assumption in the model. At first glance, it may seem that such people are disregarded completely, but they are actually accounted for in a slightly different way. The only fundamental assumption in the model is that people as a rule group their activities to avoid extra and unneeded expenditure of time or money. The major change in the Late Republic is not the displacement of the peasantry towards towns on a massive scale, but an increasing economic and perhaps administrative concentration on those towns. Although this may seem just a minor adjustment of the model proposed by Comella and Pensabene, the market model proposed here actually gives a motivation for choices being made in people’s ritual behaviour which is not class-specific, and at the same time accounts for certain characteristics of the development of the sacred landscape which the displacement model did not do, or at least not in a satisfactory manner. The market model gives a better explanation for the observed chronology of the phenomenon, which starts in the third century and is therefore not strictly connected to the disappearance of fictile votive objects, while at the same time giving an explanation for the concentration of cult places in or near urban centres and alongside roads. It incorporates more aspects of changes in the late republican landscape, such as the development of the road network, while not beholden to the doctrine of the declining free peasantry. The attractive feature of the market model is that it allows people to live everywhere; it just predicts certain constraints on the choices being made in people’s ritual behaviour, connecting these choices to others concerns in people’s lives.

An emphasis on rational, pragmatic elements in individual ritual behaviour may also provide us with certain insights into the change in votive practices. A more pragmatic approach to this problem brings us close to the reason given for this phenomenon by Jean-Paul Morel, who states that the ex votos specifically produced as such, the ex votos par destination, had become so highly standardised that the devout perhaps felt that it did not accurately represent them in their contact with the gods. The standardisation of votive material which had fed

221 The private character of (anatomical) votive offerings has been stressed by others (Van Straten 1981, 65; Glinister 2006, 29).

222 Since Latium was a region with a dense urban network, a higher intensity of contact of peasants with the urban market is suggested. For a general discussion of this and other aspects of the urban-rural relationship, see De Ligt 1991, esp. 45-48. According to Luuk de Ligt, “in regions where urban density is high, the marketing pattern will approach a ‘central place system’ (De Ligt 1991, 48).

223 Morel 1992, esp. 229-231.
the competitive struggle between cult places outlined above had perhaps reached its limits, and people turned to other gifts. On the one hand, it is possible that since these gifts had become so highly standardised, it was felt that it no longer mattered what was given to the gods, and that a ‘transformed’ common object served a votive purpose just as well as a specially produced object. This would mean that ex votos *par transformation* are the next logical step in the process of standardisation. On the other hand, it is possible that people felt that gifts that were specifically marked by them better represented them as an individual in their contact with the divine world. In this case, ex votos *par transformation* are a reaction against standardisation; offerings became poorer but at the same time more personalised, although these signs of personalisation, the transformative action that makes the object truly sacred, are often so small and unobtrusive that archaeologists have a hard time identifying them as sacred. This shift from ex votos *par destination* to ex votos *par transformation* in my opinion could be seen as another sign of religious pragmatism, of choices being made on a practical level while still intimately tied to an awareness of the sacred.

A second sacred landscape: religious structures

In the previous section, I have tried to construct a model to describe changes in the Latial sacred landscape using Central Place Theory, in the hope that this would shed light on some of the developments visible in this sacred landscape. As it turns out, several developments, such as numerical decline and urban concentration of sites which have yielded evidence of votive material, can be accounted for with this model. In the following pages, I will reconstruct the Latial sacred landscape using a different indicator, namely building remains. As I have stated earlier in this chapter, this category perhaps represents a different dimension of the religious system and it should therefore be considered separately. After this ‘built’ sacred landscape has been reconstructed and developments in this landscape have been analysed, the results can be compared to those for the ‘votive’ sacred landscape.

Methodological considerations

We can determine the number of cult places with the remains of permanent structures from the sixth century onwards. Alessandro Guidi has argued that the remains of huts, found underneath the foundations of later religious structures at Rome, Satricum, Ardea and Velletri can in fact be identified as ‘sacred huts”, proving the existence of pre-Archaic, more or less permanent cult buildings. However, there is no consensus about the religious nature of these huts, and the sole fact that a temple is later built at the same location does not constitute proof of the ‘sacred hut’ hypothesis. The material evidence under consideration here consists
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224 The increased standardisation of certain votive objects, such as terracotta votive heads (Comella 2004, 336) and terracotta statuettes (Comella 2004, 341), indeed seems to have been a particular development of the late republican period.

225 Guidi 2000, 236. Recently, remains of a hut in which a girl was buried have been excavated underneath the Archaic foundations of the temple of Juno Sospita at Lanuvium, adding another ‘temple hut’ to the list (Attenni 2008, 137).

226 For a critical evaluation of the existence of the ‘sacred hut’ of Satricum, see Bouma 1996 I, 94-101.
of actual structural remains such as temple podiums and parts of the elevation which can often, although not always, be dated on the basis of stylistic or technical criteria. Stylistically, the form of mouldings and cornices, as well as column capitals, and sometimes decoration in the form of stucco or wall painting can be used to determine the construction date of a building. Sometimes, even the style of the ground plan itself has been used to establish a basic chronology for certain buildings. Technical details can also be used to establish chronological ranges, such as the type of stone used, and for late republican structures the type of facing of opus caementicium. In addition we can reconstruct the existence of sacred structures on the basis of associated material such as architectural terracotta decoration, for which stylistic typologies exist spanning virtually this entire period, and epigraphic evidence, which in this case has been used if it formed an integral part of the sacred structure or if the information from the inscription could be unambiguously seen as evidence for the existence of a sacred structure. Sometimes, if a secure date cannot be attributed to a construction phase, associated votive material is used to date the structural remains, but given the complex relationship between religious structures and votive material, I think such dating methods should be approached critically, especially when clear stratigraphic information is absent.

I should point out that dated material evidence is somewhat problematic as an indicator of continuity and abandonment of religious structures. From the remains, we can only reconstruct alterations or restorations to the building, which are sure signs of continuing existence, yet we can never be sure if a lack of such activities indicates actual abandonment. A tendency exists to argue that if a cult-related structure is built in a certain century and votive material continues in the next century though no clear indications of restorations or restructuring is documented for the building, its continued existence can be supposed. As indicated above, the use of evidence not strictly related to the architectural form of the structure cannot be accepted as valid, unless found in a clear stratigraphic relationship, which is rare. It is possible that buildings continued to exist without us being able to deduce it archaeologically. Especially in the late republican period, when cult buildings were increasingly built entirely in stone, repairs could have become less frequent, since the material was far more durable than that used in earlier periods. The ‘life expectancy’ of a cult building after its construction could therefore have been substantially higher. However, for argument’s sake, in the following analysis the continued lack of structural activities at a site with building remains, in the form of either maintenance or alterations, will be interpreted as abandonment. Thus, in this section ‘continuous’ indicates sites for which we have material evidence of continued existence, ‘lost’ indicates sites for which there is no evidence indicating such continued existence. Effectively, this means that these results present a ‘worst case scenario’, indicating a minimum for the number of functioning sacred buildings. However, the majority of cult buildings interpreted here as having been abandoned do not show any signs of subsequent repairs or other building activities. This indicates, in my
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227 Starting with Andren 1939 hundreds of publications have dealt with the systematic study of architectural decoration and roof systems, either dealing with single structures or regional typologies.

228 As a rule, epigraphic evidence associated with religious structures are inscriptions either documenting the initial dedication of the structure, the finishing of certain parts of the structure, or restoration thereof. On the methodological problems of connecting inscriptions to the visible archaeological remains, see Fagan 1996. Although mainly writing about the (late) imperial period, his general observations are also valid for republican times.
view, that they were indeed abandoned at some point, although possibly somewhat later than indicated here. The use of graphs in the following section is comparable to the procedure for sites identified on the basis of votive material, so the methodological considerations about aggregation and the visual presentation of the data for that category of material evidence also apply to the following.

**Presentation of the data**

From the sixth century onwards, we see a gradual increase of the total number of cult places, a trend continuing well into the second century (tab. 3; figs. 9, 10). There is no dip in the fifth century, the ‘crisis’ century as far as votive material is concerned, although the effects of the historical circumstances possibly affecting sites with votive material are perhaps visible in the fourth century: 13 cult places with structural remains in the fifth century no longer exist in the fourth, or at least do not have datable building remains in this period. What is perhaps more significant is that only three of the 13 ‘lost’ structures reappear in the third century, indicating that the abandoned structures were not rebuilt. Enough cult places continued to exist into the fourth century to ensure, in combination with the number of new cult places, an overall rise in the number of cult places. The aggregate number of constructed cult places reveals a considerable flattening of the upward curve in this period. Only in third century do we see an increase in both total and aggregate numbers, continuing into the second century.

Although there are a substantial number of lost cult places in the second century already, it is only after this century that there is a notable decrease in the total number of cult places. The number of cult places continuing to exist falls and the increase of the second century is due entirely to the large number of new cult places. The decrease of the first century is caused by a large number of lost cult places – almost twice the number of the preceding century - and a small number of new cult places. A striking fact is that virtually all discontinuous cult places are older cult places, for the most part dating to the fourth century or earlier. Of the 15 cult places that are newly constructed in the second century, 12 continue to exist in the following century, thus representing about a third of the total number of cult places existing in the first century. A relative majority of both new and lost cult places in the second and first century is extra-
Fig. 9. Number of cult places in Latium, identified on the basis of building remains. Total number of cult places (top), urban cult places (middle), extra-urban cult places (bottom).
Fig. 10. Aggregate number of cult places in Latium, identified on the basis of building remains. Total number of cult places (top), urban cult places (middle), extra-urban cult places (bottom).
urban; about half of the extra-urban cult places of the second century are new compared to a quarter for urban cult places. In the first century, half the number of extra-urban cult places of the second century is lost, again compared to a quarter of the urban sites. Aggregation lessens this disparity somewhat, but not by much. New aggregate extra-urban cult areas in the second century still comprise half of the total number, compared to a third for urban sites. Aggregation makes no difference in the case of lost cult places. Half of the extra-urban areas of the second century are abandoned in the first century, opposed to a quarter for urban areas. This suggests a somewhat higher ‘volatility’ for extra-urban cult places: overall it is in this category that we find the highest proportions of new and lost cult places.

Considering the different ratios (tab. 4), a far more consistent picture emerges for the sites with building remains than for those with votive material. The ratio of urban to extra-urban sites for the total number of cult places indicates that there are about twice as many urban cult places as extra-urban ones in general. Only in the fifth century does this figure drop slightly, indicating that the proportion of extra-urban sites in these centuries is slightly higher, although urban sites are still in the majority. Aggregation results in figures close to one for all six centuries, meaning that there is roughly the same number of aggregate areas with urban cult places as extra-urban ones. As noted above this indicates that multiple cult sites within the same area is a decidedly urban phenomenon during the entire period considered, which is confirmed by the separate aggregation figures for urban and extra-urban cult places. The aggregation effect on extra-urban cult places is almost non-existent. For three out of six centuries it makes no difference at all, and for the remaining three the effect is only small, with a ratio between three-quarters and one. This means that there are very few delimited extra-urban areas – in all probability to be identified with urban territories - with more than one cult place in each century. Conversely, the aggregation effect on urban cult places is very strong. It reduces the number of cult places by more than half. In truth, a large part of this effect is to be attributed to the urban area of Rome. For instance, the city provides 12 out of 52 total cult places in the second century and 10 out of 37 in the first, which furthermore suggests that the influence of Rome on aggregation figures actually grows larger in these centuries. However, even considering this caveat, religious building activity seems to be concentrated in the urban centres of Latium, with non-aggregated figures for urban contexts twice as high as those

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Century (BC)</th>
<th>6th</th>
<th>5th</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>1st</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban : extra-urban (tot.)</td>
<td>2,00</td>
<td>1,54</td>
<td>1,92</td>
<td>2,36</td>
<td>2,00</td>
<td>2,08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban : extra-urban (agg.)</td>
<td>0,86</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td>1,10</td>
<td>1,08</td>
<td>0,94</td>
<td>1,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate : total (both)</td>
<td>0,62</td>
<td>0,63</td>
<td>0,55</td>
<td>0,53</td>
<td>0,63</td>
<td>0,65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate : total (urban)</td>
<td>0,43</td>
<td>0,50</td>
<td>0,44</td>
<td>0,39</td>
<td>0,47</td>
<td>0,48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate : total (extra-urban)</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td>0,77</td>
<td>0,77</td>
<td>0,86</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td>1,00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Ratios on the basis of table 3, total (tot.) and aggregate (agg.).
for extra-urban contexts during each century, suggesting the existence of multiple religious buildings in each town of Latium.

The spatial representation of the data does not show the same dramatic shifts observed in the distribution patterns of sites with votive material (figs. 11-13). There is a rather dispersed pattern for the third century (fig. 11), with urban cult areas outnumbering the extra-urban ones, again suggesting that at least some of the sites labelled as extra-urban using the *intra* or *extra moenia* criterion are actually suburban ones, something which does not become apparent from the bar graphs. The map representing the second century is not much different, with a slightly though not significantly larger number of sites, due to an increase in urban or suburban sites (fig. 12). The first century has the lowest number of sites, although again not by a very wide margin (fig. 13). There thus does not seem to be a dramatic ‘disappearance’ of cult places with building remains. There is a slight but not very marked shift in spatial concentration, with more religious structures being built along major traffic arteries and in or around urban centres, but most of the sites with building remains were already located in the same general positions in the third century, and probably before. On the whole the built sacred landscape seems to be rather stable.
Analysis and evaluation

The analysis of the sacred landscape of Latium reconstructed on the basis of building remains must of course stand or fall with our ability to ascertain if a lack of datable remains associated with (re)construction activities in a certain century for already existing structures constitutes abandonment of the site. While this will probably remain an unsolvable problem, I have indicated earlier that it is unlikely that buildings can remain standing for centuries without some form of restoration. Given the fact that revivals, buildings displaying signs of building activity after a period in which we have no indications for such activities, are quite rarely attested, I think it is safe to assume that most of the buildings labelled as ‘lost’ were indeed abandoned at a certain point not too far removed from the period indicated in the graphs. At the very least, the lack of building activities at already existing sites indicates a reluctance to invest further in monumental forms, leaving the structures ‘as is’.

The Late Republic is obviously a period in which many cult places were lost or abandoned, as far as building remains are concerned, but it is perhaps more appropriate to typify this as a period of reorganisation of the religious topography instead of downright decline, with only the first century actually displaying signs of stagnation. We see a considerable number of new cult places in each century all the way up to the first century. Although a considerable number of sacred structures are lost during the last two centuries BC, the total number of

Fig. 12. Distribution of cult places in Latium, identified on the basis of building remains (second century BC).
sites does not fall by much, nor is there a significant change in the overall areas in which these structures are found. This reorganisation affects extra-urban sites most, having only limited impact on urban sites. If we look at the development of the built sacred landscape, it is actually the second century which can be typified as a temporary peak in building activity, with the number of cult places in the first century reverting to a more ‘normal’ level, comparable to the centuries before, especially if we consider aggregate cult areas (fig. 10). Considering the breakdown per century of existing cult places (fig. 14), the picture is again very balanced. The number of new cult places seems to be roughly similar in each century, with the exception of the third and first centuries, in which the number of new cult places is considerably lower than in the other centuries. We also witness a gradual decline in the number of cult places that are newly built each century; as time goes by, more and more structures are being abandoned. A curious case is the structures dating to the sixth century, which experience a revival in the third century after two centuries of increasing abandonment. While this could possibly be proof of the durability of temple structures, demonstrating that these temples continued to exist between the sixth and third century without visible signs of repair, it is equally possible that in the third century new cult places are built on the site of more ancient shrines. However, this seems to be the exception rather than the rule, and based on this breakdown we might carefully suggest that abandonment of religious structures was perhaps a ‘normal’ occurrence, with older shrines losing relevance in changing historical circumstances.

Fig. 13. Distribution of cult places in Latium, identified on the basis of building remains (first century BC).
The fourth century remains a puzzling period. Most of the fifth century structures have been dated stylistically by their terracotta architectural decoration, which leaves a considerable margin for chronological error. However, current *communis opinio* places most of these structures in the first half of the fifth century, therefore leaving the possibility open that they were constructed early in the century and were abandoned subsequently. The exact date in that century may thus shift with changing interpretations of terracotta typologies and corresponding chronological reappraisals. The proposal of Roman-Volscian belligerence as an explanation for the disappearance of the cult places in the fifth century (for to be labelled as ‘lost’ in the fourth century, the building must have been abandoned at some point in the previous century),

![Graph showing the total number of existing cult places in Latium, identified on the basis of building remains per century, subdivided into the periods of earliest evidence for cult activity.](image-url)
is perhaps more sound for building remains than for sites with votive material, at least in a chronological sense. Since not all of these towns were captured in the beginning of the fifth century and some changed hands between Romans and Volscians several times during the long conflict, the date of the temples that were built in the fifth century and subsequently lost need not all be early fifth century. Furthermore, if we look at the breakdown per century of abandoned sites (fig. 15), we notice that the majority of sites that were abandoned during the fourth century originate in the sixth century, which could easily have been destroyed in the beginning of the fifth century without dating difficulties.
So, comparing the observations for sites with religious structures to those who have yielded votive material, we can perhaps conclude that building remains are somewhat easier to interpret, presenting less vexing difficulties apart from the problem of dating the abandonment of structures. The development over time of the built sacred landscape does not exhibit the clear pattern detectable for sites with votive material and does not have overall signs of outright decline, but rather fluctuation. However, it is clear that the ‘built’ sacred landscape also undergoes changes in the late republican period, with a higher degree of new and abandoned cult places in the last centuries BC, although the issue of when these buildings were abandoned is especially relevant to these late republican structures built entirely of stone and therefore perhaps not in need of frequent repairs. The analysis of the built sacred landscape thus indicates that there are indeed some significant differences, as far as we can tell using archaeological sources alone, in the development between the two sacred landscapes, which supports the decision to consider them separately. However, there are also some similarities in general trends between the two sacred landscapes, which indicates that for all their differences, both belong to an overarching religious system which was probably affected by a similar process. In the next section, the relationship between votive material and religious structures will be considered somewhat further, with special attention for the grand monumentalisation of certain sanctuaries in Latium in the late republican period.

Monumentalisation and votive practices

Interpreting religious structures as a phenomenon that is different from votive religion yet in some ways related to it, one could argue that building activity and especially monumentalisation can be seen as indicators of success in the religious market. The extension of several late republican sanctuaries in Latium could have been the result of competitive success; the massive scale of building activity should, in that case, be seen as a phenomenon which singles out the sanctuaries that continued to attract worshippers or even witnessed an increase in attendance because of their advantageous location. A logical assumption is that some of the income generated by the sanctuary was spent on lavish building projects, with more income meaning bigger sanctuaries. Reversing the cause and effect direction between architecture and popularity, one could even argue that perhaps building activity did not result from continuity or even an increase of frequentation, but was actually a method for certain sanctuaries to become more visible and thereby attract more worshippers: (monumental) architecture as a means to lure the customer, an advertisement in stone by the creation of a religious complex that is literally too large to ignore. Whether viewed as a result of the competitive struggle between cult places or as a way of influencing it, it does not seem too difficult to connect the two phenomena. The idea is perhaps supported by the location of sanctuaries with building remains in the last two centuries of the Republic, which all seem to follow the general dictates of the religious market, being located along major traffic arteries or in or nearby urban centres.

The traditional approach to the construction or beautification of public structures has been to view this as an act of munificence; (local) aristocrats spending parts of their considerable resources for the public good in return for prestige and possible political gain. This notion and the possibility of building activity made possible or even fuelled by the competition between
cult places as presented above are actually perfectly compatible. In both cases, the presence of people in the sanctuary is of vital importance; for the existence of the sanctuary because of the income they generate and the continuity of religious practices they ensure, for the aristocrat because building projects intended to enhance his prestige need to be seen and appreciated. It does not make sense for the elite to focus their euergetistic attention on sanctuaries that are not or infrequently visited, since the return in symbolic profits would be minimal; visual display needs observing eyes. They will preferably select a cult place that is situated advantageously, to ensure a steady stream of visitors. Since these are precisely the factors that determine the success, or perhaps we should say popularity, of a cult place in the market model presented here, it seems likely that the two phenomena coincide.

**Votive material in Latial monumental sanctuaries**

In order to determine if a connection existed between the popularity of a cult place, measured by the number, and perhaps quality, of votive offerings recovered on the site and the monumentalisation of these sanctuaries in the late republican period, it is necessary to give an overview of the votive material that has been found at the monumental sanctuaries of Latium. What development do we see over time, and especially in the period immediately before the monumentalisation phase?

At the sanctuary at Fregellae large amounts of votive material were found, consisting of typical mid- and late republican ex votos such as anatomical terracottas, statuettes of animals and humans including swaddled babies, small terracotta *cippi*, donary bases, a loom weight and a horse’s hoof in terracotta, as well as common and black-glazed pottery. The material can be dated between the late fourth and the early second century. It is therefore possible that the cult place was not used as such until the foundation of the colony in the late fourth century.

The sanctuary of Juno Gabina has also yielded votive material in abundance. The earliest material found at the site cannot be interpreted as evidence for the existence of a cult place, but should probably be related to a domestic or settlement context. Only in the late sixth century a shift towards a ritual context becomes evident from the material. Part of the material was found scattered throughout the sanctuary, and part was found in three deposits, one of which, the so-called *favissa I*, belonged to a more or less independent cult area probably dedicated to Fortuna, while the other two deposits contain votive material which can be related to the sanctuary as a whole. Fifth century material is relatively poorly represented, but in the fourth century the sanctuary experiences a phase of revitalisation, corresponding to large quantities of pottery, common and black-glazed, as well as votive terracottas including statuettes and other finds.

---

229 Colasanti 1906, 85-89; Sydow 1976, 349; Rizzello 1980, 140-151. For the material recovered during the systematic excavation of the site, see Coarelli 1986, 75-82 (black-glazed pottery), 83-88 (common pottery and amphorae), 89-144 (terracotta votives and other finds).


232 Almagro Gorbea 1982, 603-604.

233 Almagro Gorbea 1982, 604-605.
anatomical votives and objects such as oil lamps.  

According to the excavators, the period from the middle of the third to the middle of the second century signals another dip in the level of activity at the sanctuary, which is particularly evident from the reduced number of black-glazed pottery found dating to this period.

The sanctuary of Diana Nemorensis also seems to have enjoyed a long existence as a cult place prior to the late republican monumentalisation. At a great number of locations in and around the late republican sanctuary, votive material has been found, either as scattered material or in actual deposits. The earliest material, consisting of miniature pottery and some bronze objects, dates to the late eighth or early seventh century. The initial phase of the cult continued into the sixth century, while fifth century material seems to be completely absent. From the fourth century onwards, votive material is amply attested, mostly consisting of large quantities of terracotta objects, both anatomical votives and statuettes, with pottery, mostly black-glazed, present in lesser numbers.

At the sanctuary of Juno Sospita at Lanuvium, especially the mid- and late republican period are well represented as far as votive material is concerned. Some material, including some miniature pottery, has been found which suggests cult activities in the late Iron Age, but it is not particularly numerous. As in other sanctuaries, the fifth century is not well-represented at Lanuvium, while the evidence becomes more abundant again for the following period. Large amounts of pottery of various types were found, and many terracotta votives, statuettes as well as anatomical votives. In addition, many artefacts in other materials were found, manufactured in metal, bone, ivory, glass and crystal. The votive material seems to continue without notable interruptions from the fourth century into the imperial period.

At the sanctuary of Hercules Victor at Tibur, no votive material whatsoever has been found which predates the late republican monumental phase. Nearby, on the banks of the Aniene River in the so-called Acquoria district, a large votive deposit has been discovered with material ranging from the archaic period to the second century. Although this deposit is located at the foot of the monumental sanctuary, the existence of a direct relationship between the two is unlikely. We thus have a sanctuary which was monumentalised in the late republican period for which we cannot establish archaeologically if it was a particularly ‘popular’ cult place in the period preceding monumentalisation. The sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia also poses problems. There is a votive inscription dated to the third century which mentions the goddess, but Sandra Gatti has recently expressed her doubts about whether this inscription should be connected to the sanctuary. Votive bases and votive statues were set up in the sanctuary after its monumentalisation, but as of yet there is hardly any evidence attesting ‘popular’

234 Almagro Gorbea 1982, 609-610. For the most important categories, see Pérez Ballester 2003 (black-glaze); Almagro Gorbea 1982, 263-300 (votive terracottas); Almagro Gorbea 1982, 505-524 (oil lamps). The other types of pottery, not all of them necessarily votive, are also discussed in Almagro Gorbea 1982.
235 Almagro Gorbea 1982, 610. The excavators relate this dip to the Second Punic War and its aftermath.
236 Bouma 1996 III, 60-64.
239 Antonielli 1927; Bouma 1996 III, 100-102.
240 Gatti 1995, 103-106. According to Gatti, the inscription is an integral part of material which can be attributed to a different sanctuary.
religiosity at the sanctuary in the period prior to monumentalisation. The same holds true for the sanctuaries at Tusculum and Terracina. While the latter has at least yielded a votive deposit containing the famous ‘crepundia’, miniature objects in lead, which can be dated to the first century, the sanctuary of Tusculum has not yielded any material evidence which can be related to its cultic functions. This means that of the eight sanctuaries being considered in this study, it is impossible for at least these last four to relate the late republican building phase to patterns in the deposition of votive material in the periods prior to the monumental phase. Of the other four, the excavators have argued for a decrease in votive activity in the period prior to monumentalisation for the sanctuary of Gabii, which means that the rise in popularity either directly predates monumentalisation, or can perhaps be considered a result of it, at best. The only sanctuaries which document a continuity of votive practices all through the mid- and late republican period up to, and in some cases also after, the phase of monumentalisation are Fregellae, Nemi and Lanuvium. While there is no dip discernible in the amount of votive material during this period in these sanctuaries, neither can a large increase be observed in the period just before the sanctuary was monumentalised. This makes it extremely difficult to view monumentalisation as a direct result of an increase in popularity of the sanctuary.

The problem of inter-site comparison

The problem of relating votive to building activity at the monumental sanctuaries of Latium can also be observed elsewhere. While the idea of a symbiosis between the operation of market principles and building activity at cult places is an attractive one, it is rather more difficult to find factual support for it. If the observations made above were to be correct, one would expect it to be supported by the yields of votive materials on the various sites with monumental remains. The number of sanctuaries with building remains dated to the second and/or first century where no evidence whatsoever of votive material was found is limited: one fifth of the total number of sites. Interestingly, the majority of these sites (about 80 %) are new constructions of the second century, meaning that sanctuaries are constructed that do not have any prior religious history in the form of either votive material or building remains. And although the relatively low percentage of sites without any evidence of votive material seems to support the idea of a strong link between the presence of votive material and building activity at a site, in both centuries, second and first, about half of the total number of sites only produced evidence of votive material dating to the period before the second century, i.e. before the main construction or monumentalisation phase. The fact that a considerable number of late republican sanctuaries with building remains did not yield any votive material from either that or previous periods, combined with the fact that an additional group of sanctuaries did not yield any votive material dating to the period during or after construction or monumentalisation activities, would seem to undermine the connection between popularity

241 Some have argued that reports by Emmanuel Fernique from the late 19th-century document votive material related to the sanctuary of Fortuna (Fernique 1878; Fernique 1880). Some modern scholars accept a connection between the deposit described by Ferbique and the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia (De Laet/Desittere 1969, 17) while others have expressed doubts (Bouma 1996 III, 69 n. 703).
and building activity, or at the very least the possibility of ‘proving’ such a connection.\textsuperscript{243} The problem that was signalled for the individual monumental sanctuaries thus seems to affect the sacred landscape as a whole.

In addition to the problem of the simple absence of votive material, in the cases where votive material was recovered at sites with building remains dating to the late republican period, inter-site comparisons are problematic. Still reasoning from the assumption that building and monumentalisation could have been related to the religious market of the Late Republic, one would expect to see an effect not dissimilar to the modern phenomenon of large supermarkets pushing small local grocery stores out of business. This would seem to be a fitting analogy, since this particular form of competition is also related to the advantages of a greater variety of choice in comparison to the smaller local stores which offsets the potential greater distance the consumer has to travel to reach the supermarket, which is exactly what we seem to be observing in the Latial sacred landscape according to the CPT-model; vicinity is apparently not the most important consideration when considering which (religious) establishment to frequent. However, for the analogy to be effective and to prove that building activity and competition are related we would have to notice an increase or concentration of votive material at those sites with building remains. Here, the problem of change in votive religion during the Late Republic is especially relevant. For how does one compare a statuette or an anatomical terracotta to a coin or a small marble altar? There is no objective exchange rate, no objective norm to which other votive objects can be compared, and certain types of votive offerings may have been more susceptible to extraction in antiquity for their intrinsic value (such as coins and metal objects), making them more vulnerable to under-representation. To this problem of the subjective worth of votive objects should be added the problem of the differences in methodologies and research aims in the different excavations or surveys which have unearthed cult places. Many of these research projects may not have recorded all the material found, or perhaps did not fully excavate a site but only a portion. While general trends in use and frequentation may be gauged from such research, it would be methodologically unsound to quantitatively compare the results of different sites. Thus, inter-site comparison made in the hope of proving a connection between building activity and an increase in offerings seems to be impossible in general.

Conclusion: devotion and display

The Late Republic was a period of profound change in the sacred landscape. The very nature of votive religion seems to be changing, and is accompanied by a numerical decrease and spatial concentration of cult places. Some have suggested that the former change was the cause of the latter one. I would be more inclined to reverse the direction of this causal relationship, and interpret urban concentration of cult activity as a catalyst for religious change, although this can only be tentatively suggested and not (yet?) proven here, or at the very least consider the two phenomena manifestations of the same rational religious mentality. The central notions of

\textsuperscript{243} Bouma also noted the curious discrepancy between the absence of votive material and the presence of sacred structures (\textit{Bouma} 1996 I, 217 n. 9).
Central Place Theory related to the concept of instrumental rationality can be used to explain the declining number of cult places as well as their concentration in and around urban centres and alongside roads a result of competition and selection. The very existence of a degree of uniformity in religious practice created an inherent competition between cult places, resulting in a religious ‘survival of the fittest’ in which those sanctuaries that were most successfully integrated into the developing urban socio-economic infrastructure continued to exist and even flourished while others were abandoned. The essential keys to success for any cult place in the late republican period were an advantageous location and the number and importance of the services on offer, in order to ensure a steady stream of visiting worshippers.

The market model can be used to open up new, fresh approaches to traditional research subjects, providing a different angle to familiar themes. Some may perhaps complain that the rational approach to religion taken in this chapter seems to take the cult out of cult places, but this is not my intention. It just forces us to consider religion and the way in which it functions in a different, perhaps counter-intuitive way, to reconsider our preconceptions about such matters and test their validity and usefulness. One of the main attractions of the model in this respect is its non-exclusive nature. It is compatible with many established ideas about the way in which cult places are used by individuals and society as a whole. It just adds a new conceptual layer which may illuminate aspects that were perhaps under-represented or difficult to explain before, and thus has a predominantly descriptive function: a tool to understand the changes in the Latial religious landscape and the possible factors contributing to these changes. It remains to be seen if the model can be applied more universally, and if it can eventually be used in a prescriptive manner.

I hope to have shown that the changing sacred landscape of Latium in the late republican period demonstrates that the presence of people alone is perhaps not enough to guarantee cult activity in a certain area. The fact that people weigh the costs and benefits of their - religious and non-religious - actions, and especially possible combinations of those actions, has a large impact on the distribution of cult places in Latium. In the absence of religious distinctiveness, the non-religious functionality of cult places may not just constitute an added value, but an essential key to success or even existence. The sacred landscape reconstructed on the basis of votive material thus undergoes some far-reaching and period-specific changes in the Late Republic, while the same cannot be said of the built sacred landscape.

Virtually all known monumental sanctuaries are located either within or nearby urban centres or along important traffic arteries. In other words: the built sacred landscape, including those structures monumentalised in the late republican period, seems to follow the same general rules in the late republican period as the sacred landscape based on votive material. The choice of sites selected for rebuilding or monumentalisation obviously took into account the importance of an advantageous location for the success of any sanctuary. We can observe a spatial pattern that is comparable to the concentration of sites identified on the basis of votive material. However, the main difference is that for the construction of religious structures these ‘rules’ had probably been observed from the moment of their genesis in the sixth century onwards, while the concentration in these locations of those cult places primarily determined by ritual or votive practices instead of building activity was a new development. Visibility and recognisability of the sanctuary in the landscape had always been important, a fact which
points, in my opinion, to a representational function of religious structures in addition to their function as places of worship. Since it has become apparent that a direct relationship between building activity and the religious fortunes of sanctuaries is impossible to prove, it is perhaps time to explore this other side of cult places: sanctuaries as showcases for the elite.
In the previous chapter, I examined the religious context of the late republican monumental construction phase of sanctuaries in Latium. A model was offered to explain changes in the Latial religious landscape, incorporating the notion of competition between cult places. I subsequently tried to relate the monumentalisation of some Latial sanctuaries to this competitive model, but did not find conclusive proof that the two phenomena were causally related. While there seems to be a concentration in certain locations of religious activity in the late republican period compared to the mid-republican period, because of changes in votive religion it is difficult to prove an increase in the number of visiting faithful in individual sanctuaries. However, even if we had observed a correspondence between increased religious activity and monumentalisation, the fact that the votive and the built sacred landscape seem to develop more or less independently up to this period should make us wary of establishing a direct link between a supposed increase in religious activity and monumentalisation. Furthermore, as we have seen a large number of sanctuaries were probably controlled by towns and the political elites of these towns, making a model which incorporates independently acting sanctuaries adapting to a religious market problematic as an explanation for all the changes in the sacred landscape, for instance architectural developments. While religious factors influencing the monumentalisation process cannot be excluded, the second aspect of the sacred landscape explored in the previous chapter, the construction and monumentalisation of sanctuaries, should perhaps be seen as a phenomenon related to the socio-political context as well as the religious context. The construction of monumental sanctuaries is an expression of elite preoccupations and aspirations and as such a reflection of the conditions and changes of the socio-political landscape. In this chapter, therefore, I will concentrate on this aspect of sanctuaries. I will attempt to reconstruct this socio-political context of the monumentalisation process and examine if a significant relation between monumentalisation and socio-political developments of the late republican period perhaps existed.

Monumentalising sanctuaries: prerequisites

The phenomenon of constructing sanctuaries in an increasingly monumental form, understood here in the sense of more or less unified building complexes instead of just temple buildings, seems to have been a phenomenon with a somewhat limited chronological and geographical range. Although early examples of Italic building complexes with what can be considered monumental proportions, especially in comparison with contemporaneous sanctuaries in the vicinity, can be dated to the late third century, the period of the most intensive building activity is in the second and first century, and more in particular the period from c. 150 to
50 with an apex between the last quarter of the second century and the first quarter of the first century. The phenomenon seems to have been concentrated in Central Italy. Although examples of monumental sanctuaries have been found in other regions, we find the largest number of examples, as well as the most substantial in size, in the area of Latium, Campania and Samnite territories. This wave of monumentalisation has been connected to certain other developments characteristic of the late republican period, namely the increase in wealth in the Italian peninsula, the influence on traditional Romano-Italic architecture of Greek-Hellenistic examples and the availability of new building techniques, most importantly opus caementicium.

The influence of wealth

As mentioned before, it is commonly thought that many Italic sanctuaries were actively involved in the economic infrastructure of the peninsula. First of all, sanctuaries possibly had production centres on or nearby the sacred premises that undoubtedly generated income for the sanctuary.\textsuperscript{244} In addition to their own means of production, sanctuaries were often used as the place where (regional) markets were organised, although the economic gain for sanctuaries, other than the presence of people possibly making offerings or perhaps donating a part of the proceeds to the sanctuary, is less clear in this case.\textsuperscript{245} Although it is possible that trade intensified in Latium and thus the revenues received by sanctuaries likewise increased, the immense wealth flowing into Italy in the late republican period came primarily from the East.

The sources of this new wealth were twofold: it was either the direct consequence of empire, in the form of war booty and tribute exacted from conquered territories,\textsuperscript{246} or an indirect result of Roman expansionist policies in the form of intensified trade by Roman and Italic negotiatores and mercatores in the eastern parts of the Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{247} Sanctuaries probably benefited from these newly gained riches in several ways. One possibility is active involvement in overseas trade on the part of sanctuaries,\textsuperscript{248} although there seems to be little concrete evidence for this and the suggestion of this possibility actually raises a host of questions regarding the status of sanctuaries and the degree of their independence, comparable to those raised in the previous chapter, and the present state of knowledge does not permit us to answer these questions in a satisfactory manner.

It is far more likely that sanctuaries benefited from the wealth of the East in an indirect way. The traditional view, to which I shall return in more depth below, is that part of the victory booty (including the so-called manubiae, which will be discussed more thoroughly later in this

\textsuperscript{244} Morel 1989-1990.

\textsuperscript{245} For a close relationship between the development of the sanctuary of Hercules Victor at Tibur and economic activities related to transhumance at the site, see Bonetto 1999, esp. 301-305.

\textsuperscript{246} Peter Bang emphasises the importance of empire and especially tribute, as an economic mechanism instead of a market economy. According to him “tributary exploitation was a much stronger force than the market in shaping the economic history of the Roman empire” (Bang 2007, 54).

\textsuperscript{247} See, for activities of Romans and especially Italians in the East: Hatzfeld 1919; Cassola 1970-71. A veritable explosion of the volume of trade can be induced from the vast increase in the number of shipwrecks dated to the late republican period in comparison to previous periods (Parker 1992, 549 fig. 3; 550 fig. 4).

\textsuperscript{248} Active involvement in trade in the East has been suggested recently for the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste (Calò 2003, 63-64).
chapter) was dedicated to the gods, and that the erection of temples and the organisation of festivals and games were likewise financed \textit{ex manubiiis}. Of course, this general idea pertains mostly to Rome, but may have been true for Latium as well. Greater amounts of booty would therefore supposedly also lead to a higher number of constructed temples.

The increase in the volume of trade documented for the (late) republican period could have lead to an increase in the quantity or quality of votive offerings.\textsuperscript{249} As with booty, it is likely that traders offered a part of their revenues to the gods in gratitude for their good fortunes, and it is possible that at least part of these offerings were monetary in nature.\textsuperscript{250} The connection of this new-found wealth to monumentalisation in the late republican period would be that either sanctuaries possessed sufficient funds of their own to finance construction activities, or that those individuals enriched by war and trade ‘donated’ new structures to a sanctuary and thereby to its main divinity.\textsuperscript{251} The former idea is undermined by the fact that in the cases where the source of finances for public building activities in the towns of Latium can be ascertained, evidence generally points in the direction of magistrates or municipal treasuries providing the necessary funds.\textsuperscript{252} Although in the former case it is possible that the necessary funds were drawn from the \textit{area} of the sanctuaries, in the end the civic magistrates were still the ones controlling the process; we do not have firm evidence for construction activities at sanctuaries initiated by (representatives of) the sanctuary itself. This would seem to support the idea that as a rule aristocrats were responsible for building activities at sanctuaries, either individually or collectively, using private, communal or sacred funds.\textsuperscript{253}

However, if we accept that the availability of sufficient resources in itself would be a decisive stimulus for the monumentalisation of sanctuaries, it is strange that the phenomenon has such striking chronological and geographical limits.\textsuperscript{254} Furthermore, if it was solely money determining whether a certain sanctuary should be rebuilt or not, we would actually expect an even greater number of building projects. Instead, while undeniably intensive, building activity and especially monumentalisation seems to have been targeted at specific areas and specific sanctuaries. It therefore seems likely that wealth is not the principal reason for monumentalisation, but rather the means by which other ambitions could be fulfilled.

\textit{The influence of examples}

An increase in the level of wealth was not the only result of the wars and trade in the Mediterranean East. One of the features regularly cited in scholarly research about Latial sanctuaries, already mentioned in the Introduction, is the fact that the design of the building complexes owes a great deal to the examples of the Greek-Hellenistic East, especially

\textsuperscript{249} For instance, the successes in the East of traders from Praeneste have been connected with the success of the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia, patroness of the trading class \textit{par excellence} (Pensabene 2005).
\textsuperscript{250} The monetizzazione of votive religion noted by Torelli (see Chapter 1) could have been related by the intensification of trade and the monetary economy.
\textsuperscript{251} See Ziołkowski 1989-1990 for the idea of sacred structures as constituting votive offerings in their own right.
\textsuperscript{252} Lomas 1997, 27-29.
\textsuperscript{253} Cébeillac-Gervasoni 1990, 721-722.
\textsuperscript{254} Building activity in the, undeniably prosperous, Augustan and Julio-Claudian periods, takes place in a great number of cities, but the intensity cannot match that of the late republican period (Lomas 1997, 30).
sanctuaries on two of the Dodecanese isles, Kos and Rhodes, and the city of Pergamon.\textsuperscript{255} The sources of contact with Greek culture shifted in the course of the third century from Magna Graecia and Sicily to Greece proper, Macedonia, the Aegean islands and Asia Minor.\textsuperscript{256} This contact brought about what has been called the ‘hellenisation’ of Italy, the adoption of ‘new’ Greek cultural elements combined in different forms and degrees with traditional cultural elements.\textsuperscript{257} The concept is a highly problematic one, dealing as it does with cultural interaction and transmission. Like the term ‘romanisation’ it presupposes one-sided cultural influence from a dominant to a dominated or receptive culture and as such oversimplifies the complicated and hardly unambiguous processes at work in the meetings of culture.\textsuperscript{258} A further problematic feature is that the dominant-dominated dichotomy in the case of hellenisation only refers to perceived cultural values, Greek representing the pinnacle of artistic achievement. The paradox in this situation is that the actual relationship of power between the two cultural groups is reversed, a striking and interesting contrast to the situation of romanisation in which the dominant side in terms of culture and power is the same, namely Rome.

The main elements of Greek-Hellenistic influence on the design of the Latial building complexes are supposed to be the axial symmetry of the design and the mathematical proportions of the lay-out, and perhaps most importantly the scenographic effect of the building complexes. It is interesting to note that these influences thus seem to pertain specifically to the standardised Latial sanctuary type as presented in the Introduction. It will become clear in the next chapter that not all Latial sanctuaries displayed these characteristics. Therefore, it might be necessary to adjust our idea of which elements of sanctuary design were the result of a supposed Greek-Hellenistic influence. In addition, although a certain degree of (formal) similarity between the Hellenistic architecture of the eastern Mediterranean and the monumental sanctuaries of Latium cannot and should not be denied, a direct causal relationship between the two is perhaps more difficult to prove.

Several of the grand architectural projects of the Greek-Hellenistic East, such as the sanctuary at Kamiros (reconstructed in monumental form at the end of the fourth or the beginning of the third century) and the sanctuary of Athena at Lindos (with construction activities spanning virtually the entire third century) certainly predate the construction of monumental complexes in Central Italy, making it possible that they functioned as architectural models.\textsuperscript{259} However, the sanctuary most often named as a direct typological influence is the Asklepieion of Kos, since this complex, in contrast to the examples cited earlier where axial symmetry is only applied to secondary structures but not to the temple building itself,\textsuperscript{260} observes the same strict axiality centred on the temple building as some of the central Italic examples.\textsuperscript{261}

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{255} The sanctuary of Asklepios on Kos, the sanctuary at the city of Kameiros and the sanctuary of Athena at Lindos on Rhodes, and the sanctuaries of the Pergamene citadel.
\bibitem{256} M\textsc{orel} 1989, 502.
\bibitem{257} G\textsc{allini} 1973; C\textsc{oarelli} 1976; M\textsc{orel} 1989, 502-503 (art and architecture in general), 506-509 (temples and elite architecture); I\textsc{sager} 1993, esp. 267-268 (on temples); W\textsc{allace-Hadriil} 2007, 356-363.
\bibitem{258} L\textsc{omas} 1995, 108. See also W\textsc{allace-Hadriil} 2008, esp. 17-28, connecting the processes of romanisation and hellenisation in Italy.
\bibitem{259} C\textsc{ali\textcircled{O}} 2001 (Kamiros); L\textsc{ippolis} 1988-1989 (Lindos).
\bibitem{260} C\textsc{ali\textcircled{O}} 2001, 106.
\bibitem{261} C\textsc{oarelli} 1987, 29. It must be noted that in this case too, the interpretation of the sanctuary of Kos as an architectural model can be applied above all to the standardised Latial sanctuary.
\end{thebibliography}
According to the most recent research on the building complex of Kos, the late Hellenistic phase with its characteristic division into three terraces, a change in the orientation of the entire complex towards the northeast, and the axial, central placement of the main temple on the upper terrace surrounded by a porticus triplex, can probably be dated to 170-150. This would make the construction of this upper terrace contemporary with the construction of the sanctuaries of Fregellae and perhaps even Gabii, instead of earlier, thereby problematising the supposed influence of the sanctuary at Kos on these two sanctuaries, especially the former, and the supposed mediating role of Kos in the transmission of architectural models of Asia Minor to Italy. Interestingly, the new monumental phase of the sanctuary at Kos seems to coincide with an increased Roman and Italic presence on the island and within the sanctuary, again underlining the problems and complexities inherent in the analysis of the direction and degree of cultural influence.

Even ignoring these chronological problems, a difficult question remains regarding the process of adoption and adaptation of ‘alien’ cultural elements, especially in the case of such an important architectural category as religious structures. It has been pointed out that Roman religious architecture was by nature ‘viscous’, retaining roughly the same form over a long period of time. Why would Romans and Italians then readily adopt Greek-Hellenistic architectural models? It is certainly possible that they were so impressed by the monumentality of the Greek-Hellenistic building complexes and the technical ability of their constructors that they simply had to build similar monuments themselves, recreating the visual impact of these complexes in Italy. As with the financial resources described above, and with the new building techniques below, simple availability does not necessarily lead to use or incorporation. There has to be a motive behind the adoption of Greek-Hellenistic models, a reason why patrons would want to build such imposing complexes. A simple hypothesis would be that if they were impressed by these monuments, building similar monuments would mean that they themselves wanted to recreate this same effect, i.e. impress others. If we accept that the construction of monumental sanctuaries of Central Italy was indeed influenced by design schemes from the East, we must ask ourselves why this choice was made, and how we should interpret the message that was being conveyed by the choice for this specific architectural language.

The influence of building techniques

Late republican monumentalisation is often connected to the rapid development during this period of a spectacular new building technique, Roman concrete or opus caementicium. A building technique was now available with which solid and durable substructures and elevations could be built rather cheaply and easily, at least when compared with opus quadratum. Opus

---

262 Interdonato 2004, 242-244.
263 Interdonato 2004, 245. In the traditional view, this increased presence would explain the eventual adoption of Greek-Hellenistic models in Italy itself, Romans and Italians being the carriers of the innovative architectural language back to Italy.
Caementicium revolutionised Roman building in two significant ways. Firstly, the technique made it possible to build at locations where it had not been possible before because of a lack of building grounds which could now be artificially transformed into even terraces suitable for building. Secondly, buildings could literally reach new heights since the limitations imposed by traditional building techniques were partly offset: being a lighter and in many ways more sturdy material, concrete enabled the construction of higher buildings, sometimes with multiple storeys. However, as with the two previous 'causal factors' of the monumentalisation process in Italy, the availability of this particular building technique does not necessarily lead to the construction of monumental building complexes. The availability of a fast, durable and relatively inexpensive building technique must certainly have facilitated the choice for larger architectural complexes, but does not in itself explain that choice.

We must keep in mind that the majority of building complexes signalling the start of the monumentalisation process, both in Latium and in other regions of Italy, at the end of the third and beginning of the second century, were still built in opus quadratum, and the chronological sequence of monumental complexes in Latium does not coincide perfectly with the spread of the new building technique. While a modest amount of opus caementicium was used in the construction of the sanctuary at Fregellae, it seems to have been used solely for the temple podium, while the monumental aspect of the complex was defined to a large extent by the addition of lateral porticoes, in which concrete was not used. We are thus unable to link the availability of the building technique here to the monumental form, since concrete was not used to achieve the overall monumental appearance of the sanctuary, which for the most part relied on traditional building techniques. The sanctuary of Juno at Gabii was built somewhat later than the complex at Fregellae and was situated much closer to Rome, where opus caementicium was arguably further developed and where advances in the technique originated and from which they were disseminated, both factors which would have encouraged the use of the technique on a larger scale.265 However, it does not seem to have been used at all for the construction of the monumental late republican sanctuary, which was partly cut into the bedrock and constructed in traditional opus quadratum using the locally quarried lapis gabinus.

The fact that opus caementicium was used either sparingly or not at all in the earliest examples of monumental sanctuary architecture in Latium in the late republican period would seem to disprove a direct causal relationship between the availability of the technique and monumentality. Rather, the choice for a monumental lay-out was motivated by other factors, with the technique to be employed in the construction being an aspect which was probably decided on at a later stage, again subject to specific motivational factors.266

The need for an explanation

Although the chronological overlap of the monumentalisation process and each of these three factors is probably more than just coincidental and all three certainly contributed to

265 See Rakob 1983 for a discussion of the development in and spread from Rome of the different forms of opus caementicium.

266 In Rome the opus quadratum technique remained a preferred construction method for truly prestigious constructions well into the Empire because of its ideological connotations (Gros/Torelli 1988, 103).
the character and development of the monumentalisation of Italic and in particular Latial sanctuaries, these are all preconditions rather than explanations. Just because the factors mentioned above are all extant at some point does not mean they necessarily lead to the construction of monumental sanctuaries, especially if we consider some of the reservations expressed above. This means that although influential in their own right, what we have here is the grease of the monumentalisation process rather than its motor. The rest of this chapter is devoted to an attempt to discover the true driving force behind the need of Roman, Latin and Italic aristocrats and communities to rebuild sacred places in an ever more grand and ostentatious way. We shall see that economic capital, Greek Hellenistic architectural examples and developments in building techniques all have their place in this explanation, but as parts of a bigger picture.

Sanctuaries and society

Sanctuaries were important focal point in society. While the previous chapter may have called into question the idea of sanctuaries as ‘automatic’ central places with regard to private religiosity, it was also stressed that as physical objects cult places were important landmarks and in a symbolic sense probably played a significant role in the lives of people living in Latium. What then were the roles of sanctuaries for communities and for society as a whole? In general, religious sites have been seen as important features of the expression of identity by certain groups. Through such religious sites groups could represent themselves and distinguish themselves from other groups. It follows that the value of a sanctuary is determined by its audience (in line with previous chapter), both internally (the group using the sanctuary as an object representing the group) and externally (other groups viewing and interpreting the sanctuary). The most important question in the interpretation of the development of cult places then becomes to what group or groups they were catering. The traditional view is that sanctuaries had a local importance, celebrating communal pride, something that has also been stressed for the monumental sanctuaries of Latium, a point to which we shall return later. However, supra-regional significance has also been claimed for certain sanctuaries, especially in areas which were not as highly urbanised as Latium. In these areas some of the central administrative, economic and political functions that were mostly concentrated in towns and their civic buildings on the western Tyrrhenian coast were fulfilled by sanctuaries. Furthermore, a case has been made that the monumentalisation of sanctuaries performed a specific symbolic function in certain areas during the period of Roman expansion, namely that these were focal points of the articulation of (cultural) identity. By using their religious spaces, groups could present themselves and, perhaps more importantly, distinguish themselves from others. The following sections will examine the theoretical foundations for especially these latter claims by looking at ritual and religion as constituent parts of the perceived identity of groups and by applying this theoretical foundation to monumentalised sanctuaries in Samnium and Lucania.

267 LOMAS 2003, 41; FARNEY 2007, 72.
The importance of cult places as focal points of society has long been acknowledged, but in the context of the present study it is important for us to understand in what specific way sacred places were connected to society. Only an understanding of the mechanisms affecting the intertwinement of religion and society can help us determine what the exact role of cult places was, so that we can appreciate the impact of the monumentalisation of these cult places. In addition to being functioning religious centres, with the capacity to unite people in the present in a very real and physical sense through communal worship and festivals, it is the link to the past that is especially important in this respect: spaces and places, cult places among them, play a vital role in the collective memory of specific groups. The ‘collective’ or ‘cultural memory’ is the memory that is shared, transmitted and often (re)constructed by groups, superseding the personal, individual memory. It “refers to the collectively shared knowledge of society, the peculiar set of certainties and convictions it has about itself and, in particular, about its historical roots”. In this sense, the collective memory is used to stabilise groups, defining their core values and characteristics, and in so doing it can actually construct group identities. Collective memory needs a vast array of devices to ensure its correct and durable transmission; besides writing, perhaps the most obvious means of memory storage, oral transmission is perhaps just as important, as are events such as festivals, ceremonies and rituals; and places, both those in which these commemorative events take place and the specific places of important historical events and the monuments marking these places. Physical places thus play an essential role, since they are the physical reminder of tradition: the very origins of communities are often connected to specific places, although often reconstructive and in hindsight. Cult places play an important role in collective memory, since religion is seen as one of those important defining characteristics of groups, and entire sacred landscapes are constructed as a result.

The collective memory, and the role specific places play in collective memory, is both active and highly structured. Commemorative places are not just oriented towards some distant, perhaps even partly mythical past as a collective reference point for societies in the present, it also documents contemporaneous divisions of power with an eye to the future. “Cultural memory is the main source for patterns of perception, for conceptions of order, right and wrong, and for the framework in which to interpret one’s own contemporary social environment and world of experience”. This means that, within certain limits and restrictions, sacred landscapes had to be flexible and adaptable. They were not structured solely by events in the past, but could also be influenced by events in the present that had to be incorporated.

---

269 The term ‘collective memory’ was coined by Maurice Halbwachs (HALBWACHS 1950). Building on Halbwachs’ ideas, Jan Assmann used the term ‘cultural memory’ instead, but the meaning and connotation of the two terms are virtually identical (ASSMANN 1997).
270 HÖLKENSKAMP 2005, 251; HÖLKENSKAMP 2006, 481.
271 The term ‘lieux de mémoire’ has been coined for such places by Pierre Nora.
272 EGELHAFF-GAISER 2000, 234.
273 EGELHAFF-GAISER 2000, 236.
274 HÖLKENSKAMP 2006, 481.
into the collective consciousness.\textsuperscript{275} The community did not just care for and preserve a static landscape of commemoration, but added to this landscape, creating and staging new spatial structures, either spontaneously or planned.\textsuperscript{276} Over the course of centuries, commemorative landscapes could thus be altered, corrected, enlarged and completed by the participation of many actors. While this may imply an inherent risk of chaos, the constant link to and symbiosis with the stored body of cultural memory in societies ensures that new additions to this body are seldom arbitrary. The collective memory acts as a structuring device, since it disciplines and integrates the members of a society, reinforcing the cohesion of that society and thus partly determining the mental, cognitive maps people use to view the world around them: “a society’s shared cultural knowledge possesses a normative dimension as it contains binding ‘instructions’ about how to act in the present and the future”.\textsuperscript{277} Memory, in particular collective or cultural memory, thus needs spaces and places to anchor it to certain geographical areas and the groups living there, to continually confront those groups with their shared past and the norms and traditions that bind them.

\textit{Sanctuaries and romanisation}

The phenomenon of religious transformation and its connection with expanding Roman influence has been redefined several times over the past decades, owing to the changing perceptions about romanisation processes as a whole: the symbolic expression of ‘self’ as opposed to the ‘other’ has been one of the central questions in recent archaeological research of indigenous (Italic) peoples and the influence of Roman expansion and dominion. Since collective or cultural memory plays an important role in the definition and expression of group identities, and as we have seen were also used to assign contemporaneous developments their proper place within the framework of collective memory, it is likely that cult places were in some ways used to articulate reactions to the expansion of Rome and the possible threat this posed to group definitions and stability.\textsuperscript{278} The fact that several sanctuaries were monumentalised in the areas newly conquered by Rome, from the late third century onwards, might therefore be interpreted as a reaction to these events, and indeed several attempts have been made to interpret monumental sanctuaries within the framework of romanisation.

The main opposing ideas on the role of (monumental) architecture, sometimes seemingly incorporating traditional Roman forms, are that it is either the result of emulative strategies or an expression of communal pride opposed to Roman rule, or more specifically its possibly disintegrative effects on traditional society.

The first idea is based on the assumption that indigenous groups adopted typically Roman forms of expression, a sign of \textit{romanitas}, out of a wish to participate in the empire, a model

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{275} It is this mechanism which lies at the root of what Eric Hobsbawm has termed the ‘invention of tradition’ (\textsc{Hobsbawm}/\textsc{Ranger} 1983), the creation of entirely new (national) myths and traditions which are made to look as if they are part of a long tradition.
\item \textsuperscript{276} \textsc{Egelhaaf-Gaiser} 2000, 236.
\item \textsuperscript{277} \textsc{Holkeskamp} 2006, 481.
\item \textsuperscript{278} Apart from the Italic examples mentioned in this text, the importance of the past in the formulation of reactions to Roman rule has also been stressed for Greek cities, especially during the Imperial period (\textsc{Alcock} 2001, esp. 323, 330).
\end{itemize}
that has been termed self-romanisation or \textit{autoromanizzazione}.\footnote{For this concept, see \textit{Sherwin-White} 1973, 222; \textit{Brunt} 1976; \textit{Millett} 1990a; \textit{Millett} 1990b, 38; \textit{Torelli/Lachenal} 1992, xxxvii; \textit{Woolf} 1998, 247; \textit{Curchin} 2004, 13.} It has been formulated as a reaction to the traditional vision of romanisation as a civilising mission on the part of Rome, a top-down process, assimilation being initiated and imposed by the Roman conquerors, ultimately supplanting indigenous culture with a new, Roman culture. The self-romanising model is a reaction to this classical, and out-dated model of romanisation in the sense that it places the initiative for the romanising process with the indigenous groups. In most cases it would be the elites of indigenous societies adopting Roman symbols in order to retain their power positions. Roman culture would then permeate lower social strata by a trickle-down effect, with the lower strata emulating the higher ones just as the latter emulated Roman examples. This model of voluntary romanisation, sometimes called ‘adoption by imitation’, either implicitly or explicitly states that indigenous groups somehow regarded Roman culture as being superior to their own, or more pragmatically regards Roman symbols as the necessary means to maintain some semblance of the \textit{status quo}. Monumental architecture would in this model be interpreted as a sign of self-romanisation, with indigenous cult places being rebuilt in a new, grand and supposedly ‘Roman’ manner, thus showing the willingness and ability of local elites to adopt Roman architectural practices. The model of self-romanisation has been severely criticised both for its elitist perspective and the assumption of Roman cultural superiority.\footnote{\textit{Webster} 2001, 215-216.} I shall return to the concept of self-romanisation at the end of this chapter.

At the other end of the spectrum we find the idea that cult places can be seen as a counteractive device, a symbolic strengthening of the (indigenous) cultural identity as a
response from local communities to the disintegrating force of social change and the loss of political and territorial autonomy, using cult places as a symbolic cultural anchor.\textsuperscript{281} This model, stressing the use of cultural memory in the reaffirmation of group identity that can ultimately take the form of ‘symbolic resistance’, can be seen as a direct result of the recent trend in romanisation studies of an increased focus on indigenous culture as inherently valuable - opposed to the idea that it is inferior to Roman culture - and the persistence and continuity, or even revival, of traditional customs in the wake of Roman expansion. It can also be viewed as a reaction to the model of self-romanisation, as it stresses the continuity of local culture instead of the adoption of supposedly Roman cultural symbols. Two examples from the regions of Lucania and Samnium will illustrate this model. The first and earliest is the sanctuary at Rossano di Vaglio (fig. 16). In contrast to many small local sanctuaries that were abandoned in the course of the third century as a result of socio-economic and military developments, cult practices at Rossano di Vaglio continued and the sanctuary was even restored and monumentalised in the course of the second century or perhaps even as early as the end of the third century.\textsuperscript{282} In this monumentalisation process, the traditional functional and spatial organisation of the sanctuary, of the so-called courtyard shrine type, was carefully retained. At a time when Lucanian society was under stress and many traditional elements of that culture were lost, the sanctuary of Rossano di Vaglio could be interpreted as a shining beacon of historical consciousness. Not only because of the traditional religious aspects, including the continued worship of local divinities, Mefitis probably being the main goddess of the sanctuary,\textsuperscript{283} the display of votive offerings and the continuity of rituals, but also by the use of the site for the commemoration of important episodes of Lucanian history: it is seen as a distinct possibility that in this sanctuary illustrious figures from the Lucanian past were remembered or even venerated.\textsuperscript{284} The commemoration of the shared past in a period when the cultural identity of the Lucanians as a group was threatened and political autonomy had been lost can be understood in the light of the concepts of collective memory described above. The monumentalisation of the sanctuary at Rossano di Vaglio, rather than a sign of adoption by local elites of Roman architectural schemes, should therefore perhaps be seen as an example of symbolic resistance to Roman rule and its effects on Lucanian society.

A similar mechanism is perhaps discernible in the monumentalisation of the sanctuary at Pietrabondante in Samnite territory (fig. 17). Like Rossano di Vaglio, Pietrabondante had been an important central place for Samnite society since the fifth century, in both a socio-political and military sense.\textsuperscript{285} In the late second century, a period when tensions between Rome and her allies were mounting, the sanctuary was ostensibly monumentalised, resulting in the characteristic lay-out of a central temple building flanked by two lateral porticoes with a theatrical cavea in front of the temple. The monumental phase of the sanctuary incorporates both traditional elements, such as the temple plan, and innovative aspects, such as the theatrical cavea.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{281} Cohen 1985, 50.
\item \textsuperscript{282} Nava/Cracolici 2005, 103.
\item \textsuperscript{283} Worshipped as Mefitis Utania, she occupied a position at least equal but perhaps superior to that of Jupiter in the local divine hierarchy, which could also have been significant for the symbolic meaning of the entire monumental complex (Lomas 1996, 166-167).
\item \textsuperscript{284} Pelgrom 2004, 27.
\item \textsuperscript{285} Stek 2004, 33-34.
\end{itemize}
placed in front of the temple. While the innovative aspects seem to point towards romanising or at the very least hellenising influences,\textsuperscript{286} the sanctuary was at the same time an important central element in Samnite society, and perhaps played a role for the Samnites in their ethnic self-definition as evidenced by the epigraphical finds at the sanctuary.\textsuperscript{287} Furthermore, various traditional elements of the building plan can be stressed.\textsuperscript{288} It has even been suggested that certain traditional (military) ritual measurements were reproduced in the dimensions of the ground plan.\textsuperscript{289} This would point towards an increased ethnic awareness, or at least a restating or reassertion of a communal identity, on the part of the Samnites on the eve of the Social War which was expressed by the monumentalisation of the central sanctuary of Pietrabbondante. In this way, the sacred landscape of Samnium was actively constructed, corresponding well to the theories on collective memory mentioned above, using important physical places in this collective memory not just to commemorate the distant past, but actively using it as a reference point for contemporary developments in society. Considering the continuity of cult activity and previous building activity at the site, Pietrabbondante was undoubtedly an

\begin{eqnarray*}
\text{Fig. 17. Final monumental phase of the sanctuary at Pietrabbondante (Stek 2009, 41 Fig. 3.1).}
\end{eqnarray*}

\textsuperscript{286} Interestingly, the form of the theatre is typical of Greek-Sicilian theatre plans (Hülsemann 1987, 133).

\textsuperscript{287} An inscription dated to the second century (i.e. roughly the period of monumentalisation), even contains a reference to the Samnites as an ethnic group, according to some scholars (see Stek 2009, 40-41, esp. n. 46 discussing this ‘ethnic’ interpretation of the inscription).

\textsuperscript{288} Coarelli/La Regina 1984, 298; Stek 2009, 51-52.

\textsuperscript{289} Stek 2009, 51.
important element in the collective memory of the Samnites, and it should therefore come as no surprise that this sanctuary in particular was used in the real and symbolic struggle of the Samnites against Rome.

These two examples illustrate how the idea of a collective or cultural memory can be used to interpret the monumentalisation process of the (late) republican period in Lucanian and Samnite territories. These cult places were means by which a shared identity was consciously expressed. They can be seen as the symbolic occupation of sacred places as vital and actively structured parts of ‘systems’ or ‘landscapes’ of memory which are characteristic of that specific society in periods when the structure of those societies was threatened by the power of Rome.

Gegenarchitektur: the sanctuary of Fortuna at Praeneste

As the previous sections have shown, a ‘romanising’ interpretation of sanctuaries, interpreting these complexes as places of stored and expressed collective memory, used for the affirmation of a communal identity, sometimes taking the form of symbolic resistance to increasing Roman influence, has proven to be fruitful for sanctuaries located in areas such as Samnium and Lucania. Interpreting monumentalisation as a reaction to the expanding Roman territorial control of once autonomous regions seems to answer important questions about the specific context of and the motivation for construction activity and generates new research questions for these areas. Chief among these research questions are the articulation of ethnic or cultural identity and the manifestation thereof in the archaeological record. The objective is now to ascertain if a similar model would be productive in the Latial context. In an article in 1983, Coarelli describes the monumentalisation process of Latium in terms which seem to echo the ideas expressed for Samnite and Lucanian sanctuaries above. He states that the phenomenon should be seen as a sort of self-affirmation by the leading Italic elites, revaluating their religious and local traditions in a polemic way in their dealings with Rome, even if it was not perhaps meant as downright anti-Roman hostility.

A fitting starting point for the evaluation of a model in this vein as an explanation for the Latial monumentalisation process would be the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste (fig. 18). As will become clear, the historical setting and the specific characteristics of the sanctuary and the town to which it belonged would, at first glance, seem to fit well in a ‘romanising’ framework and the remarks made by Coarelli about the monumentalisation of local sanctuaries, interpreting monumental sanctuaries as examples of symbolic resistance to Rome, or a reassertion of local identity necessitated by the structural changes involved in Roman political domination. This view has been suggested for the sanctuary at Praeneste by Anne Ley and Regina Struss. I will briefly present their main arguments here, where necessary or desirable supplemented with additional information, and in so doing reconstruct the context of building activities at Praeneste according to their reading of the monument, and subsequently critically assess this ‘best-case scenario’.

---

290 Coarelli 1983, 198.
291 Ley/Struss 1982
Fig. 18. Reconstruction of late republican monumental phase of the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste. I-III lower terraces, IV. terrazza degli emicicli, V. terrazza dei fornici a semicolonne, VI. piazza della cortina, VII. cavea and porticus in summa cavea (KAHLER 1958, 198 Abb. 3).
The sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste was located at the northern extreme of the urban plateau and forms the logical visual conclusion of the town, by its very size dominating the surrounding area (fig. 19). It was planned as part of, or perhaps even as the culmination of, a grandiose restructuring of the urban area in the late republican period.\footnote{Quilici 1989.}

\footnote{Quilici 1989.}
Ley and Struss point out certain characteristics of the monumental complex itself which they regard as particularly meaningful in the context of its symbolic meaning: the extensive use of substructions, the strict axial symmetry of the complex and the unusual placement of the theatrical cavea, and the specific use of the various architectural orders within the complex.293

The creation of seven artifical terraces constructed of opus incertum was certainly not necessary to simply connect the two traditional focal points of the cult place, namely the aedes and the oracle.294 Rather, the use of visible substructions in Roman and Italic architecture has a symbolic aspect and is generally accorded a militant and controlling character.295 The three lower terraces, serving as a sort of base for the rest of the structure, give an aura of impenetrability, enhanced by the use of polygonal walls, calling to mind the impressive defensive city enclosures of Latium (fig. 18, I-III). Besides the vast scale of the complex, probably inspiring a feeling of insignificance and subordinance in those approaching it,296 the architecture asserts itself in another way on the visitor.

Once past the fortress-like obstacles of the first three terraces, the specific design of the sanctuary began to impose itself on the visitor. Because of the strict axial symmetry of the rest of the complex, the central aedicule of the great triangular façade of the sanctuary would have appeared from the distance to be the central entrance to the sanctuary, yet turns out to be only a shallow niche upon closer inspection: the fourth terrace can only be reached by two lateral ramps (fig. 20), which would not have been identifiable from a distance.297 After this point, in spite of the many ways from which one could choose to penetrate deeper into the complex, it would have been impossible for visitors to reach all terraces without retracing one’s steps.298 The variation in axial and lateral staircases would have further frustrated the visitor; the building complex which had seemed to be so well-organised and predictable on the basis of its formal axial symmetry reveals itself to be far less comprehensible once entered.299 The possibilities in design enabled by the use of substructions not only represent the subjection of nature, but of the visitor as well and in so doing conveyed the power claims of the builders.

The axial symmetry of the complex, in addition to presenting visitors with a ‘false’ central entrance, also indicated the theatrical cavea as the visual end point of the complex, since the temple itself was probably hidden from view by the porticus in summa cavea, at least from the lower terraces (fig. 18, VII).300 Since the cavea probably could not be used as an actual theatre because of the lack of a scaenae frons, Ley and Struss suspect a symbolic function of this specific form here, traditionally interpreted as a reference to the comitium, the political gathering place of the free Latin communities and thus a reference to the political independence of Praeneste itself.301 According to Ley and Struss, the vertical succession of the different architectural orders – Doric, Ionic and Corinthian - can perhaps also be interpreted as a reference to Praenestine

---

293 Ley/Struss 1982, 122.
294 Ley/Struss 1982, 123. See, for the supposed ‘bipolarity’ of the cult complex, Kahler 1958, 241-245; Coarelli 1987, 72-74.
295 Drerup 1966.
296 Ley/Struss 1982, 123.
297 Ley/Struss 1982, 118, 124.
298 Ley/Struss 1982, 125.
299 Ley/Struss 1982, 125.
300 Ley/Struss 1982, 122, 125.
society, basing themselves on a passage in Vitruvius. Ley and Struss suppose that Vitruvius adopted conceptual labels of patriarchal society for his characterisation of the architectural orders, which he then placed in a hierarchical relationship: the Doric order representing the *pater familias* in his role as supporter of family and community, the Ionic order representing the *mater familias* in her role as manager of the household and responsible for the education of the next generations, and the Corinthian order representing this next generation, the maiden who is the hope for the future of both the family line and society as a whole. The fact that the Corinthian order is used in the culminating point of the sanctuary, the *porticus in summa cavea*, enhances the political and societal symbolism of the complex.

In addition to the architectural characteristics of the complex and their potential symbolic meaning, its religious significance is also important. It is dedicated to Fortuna Primigenia, the poliadic deity of Praeneste. The ancient oracular cult of the goddess had become famous throughout Italy and even beyond and must have constituted an immense source of pride for the city. Furthermore, the specific theology of the cult suggests that Fortuna Primigenia, the first-born, was venerated in the sanctuary as a mother-goddess, with a statue depicting

---

302 Vitru. *De arch.* 4.1.6-8
303 Ley/Struss 1982, 127.
her suckling the infants Juno and Jupiter, and therefore possibly a step above them in the local divine hierarchy.\footnote{The superiority of Fortuna Primigenia to Jupiter could be seen as a parallel to the situation in Rossano di Vaglio, with Mefitis Urania as supreme goddess.} In addition to this theological superiority to Jupiter, chief god of the Roman pantheon, we know from the sources that the Roman Senate had apparently labelled the cult of the Prenestine Fortuna as alien, at least during the third century and probably also before, on at least one occasion forbidding the consultation of her oracle to a Roman official.\footnote{Val. Max. 1.3.2. In this fragment, decisions about state matters made by consulting the lots of Fortuna would have been regarded by the Senate as having been made with foreign auspices (\textit{auspiciis alienigenis}).} Thus, the image appears of a monument celebrating the city of Praeneste and the goddess protecting and favouring this city.

The significance of the location of this sanctuary also fits neatly into a romanising model for monumental sanctuaries. Praeneste was one of the most important centres of ancient Latium, and had in the past more than once taken up arms against Rome. There seems to have been a traditional antagonistic relationship between the two cities, and while Rome had confiscated most of the territories of the city after various military defeats, Praeneste was one of the few cities enjoying a treaty with Rome on equal terms and remained, formally, an independent community in contrast to the vast majority of other towns in Latium.\footnote{Le y/st r u s s 1982, 128-129.} Significantly, Rome had offered Praeneste the full Roman citizenship as a reward for her staunch support during the Hannibalic War, but the offer was declined, arguably because the inhabitants of the town preferred to remain citizens of Praeneste rather than citizens of Rome outside Rome.\footnote{Le y/st r u s s 1982, 129.}

Of course, after the enfranchisement laws of 90 and 89 the full citizenship was granted to Praeneste, making the date of construction of the sanctuary especially significant. Generally, there have been two extremes in the fierce debate on its chronology, one side claiming that the sanctuary was built around the middle of the second century BC, the other claiming that it was a creation from the time that Praeneste had been made a colony by Sulla, thus after his capture of the town in 82. For the interpretation of the complex, this seems to matter greatly. An early date means that the complex was built at a time when the city still enjoyed her nominal independence. A Sullan date implies that the complex was built at a time when the city had been formally Roman for several years. In addition, the later chronology implies a construction of the complex after the capture of the town by Sulla, which means that a large part of her male citizenry and traditional aristocracy had been slain or exiled and replaced by veterans from Sulla’s troops, thereby significantly altering the social dynamics of Praenestine society.\footnote{Le y/st r u s s 1982, 117.}

Nowadays, a \textit{communis opinio} seems to have been reached which favours an early date of the complex. An examination of the epigraphical evidence related to the sanctuary, coupled with a prosopographic survey of the various Pranestine \textit{gentes}, carried out by Attilio Degrassi, has been particularly important in deciding on a construction date.\footnote{Degrassi 1969. Although widely accepted, Degrassi’s conclusions have been questioned on the basis of insufficient evidentiary grounds by Manfred Clauss (Clauss 1977). While Clauss’ remarks are at least partly justified, Degrassi’s chronology is corroborated by stylistic and technical characteristics of the sanctuary.} Judging by some important building inscriptions, the sanctuary was built by magistrates belonging to aristocratic families that suffered from the Sullan proscriptions, making it unlikely that they reached high office.
after 82. In addition, the only magistrates mentioned by title in the inscriptions (censored) most likely belong to the pre-municipal period of the city, and the phrase de senatus sententia occurring in some inscriptions also refers to the period when the city was still autonomous, making 90-89 the terminus ante quem for the construction of the sanctuary. The practice of using cognomina by freed slaves on dedications in the sanctuary has led Degrassi to conclude that the sanctuary must have been constructed at the end of the second century. A late second century date is furthermore corroborated by certain stylistic aspects of the sanctuary’s architecture and decoration.310

According to Ley and Struss, the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia can thus be typified as a communal building project undertaken by officials representing the entire community of Praeneste (referring to the Senate mentioned in the inscriptions), wholly in keeping with the symbolism of some of the architectural characteristics described above highlighting the character and solidarity of this society. The late second century date is also significant because of the fact that, according to Ley and Struss, Rome itself was suffering from an economic and social crisis at this time, which manifested itself among other things in a decrease in building activity in Rome.311 Because the Roman state was engaged in military campaigns in Asia Minor and Spain, arguably to divert attention from this internal crisis by seeking military successes abroad, less attention was paid to Central Italy, suggesting that the construction of the monumental sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia was undertaken at this time specifically because Rome was looking the other way.312 However, the troubled relationship with Rome must have been the prime reason for the construction of the sanctuary: while still independent in name, the pressure of Roman power must have been keenly felt. The sanctuary suggests power claims on lands no longer the property of Praeneste but of Rome, and the actual autonomy of the city seems to have diminished over time, for example loosing the right to mint her own coinage in 268.313 The proud celebration of the community of a city-state striving to retain her independence must have clashed with the historical reality of a powerful and expanding Rome encroaching on the city’s autonomy. Like the monumental sanctuaries in Samnium and Lucania, celebrating local or regional communal identities in the face of growing Roman power, Ley and Struss present us with a sanctuary at Praeneste that was an architectural means to resolve these conflicting views, a monument representing an idealised self-image in a harsh historical context. The sanctuary was built by the local elite in commemoration of the glorious past of the city of Praeneste, celebrating those aspects of which Rome had effectually robbed her: might and independence.314

A critical assessment

In the previous section I have briefly sketched the interpretation given by Ley and Struss of the sanctuary of Fortuna and the historical context in which it should be placed, which

310 See Caputo 1990-1991, 228-231 (mural decoration); Coarelli 1987, 50 (sculpture); Lauter 1979, 392-394 (architectural and stylistic aspects).
313 Magoffin 1908, 71.
314 Ley/Struss 1982, 132.
is broadly comparable to that proposed for the monumental sanctuaries of Samnium and Lucania. According to this view, the monument is to be seen as an example of auto-celebration, a commemorative representation in stone of an independent community, an act of symbolic resistance to growing Roman power threatening this independence. However, the elements stressed by Ley and Struss supporting their interpretation of Praeneste as an example of Gegenarchitektur comparable to the sanctuaries of Rossano di Vaglio and Pietrabbondante, are actually a lot less clear-cut than in these Lucanian and Samnite examples and are in fact highly ambiguous, thereby undermining the admittedly elegant interpretation of the building complex.

The first characteristic of the complex is its almost revolutionary new form. There have been few, if any, building complexes in Italy and in the rest of the empire, which can rival the sanctuary at Praeneste for sheer architectural invention. Although Ley and Struss point out features which would be indicative of a ‘historically commemorative’ function of the complex, most importantly the cavea and the use of the different architectural orders representing society, what must have struck people most was undoubtedly the modernity of the sanctuary, completely transforming and unifying the traditional cult areas up to the point that it was hard to distinguish the original cult places at all. While some traditional elements may have been maintained in the design, it certainly had those in a lesser quantity and they were difficult to recognise. This would cast some doubt on the suitability of this particular sanctuary in this particular form as a monument celebrating Praeneste’s illustrious past, since specific references to this past were virtually nonexistent in the formal layout of the monumental sanctuary.

The main arguments supporting the idea forwarded by Ley and Struss of the sanctuary of Fortuna as an example of Gegenarchitektur are also perhaps less tenable than might be thought at first. The general characteristics of the complex pointed out as indicators of a controlling quality of the architecture of the sanctuary, namely the extensive use of substructions and the supposed consciously deceptive architecture of the complex, would indeed seem to support such a notion. However, it is possible that the massive substructures were actually necessary to support the entire complex, buttressing it and containing the underlying rock surface. While certainly adding to the monumental appearance of the complex, the message conveyed by these lower terraces can hardly be called specific.

Furthermore, the idea that the design of the complex was an attempt to mislead visitors is only valid up to a certain point. While the ascent through the lateral ramps was perhaps unexpected, although a lateral entry to a sanctuary was probably more rule than exception, the rest of the itinerary through the sanctuary as suggested by Ley and Struss, side-stepping certain parts of it in favour of others, is no more than a guess. Additional features, such as decorative devices or even temple personnel, may have guided visitors in ways not immediately suggested by the architecture; the other senses could also play an important role in guiding visitors through the complex. For instance, it is very possible that the fourth terrace, which housed both the oracle and an altar, was accessible from the central platform at the top of

315 The question of the incorporation and recognisability of older building phases in the late republican monumental design will be dealt with in Chapter Three.

316 Hearing and smell, for instance, can be helpful means for sensory experience (Egelhaaf-Gaiser 2000, 233).
the lateral ramps, contrary to what Ley and Struss claim, since there are many monumental sanctuaries with less-than-monumental access points.317

In addition, instead of mystifying the visitor at every step, as has been suggested, the sanctuary of Fortuna guided people through its interior. While the plan may reveal a juxtaposition of axial and lateral options, other elements could attract the sight, such as the tholos marking the site of the oracle on the terrazza degli emicidi, thereby guiding the visitor towards certain areas of high cultic significance (fig. 21). Furthermore, the presence of water at certain crucial stages of the route may have played an important role as well. Fountains were placed at the very beginning of the route, at the bottom of the lateral ramps, where pilgrims could ritually cleanse themselves. They were then guided up these ramps by the placement of great fountains placed in niches built into the great substructions walls of the terrazza degli emicidi. At the crucial nodal point at the top of the access ramps, water again may have influenced the decision of which path should be followed. Placed at the sides of the axial staircase, two fountains must have attracted the attention of the visitors primarily by the sound of water splashing into the basins, thereby partially offsetting the impact of the view of the

---

317 It is argued that the spaces to both sides of the axial staircase would have been too narrow to function as suitably monumental entrances to this terrace (Ley/Struss 1982, 118; Coarelli 1987, 47).
valley at this point, or at least constituting a new sensory experience after having taken in the scenery. I would like to stress that in my opinion the placement of these fountains argues against the idea that visitors would automatically take the staircase to continue an axial ascent. A choice could be made here, either entering the terrazza degli emicicli, which would perhaps require an additional ritual cleansing at the fountains, or continuing upwards towards the piazza della cortina, where fountains again attracted the attention towards the final terrace with the semicircular portico and the aedes located behind it.

Furthermore, it is not even certain what parts of the sanctuary were accessible to whom and when. The itinerary sketched by Ley and Struss assumes all parts of the sanctuary to have been open to all visitors, which may not have been the case. Exclusion from parts of the sanctuary would limit visitors’ contact with its misleading architectural features and thus undermine the supposed effect of this particular aspect of the complex. It is also possible that certain parts of the sanctuary were more intensively used on certain days according to the events taking place, naturally leading visitors to these places. Summing up, we can state that the observation of a ground plan alone does not necessarily tell the whole story when talking about itineraries through the complex.

Emphasis is also placed on the symbolic functions of particular elements of the architecture, namely the seventh terrace in the form of a theatrical cavea and the use of the architectural orders. Regarding the first, I agree with the idea that it could probably not have been used as an actual theatre because of the absence of a scena frons, although the construction of a temporary scenae for scenic performances remains a distinct possibility. However, the symbolic connection with the comitium and its reference to political independence is one that I find problematic at best. It is based purely on a similarity in form of the reconstruction of the republican Roman comitium and similar round or half-round structures. There is absolutely no archaeological evidence supporting the existence of comitia with this specific form in Latin communities that were not colonies, and it is striking that the similarity between the comitia of Rome and Latin colonies is usually invoked to prove a connection to Rome, emphasising the essentially Roman character of architectural and institutional forms encountered in these colonies. In the case of Praeneste, it is used by Ley and Struss in the opposite way, referring to a political past independent of Rome, simply by observing that the traditional Roman constellation of comitium and curia is absent here. In the following chapter, I will go into further detail on this subject, but will state here that the half-round form can also be explained as an architectural element enhancing the scenographical qualities of the complex, or its inclusion in the monumental design may have had cultic reasons.

The same might be said of the use of the different architectural orders. First of all, the equation of the Doric, Ionic and Corinthian orders with the Roman societal labels of pater familias, mater familias and virgo is surely an over-interpretation of the Vitruvian text. While Vitruvius does relate the orders to the human form (male, female and virginal), he does not represent these in a societal context, and I think we must be wary of simply accepting this particular reading of the text. Moreover, applying the symbolic categories of pater familias,

---

318 Mouritsen 2004, esp. 38-40. See also Coarelli’s reaction to Mouritsen’s article: Coarelli 2005, esp. 25-27 on the curia-comitium.
mater familias and maiden to the orders is, in my opinion, not only an over-interpretation of the text, but also of the building complex itself. The succession of orders can just as well be said to be purely decorative, especially given the fact that the orders are not strictly confined to separate levels but are mixed up within single levels, and the piazza della cortina, the level before the porticus in summa cavea, already has a double colonnade built in the Corinthian order, thereby diminishing the supposedly ‘crowning’ effect of the semicircular, Corinthian colonnade one level higher. Furthermore, the use of increasingly lighter and airier architectural elements the higher one goes is a more or less natural way to offset architectural bulk and relieve the supporting parts of the complex of some of the pressure.

The final parts of the argument supporting the idea of Gegenarchitektur are the nature of the divinity worshipped at the sanctuary and the political reality at the time of its construction. Fortuna Primigenia was ostensibly a truly Prenestine goddess with an exalted position in the local theology, possibly placing her above Jupiter and Juno. There are several critical sides to be made here. First of all, there are also dedications to the goddess associated with the sanctuary as the daughter of Jupiter,\(^\text{319}\) thereby upsetting the theological argument of Fortuna as a superior goddess and thereby symbolically placing Praeneste above Rome. On the contrary, the cult of Fortuna seems to have been quite flexible, able to simultaneously incorporate different and seemingly contradicting notions of the goddess.\(^\text{320}\) Patrizio Pensabene has even suggested that the popularity of the civic cult of Fortuna Primigenia was of relatively recent date: according to him, until the third century the cult of Hercules seems to have been far more popular, while the cult of Fortuna, although probably of ancient origin, only really took flight from this period onwards as far as votive material is concerned.\(^\text{321}\) It also seems that the sanctuary was in the first place tied to the leading families of Praeneste involved in the Eastern trade, and that the sanctuary was thus also tied to specific groups instead of just representing the city at large.\(^\text{322}\) The introduction of the cult in Rome in 204 perhaps makes her a less suitable figure-head of Prenestine opposition to Rome in any case.\(^\text{323}\) And while the sanctuary was certainly a source of local pride and had international renown, it is also true that Rome

---

\(^{319}\) Jacqueline Champeaux rejects the idea of Primigenia meaning first-born of the god Jupiter (Champeaux 1982, 29-38), based on a semantic analysis of a well-known dedication by a certain Orcevia expressing her gratitude for the birth of a child (CIL XIV 2863: Orecia Numeri [uxor] / nationum cratia / Fortuna Dione filicia / Primo cenia / donum deo). The paradox has resulted in different hypotheses, suggesting either the simultaneous existence of two different and seemingly opposing cults (Champeaux 1982, 85-86) or an evolution of the cult, developing from daughter-goddess in the third century, the time of the Orcevia dedication, into mother-goddess in the first (Champeaux 1982, 86-88). Both explanations are highly problematic in the light of the available evidence.

\(^{320}\) Champeaux 1982, 134-137.

\(^{321}\) Pensabene 2001, 60, 73-74; Pensabene 2005, 135. However, he bases his idea of the increased importance of the cult of Fortuna on the written sources, epigraphical evidence, and architectural terracottas attesting a third-century building phase of the sanctuary. The sources only record the significance of the cult in relation to Rome, the epigraphical evidence is extremely scarce in any case, and according to Rudolf Känel the terracottas should be dated to the second century, thus leaving no material evidence for a mid-republican building phase. This means that Pensabene’s suggestion is based on very little evidence indeed.

\(^{322}\) An analysis of the epigraphy of the sanctuary of Hercules at Praeneste seems to indicate that different Praenestine gentes favoured different sanctuaries (Tedeschi 1997, 189-190).

\(^{323}\) For the introduction and development of the cult in Rome: Coarelli 1994; Beard et al. 1998, 89. Ley and Struss seem to doubt if the Fortuna Primigenia cult introduced at Rome, under the name of Fortuna Publica populi Romani Quiritium Primigenia, was different from the Praenestine cult (Ley/Struss 1982, 129 and esp. n. 98). Coarelli, however, resolutely states that this hybrid cult is the responsibility of modern scholars; in the Roman context there is always a clear distinction between Fortuna Publica and Fortuna Primigenia (Coarelli 1994, 129).
had some say in its administration and in allowing foreign dignitaries to visit it. It is perhaps this ambivalence of the cult, in an intermediate position between Rome and Praeneste rather than a cult which was truly symbolic for Praeneste itself, which was important in the further development of the sanctuary and its monumentalisation.

A final point that needs to be clarified is the period of construction, since Ley and Struss essentially claim that the construction of the sanctuary was made possible by the fact that Rome was spending less attention to affairs in Latium and was instead concentrated on foreign military campaigns to somehow ease the tension created by internal political conflict. While this may be true to some extent, the involvement of Latins and allies in the political struggles involving the Gracchi and their opponents is well known and demonstrates Roman involvement in Latin affairs, even if they did not concede to certain desires expressed by the allies. Furthermore, the construction of the sanctuary of Praeneste was begun in the last quarter of the second century according to the chronology now widely accepted, either shortly before or immediately after the revolt of the Latin colony of Fregellae in 125 and its swift and ruthless suppression by Rome. To claim that Rome was looking the other way in this period in the light of this episode is, I think, simply untenable. The construction of a truly anti-Roman monument, or at least one that could be readily interpreted as a form of Gegenarchitektur, this close to Rome in the decades immediately following the object lesson demonstrated at Fregellae would have been foolish indeed, and would have almost certainly alerted Roman authorities.

In short, I think there are serious objections which can be raised against a reading of the sanctuary of Praeneste as an example of the symbolic auto-celebration of a once truly independent city. While evidence can be interpreted in favour of such a reading, as has been done by Ley and Struss and others after them, and while there are certain parallels between the Prenestine sanctuary and those at Rossano di Vaglio and Pietrabbondante which would seem to support this view, the simple fact is that a close reading of the evidence simply does not support this thesis, or at the very least keeps open the possibility of different, and diametrically opposed readings of the same complex. While citizens of Praeneste were sometimes the object of mockery in Rome, the contemporary trend is one of heavy and intensifying involvement in Roman politics, which is ultimately demonstrated by the city’s fate at the hands of Sulla in 82, after Praeneste had sided with the Marian faction and had to pay dearly for choosing the ‘wrong’ side. Instead of remaining aloof of Roman politics and basking in their own perceived importance or the memory of glories past, Praeneste by this time was knee-deep in Roman political struggles, and it is hard to imagine that their attitudes had changed so drastically in the course of a single generation, or one or two generations at most; the time separating the foundation of the Sullan colony in 82 and the construction of the monumental sanctuary in the last quarter of the second century.

324 King Prusias of Bithynia asked the Roman Senate for permission to sacrifice at Praeneste, and moreover did so in fulfilment of a vow made for the victory of Rome (Liv. 45.44)
Sanctuaries in a Latial context

Having reviewed the feasibility of a reading of the building complex at Praeneste as an example of the reassertion of a communal identity in response to the growing power of Rome, it is clear that we encounter several problems with such a reading even for Praeneste, supposedly our best-case scenario. It is now time to turn to the other monumental complexes and see how they fit in this framework and if the situation in Praeneste is similar to that in other towns in Latium.

The characteristics of monumentalised sanctuaries

Although a more thorough architectural analysis of the various building complexes will be presented in the following chapter, a general observation which can be made here is that of the eight sanctuaries selected for further study, roughly half consist of truly unified building complexes. Next to Praeneste, these are Fregellae, Gabii, Tusculum (although we have far fewer architectural remains to work with in this case) and Tibur. It is true that the other three sanctuaries, at Lake Nemi, Terracina and Lanuvium, are monumental complexes within more or less delineated boundaries, but the composition of these three complexes seems to be a lot more haphazard than in the other cases. Although a standard architectural composition of a central temple, a surrounding pi-shaped portico and a frontal theatrical cavea imposes itself when thinking of Latial sanctuaries (as presented in the Introduction), it is striking that only two sanctuaries actually present this particular design scheme: Gabii and Tibur. Another possible example is Fregellae, which has the typical central temple and portico, but does not seem to have had a permanent cavea construction. The connection between cavea and comitium, and thus a symbolic reference to political independence, suggested for Praeneste, can thus be hypothetically made only for Gabii and Tibur. However, in at least one of these two complexes, at Tibur, we have evidence for a permanent scaenae frons, while in the case of Gabii we have epigraphical evidence documenting the organisation of theatrical performances, which suggests that in these cases, in contrast to Praeneste, the cavea did have a functional use instead of, or perhaps in addition to, a purely symbolic one. Furthermore, the design scheme for the sanctuaries at Gabii and Tibur recalls the traditional Roman one of a cavea with a higher Curia or temple building.

While the other sanctuaries do sport certain traditional elements, such as a mid-republican temple that was incorporated into the monumental sanctuary at Lanuvium, they also display variations in style and composition, making it difficult to distinguish strong symbolic markers of local identity in the complexes, at least in an architectural sense. Something that many sanctuaries share with the complex at Praeneste is an aspect that Ley and Struss considered significant, namely the use of extensive substructures, creating a monumental form not directly necessitated by the sanctuary’s cultic functions. Indeed, when we consider the dimensions of monumental sanctuaries of Latium, we find them to be in excess of sanctuary complexes of earlier periods, including in the overall design secondary structures previously more loosely associated with the sanctuary (fig. 22). However, this tendency towards over-sizing which was deemed significant for the sanctuary at Praeneste is again something we encounter in virtually
all the monumental Latial sanctuaries, and as we shall see below the specific contexts of these complexes differ greatly, making it hard to establish this as a significant symbolic aspect of a sanctuary as was done for Praeneste by Ley and Struss. Indeed, the increase in dimensions seems to be a characteristic that is encountered in varying social or political contexts, and thus requires a different explanation. Although there is a considerable degree of architectural variation between the monumental sanctuaries of Latium, it is very difficult to reduce these variations to expressions of a specific communal or cultural identity and even more difficult to interpret them as expressions of anti-Roman sentiments.

The same might be said of the religious aspects of Latial sanctuaries. The cult of Fortuna Primigenia was interpreted as a specifically Prenestine cult by Ley and Struss, and the existence of other highly specific cults may give us some clue about how to interpret the various sanctuaries. The main cult for at least one of the monumental construction phases is known for six out of the eight sanctuaries. The sanctuary at Fregellae was dedicated to Aesculapius, and constitutes the only example of a republican sanctuary dedicated to this relatively ‘new’ god archaeologically attested outside Rome.\textsuperscript{326} The introduction of this god in Rome is dated to 293, while the start date of his cult at Fregellae is uncertain, although probably contemporaneous with or slightly later than the god’s arrival at Rome.\textsuperscript{327} The sanctuary at Gabii was almost certainly dedicated to Juno Gabina. Although it has been suggested that the

\textsuperscript{326} The dedication was documented on the sanctuary’s altar: \textit{Aise[o]lap[io]} (Coarelli 1986, 43).

\textsuperscript{327} The earliest anatomical terracottas found at the sanctuary site which suggest a cult with healing properties are dated to the late fourth century, but it is not clear which deity was venerated at the spot in that period.
monumental sanctuary along the via Gabina was dedicated to Apollo and the so-called East
Sanctuary to Juno Gabina, the inscription IVN on some antefixes of the *potnia theron*-type
belonging to a phase of redecoration in the early first century makes it highly likely that this
was the sanctuary of Juno.\(^{328}\) In addition, terracotta votive statuettes found at the sanctuary
of an enthroned, diademed goddess have been interpreted as representations of Juno, in
the standard (Hellenised) iconography of the republican period.\(^{329}\) A final, literary reference
concerns a mention of the cult of Juno in relation to Gabii in Vergil’s *Aeneis*,\(^ {330}\) and since the
late republican sanctuary was probably the only still-existing cult place in his time, as far as
we can tell, this can perhaps be used as circumstantial evidence for the assumption that the
monumental sanctuary was indeed dedicated to Juno Gabina. The sanctuary on the shores of
Lake Nemi was dedicated to the ancient Latin goddess Diana Nemorensis.\(^ {331}\) This is a highly
interesting cult, presided over by the enigmatic *rex nemorensis*, chief priest of the goddess,
according to tradition always a runaway slave who had to challenge and kill the reigning *rex
nemorensis* to secure the position.\(^ {332}\) The cult of the goddess was fairly complex, and under
the name of Trivia or *Diana triplex* seems to have incorporated triple aspects of the goddess
as ruler of the spheres of the netherworld, earth and heaven.\(^ {333}\) We know that the suburban
sanctuary at Tibur was dedicated to Hercules Victor, a god who was widely venerated in
Latium, including at Rome, probably in the area of the Forum Boarium.\(^ {334}\) The late republican
sanctuary at Lanuvium was dedicated to Juno Sospita, also a popular goddess in the wider
area during the republican period.\(^ {335}\) The sanctuary on Monte S. Angelo at Terracina has been
traditionally referred to as the sanctuary of Jupiter Anxur, although there is no epigraphical
evidence to support this identification, and the traditional interpretation has been called into
question by Coarelli, who has suggested a dedication to Feronia for the phase of the *piccolo
tempio* and a dedication to Venus Obsequens for the first-century temple.\(^ {336}\) There is no clear
consensus about the cults of the sanctuary on Monte S. Angelo however, and since most of
the hypotheses are based on a single passage in Pliny that is ambiguous and corrupted, instead
of on archaeological evidence, it is unlikely that this will happen in the foreseeable future.

\(^{328}\) Almagro-Gorbea 1982, 595.

\(^{329}\) Almagro-Gorbea 1982, 300, 599.

\(^{330}\) Verg. *Aeneis* 7, 682.

\(^{331}\) The cult of Diana at Lake Nemi has been well-attested in the written sources. In addition, the monumental
late republican phase was decorated with antefixes depicting the goddess in several guises, confirming the
identification of the sanctuary (Kanel 2000, 133, 134, 136).

\(^{332}\) The most famous anthropological study of this priesthood is *The Golden Bough* by James Frazer (Frazer 1890).
See also Spinetto 2000 for a more recent appraisal of Frazer’s work, and Green 2007, 147-184, for a more recent
analysis of the phenomenon.

\(^{333}\) This triple aspect of Diana, equating her with Selene-Artemis-Hekate, seems to have been adopted from the

\(^{334}\) See Coarelli 1988, 164-204, for a detailed analysis of the cult and the possible sites for the cult place. It seems
the famous circular temple on the Forum Boarium is the most likely candidate.

\(^{335}\) Chiaretti 1979, esp. 280-285. See Schultz 2006 for the political significance of the cult at Rome.

\(^{336}\) Coarelli 1987, 123-125. Coarelli’s prime argument is that the sanctuary on Monte S. Angelo surely cannot have
been dedicated to Jupiter Anxur because the principal temple of the city, in Coarelli’s eyes a temple on the city’s
acropolis where temple remains have been found, must have been dedicated to the principal deity of the city. His
hypothesis that the earlier phase was dedicated to Feronia is based on a reading of a passage of Pliny’s *Natural
History* which he also uses to date the various phases of the monumental complex (Plin., *Nat. Hist.* II, 146:“*In
Italia inter Terracinum et aedem Feroniae turnis belliiis temporiibus desivere fieri, nulla non earum fulmine diruta*”). See Qulici
2005 for a critique of Coarelli’s interpretations. The suggestion of a dedication to Venus Obsequens is primarily
based on inscriptions found at the sanctuary (Coarelli 1987, 122).
For the sanctuary at Tusculum, we have even less solid evidence to help us determine the principal cult of the sanctuary. Several civic cults have been attested in the written sources, but as of yet it has not been possible to attribute these cults with certainty to specific cult places in or around the city. For the sanctuary at the western gate, a dedication to the Dioscuri has been suggested, but this is little more than an educated guess, and it has been argued that a dedication to Hercules, or Jupiter, is perhaps more likely. A dedication to Juno has recently been proposed as a final option, which is perhaps the least plausible of the four cults suggested for the sanctuary.

Of these cults, the only one that can be said to have a more or less anti-Roman flavour is that of Diana Nemorensis. Her sanctuary seems to have played a role in Latin resistance to Roman rule during the late archaic period, judging from a dedication made there on behalf of several Latin cities mentioned by Cato. The cult of Diana furthermore seems to have become the object of a symbolic struggle between Rome and the Latins, with rival cults at Lake Nemi and on the Aventine hill at Rome, although the relative chronological order of the instatement of both cults is still hotly debated. However, while this early anti-Roman connotation of the cult may have been strong and indeed may have been remembered in the late republican period, the specific context in which the sanctuary was monumentalised is thoroughly Roman, which will be made clear below. Most of the other divinities had an official cult at Rome (Aesculapius, Hercules Victor and Juno Sospita) or were roughly equivalent to official Roman divinities (Juno Gabina). The only other specifically local divinities are Feronia and Jupiter Anxurus, but since neither can be connected to the monumental sanctuary at Terracina with absolute certainty, it would be useless to advance elaborate theories on the characteristics of these cults and suggest possible implications of those theories. While some of the cults associated with the monumental sanctuaries could possibly be interpreted as anti-Roman in nature, in most cases the context makes such an interpretation highly unlikely.

337 Quilici/Quilici Gigli 1995, 533. The discovery on the acropolis of Tusculum of an inscription mentioning the aedini of the temple of castor and Pollux (CIL I.1443) would seem to suggest that the temple was located in this area instead of identifying it with the extra-urban sanctuary, although Quilici and Quilici Gigli claim that the block with the inscription was reused, which would mean that it is possible that it was originally placed in the extra-urban sanctuary and moved to the area of the acropolis at a later stage.

338 Ribaldi 2008, 52-53; Gorostidi Pi/Ribaldi 2008, 78-79. An inscription from Capua perhaps mentions the sacra tuscolana of the god (CIL I.1582: [Hercule?] / [Tuscolana / sacra]), and a re-used and reworked cippus dated to the second quarter of the second century, found during excavations in the forum area of Tusculum mentions a decuma to Hercules (Núñez/Dupré 2000), documenting the existence of the cult but not the location of the cult area. The extra-urban setting of the sanctuary just outside the city gates, similar to the great sanctuary at Tibur, would be an, albeit circumstantial, argument supporting an attribution to Hercules.

339 Ribaldi 2008, 52; Gorostidi Pi/Ribaldi 2008, 77-78.

340 Gorostidi Pi/Ribaldi 2008, 79. An inscription from the vicinity of Santa Maria Capua Vetere (CIL I.1581), found together with the Hercules inscription presented above (CIL I.1582), mentions the sacra tuscolana of Juno Lucina, and the Tusculan extra-urban sanctuary has been tentatively suggested as the provenance of an acrolith of the Juno Sospita type, which would clearly be a case of clashing epithets if both inscription and sculpture pertained to the same sanctuary.

341 Cato, Origins, fr. 58 P. According to Tim Cornell, the political centre of the Latin anti-Roman alliance was the Lucus Ferentinae, also situated in the territory of Aricia, with the dedication in the grove of Diana recording a “parallel religious event” (Cornell 1989b, 273).

342 See Ghini 1995, 143, for an concise overview of standpoints in the debate.
The geographical distribution of monumentalised sanctuaries

With regard to the spatial distribution of late republican monumental sanctuaries in Latium, we can roughly distinguish two groups (fig. 23): one group of monuments can be found in relative proximity to Rome, with a maximum distance of about 30-35 kilometres (Gabii, Tusculum, Praeneste, Nemus Aricinum, Tibur and Lanuvium) and another group is located at a considerably greater distance of about 100 kilometres (Fregellae and Terracina).

The vast majority of these sanctuaries were located on ager romanus, in areas which had enjoyed the full or partial Roman citizenship for several hundreds of years. Gabii had been one of the first areas conquered by Rome, according to tradition already in the Regal period. The area of the Alban lakes was fully incorporated into the Roman state in the course of the fourth century after the defeat of the Latin cities by Rome: Tusculum became a municipium in 381, Lanuvium and Aricia (to which the care of the sanctuary of Diana Nemorensis was probably entrusted) followed in 338. Tibur and, as already mentioned, Praeneste were the only two cities in Latium that continued to be nominally independent, having concluded treaties on equal terms with Rome after the Latin wars. Terracina had become a colonia civium Romanorum in 329, added to the existing settlement of Anxur, and was thus at least partly inhabited by Roman citizens. Fregellae was a Latin colony, founded, like Terracina, in 329, and thus enjoyed roughly the same set of rights as the ‘original’ Latin communities of Praeneste and Tibur.
With respect to the towns to which they belonged most of these sanctuaries were located within (Gabii, Praeneste and Lanuvium) or just outside (Fregellae, Tusculum, Terracina and Tibur) the city walls, the sole exception being the sanctuary of Diana which was located at a distance of about 3 kilometres from Aricia. We can thus conclude that most of these sanctuaries were strongly connected to urban centres and the infrastructural network, as is true for most sacred structures in the late republican period (see Chapter 1), and that, at least for the ‘inner ring’ of six sanctuaries, their distance to Rome is in most cases about as great as the distance from each other.

Another constant is the position of monumental sanctuaries with respect to surrounding structures or the urban fabric. They are invariably located in decentral locations, that is, located just outside city walls or in the outer parts of town, or in almost complete isolation. This can be explained in two ways. First, their very position must have constituted a decisive factor in the selection of these cult places for monumentalisation. The density of structures surrounding temples located in the heart of the city puts constraints on their expansion possibilities, since these structures were not simply demolished to make room for a more monumental sacred complex.  

This was not a problem for those cult places which were eventually monumentalised, since their peripheral or isolated position enabled them to expand. A second, and perhaps more important explanation for the specific location of these sanctuaries was that the peripheral or isolated position greatly enhanced their visual impact. The monumental sanctuaries of Latium are either the very first structures confronting the travellers approaching a city, or they were planned as the (visual) culmination of the urban area. Isolated sanctuaries have this effect as well, since they invariably stood out from their surroundings by their architectural mass. Thus, in all cases, the location of the monumental sanctuary was chosen because it created the possibility to transform the cult place into a real eye-catcher.  

Although more complex factors undoubtedly were important in the selection of cult places for monumentalisation, the generic rationale behind this choice can thus be summarised as the suitability of the location for structural expansion and its potential for imposing display.

The identity of the patrons

It is often difficult to establish the identity of those responsible for the monumental construction phase of a sanctuary. In the case of Praeneste we have established that the complex was built by civic magistrates acting on a decree of the local Senate. Unfortunately, we can only identify the patrons of sanctuaries with certainty in two other cases. In the sanctuary of Juno Gabina at Gabii, an inscription was found belonging to the main altar of the sanctuary, an integral part of the whole building project, on which a certain Cethegus was named. Only two aristocratic families are known to have used this particular cognomen, one of which did not rise to a position of prominence until the imperial period, making it likely that we are dealing

343 I have argued elsewhere that the need for greater visual impact of temples within spaces that exerted constraints on their dimensions may have been an important factor in the development of extraordinary temple types, such as those with transverse cellae (ROUS 2007, esp. 343-344).

344 The actual position of monumental sanctuaries tallies well with what we know of contemporary connotations of the use of substructures, which is decidedly militaristic (DREERUP 1966).

345 Coarelli in ALMAGRO-GORBEA 1982, 125-130.
here with the *gens* Cornelia. Un fortunately, the inscription is incomplete, thereby making it difficult to ascertain which particular member of this *gens*, which possibly had its roots in Gabii, was responsible for the construction. Epigraphic evidence found in the sanctuary of Hercules Victor at Tibur seems to reveal a situation similar to that of the Prenestine sanctuary, mentioning *quattuorviri*, magistrates of the city, responsible for the construction of particular sections of the sanctuary. Besides Praeneste, these are the only two known instances of inscriptions giving us an indication of the name of those responsible for the construction of (part of) the sanctuary, and in the case of Tibur also the capacity in which they contributed, namely as magistrates of the city acting on a *senatus consultum*. These two examples demonstrate that we are dealing with two completely different situations: the sanctuary at Tibur is obviously a communal project, while the sanctuary at Gabii was probably the work of a single individual. For the other sanctuaries, we only have fragmentary evidence if evidence exists at all.

During the excavation of the sanctuary at Fregellae, an inscription was found, again on an altar, which at least gives us certainty about the identity of the divinity of the sanctuary, Aesculapius, but only preserves the very last part of the identity of the dedicant. The letter F could either represent the abbreviated form of *f(ecit)*, or the abbreviated indication of the filiation of the dedicant. Furthermore, we cannot be sure if the inscription mentioned someone making a dedication in an official capacity, as a magistrate of the city, or not. Although a number of dedicatory inscriptions have been found at the sanctuary of Diana Nemorensis, none of them can be directly linked to the construction of the monumental sanctuary. For the sanctuary of Juno Sospita at Lanuvium, there is only circumstantial evidence which can be used to identify its patrons. It seems likely however, that one of the leading families of Lanuvium, the Licinii Murenae, were actively involved in the activities at the sanctuary. An equestrian statuary group found there is linked to the family, and it is therefore possible that they may also have been involved in the actual construction of the sanctuary. According to Coarelli, the monumental complex is almost certainly the work of Lucius Licinius Murena, the first citizen of Lanuvium to obtain the consulship in Rome in 62.

For the sanctuaries at Terracina and Tusculum we lack even fragmentary or indirect evidence. This brief overview demonstrates that monumental building in Latium was not exclusively tied to communities, nor to Latins for that matter. There are individual projects, such as the sanctuary at Gabii, and clearly communal projects, such as the sanctuaries at Praeneste and Tibur, which seem to employ some of the same formal architectural means.

---

346 Coarelli in Almagro-Gorbea 1982, 125-126.
347 Coarelli has a preference for Marcus Cornelius Cethegus, consul of 161, over Publius Cornelius Cethegus, consul of 180.
349 Coarelli 1986, 43. The inscription reads: [...] *Aisc[olapjio]*.
350 Coarelli 1986, 43. Coarelli indicates that a statistical comparison with other inscription like it would make the second option, of filiation, more likely.
352 Coarelli 1981, 253; Coarelli 1983, 197; Coarelli 1987, 155-159.
The chronology of the monumentalisation process

In the case of the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste, the date of construction was extremely important in determining the social and political context of the construction process: according to the two traditional dates for the sanctuary, it was either built by a traditional aristocracy of a nominally independent city or by a new pro-Sullan aristocracy or even Sulla himself in a time when the city had been made a colony and had certainly lost her independence after the enfranchisement laws of 90 and 89. This demonstrates what a difference the chronology of monumental sanctuaries can make for some interpretations of these complexes (fig. 24). The earliest example seems to have been the sanctuary at Fregellae, which is traditionally dated on stylistic criteria in the second quarter of the second century BC, although an earlier date for the monument has also been suggested. The sanctuary of Juno at Gabii is only slightly later in date. The excavators have fixed the period of construction of the monumental complex, using stratigraphical and stylistic data, to the middle of the second century. The first monumental phase of the monumental sanctuary at Terracina, the so-called piccolo tempio, has been dated to the third quarter of the second century on the basis of stylistic and technical criteria, although Lorenzo Quilici has raised objections against this date, arguing that an early first-century date is just as feasible. Accepting Degrassi’s analysis of the epigraphical data from the sanctuary of Fortuna, it would be next on the time-line, having been built in the last quarter of the second century. The exact chronology of the first monumental phase of the suburban sanctuary of Tusculum is uncertain, with only technical characteristics of the opus incertum to guide us, but it seems to have been constructed in the second half of the second century or at the latest at the start of the first century. The great sanctuary of Diana

353 Lippolis in Coarelli 1986, 38. In the absence of certain stratigraphical data, this date has been suggested by referring to palaeographic evidence (the altar inscription), the First Style mural decorations (see also Caputo 1990-1991, 220-224) and the style of the mouldings. An earlier date, in the first quarter of the second century BC, has been suggested by Pier Giorgio Monti, referring to historical data (Monti 1999, 44-48).

354 Almagro-Gorbea 1982, 610-611. The five criteria on which the date is based are: a) the material of the fill layers of the platform on which the monumental sanctuary is built belong overwhelmingly to the period before 150 BC; b) the east wall of the sanctuary was built on top of an older shrine dedicated to Fortuna, which constitutes a terminus post quem of 190-189 BC by a dated coin found in the deposit belonging to this shrine; c) the architectural terracottas belonging to the monumental phase have stylistic parallels which are dated to the mid-second century BC; d) the stylistic characteristics of the architecture of the complex have parallels in other architectural examples dated to the mid-second century BC and are possibly related to a group of Greek architects working in the area around this time, most notably Hermodoros of Salamis; e) the Cethegus mentioned on the altar inscription and likely responsible for construction the entire complex should probably be identified with Marcus Cornelius Cethegus, consul of 160.

355 Coarelli 1987, 115. Mentioned are the First Style mural decorations (Caputo 1990-1991, 225-227 seems to follow the date already given to the structure for the painted decoration, thereby making it problematic as an independent dating criterion) and the characteristics of the opus incertum used.

356 Quilici 2005, 278-279. Quilici argues that the crudeness of the facing of the opus incertum used in the substructions of the piccolo tempio do not necessarily indicate an earlier date as implied by Coarelli, and First Style decorations were still being used in the first decades of the first century. However, Rudolf Känel’s interpretation of the terracotta decoration which according to him must have belonged to this phase and which will be treated in Chapter 3 indicates a date around 130-120.

357 Quilici/Quilici Gigli 1995, 530.
Nemorensis on the shores of Lake Nemi was probably monumentalised around the turn of the century, and more specifically in the first decade of the first century.\textsuperscript{358}

These are all the sanctuaries that can be dated with a reasonable amount of certainty to the period before the Social War and the enfranchisement laws, a date which is significant according to some because of the difference in formal status of many communities after 90/89, changing from independent or allied cities to communities fully incorporated into the Roman state, at least in a legal sense. The construction date of the sanctuary of Hercules Victor at Tibur is very interesting in this respect. Given the scale and complexity of the building project, construction activities probably spanned several decades, and while certain building inscriptions allow us to date several of these activities to the years between 89 and 82, it is very likely that construction had started well before this date and that the complex was not yet completed in 82.\textsuperscript{359} It is therefore the only building complex in this group for which the monumental construction phase crosses the supposedly meaningful chronological boundaries of the enfranchisement laws and the upheavals of the civil war between Marius and Sulla,

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Sanctuary & 175 (BC) & 150 & 125 & 100 & 90 & 75 & 50 \\
\hline
Fregellae & & & & & & & \\
Gabii & & & & & & & \\
Terracina (phase 1) & & & & & & & \\
Tusculum (phase 1) & & & & & & & \\
praeneste & & & & & & & \\
Tibur & & & & & & & \\
Nemi & & & & & & & \\
Terracina (phase 2) & & & & & & & \\
Tusculum (phase 2) & & & & & & & \\
Lanuvium & & & & & & & \\
Tusculum (phase 3) & & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Chronology of the monumental phases of Latial sanctuaries.}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{358} The \textit{opus incertum} used for the construction of the sanctuary is already rather regular and thus rather advanced technically, and should be dated to the late second or early first century BC (Coarelli 1987, 171). For a specification of the construction date based on stylistic and technical analysis of the architectural terracottas, see Kanel 1997. He suggests that while the stylistic characteristics of certain antefixes places them at the beginning of the first century, the quality of the clay suggests a later date, making it possible that building activity at the sanctuary started at the beginning of the century and lasted several decades. Further evidence which can provide information about the construction date is a colossal female head in Greek, possibly Pentelic marble which was found at the sanctuary and perhaps formed part of the (new) cult statue associated with the monumental sanctuary (Martin 1987, 182-191). Stylistic parallels with the cult statue of the temple of Fortuna Huisse Dei in Rome, construction of which started in 101, also points to a construction date for the sanctuary of Diana starting around 100 (Coarelli 1987, 174).

making it a highly significant monument for the interpretation of the monumentalisation process in general.

It is more difficult to establish the construction date of the second monumental phase of the sanctuary on Monte S. Angelo at Terracina. Coarelli has suggested a terminus post quem of 82, based on his interpretation of a passage of Pliny’s *Natural History*.\(^{360}\) Coarelli’s reading of this passage has recently been called into question, quite convincingly, by Lorenzo Quilici.\(^{361}\) This leaves us with only stylistic characteristics, which are not very specific and indicate a date after the first decades of the first century.\(^{362}\) The second monumental phase of the sanctuary of Tusculum is dated to the first half of the first century, also without the possibility of further specification since construction technique is the only available chronological evidence.\(^{363}\) The sanctuary of Juno Sospita at Lanuvium can probably be dated to the second quarter of the first century, more specifically the years 66-62.\(^{364}\) The third and final phase of the sanctuary of Tusculum, in which it assumed its most grandiose form, has a chronological range of some time before the middle of the first century and not later than the beginning of the Imperial period, and is therefore probably the last in the line of the great monumental building projects in Latium.\(^{365}\)

*The diversity of Latial monumental sanctuaries*

An interpretation of these sanctuaries must necessarily take into account all these described factors, and as the short survey of the monumental sanctuaries of Latium presented above hopefully points out, it is not a particularly homogenous group, resulting in an interpretation of these monuments that is far from unequivocal. As we have seen, the specific characteristics of the sanctuaries do not enable us to identify them as clear statements of anti-Roman sentiments, especially since we have no evidence of belligerence directed against Rome on the part of the towns to which the sanctuaries belonged, Fregellae being the one clear exception. Furthermore, when they are subjected to Roman military actions, it is because of their involvement in Roman internal politics, not because of opposition to the Roman state as a whole. The fact that roughly similar architectural forms (see the Introduction and the critical assessment of architectural similarities in Chapter 3) are used in diverse contexts (with regard to the specific nature of the main divinity of the sanctuaries, the legal status of both the community to which the sanctuaries belong and, more specifically, those responsible for the construction, and the

---

\(^{360}\) For the full analysis, see Coarelli 1987, 123-125.

\(^{361}\) Quilici 2005

\(^{362}\) Coarelli 1987, 117. The clearly articulated mouldings of the temple are fairly advanced and cannot be dated any earlier than the first decades of the first century.

\(^{363}\) Quilici/Quilici Gigli 1995, 531.

\(^{364}\) Coarelli 1983, 197; Coarelli 1987, 156-157. Coarelli bases this date on a stylistic analysis of the equestrian statuary group found at the sanctuary and thought to have been set up at the time of the monumental construction phase, and the supposed connection of this phase with Licinius Murena, mentioned above. A first-century date is perhaps supported by a stylistic analysis of the architectural terracottas with which the temple was redecorated (André 1940, 432-436), although it is of course impossible to firmly link this redecoration phase to building activities at other parts of the sanctuary.

\(^{365}\) Quilici/Quilici Gigli 1995, 531. In this final phase, an *opus mixtum* is used of *opus reticulatum* and *opus latericium*, with the latter limited to simple bands, and more importantly for the most part consisting of tiles instead of fired bricks.
chronology of the sanctuaries) should warn us against overly generalising interpretations. This makes it difficult, for instance, to simply perceive monumentalisation as an expression of local identity, as the last flowering of an independent local consciousness. Of course, it is possible that some sanctuaries were indeed (partly) intended as symbolic representations of the community as a whole, but if we are looking for an overarching rationale structuring the monumentalisation process, it is difficult to accept local pride as a prime explanation for monumentalisation practices.

This could mean that we have to fall back on a relativistic attitude and accept the fact that each sanctuary should be studied in its own local context and that the reasons for monumentalisation are case-specific and particular, or, in other words, “very regionally and historically specific.” This would seem to justify fundamentally different interpretations of the symbolic meaning of certain (architectural) elements in each specific context. It would imply that there is justification for interpreting monuments in a radically different way just because of a purely formal division such as the enfranchisement laws of 90 and 89 or, perhaps even more relevant for the Latial region, the proscriptions and colonisation schemes of Sulla in 82. With this we run into a different problem, namely reading too much into single monuments, using the singular context of the building complex as an excuse to interpret sometimes generic architectural elements as particularly meaningful to that context, at the expense of general regional developments. Of course, the specific form and development of each sanctuary must have been influenced by local circumstances, but there certainly seems to be a force driving the whole process of monumentalisation which supersedes case-specific explanations: the development of the phenomenon over time, its limited chronological and geographical range, suggests that there is indeed some motor driving the whole process, some rationale structuring it. I hope to have made clear here that I do not believe the concept of ‘symbolic resistance’ to be this structuring principle for the sanctuaries of Latium, however applicable it may be to other regions of Italy.

Summing up the relevant information for the monumental sanctuaries of Latium which has thus far been discovered, it is clear we are dealing with increasingly monumental building complexes that seem to share certain generic characteristics. This same general monumental form is used by individuals and communities, with differing backgrounds: Latin and Roman. While the monumentalisation process starts in the third quarter of the second century, construction activities seem to be particularly intense around the turn of the century, in the last quarter of the second and the first quarter of the first century, a period in which not only the highest number of sanctuaries is under construction, but also those with the largest size. Furthermore, these construction activities were concentrated in the Roman Suburbium, with the notable exceptions of Fregellae and Terracina. This proximity to Rome should surely be considered when trying to explain the particulars of the monumentalisation process in Latium. In the next sections, I will propose a model with which to approach this process. This

---

366 Coarelli stressed the Roman background of most of the Latial monumental sanctuaries during a contribution to a recent conference in Rome (Sacra Nominis Latini, 19-21 February 2008, conference proceedings forthcoming), while maintaining that the sanctuary of Praeneste was an expression of local pride and consciousness, thus partly retracting his statements about monumental sanctuaries encountered in his earlier work (Coarelli 1983, 198).

367 LOMAS 2003, 29.
will hopefully provide the grounds to view the sanctuaries of Latium as part of a coherent regional process, taking into account the particular and diverse aspects noted above, and doing justice to both their specific local contexts and to the presence and influence of Rome.

**Building to compete**

In examining the relations between Rome and Latium and the role which temple, or sanctuary, construction plays within these relations, I turn towards the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu. Although this may seem an unlikely choice, a key concept which has been used to explain the advantages for people to invest in public works without an immediate material return is that of ‘symbolic capital’, a term coined by him, which is more or less equivalent to and commonly referred to as prestige, reputation or renown. However, all too often this term is used in isolation, even though it actually forms part of a much larger body of sociological work in which it is firmly embedded and from which it derives a lot of its meaning. Although Bourdieu’s theories have attracted their share of critics, claiming that his work leaves intact a questionable and untenable subject-object dichotomy, it is clear that these criticisms often imply that Bourdieu’s theories have their limits, not that they are untrue or completely useless. Especially the basic premises of his work, grounded in extensive field-work, have never been convincingly disproved altogether. Furthermore, the fact that he himself essentially applied concepts developed originally during the observation of tribal societies to modern society perhaps justifies the application of these same concepts to a society in classical antiquity.

Bourdieu’s sociological theory centres on the question of the origin, maintenance and legitimation of power relations, the mechanisms of control in society. It is concerned with asymmetric power relations in the social world and accords an important place to cultural products, thereby making it an especially useful instrument with which to approach the relations between Roman and local elites and the role which cultural products play in Roman-Latial relations. Since the construction of religious structures is firmly entrenched in Roman, and Latial, power systems, being an elite preoccupation, Bourdieu’s writings may actually provide valuable new insights into this process; we are dealing with social groups operating within a single social space (Roman aristocrats and local elites, brought into direct contact after the Roman conquest) and cultural products produced by the actors in this social space (sanctuaries). Bourdieu’s work would thus seem to be very well suited, with some minor adjustments, to a sociological approach to the Roman political system and the place of communal and private expenditure on public building within this system.

---

368 See, for an example of the application of the concept to Roman politics, HOLKESKAMP 2004, 93-105.
369 SCHINKEL 2007, esp. 723-726.
Bourdieu introduces a notion of social classes based on the distribution of different forms of capital which determines the position of actors in social space: actors are placed in a social topography. In the writings of Bourdieu, capital does not refer exclusively to the modern, economic notion of capital as being almost exclusively monetary in nature. Bourdieu regards capital as a generalised resource which may be monetary but does not necessarily have to be, and it may or may not be tangible. He distinguishes three forms of capital: economic, cultural and social. The simplest and most straightforward of these three is economic capital, as it refers to actual, physical things: monetary income as well as other financial resources and assets. A more complex form of capital is cultural capital, since it covers a relatively wide scope of concepts in relation to the other two forms of capital, and in general refers to the amount of cultural ‘baggage’ an actor possesses, his knowledge of a culture and its specific codes. The concept is relatively flexible and takes on different forms and specific meanings in Bourdieu’s global theoretical framework, and is “alternatively an informal academic standard, a class attribute, a basis for social selection, and a resource for power which is salient as an indicator/basis of class position”. It will become obvious that in the historical context of the present study, we shall encounter cultural capital especially in the latter three forms and in particular its last form. What constitutes cultural capital varies depending on the period, the society and the social class. It can be acquired by deliberate inculcation but also unconsciously. The earliest conditions of its acquisition are often discernible and this gives it its distinctive value. In modern society, it is the family and the educational system where cultural capital is primarily acquired and transmitted; in a Roman context these would have overlapped in the context of the household, since no separate educational system existed. Cultural capital can exist in three forms: the embodied or incorporated state, the objectified state and the institutionalised state.

The first takes the form of lasting dispositions of the mind and the body which are generally acquired during childhood. The embodied dimension of cultural capital is rooted in the body itself and means that the body itself is an instrument of cultural capital. As such, it is closely related to another key concept in Bourdieuan theory, namely that of *habitus*. By this, Bourdieu means a deep-structuring matrix within the body that structures people’s reactions to particular situations according to their past experiences and their mental resources. It is a sort of mental ‘black box’ that draws upon what are perceived to be the behavioral ‘rules’, which are class-specific, and what has gone before to suggest likely ‘correct’ reactions (‘output’).

---

371 Anheier et al. 1995, 862; Bourdieu 1986, 243; Bourdieu 1997, 47.
373 Lamont/Lareau 1988, 156.
374 Bourdieu 1986, 245; Bourdieu 1997, 49. An example is the specific pronunciation of a certain class or region, sometimes recognizable by others but most of all by those individuals from the same class or region.
375 Gunn 2005, 55.
376 Gunn 2005, 60.
through the processing of certain situations (‘input’), especially where normative rules are not explicit. *Habitus* thus has a fundamentally historical nature, drawing on past experiences and being first formed during childhood, and is subject to reinforcement or modification through its subjection to experiences. Although it is generally conceived of as an unconscious process, the concept of *habitus* does not rule out conscious strategic action: “the lines of action suggested by *habitus* may very well be accompanied by a strategic calculation of costs and benefits, which tends to carry out at a conscious level the operations that *habitus* carries out in its own way”.378

The objectified state of cultural capital is closely related to the embodied state. It generally refers to cultural goods such as literature, paintings and monuments. These cultural goods can be appropriated materially, through inheritance or transactions (for which one would need a certain amount of economic capital), but the symbolic appropriation of these cultural goods, an understanding of their cultural worth and meaning, presuppose the possession of embodied cultural capital. One needs the embodied keys to unlock the true potential of objectified cultural capital.

The institutionalised state of cultural capital is a special form of the objectified state and refers to qualifications which are institutionally recognised and which more or less document the possession of a certain amount of cultural capital by an individual.379

The concept of cultural capital as an explanation for success in, for example, the educational system has been criticised for being arbitrary and elitist: the possession of cultural capital, the appreciation of “elite” genres, is not meaningfully related to what schools and work organisations aim to accomplish in modern society and not relevant to the purported aims of a particular society; cultural concerns are not actually used in making social distinctions.380 While there may be some truth to this criticism in a modern context, I think it will become apparent from the following that the possession of cultural capital was extremely relevant in the Roman context in making cultural distinctions, especially in elite circles, with which we are mainly concerned in the context of this study.

The final form of capital is social capital, which are resources resulting from the participation of an actor in social networks, or, in simpler terms, by being a member of a group.381 The volume of social capital possessed by a given agent depends on two factors: first, the size of the network itself which he can effectively mobilise and second, the volume of all three forms of capital possessed by all other individual agents within that network. These networks require an initial act of institution, even in such cases where the network is perceived as being a ‘natural’ one, such as a family group. As Bourdieu states it, “the network of relationships is the product of investment strategies, individual or collective, consciously or unconsciously aimed at establishing or reproducing social relationships that are directly usable in the short or long
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term”. Social capital, it seems, requires work. However, the effort needed to establish lasting social connections is, like all forms of capital, unevenly distributed among agents. The more capital a person possesses, the more sought after a person will become, since the social capital resulting from a connection with this person will be greater. And since social capital is all about networks, the possession of a high amount of social capital will be even more highly prized. The possession of social capital can be inherited, symbolized by a great name, indicating those that are worthy of being known. In this sense, social capital can become institutionalised in the form of a title of nobility, “the form par excellence of the institutionalised social capital which guarantees a particular form of social relationship in a lasting way”. Since the amount of capital possessed by the members of a group is important in determining its value to each of its members, the terms of access to a group are especially important. Each time a new member enters the group, it runs the danger of being redefined: “the definition of the criteria of entry is at stake in each new entry”. This means that each member of the group is responsible for safeguarding the boundaries and entry criteria of the group, since individual members are the ones that engage in social relationships and thus provide the means of access to the group. By admitting new members who are in some way different, for instance because of a different composition of capital or a different social background, they run the risk of modifying the whole character of the group, its boundaries and identity.

Social capital may thus seem to be a rather diffuse concept, consisting of endless diffusions of nodes and ties, and difficult to mobilise. However, every group can concentrate the totality of the social capital on which the existence of the group is based in the hands of a single agent or a small group of agents “to represent the group, to speak and act in its name and so, with the aid of this collectively owned capital, to exercise a power incommensurate with the agent’s personal contribution”. Besides the advantage of offering the possibility of concentrating social capital and thus making it more effective, institutionalised delegation can also be used as a regulatory device to ensure group cohesion and assess the suitability of membership of individuals who do not adhere to group rules, thus shielding the group as a whole from discredit. Because of the great potential power of the delegate’s status and the possibly disruptive internal competition for the position, it is especially important for the group to carefully regulate the conditions of access to both the group itself, since its members are all potential delegates, and to the right to declare oneself a delegate within the context of the group. The latter is important since the act of delegation also has some inherent dangers. Because the act of delegation concentrates the social capital of the entire in the hands of a single individual or a small group, the entire group runs the risk of becoming the object of the use of this power by the delegate.

Each of the three mentioned forms of capital - economic, cultural and social - can be converted into another form, at an expense of time and effort. In truth, the basis of all different types of capital is economic capital. The acquisition of cultural capital takes time, since
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it is a learning process, and the possession of economic capital, the means to sustain oneself, enables one to lengthen the period of the learning process. The possession of economic capital creates the opportunity of leisure time, both for those wanting to accumulate cultural capital and for those able to transmit it. The element of time is also important in the conversion of economic capital into social capital: one can give a gift, but without an amount of effort or time expended in the exchange process, it would be nothing else but an economic exchange and would not create social capital. The effort and time invested more or less disguises the economic nature of the exchange and makes it socially valuable. In fact, another keyword in the theory of Bourdieu is misrecognition: the other forms of capital produce their most specific and powerful effects only to the extent that they conceal their ultimate reducibility to economic capital, the fact that they are misrecognised as something other than economic capital, that their material roots are misrecognised.\(^{387}\) The importance of misrecognition in social exchanges is perhaps also the reason why it is more difficult to convert cultural and social capital into economic capital,\(^{388}\) since this could possibly reveal their material nature.

The form in which these different forms of capital are perceived and recognised by others as legitimate is called symbolic capital.\(^{389}\) The concept is especially important in the perception and recognition of cultural capital, since this is probably the most intangible of the three forms of capital; money and other assets can be counted and quantified, and one can often ascertain if someone belongs to certain networks or moves in certain circles, especially in those cases where access to membership is carefully guarded and the conditions for access necessarily made explicit from time to time. The transmission of economic and social capital is more direct and visible than the transmission of cultural capital. The concept of symbolic capital is also especially relevant when we consider the relation between the embodied and objectified state of cultural capital. For instance, one can possess a costly painting while not knowing its exact value in art-historical terms. While this painting would serve as a status symbol to some, the lack of connoisseurship of its owner would reduce the value of possession of the painting to those who do understand the cultural implications of the painting: the potential as symbolic capital of the objectified state of cultural capital is directly dependent on the embodied state. Since symbolic capital is in some sense the perceived and recognised form of other forms of capital, it should come as no surprise that misrecognition again plays an important role: “symbolic capital, a transformed and thereby disguised form of physical ‘economic’ capital, produces its proper effect inasmuch, and only inasmuch, as it conceals the fact that it originates in ‘material’ forms of capital”.\(^{390}\)

The distribution of different kinds of resources or capital, including symbolic capital, determines the place of an agent in social space, or within what Bourdieu calls a ‘field’, a structured space of social positions.\(^{391}\) Bourdieu distinguishes many different, and independent, fields within the larger social field, which are each determined by the prominence of a specific
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type of capital within that field.\textsuperscript{392} Furthermore, each field has its specific ‘rules’ about the conversion of forms of capital into another form. Within each field, and in the overall social space, agents are positioned according to their overall volume of capital and the composition of this capital, the amounts of economic, social and cultural capital relative to each other.\textsuperscript{393} This also means that the structure of each field determines the positions of power within that field, the forms of capital that are seen as relevant in that field, and with it the terms of access to a particular field. There is no natural principle dictating the prominence of a specific form of capital; rather, the hierarchy of a field is “an arbitrary social construction which serves the interests of some groups more than others”.\textsuperscript{394} Those who are in power, and thus automatically possess the required forms of capital of the field, dictate or at the very least maintain the structure of the field, the very structure that solidifies their position in it.\textsuperscript{395} However, the fact that people see the power of these dominant classes within the field as legitimate, transforming it into symbolic power, means that social actors in a field misrecognise the arbitrariness of these power relations.\textsuperscript{396} By acting in accord with social convention, each agent tacitly adheres to the inherently arbitrary social universe and in doing so accepts its classificatory schemes and automatically reproduces the convention because the structures of the field are internalised and passed on. The most perfect case of this kind of misrecognition of arbitrariness is called \textit{doxa}. With this term Bourdieu indicates a social world which is seen as self-evident and undisputed, a natural given.\textsuperscript{397} In this situation, there is a perfect fit between the objective structures of the field and the internalised structures of the agents, their habitus. The doxic state can be broken if a competing discourse is set up to confront it, a critique which brings that which is taken for granted, the undisussed, into discussion. The perfect fit between objective and subjective structures is broken and the social world is no longer perceived as a natural phenomenon. In this situation, the arbitrary nature of social classifications can become apparent and can be called into question. In these situations, the dominant class will seek to maintain their position of power by consciously systematizing those classifications which were taken for granted before; \textit{doxa} becomes orthodoxy.\textsuperscript{398} Orthodoxy is made possible, or made necessary, by the fact that agents are now aware of alternatives to the existing social order, and the fact that the existing social order is maintained instead of the alternatives is based on arbitrary principles.

It is clear that especially in non-doxic states, a field is “always the site of struggles in which individuals seek to maintain or alter the distribution of the forms of capital specific to it”.\textsuperscript{399} There are three basic strategies agents pursue within fields:\textsuperscript{400} conservation, aimed at preserving the status quo and primarily pursued by those in dominant positions; succession, generally pursued by new entrant into the field and aimed at gaining access to the dominant
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positions while maintaining most of the characteristics of the field in terms of the prominent types of capital; and subversion, pursued by those dissatisfied by the chances offered by the present characteristics of the field, aiming to redefine its structure. It is important to note that “social contradictions and struggles are not all, or always, in contradiction with the perpetuation of the established order”. 401 Although in the case of subversion strategies a more or less radical rupture is inevitable, the other two strategies leave room for a high degree of continuity, and even the subversion strategy may in some sense contribute to the perpetuation of the established order. This follows from a concept which Bourdieu calls *illusio*. 402 Everyone active in a certain field, including those entering it, must adhere to its basic rules; it is an involvement, commitment and investment in the ‘game’ being played. Even those pursuing subversion strategies must at first, when entering the field, recognise the value of the game being played. 403 At least at first, agents have to submit to the effects of dominant classification within a field in order to make use of these effects. 404 If they would not do this, their entering the field would be quite useless, since it would mean they did not believe there was anything of value to be gained in the field. *Illusio* has a circular character, since it is both the product of the game, as the game yields results which are viewed as valuable and thus worth pursuing, and the condition of the game being played, as one has to have a sense of the rules and the stakes in order to be able to play at all. 405

*Translating Bourdieu: the republican political system*

A considerable part of Bourdieu’s work is aimed at understanding class differences in modern society, and especially the differences in performance in, for instance, the educational system, by people with different class backgrounds. Bourdieu’s concept of fields is to some extent tied up with the occupational and cultural differentiations in modern society, while in pre-modern societies these fields would not have been autonomous. 406 However, the basic theoretical foundations of his work, of which I have given a brief outline above, can certainly be applied more widely, and can be used to describe and understand the conditions of access to the field of power during the Roman Republic. 407 The specific nature of the Roman republican political system was determined in large part during and by the struggle between patricians and plebeians at the beginning of the fourth century. 408 Since the fall of the monarchy, the patricians had maintained their dominant position in the Roman field of power by virtually monopolizing the high religious and civic offices, exemplified by the right to interpret religious signs, the
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auspicia, and the possession of imperium, the highest form of command. It was never a doxic state, since from the very beginning plebeians opposed the patrician political monopoly, and patricians explicitly and openly barred plebeians from the high curule magistracies, protecting their privileged position. The early phase of the Republic was thus characterised by struggle between plebeians and patricians centered on access to and domination within the field of power. It is important to note that plebeians never strove for a wholesale reorganisation of the high magistracies and their inherent responsibilities and powers; the strategy pursued by plebeians can therefore be described as a strategy of succession, attempting to gain access to the dominant positions while maintaining most of the characteristics of the field. The so-called Struggle of the Orders is a perfect example of the concept of illusio; plebeians recognise the value of the game and the stakes of the game, since “the very holding of these functions as such was to gain them political emancipation and guarantee their equality, as a consequence of the weight and time-honoured prestige of imperium, auspicia and office”. By entering the struggle for these functions, plebeians automatically acknowledge the fundamental importance of these functions. Over time, the two groups merged into a new political class, the nobilitas, with a broadening body of “uncontroversial and eventually self-evident rules”.

These new, uncontroversial and self-evident rules of the patricio-plebeian nobilitas entailed that in order to be able to play in the highest echelons of the Roman political game, and ultimately to attain one of the high magistracies, a substantial amount of all three forms of capital was required. The first requirement was economic capital. Those eligible for membership of the Senate and for the highest civic offices were likely subjected to a minimum wealth requirement, and voting rights in the different assemblies were also related to the property class to which one belonged. Economic capital was thus an essential requirement for political participation, and the amount of economic capital determined the extent of political rights and possibilities. While economic capital was a prerequisite, cultural and social capital were no less important. In order to have a successful career in Roman politics, one would have to be able to understand the rules of the political game and the way in which it was played. Rhetoric was an important part of Roman political discourse, probably in no small part to underline the elevated and exclusive nature of this discourse, and the role cultural capital plays in rhetoric should be evident; both the ability itself to speak well in public, to be able to correctly use rhetorical devices and improvise, requires a certain amount of training. Furthermore, speeches were often riddled with references to the great events and individuals of Roman history, knowledge of which was essential for understanding the message being conveyed. Political advancement was thus to a large extent dependent on the amount of embodied cultural capital.
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an agent possessed. Social capital was equally important in the pursuit of a political career and membership of the political class. Membership in elite networks ensured the support of other aristocrats in elections and could facilitate an agent’s rise in the political hierarchy. Moreover, since the attainment of high office was ultimately dependent on popular election, it was essential to gain enough support among the voting assemblies. An important instrument was the Roman clientele-system.\footnote{Rouland 1979; Lintott 1999, 178-181.} An agent’s clientele consisted of all those who were in some way dependent on the agent, and who would support their patron in an election.\footnote{The clientele-system is ultimately a more or less institutionalised form of conversion of economic into social capital: the patron’s assistance to the client more often than not consisted of aid in economic matters, by securing positions and jobs or by providing loans, in return for recognition and the ability to call upon the client’s loyalty when the patron would need it.} Elite connections would furthermore ensure the support of their clients in elections. The role of social networks in the Roman political system should therefore not be underestimated, nor should the role of inherited forms of capital.

The \textit{gens} to which one belonged was important for the acquisition of all three forms of capital. First of all, material inheritance could secure the property qualification needed to take part in Roman politics, to remain a member of the political class. Second of all, it was customary that the father’s clientele was transferred to the son, thus making social capital a part of the inheritance. The family or household is also the place where the \textit{habitus} is initially formed and cultural capital is (first) acquired, and those born into the important families of the Roman state would have had a distinct advantage in acquiring the cultural capital required for a successful political career, both because the necessary economic capital was available to ensure a lengthy educational period and because agents belonging to important families would have been surrounded by those with a successful political career in progress or already behind them. Agents would thus be continuously exposed to those possessing the ‘correct’ cultural capital for a political career in their own houses. Indeed, it seems likely that the children of the \textit{nobilitas} would have been groomed for such a career from an early age, with an education in rhetoric and other useful disciplines. The advantages of being born into an old, established and influential family for political advancement can perhaps explain the fact that the vast majority of high offices were held by a rather limited number of families.\footnote{For example, between 232 and 133 BC almost half of the total number of consuls was provided by only 10 families (Scullard 1951, 11). This implies a concentration of magisterial power in the hands of a select group of \textit{gentes}.} Moreover, from the consular lists it appears that it was more difficult for those who were not from these established families to attain the consulship.\footnote{Only a third of those becoming consul between the Second Punic War and the end of the Republic came from families without consuls in the previous three generations, and only a third of the first members of a family attaining the consulship (\textit{homines novi}) had sons who would also become consul (Lintott 1994, 47).} The members of established consular families thus would appear to have had an inherent capital endowment and \textit{habitus} that was ideally suited to success in the Roman politics.\footnote{Fowler 1997, 178: “members of the dominant class appear distinguished because, being born in a distinguished position, their habitus – their constituted social nature – is immediately adjusted to the immanent demands of the game and they are thus able to affirm their distance from others without having to do so.”}

Perhaps needless to say, symbolic capital in the form of recognition also played a major role in the Roman political system. This is perhaps best exemplified in one of the central...
institutions of the state, the Senate, which functioned as “the neutral platform on which patrician and plebeian members met on equal footing”. The authority of the Senate did not derive from any constitutionally anchored position, and its executive powers in the mid-republican period seem to have been rather limited. However, among its members a vast amount of military, political and legal expertise was stored, and it was probably on these recognised forms of capital, this aggregated symbolic capital, that its central position of authority was based. Precisely because the terms of office of the high magistracies were limited, the continuity of Roman politics was guaranteed by the Senate, the only political body with the expertise and capacity for long-term policy-making. Since only those with a considerable amount of capital were likely to be elected to high office, which ensured membership of the Senate after the term of office, the political system was more or less designed to select those individuals from which the senatorial body as a whole would benefit most, since those individuals attained high office who would contribute the most to the pool of expertise and symbolic capital from which the Senate drew its authority. And it was exactly this storage of knowledge and competence which was the basis for the development of the Senate during the phase of territorial expansion into the central institution of the increasingly complex Roman state, since in contrast to the slightly amorphous and difficult to mobilise popular assemblies, it was the only “permanent body with sufficient skill and experience to make informed decisions”. In the late republican period, “the Senate dominated all aspects of public life, with complete control of state finances, military policy, foreign affairs, and law and order”, as well as having “full charge of all matters relating to the state religion”. Membership of this body was the closest thing to a title of nobility, an institutionalised form of social capital.

There certainly was an inherent tension between the Senate and the elected high magistrates, a tension which is inherent in all forms of delegation. In a sense, the only way in which the symbolic power of the Senate could be used effectively, was through the high magistrates, since these were the ones who could convene assemblies and propose legislation. The accumulated capital of the Senate was concentrated and used by the high magistrates; the agents mandated by the group, in this case the holders of high office, could in theory certainly exert their power on and possibly against the group, the Senate. However, this tension mostly remained latent because at the end of his office, the magistrate would return to join the ranks of the Senate and add to its authority by the increase in individual status inherent in the holding of high office, thus adding to the amount of symbolic capital of the Senate as a whole. It is not difficult to see how the prospect of eventually rejoining those who were essentially his peers would deter high magistrates from abusing the imperium they were invested with by the Senate. The
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fact that every senator was a potential magistrate and every magistrate would return to being
a senator ensured a careful balance of power in which excesses were avoided and in which
service to the state and personal achievement were carefully balanced.\textsuperscript{429} The Senate even took
measures to prevent the abuse of power by single magistrates, by curtailing and eventually
eliminating altogether the practice of iteration, re-election for multiple and/or consecutive
terms.\textsuperscript{430} By controlling the possibility of attaining high office, the Senate ensured that the
magistrate would remain loyal towards his peers, and not to the people, since he had no need
to take account of the people for the purpose of re-election, while he would be confronted
with his peers in any case. In the same sense, the magistracies traditionally associated with
championing the interests of the people, such as the tribunes, eventually became more or less
junior magistracies, stepping-stones for aspiring individuals on the way to higher magistracies,
and therefore subject to the approval of the Senate for the continuation of their journey up
the magisterial ladder.\textsuperscript{431} During the expansion of the Roman state and the development of the
patricio-plebeian nobility, the Senate became, through a series of measures strengthening its
position and keeping the power of individual magistrates in check, the “main pillar of the new
aristocratic ethos of service in office”.\textsuperscript{432} Competition was actually encouraged, functioning
as a motor for the Roman political system, channeled by the Senate: competition for high
office continually reaffirmed the value of these offices and the particular system in which
they were embedded. The \textit{nobilitas} thus formed a remarkably coherent group centered on a
common ideology, in which “competition was not only acceptable, but actually encouraged by
the collective code of behaviour”.\textsuperscript{433} The explanation for this phenomenon, so specific for the
Roman political system, could be that aristocratic competition continually reinforced the rules
and the stakes of the Roman political game and the role of the Senate as the ultimate arbiter
in the control of access to power and distinction.

\textit{Aristocratic competition and temple building in Rome}

The introduction of new cults in Rome and the construction of temples related to this is an
inherently political process, involving both external and internal motivating factors. Examples
of the first are the introduction of the cults of Aesculapius and Magna Mater, both of which
seem to have been inspired by a Roman wish to partake in the greater Greek-Hellenistic world
and to strengthen the ties to these areas by establishing religious links.\textsuperscript{434} The introduction
in Rome of many Italic divinities has been interpreted as being motivated by the attempts at
integration of new peoples within the Roman state.\textsuperscript{435} Externally motivated introduction of
cults and temple construction can thus be said to be cosmological pendants to actual historic
developments. With regard to internal politics, temple construction plays an important role
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in aristocratic competition at Rome. According to scholarly tradition, the vast majority of the temples constructed in great numbers in Rome from the mid-fourth century onwards was paid for *ex manubiiis*, the victorious general's share of the war booty, and should therefore be seen as personal victory monuments adding to the *gloria* of the general and his *gens*.\(^{436}\) This model of manubial building assumes an almost complete freedom on the part of the victorious general in how to dispose of a specific part of the war booty, the so-called *manubiae*.\(^{437}\) Applied to temples, this implies that it was possible for individuals to vow, build and dedicate a temple without consultation, cooperation or authorisation on the part of the Roman Senate or the People.\(^{438}\) The erection of a temple conferred a considerable amount of prestige upon those responsible for its construction. Just as much as it was a religious building, honouring the gods, it was a lasting monument honouring the achievements of individual aristocrats and his *gens*, a permanent source of symbolic capital.

The theory of manubial building implies that the magistrate with *imperium* could introduce whichever deity he pleased in Rome and by doing so bind the entire state to the official worship of this deity, since judging from the (literary) evidence most of the temples constructed during the mid-republican period were included in the official religious calendar.\(^{439}\) This would mean that temple construction in Rome was a sort of free-for-all, a process which afforded aristocrats complete freedom to change the townscape by construction activities as they saw fit, and would point towards an almost continual misuse or even abuse of the powers of delegation. If this was indeed the case, it is not even surprising that the republican political system eventually descended into chaos during the Late Republic, but more that it operated as long and as successfully as it did. Since temples constituted such an important source of individual and gentilician prestige, the urge to conduct profitable wars abroad would have been extremely great. This would also mean that being a high magistrate during years of peace would have been particularly disadvantageous since it left one without the possibility of self-aggrandisement through temple construction from individual means, and it would further have stimulated disruptive competition between consular colleagues for the command over the armies in the most profitable regions, since these would undoubtedly enable him to construct a temple as a permanent testament to his fame.\(^{440}\) The theory of manubial building therefore presents temple construction and the means to finance it as a possible perverse incentive for high magistrates, making the centuries of relative stability seem like something of a miracle. The image it creates of the republican political and religious system is one of inherent individualism and arbitrariness, clashing with the description I have given above of this political system.

---

\(^{436}\) The opinion that many temples were financed from the victory spoils of individual generals has been formulated in numerous studies, see, for example, STMBAUGH 1978, 557; PIETILA-CASTREN 1987 (on victory monuments in general, including temples), 16-17; ZIOLKOWSKI 1992, esp. 235-258, 307-310; BEARD et al. 1998, 88; CORNELL 2000, 48; HOLSCHER 2001, 198; WALTER 2004, 134; WELCH 2006, 502; WALLACE-HADRILL 2008, 115.

\(^{437}\) See ORLIN 1997, 117-121, for the problematic nature of the term and its possible meanings.


\(^{439}\) ORLIN 1997, 35, 126.
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It rather seems that individual freedom and competition was somewhat curtailed in the Roman political system, both by the central authority of the Senate and the delicate balance between political actors. Eric Orlin has given an alternative reading of temple building in Rome during the republican period, challenging some of the central notions of the traditional manubial temple building theory and incorporating some mechanisms of balance between individual and collective. The most important differences between the traditional view of manubial building and Orlin’s reconstruction of building practices concern the role of individual generals in the building process and the role of the Senate as a central institution regulating the process. The point of contention between the traditional and revisionist model is just how individual and (un)regulated this process was. Orlin claims that there is a weak factual basis for the theory of manubial building since the funding by manubiae is only documented explicitly for five out of over 80 mid- and late republican temples that were dedicated in Rome according to our sources. Instead, more temples would have been financed by using public funds, made available by the Senate. However, ancient evidence for the funding sources of temples is extremely scanty, making it hard to draw conclusions by referring to the absence of evidence. Even if it was not explicitly documented, many temples could have been financed by using manubiae. But perhaps our understanding of the term manubiae itself should be revised. This is exactly what J. Bradford Churchill has done. He interprets the term as referring to a particular part of the war booty reserved against looting that was viewed as public property in the custody of the man under whose auspices they had been won. This means that the revision of the manubial building theory proposed by Orlin, with a balance between individual and collective, would already be inherent in the meaning of the term manubiae itself. The general had custody of the manubiae and had some freedom in choosing what to do with it, but in the end the Roman People expected it to be used in the public interest. The construction of a temple was by no means the only way to utilise the manubiae, but it certainly was one of the most obvious and lasting ways of doing so for the public good while at the same time accumulating personal prestige.

A political culture in which competition is so heavily engrained needs consensus about "the repertoire of acceptable means and media by means of which competitors try to win", in other words the kinds of cultural goods which are used and valued as signs of the kind of embodied cultural capital that is valued in Roman politics. Temple construction was obviously a part of this repertoire of cultural goods and can be said to be a product of the new patricio-plebeian political order and its specific capital requirements. The process of constructing and dedicating temples can be understood as a prime example of the illusio of the Roman political game, an understanding of and investment in the rules and the stakes of the game: it can be argued that this is exactly what is entailed by the Roman concept of the mos maiorum, loosely translatable as ‘ancestral custom’, which became the accepted set of game rules of Roman politics. The central authority of the Senate is derived from its role as arbiter in the game, its

441 Orlin 1997.
442 We only have ancient testimony that manubiae were used for the construction costs for five out of over 80 temples that were dedicated in Rome according to our sources (Orlin 1997, 130-134).
role as ‘gatekeeper’, and the balance between political actors is achieved by playing the game itself and the requirements of capital endowment and *habitus*, which ensures a certain degree of like-mindedness. This model, which incorporates competition as a positive, affirming quality is certainly better suited to the long success of the Roman political system than the egotistical power ambitions implied by the theory of manubial building.

Temples were visual expressions of status and prestige, and since we have seen that the progression of political careers was closely linked to these concepts, it was necessary for members of the political class to ‘make their mark in the public spaces of the city’. In making this mark by building a temple, not only did an individual add to his personal symbolic capital by celebrating personal achievements, but at the same time added to the collective symbolic capital of the Senate as a representative of the Roman state by celebrating the divine order that was believed to be the basis for Rome’s success. The ethos of service in office and the mutual trust and dependence between Senate and magistrates in the process of delegation is perfectly illustrated in the process of temple construction. On the one hand the Senate played an important role by making sure *manubiae* were used for the public good, giving its authorisation for the instatement of a certain cult and perhaps in some cases by providing funds for the construction of the temple; on the other the magistrate was allowed the *gloria*, the symbolic capital, of the dedication of the temple, thereby attaching his name and that of his *gens* to the temple forever. Both sides played their part in the process and both sides benefited. Furthermore, the Senate could actually add to the symbolic capital the temple could generate for the dedicant: by adding their seal of approval, the temple was incorporated into a whole series of similar monuments documenting Rome’s rise to power and the political and religious system which had made this possible. Individual dedications without Senatorial approval would surely reduce the potential for symbolic capital, lacking the cumulative power and prestige of ‘official’ temples.

Over time, the Roman townscape became a testament to this ideology of service and achievement, an expression of the specifically patricio-plebeian cultural and collective memory: a monumental memory which alluded to historical events and individuals but at the same time providing a standard for the political culture in the present; a physical reminder of the way the game had been played before and how it should be played in the present. It was a townscape produced, perpetuated and adapted to the uniquely Roman political model and the patricio-plebeian collective memory in particular, a perfect fit for the city at this time. This would also explain the supposed ‘backwardness’ of Roman town-planning; towns of Latium were seemingly far ahead of Rome in monumental urbanistic renewal, and the ‘provincial’, unbeautified appearance of the Urbs was the subject of taunts at the Macedonian court. However, in negatively valuing the Roman townscape, the Macedons fail to understand the importance of the specific urbanistic development of Rome for the continuity of Roman politics; in a sense, they could be said to lack the cultural capital needed to decipher the coded
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message Rome as a ‘city-map’ conveyed to its citizens and nobility. Uwe Walter has stated that
the basic meaning of the Roman ‘museum of history’, the principles and criteria that had been
decisive in its formation, was understood, at least superficially by a fairly broad section of the
population. Likewise, modern scholars surely are missing the point of the Roman townscape
when they write that Roman public buildings stood “isolated from one another, as reminders
of individual achievement, with little or no attempt to contribute to a wider overall plan” and
that “the republican city was no more than the sum of its parts”. Quite to the contrary, the
Roman townscape was more than the sum of its parts to those who were able to understand
the message of power, combining cooperation and competition, it conveyed.

An essentially symbiotic model of temple construction, with cooperation between Senate
and magistrates with *imperium* in which competition had its proper place, corresponds extremely
well with the vision of Karl-Joachim Hölkeskamp of Roman political culture as it came into
being in the mid-republican period, and the translation of this vision in Bourdieuan terms,
and is far better able to explain the long-term success of the republican system before its
eventual collapse, and the role of temple construction within the system, than the model of
manubial building. In the next section, I will try to extend the central notions to Latium to
determine what the possible role of local elites was within this system; especially during the
late-republican period when what had been a driving force became a disruptive force, and the
consensus about the rules and stakes of the Roman political game was breaking down.

**Extending the scope of competition: Rome and Latium**

From the previous pages we may conclude that construction activity in Rome, especially temple
building, was tailored to the specific political system of that city, engrained in a model of
competitive aristocracy. One of the constants of scholarly research of monumental building
in the whole of Italy during the republican period is that it only incorporates Rome as a
negative example to oppose, as in the interpretation of the sanctuary of Fortuna at Praeneste as
*Gegenarchitektur*, or it leaves out the building activities in the city altogether, leading to an
isolated position of Rome. Buildings in Rome were used to gain access to power and prestige
at the *Urbs*, made visible through the attainment of high office in the city and membership
of the Senate. While it may be clear from the preceding pages that I do not contest the
basic premises of these notions, I do not dismiss beforehand the possibility that monumental
building in Latium was also conditioned by this very same competitive system. According to
Kathryn Lomas, “the relationship between local elites who gave visible support to the ruling
regime and reflected this in the way they reconstructed their communities and access to power
is an obscure one”, suggesting that there is little concrete evidence to support the idea that
acts of evergetism in local communities resulted in an increase in rank or attainment of high
office in Rome. This then leads to a highly localised perspective on building activities by the

---

452 Walter 2001, 258.
453 Cornell 2000, 54. While Cornell does admit that the development of Rome was specific to its constitutional
arrangement, he does not seem to accept the notion of an overarching message conveyed by the building
activities in the city of Rome.
454 Lomas 2003, 40.
elites of Latial towns, suggesting that the incentives behind monumentalisation and urbanistic renewal were competition between local aristocrats amongst themselves and on a slightly larger scale the competition between individual cities and towns, with Rome apparently being hors concours and only acting as a catalyst for the intensification of local competition: “magistrates and private individuals who build are not so much looking to enhance their personal status in the tangible legal sense of social promotion to equestrian or senatorial rank, but are driven by the need to maintain their own status and that of their city within the local hierarchy”. What the ultimate benefits were of such local competition remains obscure; in Rome the holding of high office was a ‘quantifiable’ variable which can be interpreted as signs of success, yet what the final outcome would be of competition for a place in a local hierarchy is completely unclear, since I do not see a way for the resulting prestige to be transformed into other valuable assets.

This idea of the Roman elite and the elites of the towns of Latium, and Italy as a whole, as pursuing separate (group) interests which may complement each other but in essence do not overlap, has recently been stated more explicitly by Johannes Keller. He claims that the main interests of the Roman aristocracy focused on “the acquisition of political power, military glory, and high social status” leading to fierce and constant competition between members of this aristocracy. He furthermore claims that the group interests of the Roman aristocracy were unique, “shared by no other social stratum in Roman Italy”, and that “Roman nobles were not willing to let anyone participate in their individual achievements, be it within the circle of their order or outside it”. The elites of the allied states, on the other hand, who did not or could not share these group interests of the Roman aristocracy, pursued their own interests, namely the economy. Relations between Rome and the allies were stable and productive as long as these interests converged, but led to crisis in the beginning of the first century when economic pursuits by local elites were being hindered by Roman policy, which was prompted in turn by stagnation in the Roman campaigns of expansion in Italy and the East. This dichotomous interest model leads to the same basic conclusions about social status and its display as drawn by Lomas, namely that they were highly local in nature. Apparently, we should imagine two parallel systems, one for the Roman aristocracy and one for the local elites, which are more or less closed and rarely intersect. The erection of monumental public buildings, such as the sanctuaries under discussion here, must then firmly be placed in the latter system: they are to be interpreted as expressions of local pride and as products of the competition for status in a local hierarchy.
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In this situation, with Rome taken out of the equation and Latial towns competing for status and prominence in the second tier, as it were, monumentalisation could be seen as the result of a snowball-effect: once a town, in this case Fregellae, has built a monumental sanctuary on a scale not attempted before, other towns had to follow suit in order to maintain their position in the hierarchy, setting off a chain reaction leading to ever bigger and more impressive sanctuaries, a reading which can perhaps be partly supported by the development of sanctuaries over time (fig. 25). This form of competition, trying to outdo the architectural achievements of earlier building complexes, has been suggested in particular for the sanctuaries of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste and the sanctuary of Hercules Victor at Tibur.\footnote{Gullini 1991, 489; Merz 2001, 30.} A problematic factor, however, is the uncertain chronology of the various monuments (fig. 24), which sometimes overlaps to such an extent that it is impossible to establish with certainty which sanctuary was built first, and thus what the standards being set by predecessors were exactly. Furthermore, since it is status we are dealing with, which is based on perception and recognition, we would need to take...
into account other factors besides sheer size; surely the unique architectural features and hill-side setting of the sanctuary of Praeneste, the daring feat of engineering involved in the construction of the sanctuary of Terracina on top of a steep, 227 meter high cliff, and the incorporation of a stretch of road as a *via tecta* in the substructions of the sanctuary of Hercules Victor at Tivoli, would add to their impact in ways that are not easy to quantify. If the monumental sanctuaries of Latium were indeed used to establish the place of towns in the local hierarchy, size would be only a part of the equation. We should also take into account feats of exceptional technical daring, and expenditure on the sanctuary in relation to the size of the town itself, since larger, wealthier towns would be able to build larger and more impressive sanctuaries. Furthermore, a model of local competition does not sufficiently explain the chronological development of the monumentalisation process: if maintenance or improvement of the position in the local hierarchy is the main objective, we would expect to see a constant increase in size and building activity without a specific chronological concentration. If building monumental sanctuaries is part of a tendency of ‘keeping up with the Joneses’, which in my opinion is what Lomas and others seem to be implying, we run into the problem that there does not seem to be a particular family Jones for everyone to keep up with, nor is it clear why it was this period in particular in which everybody wanted to keep up with them.

*Late republican religious architecture in Rome and Latium: similarities*

As has been noted above, the development of monumental sanctuaries in Latium, sometimes as part of larger scale urban renewal, is often seen as a distinctive process which does not have exact parallels in Rome itself, especially with regard to the enormous scale of the buildings and the communal character of the monuments, something which has already been noted by Andrew Wallace-Hadrill.463 However, the development of religious architecture in the late republican period in Rome and Latium is perhaps more closely related than is sometimes assumed with regard to size, stylistic developments and the principal cults of sanctuaries.

While it is certainly true that many of the temples erected in Rome in the republican period were rather modest in size, there are several building projects involving sanctuaries on
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463 Wallace-Hadrill 2008, 114-116. By communal character it is meant that the monument was erected by multiple magistrates acting in unity, often acting on the instigation of the local Senate.
a considerably vaster scale in the late republican period, or employing construction techniques similar to some of the Latial sanctuaries. One of the best examples of a building complex considerably larger than other contemporary constructions is the Porticus Metelli (fig. 26), built by Quintus Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus in the period between 143 and 131. The quadrilateral portico encircled the newly constructed temple of Jupiter Stator, to which I shall return below, and the existing temple of Juno Regina, which was probably restored by Metellus. The two temples and the portico effectively formed a unified complex, distinct from the surrounding urban fabric, and measuring ca. 135 by 119 meters, comparable in size to the largest of the Latial monumental sanctuaries and actually predating them by several decades.

On the eastern slope of the Palatine hill, a building complex has been found with several phases, the oldest of which constitutes a series of vaulted spaces which must have borne an ample terrace. Unfortunately successive building phases have incorporated and cut into the oldest terrace to such an extent that the original development and elevation cannot be reconstructed. However, from the available evidence it is clear that we are dealing with an artificial platform of some size, which displays some scenographical characteristics given its placement on the slope of a hill. In addition, it has been argued that on this terrace the temple of Fortuna Respiciens was located, which means that we are dealing with sacred structures on an artificial platform, comparable to a number of monumental sanctuaries in the area.
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Moreover, given the early date in the first half of the second century, we actually witness Rome fully participating in new architectural developments.

A last example, displaying both novel construction techniques and exceptional size, is the so-called Tabularium on the western end of the Forum (fig. 27). Traditionally interpreted as the building housing the state archives, it has recently been pointed out that the inscription on which this identification is based should be interpreted differently, and that the structure

Fig. 28. Proposed reconstruction by Pier Luigi Tucci of the temple of Juno Moneta on top of the structures of the so-called Tabularium (Tucci 2005, 23 Fig. 13).

Anselmino 2006, 235.
is not the *Tabularium* itself, but a *substructio*. This substruction would have supported one or more temple buildings (fig. 28). This would mean that this constellation, built around 78, forms another parallel in Rome to the standardised image of a Latial monumental sanctuary, comprising a vast arched substructure with crowning temple or temples and, in contrast to the *Porticus Metelli* and to a greater extent than the platform on the Palatine slope, even exhibiting the same scenographical aspects in its dominating position at the head of the Forum. Although these monuments were probably the exception rather than the rule with regard to temple construction in Rome, they nevertheless clearly demonstrate that sanctuary construction on a scale comparable to examples in Latium can also be found in the *Urbs* itself. It is significant that these exceptions to the Roman rule are the work of some immensely powerful individuals: the *Porticus Metelli* commissioned by the single most powerful political figure in Rome during the mid-second century and the *Tabularium* probably related to Sulla or his faction. Clearly, these are two figures that stand out in the Roman political landscape, people who could get away with not abiding by unwritten rules. As such, they do not disprove the system described above, but demonstrate that for extraordinarily powerful figures it was possible to reshape the Roman townscape in a slightly more significant way than usual. In addition, especially in and after the time of Sulla, the consensual system was slowly breaking down; the political career of Sulla himself is one of the best illustrations of that fact.

Two other important aspects of the Latial monuments seem to connect them to developments in the city, namely the development of an architectural language incorporating elements from the Greek-Hellenistic East, and the identity of the divinities to which the sanctuaries were dedicated. Both aspects have already been mentioned earlier in this chapter, but here I would like to underline their significance to our interpretation of these monuments. From the late third century onwards, we find an increasing number of Greek architectural elements being incorporated into Romano-Italic architecture. I shall avoid the term ‘copying’ here, since it seems to imply imaginative poverty on the part of the Romans and denies specific goals and messages involved in the wholesale adoption and adaptation of Greek cultural models. In any case, these developments can be seen in both Rome and Latium. The use of Greek architectural orders, metrological principles and decorative elements such as mouldings pervaded Roman and Latial architecture. While the scale and specifics of the building projects differed, they did display some shared general characteristics.

The marble temple of Jupiter Stator, built by Quintus Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus after 146, was probably the closest thing to a truly Greek temple in Rome, being an Ionic peripteral temple built on a low *krepis* instead of the traditional high podium. The round temple of the Forum Boarium, traditionally referred to as the temple of Vesta but probably dedicated to Hercules Victor or Olivarius, built in the late second century was another example of a truly
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471 Coarelli 1988, 84-103; Stamper 2005, 68-75.
Greek temple. However, republican architecture rather seems to have been characterised by the “creative recombinations or elements from the Greek repertoire”, resulting in temples that were neither truly Greek, nor truly traditional, and for which ‘Hellenistic’ seems to be the only appropriate label. The monumental sanctuaries of Latium are also expressions of this new architectural language, albeit on a different scale. While the reasons for the ‘hellenisation’ of Roman and Italic architecture are not particularly clear, at least part of the reason for adopting this new style of building was probably its symbolic potency. Whatever term we use for the means of the transmission (copied, inspired by, adapted from), this was an architectural language that referred to the Hellenistic East and the great monarchies that had employed a similar architectural style. It was an architecture of power, and the fact that both Roman nobles and local Latin elites used this symbolically charged architectural language in public monuments in ways that are in fact distinguishable only by referring to differences in scale is highly significant.

Another aspect that binds together the city of Rome and the monumental sanctuaries of Latium is the cults that were central to these sanctuaries. As already mentioned above, there is very little evidence to suggest that these cults were explicitly, or at least exclusively, local. The vast majority of these divinities was worshipped, in one form or another, in Rome as well as Latium (tab. 5), and in some cases the popularity of the divinity in the towns of Latium
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanctuary</th>
<th>Dedication</th>
<th>Rome (introduction/equivalent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fregellae</td>
<td>Aesculapius</td>
<td>Aesculapius (293)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabii</td>
<td>Juno Gabina</td>
<td>Juno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanuvium</td>
<td>Juno Sospita</td>
<td>Juno Sospita (338)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemus Aricinum</td>
<td>Diana Nemorensis</td>
<td>Diana (sixth century?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praeneste</td>
<td>Fortuna Primigenia</td>
<td>Fortuna Primigenia (204)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terracina, phase 1</td>
<td>Feronia (?)</td>
<td>Feronia (at least third century)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jupiter Anxur (?)</td>
<td>No direct equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terracina, phase 2</td>
<td>Venus Obsequens (?)</td>
<td>Venus Obsequens (295)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jupiter Anxur (?)</td>
<td>No direct equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibur</td>
<td>Hercules Victor</td>
<td>Hercules Victor (late second century?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tusculum</td>
<td>Castores (?)</td>
<td>Castores (484)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jupiter (?)</td>
<td>Jupiter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hercules (?)</td>
<td>Hercules (no epithetum given)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juno (?)</td>
<td>Juno</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Principal cults of monumental sanctuaries in Latium and their equivalent cults at Rome (with date of introduction).
themselves was quite recent and therefore hardly a potent symbol of a truly local identity. In the case of Fregellae, we are even dealing with a completely new god, imported from Greece. Although in general we should be wary of confusing form and substance, since the two can have very different meanings for the people involved especially when symbolic expressions are involved, I think the overall context of the construction of monumental sanctuaries favours an interpretation of these aspects as signifying a close connection between Rome and the towns of Latium. A dichotomous model with Rome on one side and local elites on the other glosses over the many ties between the two, or at least fails to see these as significant.

Sanctuaries in the Suburbium: the ambiguity of place

It thus seems that there is a difference in the character of building activity related to geography, with the main distinction being a position inside the Urbs and outside the city, although this difference is far from clear-cut and can, architecturally, only be related to the overall dimensions of building complexes, although as we have seen there are exceptions even to this general statement. However, this difference does not necessarily correspond to differences in interests, since it was shown that there are also similarities between building activity in these two areas. At least certain characteristics of the sanctuaries being monumentalised, such as the divinities to which they are dedicated, seem to bridge the divide between Rome and the rest of Latium. The fact that these sanctuaries are different from those in Rome itself yet related to them in several ways is also reflected in the geographical distribution of the sanctuaries (fig. 23). As already noted above, the vast majority was built on the margins of the Roman Suburbium, while Terracina was the only town in Latium directly connected to Rome by the via Appia. The only exception is Fregellae. Although the via Latina connected the town to Rome, it also connected various other towns to the Urbs, which does not enable us to suppose a preferential status for Fregellae as can perhaps be done for Terracina.

Although the term Suburbium, used as a noun, only occurs in two instances in the ancient literature, the adjective form suburbanus is frequently used by ancient authors from the late republican period onwards. The literary use of the term is emphatically not limited to the area which we would nowadays call suburban, the immediate surroundings of a town, but includes areas at a considerable distance from the Urbs. Areas referred to by ancient authors as being suburban include Saxa Rubra, Fidenae, Nomentum, Ficulæ, Tibur, Gabii, Praeneste, Tusculum, Bovillæ, Ariæ, Velitriæ, Lanuvium, Lavinium and probably ending with Antium to the south; a zone of about 30 to 40 kilometres, the hilly ‘crown’ around Rome, although sometimes the definition of the suburban region of Rome is extended to encompass the whole coastal plain to the south of the city, including Terracina. While it may not have been a fixed, geographically delimited and recognised area in antiquity, it was nevertheless an important mental label. This means that all sanctuaries but one (Fregellae) are in some
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way directly tied to the *Urbs*, geographically and symbolically. The unique characteristics of this area are that it forms an extension of the city and performs some of the same functions of the city, yet is also part of the countryside; it is both city and non-city.\textsuperscript{477} The concept of *Suburbium* thus represents a true liminal zone between what comprised the city of Rome and what comprised the rest of Italy. In the following, the term *Suburbium* will refer to this specific aspect of proximity and connectivity to the *Urbs*. The fact that most of the Latial monumental sanctuaries were built in this area, outside Rome but more intimately linked to it than any other area in Italy is, in my opinion, highly significant and should be considered when interpreting the reasons for (re)building the sanctuaries and their meaning.

The first significant aspect of the *Suburbium* is that it may explain some of the formal differences observed between temple building in Rome and elsewhere. As explained above, building activity in Rome was embedded in a carefully balanced political system which tended to curtail the power and ambitions of individuals, ensuring that no single magistrate, with the few exceptions noted above, could construct a monument in the city of Rome on a scale comparable to that of the Latial monuments. And since the entire townscape, the ensemble of buildings could be understood by the populace as a monument to the successes of the patricio-plebeian nobility as a whole, there was probably no need for large-scale communal building projects specifically underlining this fact. This means that most building projects of Roman nobles were concentrated in the city, with the area of the Forum, especially the Comitium, and the route of the triumphal procession as areas of particular attention, since these were most intimately related with the political system and the imperial success it had brought the city.\textsuperscript{478}

This would seem to argue for a two-tiered system of competitive display, one in Rome reserved for the patricio-plebeian nobles at the centre of Roman politics, and one in the rest of Latium, and Italy for that matter, involved in their own competition for local supremacy. However, this system is perhaps somewhat too straightforward, and fails to take account of several important factors. Most importantly, it appears that high-profile Romans were actively engaged in building activities in the Roman campagna as well. A clear example is the family of the Cornelii Cethegi, one of the more important senatorial families of the first half of the second century, who were responsible for the construction of the sanctuary of Juno at Gabii.\textsuperscript{479} Clearly, there were some Romans, if perhaps not many, who were willing to spend their resources on a prestigious building project which was not directly part of Rome’s monumental memory. This re-introduces Rome into the equation from which a simple dichotomous model would have her eliminated, and suggests that the differences between Rome and Latium in the degree of monumentalisation cannot be directly explained as an articulation of different group interests. If we adhere to a two-tiered system, we would again have to account for Rome as a negative example: the vicinity of Rome prompted the cities in this particular area above all others to monumentalise their public spaces, including sanctuaries, perhaps to compete with the whole of Rome’s monumental townscape. In my opinion, this is overly simple and denies

\textsuperscript{477} Changlin 1982, 97.


\textsuperscript{479} Coarelli in Almagro-Gorbea 1982, 125-130, esp. 128-130.
the fact that in particular the area of the most intensive building activity, the Roman Suburbium, can be regarded, visually and mentally, as an extension of the city of Rome itself.\footnote{According to Strabo, the towns of Praeneste, Tibur and Tusculum were visible from Rome (5.3.11-12).}

In this respect, it is noteworthy that the sanctuary at Gabii, built by the senatorial Corneli Cethegi, was one of the earliest truly monumental sanctuaries in Latium. It therefore seems that at least some members of the Roman nobility did not feel constrained to construct buildings on a larger scale outside of the confines of the city itself, and considered building activity outside Rome a worthwhile enterprise. Apparently, the Suburbium enabled them to do what was impossible, or more precisely improper, in Rome itself, lifting some of the constraints imposed by its consensual system. The fact is that Rome was still of central importance with regard to competitive display,\footnote{Champlin 1982, 104.} so the impact of such monumental undertakings in the Suburbium provided only limited returns in terms of prestige in Rome, explaining both the limited number of Romans engaged in large-scale building activities in the Suburbium – building in Rome itself was clearly far more effective in terms of symbolic gains - and the fact that no one tried to prevent such activities: it posed very limited danger to the system. The fact that the Suburbium was not only a liminal zone, but in some ways also a marginal, or at least secondary, zone, perhaps also explains the fact that such monumental forms were chosen. Since they lacked the added status of building inside the Urbs, building projects outside the city perhaps needed the extra size in order to make a statement, to be ‘heard’ (or, more properly, ‘seen’) in the capital city. The specific characteristics of the Suburbium thus probably not only made certain forms of architectural display possible which at that time were unthinkable in the city of Rome, it also made them necessary. The formal difference in architectural lay-out is not a result of different group interests per se, but could be said to be the result of differences in political valuation of buildings in and outside Rome: geographical differentiation within a single overarching system with some degree of fluidity. The extension of the area of competitive display from Urbs to Suburbium brought with it a different set of rules which had yet to crystallise.

The concentration of monumental sanctuaries in the Suburbium is also significant because their location determines the general identity of the possible audience of the visual display inherent in these acts of monumentalisation. Besides the members of the local communities who were naturally confronted with the building complexes, there is another category of occupants of the Roman campagna in this period that is perhaps significant with respect to the intentions of the builders: the owners of the numerous villas which began to spring up in the area of the Roman Suburbium, especially in the vicinity of Tibur, Praeneste and the Alban Hills,\footnote{Bodei Giglioni 1977, 62; Mayer 2000; Mayer 2005.} as well as in the vicinity of Terracina. While the chronology of the beginning of a true villa culture and its specific character in this area is contested and subject to local variations, there seem to be at least some monumental sanctuaries that were constructed after villa owners had settled in the area, and in some cases the construction of the sanctuary and the development of villas in the area seem to be contemporaneous. In some cases, for instance Praeneste, it is not possible to ascertain if villas were already present in the area during the construction of the sanctuary, and therefore we cannot be certain if the villa owners were
among the targeted audience. In other cases, such as the sanctuary of Diana at Lake Nemi or the sanctuary of Hercules Victor at Tibur, we do know of villas, sometimes with illustrious owners, already present in the area during construction. This would seem to imply that, considering the visual impact of the monumental sanctuaries and the distance from which they could be viewed, the Roman nobles owning villas in the area would have been confronted and familiar with the sight of these large-scale building complexes. If the direct presence of important Roman nobles in the direct vicinity of monumentalised sanctuaries perhaps does not immediately imply active involvement of Romans themselves in each of these sanctuaries, it does suggest that Romans were among the targeted audience of the visual message conveyed by them.

Local elites and the Roman aristocracy

An important fact we need to consider is that building activity in the towns of Latium, both with regard to general urbanistic renewal and the monumentalisation of single building complexes, is at its most intense during the second half of the second century and the first half of the first century, with a particular concentration of activity around the turn of the century. This is the same general period in which involvement of local elites in Roman politics, or more precisely the politics of the Urbs, is at its most intense. Fausto Zevi has already pointed out in an impressive article that the architectural renewal in the towns of Central Italy of the last two centuries BC should not be seen as a residual phenomenon of Italic autonomous pride, which the Gegenarchitektur-model for Praeneste outlined above also seems to imply, but as an expression of new social forces springing up or gaining power in these towns. Instead of referring to the glorious past, these structures were very much part of the political present, which at this time, especially after the advent of Marius, was concentrated on the political struggles in Rome itself. Allying themselves to Marius and the popular faction, nobles from Latin communities either strove for power themselves at the capital, or lent active support, especially when civil war finally broke out. This seems to belie, at least for Latium, Lomas’ assertion that an upsurge in public building activities in the towns of Italy is not followed by an increase in the number of local elites attaining positions of power at Rome. There is actually a considerable degree of chronological overlap between construction activities and the intensity of Latin political involvement at the capital,

483 Gabriela Bodei Giglioni indicates that rich Romans began acquiring land and building luxurious villas in the vicinity of Praeneste from the middle of the second century onwards (Bodei Giglioni 1977, 62), thus predating the construction of the monumental sanctuary there, while Jochen Mayer maintains that this process did not really start until the end of the second century (Mayer 2005, 84), which would make it contemporaneous or even later than the construction of the sanctuary.

484 The chronologies of both Bodei Giglioni, who dates the villa culture at Tivoli in the same period as at Praeneste (see previous note) and Mayer, who dates the development of a villa culture at Tivoli to the late second century (Mayer 2005, 103) and a precocious start of the phenomenon in the Colli Albani (especially near Tusculum) in the third century (Mayer 2005, 106), antedate the construction of both monumental sanctuaries.

485 Edward Champlin argues that Roman suburban landowners hardly played any local role (Champlin 1982, 104) while others suggest that the involvement of Roman landowners with local sanctuaries was more intense (Bodei Giglioni 1977, 62; Mayer 2005).


at least insofar as we can reconstruct this involvement, for instance using prosopography. As so often, we must lament the loss of Livy’s narrative covering exactly this period of the late second and early first century, since it would have undoubtedly shed much more light on the development of Roman-Latin relations in this period. Although it cannot be taken as direct proof of the existence of causal relationships, it is interesting to note that at least some of the noble families or individuals responsible for the monumentalisation of the great temple complexes were either Romans or local elites coveting positions of power at Rome. Although the number of individuals that were actually successful in their pursuit of senatorial power was limited, this does not mean that they were not trying.

The Roman political system described above, in which it was difficult enough for those in the field to achieve high political positions, naturally disadvantaged those not even part of the field yet and struggling to enter it, but this had not quelled political ambitions of non-Roman nobles in the centuries before, when it had been perhaps even more difficult than in the late republican period. At least some of the people responsible for the construction of monumental sanctuaries were either actively involved in Roman political life or trying to be. Although we perhaps lack the overwhelming hard evidence for this assertion, since people’s attempts to achieve something can leave little trace if these attempts are ultimately unsuccessful, I nevertheless think that a reading of active Latin involvement in Roman politics is feasible, especially in the light of their subsequent involvement in the civil war between the Marian and Sullan factions.

The Roman republican system in flux

The chronology of the monumentalisation process is significant in more than one way. The signalled synchronicity between monumentalisation and political involvement, for instance, makes it more likely that the two phenomena are related, but does not explain why this particular moment in time is especially significant. If I am correct in my belief that the monumental sanctuaries of Latium somehow fit into a Romanocentric competitive system covering both the city and other towns, this period, roughly covering the century between 150 and 50 with a heightened concentration in its central decades, should have some special characteristics explaining why Latin political involvement was high during it. Apparently, members of local elites saw opportunities, especially during this period, for entry into the Roman ruling class. As I have explained above, the republican system of governance was a system of consensus. While some rules pertaining to the holding of high office were set down in laws, most of it was based on tradition and implicit rules (roughly equivalent to what the Romans themselves termed the mos maiorum) which ensured that power was de facto concentrated in the hands of a small group of noble families. Although this inner core of power was relatively stable, there was room for social mobility and many families attained senatorial rank during the republican period, including domi nobiles from the towns of Latium and the rest of Italy, albeit in proportionately smaller numbers. During the late republican period however, this consensual system started to unravel and break down. The rules of the game, to state it in Bourdieuan terms, were no longer systematically reproduced by the game itself, but increasingly called into question. The ethos of service in office, which had been the driving force behind the political consensus,
was increasingly abandoned as Roman nobles strove for individual power without heeding their senatorial peers. This breakdown of the classic republican system perhaps created new opportunities for local elites to penetrate the inner circle of Roman power, at least during the period when the cracks started to show and widen.

As was made clear in the overview of the political system presented above, it was difficult for *novi homines* to attain the higher magistracies. The possession of the right amount and the right kind of cultural capital was crucial for success in Roman politics, since it determined one’s ability to incorporate the intrinsic rules of admission to and advancement within the plebeio-patrician nobility. The system favoured certain families since it was probably believed that members of these families were naturally endowed with the required forms of capital, not in the least cultural capital through education and political training. This understanding of the importance of cultural capital brings us to one of its most important aspects in the context of Roman-Latin relations, namely as more or less institutionalised high status cultural signals used for social (and cultural) exclusion. It is not hard to imagine that it was proportionately harder for members of the elites of the towns of Latium to attain high office than for members of the Roman elite, since their particular constellation of capital, especially cultural capital, was probably invariably viewed as inferior to that of possible Roman candidates. The expression of the possession of cultural capital through behaviour (embodied capital) or objects (objectified capital) was a way to try to gain access to certain status groups, since membership of and position within these status groups is often determined by cultural capital, as we have seen for the Roman *nobilitas*. In order to ‘count’ as cultural signals, to be ‘institutionalised’, there has to be agreement about what forms of cultural capital are to be seen as acceptable or desirable by a relatively large group of people. The late republican meltdown and the political opportunities it created for local elites must be sought in the changes to this latter requirement, about the nature and acceptance of desirable cultural capital.

The so-called ‘hellenisation’ of Rome and Italy during the late republican period has been mentioned several times already, and is also important in this respect. During the second century, a fierce debate started about the effects of the influx of Greek art and artists and the attitude changes in attitude which these seemed to provoke, a debate fostered primarily by “concern about values, norms and orientations and about what should count as relevant and valuable in the everyday competition for influence and advancement”. After a period in which there was broad agreement about what was deemed acceptable and desirable, “the function of education, erudition and Greek art, that status of such knowledge in the ‘cultural capital’ of an individual *nobilis* and its value as a ‘very effective mark of distinction’ were controversial”, since “expert knowledge of styles, media and messages may turn into a kind of ‘power’ – the ability to decode the complex ‘discourse’ of power in the visual language can become a valuable or ‘powerful’ asset in a cultural milieu”. The great personal prestige and power won by victorious generals in the campaigns of Roman expansion that were disrupting the careful balance of power were thus accompanied by cultural developments undermining
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the consensual valuation of the basic requirements of the system itself. It is possible that the weakening of the Roman consensual system was perceived by local elites as an opportunity, since their inherent capital disadvantages were perhaps no longer as relevant as before. Both the “relatively large group of people” judging the criteria for inclusion was beginning to dissolve and new forms of (cultural) capital were increasingly accepted as valuable, new forms of capital that local elites also possessed through their involvement in the Roman military campaigns in the East and their involvement in trade and exchange in this same region.

Latial monumental sanctuaries: sending signals

I hope to have made plausible in the previous sections that a dichotomous interest model for Rome and Latium is hard to maintain and that there were intimate ties between the Urbs and the towns of Latium, and between members of their respective elites. The next objective is to extend the model constructed for the Roman political system and the position of temple building within this system, based on concepts derived from Bourdieu's sociological work, to encompass the whole of Latium and to see if this allows us to better understand the process of monumentalisation. We have observed that the monumental sanctuaries of Latium are characterised by some of the same formal features as architectural projects in Rome at this time, and even though the scale of single complexes is not matched at the capital, at least in the initial phases of the monumentalisation process, we also see an increase of the scale of building in Rome, for instance in such complexes as the Porticus Metelli with the two temples at its centre. The central cults of the Latial sanctuaries are also celebrated in Rome, frequently form part of the official state religion, and can sometimes be said to have had political as well as religious significance. The highest concentration of building activity can be found in the area of the Roman Suburbium, with its special characteristics of forming part of the city while being distinct from it. In this area, members of local elites and Romans undertook the construction of monumental sanctuaries, at a time when political participation, or at least the desire to participate, of these elites at the capital was at a probable all-time high, perhaps stimulated by changes in the traditional consensual system of power-sharing that had previously characterised politics in Rome. How then do these monumental sanctuaries fit into this system?

Once again, we turn to Bourdieu, and to his concept of cultural capital. In this case, we are interested in a specific feature of (objectified) cultural capital already mentioned, namely its use as a cultural signal used to gain access to certain status groups or, in other words, “to mark cultural distance and proximity, monopolise privileges, and exclude and recruit new occupants of high status positions”. In Bourdieu’s work, four major forms of exclusion, all of them based primarily on cultural capital and cultural signs, are singled out: three forms of indirect exclusion, namely self-elimination, overselection and relegation, and direct selection/exclusion based on similarities in taste (i.e. cultural capital). In the first case, people choose not to take part in something because the perceived chances of success are too low; participation
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would require subjection to social settings with which they would feel uncomfortable given their background (i.e. their specific capital endowment). This is perhaps what happens when local elites refrain from participating in central Roman politics, feeling they would not stand a chance anyway by the inherent disadvantages of the system. The next two forms of exclusion, overselection (individuals with less-valued cultural resources are subjected to the same type of selection as those who are culturally privileged) and relegation (those with less-valued cultural resources end up in less desirable positions), are extremely relevant to those members of the local elites who do try to enter Roman politics; they are subjected to the same standards as more privileged Roman aristocrats, as already noted, and while some may ultimately attain a magistracy, many will not climb far up the social ladder, instead fulfilling some of the junior magistracies and never attaining the coveted higher ones. Although Bourdieu believes most of these cultural signs are sent unconsciously, because they are the result of the functioning of *habitus* and reflects social behaviour in certain circumstances, as mentioned above Bourdieu keeps the option open of strategic calculation. Such strategic behaviour is therefore conditioned by the same circumstances as unconscious behaviour would have been, and can perhaps be seen as a conscious, more visible pendant to unconscious social behaviour. By investing resources in monumental building projects, Romans and Latins in my opinion engaged in such conscious, strategic behaviour and tried to send desired cultural signals. Conditioned by their specific *habitus*, they were inclined to believe that this specific form of expression was a way of being noticed by those in power at Rome, of expressing cultural and/or social affinity.

Of course, there are some obvious differences between the ‘traditional code’ expressed by monuments in the city of Rome and those of Latial sanctuaries. Temples in Rome, at least those built during the mid republican period, celebrated the joint enterprise of expansion, in general with a militaristic overtone; they were a monumental way of presenting *exempla* to those currently in power or aspiring to positions of power, and singly and collectively provided a mental map of the competences (in other words, capital endowments) of illustrious men of the past which should be followed in the present. Roman temple building, as objectified cultural capital, symbolised the very rules and stakes of the political game, and understanding of the rationale behind the construction of temples meant understanding the system and its inherent possibilities and restrictions. The sanctuaries of Latium, both those constructed by Romans and those by Latins, demonstrate these typical militaristic and exemplary connotations only in certain cases.

It is interesting to note that the very first monumental sanctuary in Latium, at Fregellae, apparently did refer, at least in part, to military victory, and therefore perhaps fits into the model followed at Rome. The later monumentalisation of the sanctuary of Juno Sospita was probably also related to Roman military success in the Second Mithridatic War, and some of the sculptural decoration of the sanctuary clearly demonstrates this. Most of the other sanctuaries, however, do not have such overt militaristic connotations, although one could interpret the figures of Victory in the terracotta decoration of the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia, which
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494 Monti 1999, 45-47. The interpretation of the sanctuary as having been built *ex munibus* is partly based on its architectural terracottas, to which I shall return in the following chapter.
are discussed in the following chapter, as a subtle triumphal reference, even though in this case we cannot point out a direct military occasion to which these might have referred.

However, the message these sanctuaries were supposed to convey to Rome was perhaps roughly similar. While they did not overtly celebrate military success, they did celebrate the positive aspects of divine favour. If we then again consider the fact that these were divinities shared with Rome and mostly related to the benefits brought about by imperialism (for instance, trade opportunities), we can tie them to a general religious value system celebrating Rome’s successes in general. Local elites, by building these grandiose monuments, celebrated the wealth and power generated by Roman imperial rule, in which they had at least some part. While this celebration could very well have had local dimensions, the very ambiguous character of the building projects certainly leaves open the possibility of other, external political uses. Two monumental complexes can be connected with relative certainty to individuals active in the Roman political scene and were probably built in conjunction with their attainment of the consulship: the sanctuary of Juno Gabina at Gabii, probably built by Marcus Cornelius Cethegus, consul of 160, and the sanctuary of Juno Sospita at Lanuvium, probably built by Licinius Murena, consul of 62. In the latter case, it is a distinct possibility that construction of the sanctuary began before attainment of the consulship, which means that construction activities were undertaken while Licinius Murena’s political career at Rome was still in full flight. These examples make clear that the construction of monumental sanctuaries in Latium was apparently undertaken by those with the ‘right’ kind of cultural capital, judging from their success in Roman politics, supporting the view that construction activities in places other than Rome can perhaps be related to political activities at Rome. Apparently, as has already been noted, at least some individuals thought it worthwhile to celebrate their political success by erecting monuments outside Rome.

However, a distinct feature of some Latial sanctuaries is their communal character: they were not built and dedicated by individuals, but by colleges of magistrates. In fact, in some sanctuaries multiple inscriptions are known in which different colleges of magistrates are mentioned for several parts, or phases, of the complex. This probably means that whoever was in office at particular stages of the construction process was mentioned in these particular inscriptions. It should also be clear that on most of these inscriptions mention is also made of the local Senate: the magistrates were acting on a Senatus Consultum and should therefore be seen as representatives of the social elite communally undertaking these building projects. Therefore, these building projects are not tied to individual aristocrats but can be said to be the responsibility of all members of the particular local social and political elite. We are thus dealing with examples of pooled (objectified) cultural capital, a sort of general resource to be used and referred to by multiple individuals, possibly across generations. Although the communal character of many of these sanctuaries has generally been seen as a sign of local significance and community spirit, it is worthy to note that at least for the sanctuary at Praeneste, arguably the most potent example of such localism, at least two dedicants known from the important building inscriptions belong to families which are known to have pursued

political careers at Rome at the time of the construction of the sanctuary. This once again demonstrates the problems with a neat distinction between local and Roman group interests. If a significant part of those responsible for the construction of a monumental sanctuary had other political motives than purely local ones, how are we to apply the label ‘local’ to the building project as a whole? And why would such families agree to commit the vast resources to such a project if they had no hope of benefiting from the end result? The obvious answer to these questions is that they apparently thought that such projects would eventually aid their political advancement at Rome.

Recently, Gary Farney has written an interesting study about the use of ethnic origin as a mark of distinction in Roman politics, how a label which could be termed as ‘local’ was consciously used in self-promotion. He points out that a Latin origin, especially one from the communities of Latium vetus that had enjoyed old and close associations with Rome, could translate into substantial (political) advantages. Farney believes that these ethnic origins were frequently ‘advertised’ by aspiring politicians on coin issues, thus making their ‘right’ kind of ethnic origin clear to the Roman public. We can understand this practice by seeing it as sending cultural signals to indicate a certain cultural closeness to Rome, thereby underlining the probability of the possession of the ‘right’ kinds of capital. The fact that Latin origin was displayed on coins is especially significant when we consider that members of local elites frequently used the junior magistracy of the monetary triumvirate (tresviri monetalis) as a stepping stone for their further political careers, thereby making it both possible for them to use coin issues as a means of propaganda, and important to send the right kinds of signals since this would influence their progression through the cursus honorum. The monetary evidence shows that the most common and therefore probably most effective method of advertising ethnic origin was referring to a famous cult related to their town of origin, according to Farney “symbols of parochial town pride”. Interestingly, most of these references are to cults which are connected to sanctuaries already monumentalised at the time when the coin was issued, or which were subsequently monumentalised.

The use by moneyers of cult references demonstrates the perceived suitability of subject matters related to religion for (political) self-promotion. However there is no need to view the references to these cults (and consequently their associated sanctuaries) primarily as expressions of local pride. Farney’s study actually supports the idea of Latin political ambition...
and could therefore also be seen as an argument against two-tiered systems of group interests; clearly, these Latin moneyers were interested in a political career at Rome. I therefore think that viewing these cult references as ‘mere’ symbols of parochial town pride somehow glosses over the important fact that these cults are not strictly local, but in general enjoy joint worship in Rome and in the town itself, or receive worship at the town by Roman officials. They are the symbols of joint interests, a reference to the divine favour that has made Rome, and her allies and subjects, powerful and wealthy. Furthermore, I believe that the reference to these cults on coins can be seen, especially in those cases where it refers to already monumentalised sanctuaries, as a *pars pro toto* of the sanctuary itself: the cult-reference automatically evokes the image of the monumental sanctuary. Considering the scale of these monuments and their visibility and popularity, most people and in any case those belonging to higher social strata who can be seen as gatekeepers of the social groups to which these local Latin nobles aspired, must have been aware of these monuments. When viewing the reference to place and cult, it must have been impossible not to form a mental image of the physical form of the sanctuary. Since I have already argued that this physical form could also be seen as an attempt to partake in developments at Rome and elsewhere, I think this particular evocative aspect of the cult-reference on coins reinforces its message of joint interests and destiny, and therefore its function as a cultural signal. This would imply that the monumentality of the sanctuary is an important aspect considered by moneyers when using cult references on coin issues: it is not just a reference to ethnic origin, distinguishing themselves from other local elites not of Latin origin, but a specific reference to a particular form of objectified cultural capital, the monumental sanctuaries of Latium. Of course, the subsequent use of monumental sanctuaries in a Roman political context does not necessarily prove that this was already envisioned at the moment of construction, but could rather reflect a later development in the perception of these monuments. However, I hope to have shown that the political outlook of many local nobles responsible for the construction of monumental sanctuaries involved Rome from the outset, thereby making it likely that such political uses of sanctuaries conditioned the initial monumentalisation process.

Cultural capital is thus something that is used, consciously or unconsciously, as a significant cultural sign, used in the Roman context to show a certain ‘fitness to rule’. From this, however, it does not follow that it is something that is universally pursued, nor universally accepted, and in this aspect a Bourdieuan conceptual framework is a considerable gain over others, since it allows us to incorporate the different attitudes and reactions of people. Although the system in Rome was in flux, both by a shift in the balance of power towards individual politicians instead of the aristocratic group and the adoption of Greek cultural elements influencing the ‘old’ evaluation of someone’s suitability for high office, formally the republican system with its selection criteria was upheld, and thus nobles aspiring to high office had to submit themselves to evaluation by relevant gatekeepers. And although local nobles from Latin towns hoped to send the desired cultural signals in order to be accepted as a possible candidate for the holding of (high) office, it is a distinct possibility that in some, or even most instances their efforts failed and elicited negative and derisive reactions from Romans.① This is the very danger with
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signals: they are based on perception, and in this case both the perception of Latin nobles of what constituted a ‘desired’ signal and the perception of Roman nobles of these signals as a desire to be accepted into the ruling class – perhaps instead seeing it as presumptive arrogance - could be wrong. The most appropriate place to secure a permanent monument to personal glory and so set up a permanent reminder of group membership was, of course, the city of Rome itself. But just as the highest positions of power were difficult to attain, it was even more difficult for non-Roman nobles to imprint one’s memory permanently on the cityscape. By using the countryside of Latium, and more specifically the Suburbium, as their arena of display, members of local elites created an opportunity for self-promotion not available to them in Rome. At the same time, the differences in the building projects engendered by this change of location, both formally and stylistically and in the general message they conveyed, created the possibility of misapprehension by those at whom the efforts were directed, explaining why it is not always possible to detect “an increase in rank or attainment of high office in Rome”, which would have ideally followed the construction of these monumental sanctuaries. Rather than seeing the absence of such evidence of upwards social mobility as an argument for the local nature of these building projects, I think we can interpret them as a result of the inherent ambiguity involved in sending cultural signals.

Approaching the monumentalisation of sanctuaries in Latium from a perspective incorporating Rome, regarding the wish for political participation as an important driving force behind the process, we are also able formulate hypotheses on the question why monumentalisation in this form stopped in Latium after roughly the middle of the first century. First of all, we might point to the fact that in many cases, an existing sanctuary could be used as a representational device by later generations, as evidenced by the use in Rome of cult references on coins by magistrates of Latin descent. This would make it unnecessary to invest in new sanctuaries in those towns where one already existed. Second of all, during the very last phase of the Republic and the start of the imperial period, the mechanisms by which power could be attained in the capital changed. The rise of certain extremely powerful individuals, resulting in the Augustan autocracy, illustrate that increasingly, the individual rather than the collective determined the political agenda. The rules of the game of power, which had relied heavily on consensus, changed radically. Those people coveting political power were dependent on the whims of a single individual, rather than on rules and practices established by a larger group of players. Access to the highest power and privileges was no longer strictly controlled by the Senate, but by these individuals. The delicate balance which had always characterised Roman politics, the balance between the individual to which power was delegated and the collective delegating power, was disrupted. Specific forms of cultural capital used as signs to control access to the highest status groups probably changed or devalued as a result, perhaps making it less attractive to invest in large-scale building projects such as monumental sanctuaries, which could be easily perceived as a challenge to the central power, or were simply no longer valued as a cultural sign: the message they were supposed to convey, in my opinion, of cooperation and success, had become obsolete.

506 LOMAS 2003, 40.
A re-appraisal of emulative models of Romanisation

The process which I sketched in the previous sections, interpreting monumentalisation as a part of a socio-political game in which Romans and local elites engaged, seems to have many echoes of one of the most popular models of cultural change following Roman expansion: that of self-romanisation, already mentioned earlier in this chapter. This model suggests that native elites adopted Roman cultural models, practices and symbols as a sign of power over non-elites, stressing the spontaneous nature of Romanisation. The model, most often associated with Martin Millett, conceptualises the symbols of *romanitas* as status indicators, the means to establish their social position vis-à-vis the rest of society.\(^{507}\) Millett provided a basic outline of the progression of the romanisation of native societies:\(^{508}\) (1) Rome was pre-inclined to make use of existing power relations in conquered areas and administer through native elites; (2) after conquest, a Roman administrative system was established in which the native elites were expected to participate; (3) this system allowed native elites to continue to exercise power, provided it was in broad accordance with Roman principles and interests; (4) Roman rule thus occurred by using incentives rather than coercion, while the association with the external power reinforced the native elites’ position and the use of the symbols of *romanitas* acquired through emulative practices set them apart from the remainder of society; (5) these symbols pervaded lower social strata by progressive emulation lower down the social hierarchy. Rather than the passive process of peoples waiting to be civilised by their Roman conquerors, the self-romanisation model sees natives, and especially the higher social strata, as active participants in the process of cultural change.\(^{509}\)

Millett’s model, a conscious attempt to move beyond the colonialist view of romanisation offered by Francis J. Haverfield which had come under attack from post-colonialists,\(^{510}\) has been criticised in turn for leaving intact some of Haverfield’s assumptions. Jane Webster asserts that Millett views the adoption of Roman symbols as foremost an elite phenomenon and that in his model differences in the outcome of the romanisation process were determined by pre-existing conditions in different societies rather than choices made after the Roman conquest.\(^{511}\) In short Millet’s model is perceived by Webster to be too similar to Haverfield’s, since “both are primarily concerned with the relationship between native elites and Rome, and both are based on a belief that the impetus for provincial change was emulation of Roman culture”\(^{512}\).

While Millett’s model is a step forward in that it recognises pragmatism as an important part of the romanisation process, “he does not explore the extent to which this form of pragmatic emulation was mingled with a recognition of superior cultural values”\(^{513}\). Webster sees the concept of spontaneous or self-generating (progressive) emulation as the dominant model of “native engagement with Roman material culture at all levels of society” as highly problematic, since according to her it is too much focused on elite interests while failing to account for the
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incentives for the rural poor to adopt the symbols of romanitas,\footnote{“Without an element of self interest, the only motor for change becomes the superiority of Roman culture, bringing us full circle to Haverfield’s original (acculturative) conception of romanisation as the unstoppable march of civilization” (W\textsc{e}b\textsc{e}r\textsc{t} 2001, 216).} and furthermore that it supposes that emulation was the general norm but fails to account satisfactorily for the lack of emulation when encountered.\footnote{“[Failure to emulate] is instead explained in four ways: latent persistence of folk customs…; overt resistance …; Romanization as a veneer…; and pre-conquest regional differences...(W\textsc{e}b\textsc{e}r\textsc{t} 2001, 216).} I will present a re-appraisal of the model of (progressive) emulation to describe and explain cultural exchange and transformation following Roman expansion, using concepts of Bourdieuan theory.

If we consider the fact that the post-conquest exercise of Roman power normally made use of existing power structures, which Millett also incorporates as a first assumption, it becomes clear that empire-wide, Roman rule had an important social component; patronage was an important instrument in regulating social relations between conquerors and conquered.\footnote{D\textsc{o}w\textsc{n}s 2000, 202-203.} Where a Bourdieuan approach differs from Millett’s model of self-romanisation is in the use of the ‘symbols of romanitas’ to set them apart from the rest of their society, that these are actively used as power tools. Rather, I would argue that those items or customs which modern scholars would seem to consider signs of Romanness and a sign of cultural assimilation can also be interpreted as cultural signals to those in a dominant power position, in this case the Roman conquerors. By using certain forms of embodied and objectified cultural capital, native elites signal their willingness and suitability to engage in the new power game which has formed in the wake of expansion; again, cultural capital as signs used for in- and exclusion. This does not require the recognition of a cultural superiority of the Romans, just the recognition of the current state of the field of power and the stakes and symbols which are used in this field. It thus depends on the recognition of asymmetric power relations, rather than the recognitions of cultural superiority. And I think few would argue against the existence of such asymmetric power relations between conquerors and conquered. We could call this willingness to engage in the game of power. Bourdieu’s concept of illusio, and ascribing to the relevant cultural signs a form of emulation, yet it provides us with a much more flexible framework than Millett’s, as well as providing a theoretical explanation for the trickle-down effect, since the forms of cultural capital adopted and displayed by the native elites also become stakes in the game of power already existing between them and those of lower social status in their communities. Cultural capital is thus, in some way, inserted into a dialectic of power involving Roman conquerors and native elites and, in turn, native elites and the native community.

A Bourdieuan perspective also offers possible explanations of the variability of the degree of assimilation, in other words the diffusion of symbols perceived to be typically Roman. Of course it is always possible that some people refrain from engaging in the game of power, which would make the necessity to appear to conform to a new cultural standard less pressing. But Bourdieu’s theory goes further. Greg Woolf states that “the specificity of romanitas (ideologies, as well as structures, of domination) may be as important in understanding the unity of Romanisation, as the specifity of iron-age societies is crucial if we are to understand its diversity”.\footnote{W\textsc{o}o\textsc{l}f 1992, 352.} The fact that earlier characteristics of native societies were crucial to the
outcome of cultural change accompanying Roman conquest, attacked by Webster, has a firm foundation in Bourdieuan theory: it is the pre-existing habitus which largely determines social behaviour, especially in new or unforeseen circumstances. The coming of Rome is exactly such a circumstance, and the diversity of cultural responses to Roman rule can perhaps be traced back to the operation of specific, distinct habitus. So, what Webster calls creolisation, or what Terrenato calls cultural bricolage, both terms essentially containing a mix of old and new cultural elements, can actually be the result of the combination of Roman culture filtered through the native habitus. I have mentioned above the potentialities for misunderstanding in these circumstances, and to this may be added the danger of hypercorrection, by which term we can identify the tendency sometimes observed of natives trying to be more Roman than the Romans themselves. I believe that the immense variation observed in romanisation processes might be the result of these processes. While prolonged exposure might lead to a more perfect understanding of the correct signals which should be sent, which in a traditional model of romanisation would be interpreted as signs of advanced cultural integration, this is not always the case. We have seen above that several reactions are possible when people are confronted with a field in which they are subjected to evaluation by others in dominant positions; one can either participate or be excluded from certain groups. This whole range of attitudes involved in social processes described by Bourdieu can perhaps be applied to the different manifestations of cultural change in the Roman empire.

The main advantage of using a framework of social practice to describe and explain romanisation is that it partially circumvents the standard criticism that most approaches focus on elite cultures. While attention may initially be focused on native elites as those whose contact with Roman conquerors and therefore Roman culture may be most intense, the idea of social practice can also be used to describe changes caused by contact with Roman culture in lower social strata. Since the habitus is class-related, this may also explain differences observed in elite adoption of cultural models and by those lower down the social scale. While this may still seem to represent the traditional ‘trickle down’ effect, it at least provides this phenomenon with a sound theoretical basis. While not denying that revisionist visions of romanisation, such as that proposed by Webster, have their merits, I think their resolute dismissal of older models as missing the point might in some cases be too hasty. I hope to have shown above that there may be some theoretical foundation to models of emulative practices, which actually supports some contested assumptions such as the possibility or even likelihood of an elite-driven perspective of cultural change and adaptation.
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521 Mattingly 2002, 539.
522 Webster and others have in turn been criticised for their models of cultural change (see, for instance, Wallace-Hadrill 2008, 11, who states that the model of ‘creolisation’ proposed by Webster cannot be applied directly to the Roman context, since it is only partly analogous with the modern colonial situation from which the model is derived).
523 In agreement with Wallace-Hadrill’s statement that a top-down perspective on socio-political relations between Rome and local communities “is the product of Roman power structures, not of a failure in modern analysis” (Wallace-Hadrill 2008, 11).
Conclusion: playing the power game

Vast amounts of resources were invested in the late republican period in the transformation of cult places into imposing monumental building complexes. According to Wallace-Hadrill, “such widespread monumentalisation of local cults reflects an enormous investment in local religiosity and local pride which is in no way diminished by the existence of stylistic evocations of the east, or dependence on participation in Roman imperialism and constructional technique. It seems to cut across the distinctions between the urbanised and ‘non-cities’ areas: sanctuaries were the most potent physical embodiment of local beliefs and values”. Wallace-Hadrill seems to imply in this statement that the late republican ‘wave’ of monumentalisation of cult places in Italy has a particular and universal underlying sentiment: the desire for local self-expression. However, if we take the various contexts of the monumentalisation into account, it soon becomes apparent that such universal and rather on-sided tendencies are difficult to maintain. While it may be true for the monumentalisation of cult places in Samnite and Lucanian, and perhaps even Campanian territories, the case of Latium warrants a different approach, if only because of the fact that not only local communities were involved in the monumentalisation of sanctuaries there, but also members of the Roman elite. This means that to label monumentalisation as a ‘local’ or ‘regional’ phenomenon is to exclude the possibility of interpreting within a single framework the various manifestations of the monumentalisation of sanctuaries in Latium: the building projects could be communal or individual, undertaken by Latins or Romans, and before or after the Social War, the enfranchisement laws and the Sullan proscriptions. While there is no point in denying that all these sanctuaries fulfilled important local functions and certainly added to local prestige, I think it is wrong to highlight this ‘locality’ of monumentalisation at the expense of wider outlooks of some of the patrons involved in the process. We must recognise that sanctuaries could also be stakes in non-local socio-political games. By doing this, it is possible to construct a framework which is also able to bridge these supposed divisions.

Sanctuaries could function as a form of capital to be used to secure access to certain status groups and positions. “When gatekeepers reward cultural capital, they advance the careers of the socially dominant groups and set up class-linked barriers to the less privileged. Cultural capital is not, then, just a general resource available and valuable to everyone; it is largely the property of the existing elite”. While we have seen this principle to have been true for the Roman political system, privileging a limited number of powerful families disproportionately, it is also true that there were possibilities to enter the system and even attain dominant positions in it. However, the road to power was long and difficult, and some chose not to participate (self-exclusion), while others did not achieve what they set out to do (through overselection and relegation). It is obvious that not all local aristocrats coveted positions of power at Rome, yet were involved in the monumental building projects. However, this does not mean that their local perspective determined all choices made. The whole problem is the artificial divide created in modern research between local and Roman: they are in many ways interrelated.

525 Kingston 2001, 89.
Local civic magistracies could be used by some as a stepping stone for a political career in the Urbs, clearly showing a relationship between local and metropolitan politics. This mechanism perhaps also stands at the basis of the law granting citizenship to those who fulfilled certain local magistracies, the *ius adipiscendae ciuitatis Romanae per magistratum*, which would then have the goal of codifying an already widespread practice of local aristocrats who embarked upon political careers at Rome after fulfilling their civic duties to their community.\(^{526}\) The differences in approach to central Roman politics and the possibility of participation in it can thus be seen as a difference in field strategies pursued by different actors. Judging from their involvement in Roman politics in general and more specifically the way in which they pursued these political careers, many *domi nobiles* tried to achieve dominant position within the existing field, which itself was undergoing changes at the time.

Avoiding the total relativism of a case-by-case specific interpretation of individuals, we might therefore conclude that the socio-political context conditioning monumentalisation is region-specific. For Latium, this specific context must include the consideration of local and metropolitan perspectives. While the local importance of sanctuaries is an aspect of these monuments which should not be ignored, we cannot assume that the traditional close ties to the city of Rome and the political ambitions of some members the elites of the towns of Latium which transcended the local sphere did not play a significant role in the process. The addition of a ‘romanocentric’ element in my opinion offers far richer opportunities for the interpretation of the available evidence than the adoption of a purely local perspective. While matters of local pride may certainly have played a part in the monumentalisation of sanctuaries, the possibility to use such sanctuaries to stress the suitability of *domi nobiles* to participate in the central administration of the empire through the holding of (high) magistracies at Rome could have been an equally important factor. The interpretation of the monumentalisation process of sanctuaries of Latium in which the monuments can be seen as possible stakes in a socio-political game incorporating Rome as well as other communities allows us to explain specific characteristics of form, location and chronology within a single conceptual framework. In all probability, some Latins indeed felt themselves to be “if not Roman, then at least the next best thing”:\(^{527}\) They were part of a socio-political world centred on Rome as much as on their local communities, and they wished to underline this fact by the monumentalisation of sanctuaries.

\(^{526}\) Piper 1988; Mouritsen 1998, 99-108. It is interesting to note that in general, the passing of this law has been dated to the period immediately after 125, which would make it roughly contemporary with the start of the most intense period of building activity.

\(^{527}\) Sherwin-White 1973, 108
Chapter Three
SANCTUARIES IN LATIUM:
ARCHITECTURE AND ORNAMENTATION

The two previous chapters have been concerned mostly with general explanations for the phenomenon of monumentalisation. In these chapters, the question was asked why these sanctuaries were built on such a scale in the first place. This chapter will discuss the various changes and choices involved in the monumentalisation process with regard to architecture and ornamentation. After looking at the big picture, it is now time to zoom in on individual sanctuaries to examine how the monumental late republican phase came about and whether we can perhaps explain certain particular features of their design. I will also examine to what extent they can be considered to constitute a true typological group in an architectural sense; this notion of a standardised sanctuary type has become a trend in recent research, as was explained in the Introduction. It seems likely that the construction of a monumental sanctuary was a complex process involving many factors; there are perhaps earlier building phases the builders of the late republican monumental phase had to or wanted to take into consideration, existing structures surrounding the cult place, and the overall urban fabric of which many Latial sanctuaries formed a part. In short, there are a number of external factors influencing the design of the monumental sanctuaries, and in order to fully understand these building complexes we need to reconstruct these factors as completely as possible. In turn, we can examine the (visual) influence the monumental sanctuaries exerted on their surroundings when built. Although dominant visual positions had probably always been an important aspect of the placement of temples, in the late republican period the methods to shape and create such dominant positions had increased vastly in comparison to previous periods due to the use of concrete. This constitutes an important change in the relation between sanctuary and landscape, which must have affected other aspects of sanctuary design, such as the decoration. This chapter will explore these visual aspects of sanctuaries: the decisions made in the design process and the possible reasons behind them; the decoration of the sanctuary and the relation to its architecture; and finally their place in the visual culture of the Late Republic.

The act of monumentalisation: structural considerations

In order to correctly assess the visual impact of the monumentalisation process, we need to establish exactly what changed with respect to previous phases of sanctuaries. Were these monumental sanctuaries preceded by older religious structures, and if so, what form did these structures take? And if older structures did exist, can we ascertain if they were purposely incorporated in some way into the new design? Traditionalism, even archaism, has been pointed
out as an important aspect of Romano-Italic sacred architecture, which means that the way in which the new structure related to and dealt with the past is an interesting aspect of the transformation of cult places in the context of the monumentalisation process. Of course, whether earlier phases are attested or not, the wider surroundings of the sanctuary must be taken into account when explaining the monumental lay-out, especially in matters of overall dimensions and orientation. It is likely that in most cases, a combination of factors determined the general shape of the sanctuary, even if within that general shape there is still a considerable amount of room for manoeuvring and adjustment.

What comes before: earlier building phases

There are some sanctuaries that have not yielded any evidence for the existence of earlier religious structures on the site. While the sanctuary of Aesculapius at Fregellae, for instance, must have been in use as a cult site for at least one and a half century prior to the construction of the late republican monumental sanctuary, judging by the numerous votive terracottas found on the site, there are no archaeological indications that this earlier cult site was architecturally embellished. At the site of the extra-urban sanctuary of Tusculum, as of yet no remains predating the late republican monumental construction phases have been discovered, nor was any other material found proving the previous existence of a cult place at this location.

The systematic excavations undertaken from 1956 to 1969 at the sanctuary of Juno Gabina at Gabii by the Escuela Española de Historia y Arqueología en Roma brought to light many structures and material related to cult activity at the site predating the mid-second century monumental complex. The excavators have dated the beginning of the predominant use of the area as a cult site to the late sixth century, since the majority of the material dated to the preceding period can be related to a domestic or at least non-sacred context. The first sanctuary phase probably consisted of a systemisation of the area and possibly the construction of a sacellum, given the discovery of an archaic antefix dated to the end of the sixth century.
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529 Coarelli 1987a, 26-27.
530 The existence of a pre-monumental phase is suggested by Diana Gorostidi Pi and Raffaela Ribaldi, even though they admit that no clear evidence for an earlier phase exists (Gorostidi Pi/Ribaldi 2008, 84).
531 Almagro Gorbea 1982, 604-605.
century, although no other structural remains have been discovered. To a later phase in the cultic life of the sanctuary belong several structures excavated to the west of the late republican temenos area. Immediately to the north of the steps leading up to the entrance of the late republican temenos, a small cult area was discovered comprising several cippi, a votive deposit, a pothole and a possible sacellum (fig. 29). All these elements have a notably different orientation than the late republican monumental phase, and the fact that the temenos wall of the late republican monumental complex cuts through an angle of the structure indicates that we are dealing with an earlier phase. This is confirmed by the material contained in the votive deposit, dating to the third and early second century. The cult area was probably dedicated to Fortuna, given the fact that the cippi record dedications to this goddess, and the identity of one of the dedicants, a certain Oppius, seems to indicate the involvement of citizens of Praeneste in the cult activities at Gabii.533

The structures to the north of this cult area, with the same general orientation, also seem to be connected to the mid-republican phase of the sanctuary, although their function cannot be established with certainty.

Particularly interesting is a square pit dug into the bedrock immediately behind the podium of the late republican temple (fig. 30).534 The excavators have recognised three distinct phases, two of which have a different orientation than the surrounding late republican structures and seem to belong to an earlier phase, the first of which probably at the very beginning of the sanctuary, not later than the sixth century. While the orientation of each phase differs from the others, the pit continuously occupies more or less the same spot, on the central axis of the late republican temple. The pit has been connected to another pit located at a distance of 1.50 m to the north-west of the temple, which has the same orientation as one of the earlier phases of the pit on the
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533 Basas Faure in Almagro Gorbea 1982, 221-222; Coarelli 1987a, 13.
534 Almagro Gorbea 1982, 54-55, 606; Coarelli 1987a, 19; Coarelli 1993, 50-51.
central axis of the temple. The two pits have been interpreted as parts of an early ‘sacred garden’, predecessor of the regular system of pits of the late republican phase interpreted in a similar manner, which will be discussed below. Given the continuity of at least the centrally located pit, we are undoubtedly dealing with an especially revered and important feature of the sanctuary.

On Monte S. Angelo at Terracina, the only structural elements hinting at a possible architectural organisation of the cult area prior to the first late republican monumental phase are two polygonal walls that might be dated to the fourth or third century.\(^{535}\) One of the walls is situated immediately to the north of the stairs giving access to the large temple terrace associated with the second late republican monumental construction phase, while the second wall is placed immediately to the south of the substructures of this terrace. The walls observe the same general orientation as this terrace. It is probably safe to assume that these walls belong to an earlier phase of the sanctuary, but we are not able to say this with absolute certainty, especially considering new insights into the dating and use of polygonal walling in monumental architecture which suggest that the building technique was used next to opus caementicium well into the late republican period, with the choice for one technique or the other being determined by structural, or symbolic, considerations rather than demonstrating chronological differences.\(^{536}\) The sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia clearly demonstrates that polygonal walling could be used alongside opus incertum, and Lorenzo Quilici has pointed out that polygonal walling is used in conjunction with opus incertum in other parts of the sanctuary at Terracina and the defensive wall with towers connecting the sanctuary to the city.\(^{537}\) Quilici thus concludes that while at least one of the polygonal walls, located to the north of the access stairs, does belong to a prior phase, although not necessarily of the fourth or third century, it cannot be excluded that polygonal walling was used as some kind of base or facing for the great substructures forming the great temple terrace.\(^{538}\) Giorgio Gullini maintains that the opus caementicium used for the defensive wall, the larger part of the campo trincerato (the highest terrace on the Monte S. Angelo with defensive structures) and the structures of the piccolo tempio are all to be dated to the same construction phase in the second half of the third century, which would mean that a substantial monumental complex already existed from this period onwards. He bases this date on the fact that the only historical occasion which warranted such elaborate defensive measures was the Second Punic War, a statement refuted by other scholars.\(^{539}\)

At the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste hardly any structural traces of earlier building phases can be noticed, at least not on the surface levels of the complex. It has been suggested by Coarelli that the lowest part of the oracular pit on the terrazza degli emicicli must belong to an earlier phase of the sanctuary, since it is built in an opus quadratum technique with blocks of tufa instead of the opus incertum used for the rest of the sanctuary (fig. 31).\(^{540}\) Coarelli claims that the use of opus incertum for the higher part of the pit, on top of a part of
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the pit constructed in *opus quadratum*, would have weakened rather than strengthened the construction, thereby rejecting the explanation given for the difference in building technique by the excavators, who state that the lower part in tufa did function as a foundation for the higher part in *opus incertum*.\(^{541}\) Fasolo and Gullini claim that tufa was relatively more elastic than the naked bedrock, which would explain the use of tufa as some sort of dampening device to protect the upper concrete structure. If we accept Coarelli’s assertion that these layers of tufa belonged to an older incarnation of the oracular pit, these would be the only tangible remains of the earlier phase of the sanctuary incorporated into the new design. Although not implausible in itself (the oracle was probably one of the most important aspects of the sanctuary, closely related to the sanctuary’s claim to fame in the Mediterranean world), it is very little to go on, and it is impossible to determine the extent of this earlier phase on the basis of the pit alone. If Fasolo and Gullini are correct in their interpretation of the layers of tufa blocks as ‘shock absorbers’, there is no need to assume that they are the remains of an earlier building phase and necessarily predate the monumental complex. This would mean that there are no structural remains whatsoever pertaining to the pre-monumental phase of the sanctuary.

Elements of terracotta decoration, now in the collections of the Museo Nazionale Romano in Rome and the Museo Archeologico Nazionale Prenestino, have been attributed by Patrizio Pensabene to earlier phases of the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia.\(^{542}\) According to him, these architectural terracottas can be seen as evidence for building activities at the
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\(^{541}\) Fasolo/Gullini 1953, 148.


Fig. 31. The seat of the oracle at the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia (Praeneste). Clearly visible are the lower stretches of tufa blocks and the upper shaft in *opus incertum* (Fasolo/Gullini 1953, 153 Fig. 230).
site of the sanctuary of Fortuna in the middle and late republican period, even though no structural traces of pre-monumental buildings have been discovered. The earlier terracottas consist of cortine pendule, revetments plaques, simas and cresting, dated to the third century, and two different types of antefixes, one of the potnia theron type and one of the despotes theron type, dated to the fourth or third century and therefore perhaps chronologically homogenous with the other terracotta pieces. Rudolf Känel has challenged the Pensabene’s early date of these pieces, maintaining that a late second-century date is far more likely. If Känel’s proposed alterations of the dates of the pieces are correct, there would not be any solid evidence for a mid-republican building phase of the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia.

In the sanctuary of Hercules Victor at Tibur, some traces of earlier building activity have been discovered (fig. 32). In the theatre area, the remains of walls, built in opus quadratum in blocks of travertine, have been found that have been dated to the fourth century on the basis of the building technique used. The walls, discovered underneath the cavea, have been built in a different building technique than the rest of the monumental sanctuary and have a different orientation than the semicircular foundation walls of the cavea. Moreover,

---

543 Pensabene 2001, 94.
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the walls seem to have been cut through by the construction of the cavea at certain points. Excavations have brought to light remains of perpendicular walls branching off to each side of the westernmost wall. To the east of this first wall two other walls have been found with the same orientation, one of which displays a slight curve. The interpretation of these remains is somewhat problematic. We are certainly not dealing with walls relating to buildings, but rather with retaining walls, used to create one or more terraces. They could be related to an older phase of the sanctuary itself, thereby indicating either the presence of an earlier monumental structuring of the sacred area, even if the presence of these terracing walls do not necessarily imply the existence of actual buildings. On the other hand, the walls could have belonged to another form of systemisation of the area instead of to the cult place itself. Cairoli Fulvio Giuliani has suggested that the retaining walls could have been built to support the tract of a road connecting two of the principal entry routes into Tibur, which would perhaps account for the curve in one of the walls. While this does not preclude the existence of earlier building phases of the sanctuary itself, we have no other structural remains related to the cult place, and the absence of further attestations of an earlier religious site in the sanctuary area makes this impossible to prove.  

Material evidence for earlier building phases at the sanctuary of Diana at Nemi is relatively scanty, at least with regard to primary structural remains. The archaeological attestations of the two earliest phases of the sanctuary, a protohistoric and archaic phase, mostly consisting of votive material and sculptural remains, seem to imply a hypaethral cult site. Although no actual structural remains were discovered, the existence of an impressive mid-republican temple, possibly dating to the fourth or third century, has been deduced by scholars from terracotta temple models which supposedly depict this particular temple. Moreover, a range of terracotta sculpture belonging to the ornamentation of this particular temple has been discovered, dated on the basis of quality, technique and style to the years around 300. While fragmentary, the remaining elements of this decorative system reveal a richly and diversely ornamented temple roof. The pieces range from revetment plaques and antefixes to acroteria and the decoration belonging to the column and mutuli, and many of the pieces are of high artistic quality. While the decoration of the temple was completely replaced in the middle of the second century, including a new ‘fashionable’ closed pediment instead of column- and mutulus-plaques, we do not know if or to what degree this was accompanied by building activities. The fact that Vitruvius mentions that the temple of Diana Nemorensis has a transverse cella and the fact that none of the known examples of this temple type predate the second century, perhaps indicates that the new decorative phase accompanied the construction of a new temple with these particular architectural characteristics.

---

546 The nearby cult area at Acquoria, on the banks of the Aniene below the monumental sanctuary, has rich votive deposits and shows cultic continuity from the eight until the second century, yet cannot be meaningfully related to the sanctuary of Hercules. See also Chapter One.
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The construction phases preceding the late republican phase of the sanctuary of Juno Sospita at Lanuvium are relatively well known. The final phase of monumentalisation in the first century was the last of a series of five archaeologically attested construction phases at the site, spanning almost six centuries. The three earliest construction phases involve the temple building itself, while during the two later phases construction activities were undertaken in the wider area of the sanctuary precinct. The first sacred structure at the site consisted of a relatively simple oikos, dated to the mid-sixth century, of which a brief stretch of a foundation wall in small blocks of tufa with a south-western orientation remains. Some structures in peperino can be attributed to the second building phase, which consisted of a temple in Tuscanic style which was notably larger in scale than the preceding oikos. The temple had a western orientation and some structures in peperino can be attributed to this building phase. In a favissa near the temple some architectural terracottas were found on the basis of which it has been possible to date the temple to the end of the sixth century. In the mid-republican period, probably at the end of the fourth century, a new temple was constructed on top of the late-archaic one, of which roughly two thirds of the foundation walls still remain. No other building activities have been attested archaeologically until the first century.

We can observe that, in general, evidence for earlier building phases on the sites of monumental sanctuaries varies widely. In two cases, Fregellae and Tusculum, it is absent altogether. Of other sanctuaries, such as Terracina and Tibur, the evidence is ambiguous or chronologically suspect: the remains that have been unearthed may pertain to an organisation of the area not necessarily related to the cult place, or may be closer in date to, or even contemporaneous with, the monumental phase of the sanctuary. This last point is also valid for the sanctuary at Praeneste as far as architectural remains are concerned, while terracotta decoration that had been said to belong to earlier phases has now been dated to the late republican monumental phase. At Nemi, we do have firm evidence for earlier building phases in the form of terracotta decorations which must have adorned the structures pertaining to these phases on the site. Although it is virtually impossible to tell anything about the general appearance of the sanctuary on the basis of this material, we can at least be sure that there were actual sacred structures. Only at Gabii and Lanuvium do we have actual structural remains related to earlier phases of the sanctuary. Although these by no means present a complete picture, it is a lot more than we have for the other sanctuaries, where we have to rely on educated guesswork in order to say anything meaningful about the monumental sanctuaries’ predecessors.

**Incorporation of earlier phases in the monumental design**

It is interesting to determine to what extent elements of previous structural phases were incorporated into the design of the late republican monumental phase of the sanctuaries, since this tells us something about the kind of choices that were made by the designers. Were parts of the earlier sanctuary deliberately preserved, and does this indicate that these features were

considered important or even essential for the functioning of the sanctuary as a whole? These elements, which we can perhaps call ‘survivals’, should perhaps be connected to the inherent traditionalism and viscosity of religious architecture which has often been stressed by architectural historians. While the idea is mostly confined to the architecture of temples, it is perhaps also true for sanctuaries as a whole. Of course, the location itself could be (historically) significant: the monumentalisation of a (known) cult place has far-reaching implications: the place that has held a certain religious significance to a certain group of people for a longer period of time, with or without monumental structures, is now transformed into an important visual marker in the landscape.

One of the most straightforward examples of the incorporation of earlier building phases can be found at the sanctuary of Juno Sospita at Lanuvium. There, the mid-republican temple was left standing, perhaps redecorated to a certain extent, a subject to which I shall return below, but effectively unaltered in a structural sense. Other aspects of the sanctuary belonging to earlier phases, such as the pylons on both sides of the road leading to the sanctuary just to the west of the temple, were probably also retained in the new monumental phase. Basically, this phase consisted of add-ons: rather than altering earlier structural elements in order to fit into a monumental design, new structures were added to the sanctuary area, which was thus enlarged and monumentalised in an organic way.

Examples of the visible incorporation of earlier construction phases of the sanctuary would be those where the design of the sanctuary was visibly altered to accommodate some, presumably older, structure. In other words: where a seemingly illogical or perhaps less ‘aesthetically pleasing’ structural solution was employed to include some elements that were deemed significant enough to encapsulate in the overall design and thus monumentalise. However, in the only case where this would seem to be the case, the sanctuary of Juno Gabina, we are dealing with a later addition to the sanctuary, according to the excavators. In the southeastern corner of the temenos area, the strict axially of the design is compromised: the wall is placed outward, creating a corner where the remains of a small structure in lapis gabinus have been discovered (fig. 33). Because this structure is built on top of a paved area, from which a
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paved path runs to the front of the temple podium, the excavators have concluded that the structure must at least be later in date than this path. There are no convincing grounds to conclude that this paved area and the path to the temple must be contemporaneous with the phase of monumental restructuring of the sanctuary, since there are no technical characteristics on the basis of which the paving can be dated. The differences in orientation are obvious, and the length of the path could have been manipulated in order to fit with the new temple. Can this paved area and the structure built on top of it, possibly the lower part of an altar, be remnants of earlier phases of the sanctuary? If this was the case, the awkward extension of the temenos area can be explained by the desire to include within the enclosure of the monumental sanctuary an earlier structure, which perhaps had a special cultic significance. The paved road running along this side of the sanctuary connecting the road along the shore of the lake to the via Prenestina is an important feature, since it takes this extension of the temenos area into consideration: if the road was constructed here during the late republican monumental phase, it would mean that the extension of the precinct disrupting its perfect axial symmetry was done at the time of monumentalisation, hinting at the desire to incorporate some earlier feature, whatever that may have been. The absence of other stratigraphical data and the concise description of this particular part of the sanctuary in the final excavation publication do not allow us to establish a clear chronological sequence. We therefore cannot do anything other than observing that this part of the sanctuary is remarkable given the strict axiology and regularity of its general ground plan, and that further research and perhaps excavation of this area would give us important insights in the religious life of the complex and the factors influencing the design of the monumental complex.

Although the example from Gabii is perhaps the clearest example of something happening on a structural level, either during the construction of the monumental sanctuary or afterwards, affecting the regularity of the ground plan, there are perhaps some indications that such alterations to the design of the monumental complex were also made in other sanctuaries. In its final monumental phase, a temple was constructed on the great terrace of the sanctuary on Monte S. Angelo at Terracina. The temple and the portico behind it, belonging to the same construction phase, were oriented differently than the previous monumental phase of the complex, associated with the remains of the piccolo tempio. A low wall enclosing a natural rock protruding from the ground to the east of the temple, associated with the sanctuary’s oracular function, does not follow the orientation of temple and portico, but rather that of the terrace of the piccolo tempio and the larger terrace. An enclosure wall for the oracular area was constructed that did follow the orientation of temple and portico, thereby visually associating the oracle area with these structures (fig. 34). This interplay of different orientations on the same terrace is slightly confounding. While it is obviously imprudent to use only the orientation of structures to demonstrate contemporaneity between them, the difference between the orientations of the temple, porticus and enclosure wall and the wall around the ‘oracular rock’

556 Almagro Gorbea 1982, 58.
557 This explanation for the awkward angle in the temenos area is suggested by Coarelli (Coarelli 1987a, 16).
558 Although, as has been noted in Chapter Two, Lorenzo Quilici has recently cast doubt on the identification of the piccolo tempio as an independent cult area and its traditional date in the second half of the second century (Quilici 2005, 278-279).
559 Borsari 1894, 103-104; Coarelli 1987a, 119.
perhaps does signify a chronological difference, with the latter then probably earlier in date. The wall was not broken down and rebuilt to follow the orientation of the new temple, thereby clearly setting it apart visually. Perhaps the original wall around the rock was left intact to signify that it had been part of the sanctuary for a longer period of time, thereby underscoring its age and venerability. However, since the oracle was an attractive, even necessary feature of
the sanctuary, it was also necessary to include it visually in the new set-up of the complex. So, the oracle site and its connection to the overall design of the last monumental phase of the sanctuary is somewhat ambiguous: it is set apart by its differing orientation and at the same time included in the new design by the new enclosure wall. While this may seem to be pure guess-work it indicates, as in the case of Gabii, that there are many chronological problems and uncertainties which cannot be simply glossed over when discussing the successive phases of the sanctuary.

While the underlying reasons remain elusive, the cases of Gabii and Terracina are two of the clearest examples in which we can see that design has been altered or that certain elements of the same complex seem to ‘clash’, thereby alerting us to the possibility that some, perhaps significant, choice was made when designing the monumental complex. However, more subtle or even invisible signs can also indicate that the past did have an effect on the present. Again, a clear example of this is found at Gabii, where a single feature arguably determined the lay-out of the entire complex. The already mentioned pit, interpreted as an earlier feature of the sanctuary which was carefully preserved for centuries, is perfectly aligned with the central temple axis and is equidistant from the western and eastern lateral porticos.\textsuperscript{560} This centrality of the pit is certainly too conspicuous to be purely coincidental, and must therefore be interpreted as an important, or even the most important, feature determining the monumental design.

In the previous section, mention has been made of the pit interpreted as the seat of the oracle on the eastern part of the \textit{terrazza degli emicicli} of the sanctuary of Praeneste, which would be the only structural indication of an earlier phase of the sanctuary. If this is correct, we are dealing with an important cultic element, central to the religious function of the sanctuary as a whole, and important in the establishment of the general dimensions and shape of the monumental sanctuary, although its influence on particular details of its design of the is probably limited, as will be shown below.

These last cases are examples of the earlier phase of the sanctuary determining or influencing the lay-out of the entire new monumental complex, though without careful studying of the plan and its measurements, this would not have been obvious to those visiting the sanctuary. The earlier elements have been incorporated into the new design in a ‘natural’ way, forming a harmonious instead of a dissonant element of the whole. In short, there are three basic ways of encountering the past in the monumental sanctuaries of Latium. The first one is connected to the original location of the cult place only, and leaves little, if any, trace in the overall design of the monumental complex. Arguably, this is true for all Latial sanctuaries even if some sanctuaries have not yet yielded any evidence of their prior existence as a cult place (Tusculum and Tibur). The second one is the clearly visible, ‘dissonant’ type where striking adjustments have been made to the design in order to incorporate certain older elements (Gabii), or where different phases within the same complex are clearly ‘at odds’ with each other (Terracina). The third and last category does (probably) incorporate older elements into the new design, but in such a way that it is difficult, or even impossible, to distinguish old from new (Gabii and

\textsuperscript{560} \textbf{Almagro Górra} 1982, 55. In addition, the pit seems to be located at the approximate centre of the area enclosed by the \textit{porticus triplex}, i.e. the \textit{temenos} area north of the area centred on the altar.
Influences on the monumental framework

Based on the previous sections, it will be obvious that in general, earlier building phases did not play a particularly influential role in the realisation of the monumental building design, or we simply cannot establish that they did. However, other consideration may have been important in establishing the shape of the sanctuary. Characteristics such as general dimensions and orientation of sanctuaries and temples, perhaps in some cases determined by ritual conventions, can likely be explained by examining the situational context of the sanctuary. Of course, given the fact that this context in some cases is not well known, the following

---

564 Examining the orientation of Roman temples, it is difficult to establish a general ritual rule for temple orientations, contrary to Greek temples (Aveni/Romano 1994, 546 figure 1). The orientation of Etruscan temples seems to have been determined by ritual as well, or at least to a great extent (Stevens 2009, esp. 161-162).
considerations will necessarily have a provisional character, suggesting factors which likely or possibly had an influence on the monumental design.

There are at least two sanctuaries which can be said to have developed on the drawing table. While in both cases it is likely that earlier phases of the sanctuary played an important role as ‘anchor points’ for the monumental design, the rest of it seems to have been designed using mathematical principles. The clearest example may well be Gabii, where such mathematical operations have been demonstrated for the temple building and a system of pits around the temple building, both of which will be discussed below. The pit located to the north of the temple podium, belonging to an earlier phase of the sanctuary, seems to be the central point from which the sanctuary, or at least the part surrounded by the porticus triplex, was laid out: it determines the central axis of the temple building, the ground plan of which is further determined by Pythagorean mathematics, with the application of a standard module of 10 Roman feet (fig. 35). Mirroring the length of the temple in the back podium wall gives us the approximate length of the open court, while the width of the open court is roughly equal to twice the length of the temple (160 feet). The length of the altar area is equal to the width of the temple building (60 feet), suggesting that the same modular system underlying the temple design was used, at least partly, to determine the extent of the sanctuary’s open spaces. The general dimensions of the portico also adhere to the modular system, the lateral wings having a width of 30 feet (3 modules) and the northern central section of 20 feet (2 modules). The dimensions of the tabernae contained in the lateral wings of the portico were determined by dividing the space in half lengthwise, giving a measurement of 15 feet, which was used for both length and width of the tabernae. The absence of tabernae in the northern section of the portico and its width of 20 instead of 30 feet is probably related to the fact that a road ran outside the sanctuary to this side, and the presence of the Lacus Gabinus to the northwest limited the available space. It is probable that the road was relocated to the northwest in any case due to the construction of the late republican sanctuary, since the western corner of the sanctuary covers an older stretch of road. This indicates that the mathematical principles of the design were rather rigorously applied, and that certain features, such as this road, had to make way for the calculated design as envisioned by the architect. Since the whole building complex assumed a different orientation than that shown by earlier phases of the sanctuary, it is likely that the via Flaminia, probably constructed in the late third or the second century and running in front of the sanctuary, determined the new orientation of the entire complex.

A second example of a sanctuary determined, at least to some extent, by the application of a modular design grid is that of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste. Coarelli and others have claimed that the original sanctuary displayed a cultic bipolarity, with the two poles being the aedes itself and the oracle. If we accept this theory, it will become clear that these two locations were the principal points to take into consideration when determining the lay-out of the new sanctuary if the object was to unite them into a single architectural framework as

563 Almagro Gorbea 1982, 51, 610.
565 For this idea of the ‘bipolarity’ of the cult place of Fortuna Primigenia, see Kahler 1958, 241-243; Coarelli 1987a, 72-74.
has been suggested.\textsuperscript{566} The position of the \textit{aedes} was probably taken as a starting point and the position of the oracular pit as a second important focal point. With these two fixed points in mind, Coarelli has argued that a regular grid can be superimposed on the ground plan of the sanctuary (\textit{fig. 36}).\textsuperscript{567} Within this grid, a strict axial symmetry was observed, thereby placing emphasis on the central axis of the sanctuary. These three elements - the \textit{aedes}, a regular grid and observance of axial symmetry - determined the distribution of spaces within the general dimensions of the sanctuary as a whole, which leaves the question of orientation. What was used to ‘direct’ the central axis of the sanctuary? If we look at the relationship of the sanctuary

\textsuperscript{566} Of course, it must be remembered that there are no architectural remains of earlier phases of the \textit{aedes}.

\textsuperscript{567} Coarelli 1987a, 42-44 and \textit{fig. 12}.
with the rest of the city, we note that the sanctuary more or less follows the orientation of the street grid of the city, or at least seems to be oriented on the urban plateau in general (fig. 19). Since it can be suggested that the sanctuary was planned as the final project of a phase of urbanistic restructuring involving the entire city, this hardly seems surprising.\(^{568}\) It has also been suggested that cultic considerations determined the specific orientation of the sanctuary; the central axis of the sanctuary would point in the direction of Antium. This town could have been Praeneste’s ancient harbour and, more importantly, was the site of a Fortuna cult with strong links to the Praenestine cult.\(^{569}\) The orientation of the sanctuary would thus underline the cultic relationship between the two towns and sanctuaries.\(^{570}\) However, by extending the central axis of the sanctuary we do not end up at Antium, but closer to the mouth of the Astura river, perhaps making this explanation of the orientation of the sanctuary less likely. Another possibility is that the orientation of the sanctuary was chosen for a specific effect involving the landscape. Looking out towards the valley standing on the central axis on the piazza della cortina and even more so in the centre of the cavea, the double colonnade of the central court seems to frame a symmetric landscape, with the Monti Lepini and Colli Albani each to one side (fig. 37). The symmetric composition of the landscape as framed by the architecture of the sanctuary thus emphasises the symmetry of the sanctuary itself, undoubtedly a visual effect intended by its builders.

With the orientation established, we need to determine the modular system used to shape the various parts of the sanctuary. Although the perfect modular fit of virtually all parts of the building is perhaps an oversimplification, this does not mean that a basic modular idea did not stand at the basis of the design of the sanctuary. The grid does seem to fit the actual remains reasonably well (fig. 38), while practical difficulties during construction could have necessitated adjustments.\(^{571}\) According to Coarelli the point of departure was constituted by the terrazza degli emicicli, since it measures exactly 400 feet from one end to the other, which is equal to the length of the central axis of the sanctuary from the aedes to the edge of the third terrace, the terrace on which the sanctuary proper begins.\(^{572}\) I rather think the distance between aedes and oracle was the decisive factor, since inclusion of both cultic elements was paramount to the

---

\(^{568}\) Quilici 1980; Quilici 1989.

\(^{569}\) Brendel 1960; Coarelli 1987a, 74-79 Riemann 1987, esp. 139-140; Riemann 1988.

\(^{570}\) Coarelli 1987a, 78-79.

\(^{571}\) Several of the most important measurements do seem to fit ‘perfectly’ in the modular system, such as the dimensions of the aedes (foundations and narrow free space around it), the cavea, the centres of the hemicycles, and the width of the entire complex (the terrazza degli emicicli, the piazza della cortina including external ramps).

\(^{572}\) Coarelli 1987a, 43.
design of the monumental sanctuary, and there are no other features on the terrazza degli emicicli that would explain why this exact measurement was used. While it was not exactly 400 feet, the distance between aedes and oracle could easily have been extended towards the nearest, most convenient round number. Once the general dimensions of the grid were established, application and multiplication of a basic module of 25 feet (approximately the radius of the aedes) and the observance of axial symmetry in individual parts of the sanctuary determined the final design of the ground plan and partly of the elevation.\footnote{Coarelli 1987a, 42-44, fig. 12 (ground plan), 44-45, fig. 13 (elevation). We can observe, for instance, that the centre of the axial staircase and the centres of both hemicycles on the terrazza degli emicicli divide this terrace into four equal parts measuring 100 feet each.} It is interesting to note that the oracular pit was not placed in the geometrical centre of the eastern hemicycle, where instead

---

\textbf{Fig. 38.} Grid of squares measuring 25 x 25 feet superimposed on reconstructed remains of the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste (adapted from Kähler 1958, Plan 1).
a statue was placed. The centre of the pit is located on an imaginary circle encompassing the colonnade of the hemicycle, suggesting that while dimensions were manipulated in order to fit certain elements into a geometric pattern, the overarching modular system and the axial symmetry of individual parts of the sanctuary was more important than placing the oracular tholos in the geometric centre of the terrace. In any case, its slightly eccentric placement was probably not unwelcome, since it could have served to indicate that it existed before the monumental sanctuary and thus highlight its antiquity and venerability. The progressive compression of space in both the ground plan and the elevation which can be observed for at least the higher terraces required a final vanishing point, which was without question constituted by the aedes, underlining its importance in the genesis of the entire design.

The application of mathematical principles on a single feature of the sanctuary as a point of departure in order to arrive at the monumental design is an example of intangible factors influencing the design. While tangible factors may have determined the orientation and may also have played a role in determining the final outcome when adjustments had to be made, the reconstruction of the mathematical procedures applied remains a question of projection of probabilities on the design, and cannot be absolutely proven. In the two cases above, the regularities are perhaps too strong to be purely coincidental, making it credible that a modular design was indeed used. In other cases where such regularities cannot be observed, we are dependent on an analysis of the natural and built landscape in which the sanctuary was placed to determine possible factors influencing the design.

Given the strong axial symmetry of its ground plan as reconstructed, and the fact that no structural remains of earlier buildings phases seem to have conditioned the design, the sanctuary of Aesculapius at Fregellae would appear to be an ideal candidate for a modular design scheme. However, the deplorable state of preservation of most parts of the building and in particular the temple building makes it impossible to establish if this was the case with certainty. From the preserved remains, only limited observations about regularities in the ground plan can be made. If we divide the cella into thee equal parts in both length and width, the columns of the lateral porticos would align with the posterior third of the cella length. It likewise appears from the plans of the remains that the width of the temple is equal to the length of the lateral portico excluding the rooms which adjoined the lateral wings of the porticoes, again implying a division into three equal parts. The parts of the portico attached to the temple building also seems to display some regularities, with the diameter of the column bases, 0.52 m, being used as a basic module, although application of this scheme only produces round numbers for certain dimensions. While some degree of regularity can thus be observed, we cannot establish a master plan with a common module applicable to the sanctuary as a whole. The general orientation of the complex seems to have been determined by its visibility from the urban area, while the dimensions of the complex, measuring about 62 x 23 m, seem to have been chosen to maximise the available space on the hill given said orientation.

574 Coarelli 1987a, 45.
575 Lippolis in Coarelli 1986, 35.
576 Coarelli 1987a, 28.
577 Lippolis in Coarelli 1986, 37.
The general shape of the sanctuary of Hercules Victor was also influenced by a number of circumstances related to the characteristics of the landscape and the desired visual impact of the complex. The most important factor was undoubtedly the presence of the via Tiburtina, the most important approach to the city from Rome (fig. 39). The first step in the shaping of the late republican sanctuary must have been the decision to include the stretch of this road in the building complex itself as a via tecta. If we accept the fact that, although no material evidence has been found to prove it, the cult place of Hercules had existed in this place for some time, and that the rebuilding of the sanctuary had to attain certain dimensions in order to have the desired visual impact, the necessity of including the via Tiburtina becomes obvious: this was the only area which was flat enough to accommodate the sanctuary in its monumental form, and moreover seems to have been one of last relatively flat places before the steeper ascents into the Apennines, making it an ideal resting place and thus attractive to visitors.

The general orientation of the sanctuary, just south of due west, was then determined by two factors: the fact that it had to face those travelling to Tibur on the via Tiburtina, and

---

578 Giuliani 2004, 32.
the limitations imposed on the extent of the sanctuary by the surrounding landscape. To the southeast of the sanctuary, another access road to Tibur was located, which probably limited the extension of the monumental complex to this side, since the nature of the terrain on this side would have made it difficult to incorporate this road in the sanctuary as well.\textsuperscript{580} The terrain climbs rather steeply to the east of the sanctuary, which limits the available space, or would have required cutting back the bedrock even more extensively. To the north of the sanctuary the gorge of the Aniene river is located, which means that the terrain falls off sharply in this direction which means that extension to this side would be limited as well. The orientation that was chosen for the sanctuary ensures a maximum amount of relatively level ground to build the sanctuary on. Because of these limitations imposed by the accidentation of the terrain the route of the via Tiburtina could not be altered greatly to fit into the complex,\textsuperscript{581} although the part of the road incorporated as a \textit{via tecta} was probably significantly lowered.\textsuperscript{582} In contrast to the road to the north of the sanctuary of Gabii which was diverted to make room for the monumental complex, here we clearly have a case of a pre-existing stretch of road conditioning the design of the sanctuary instead of the other way around. The orientation and extent of the sanctuary were thus determined by the presence of the via Tiburtina, a second access road and

\textsuperscript{580} Coarelli 1987a, 91.

\textsuperscript{581} The via Tiburtina, like many ancient roads, follows the optimum route considering the relief in the surrounding terrain, avoiding ascents which are too steep.

\textsuperscript{582} See the section on substructures and terracing below.
the natural terrain; the optimal spatial solution was chosen given these constraints in order to maximise the surface area of the building complex.

The presence of an important access road to the city coupled to the steepness of the surrounding terrain probably determined the general orientation and lay-out of the extra-urban sanctuary of Tusculum as well. The terrace of the sanctuary is built more or less perpendicular to the natural slope of the hill, and directly faces the access road leading up from the valley towards the western gate of the city (fig. 40). The last stretch of the road actually goes all the way around the sanctuary before reaching the city gate, thereby continually confronting visitors to the city with the monument. If the last stretch of the road, running behind the sanctuary terrace, was not altered, we can assume that it determined the maximum extent of this terrace towards the northeast: extending it further would have meant moving the road in that direction as well. If we look at the modern height contours of the area of the sanctuary, we can notice that the two earliest phases of the sanctuary are contained within two successive contours, and that the front of the later extension of the sanctuary area coincides with the next, lower contour. This suggests, assuming that the modern slope coincides more or less with the ancient one, that the natural slope of the terrain imposed limits to the area which could be occupied by the sanctuary.

The difficulties posed by the natural terrain must have influenced the design of the sanctuary at Terracina. Given the steep slopes of the cliff on which the sanctuary is built, the extent of the terraces was limited, and in each case required a substantial amount of natural bedrock to build the substructures against, as well as providing enough support for the structures built on top of them. The orientation and placement of the terraces seems to have been determined at least partly by the location of the urban area of Terracina and the panoramic possibilities with respect to the plains on either side of the Monte S. Angelo; the main temple terrace was not built at the summit of the cliff, since this would have rendered it invisible from the city itself, and it also seems to have been placed in a position to ensure maximum visibility, both from the sanctuary itself towards the plains and vice versa. In addition, the main terrace directly faced the approach to the harbour of Terracina from the Tyrrhenian Sea, a unique feature of this particular sanctuary (fig. 41). This visibility factor was apparently less important for the placement of the terrace of the piccolo tempio; while oriented towards the urban area, it would have only been visible from the area west of the Monte S. Angelo, since the area to the east would have been blocked from view by the summit of the cliff.

The visibility factor was also an important factor in determining the orientation of the sanctuary at Nemi. It faces the lake itself, which was obviously important for the view from within the sanctuary itself. It also faces the stretch of the via Appia running along the edge of the volcanic crater of which the lake forms the centre, as well as the town of Cynthianum (Genzano di Roma). From there, the via Virbia branched off from the via Appia towards the lake shore and ultimately the sanctuary itself. The sanctuary thus directly faced the point of the via Appia from which it could be reached directly. Since we cannot establish if earlier phases were important in determining the orientation of the sanctuary, this explanation which takes into account important features of the natural landscape and infrastructure seems plausible.
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583 BORSARI 1894, 105.
There are no features which can help us determine why the particular dimensions of the sanctuary were chosen. Because the area rises steeply to the east of the sanctuary, this may have limited its extension to this side, but it could have been extended further in western direction, where the theatre was later built. Perhaps earlier phases again played a role here, but we cannot be certain.

The sanctuary at Lanuvium seems to have developed rather ‘organically’. It is in some ways delimited by structures on most sides, but these structures belong to different phases.
of the sanctuary; each new phase of the sanctuary was added onto earlier ones. The area occupied by the sanctuary follows the natural terrain closely: little attempt was made to enlarge it or change its characteristics. While the temple building faces the road running in front of it, it is not exactly aligned with it, nor are other structures of the sanctuary except for those directly associated with it such as a gate building and the pylons of a supposed arch spanning the road. The orientation of the different parts of the sanctuary, especially the temple and the late republican portico, seems to have been primarily determined by its visibility from a distance. The dominant façade of the late republican sanctuary and the front of the temple seem to suggest that it was built with an approach from the west in mind, where the important road connecting Lanuvium with Ardea was located (fig. 42). The importance of this road in the republican period seems to be confirmed by the large number of tombs from that period flanking it, just outside the urban area.\footnote{CHIARUCCI 1983, 222-223 (road), 245 (necropolis). This particular burial area seems to have been the main necropolis of the city during the republican period.}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{sanctuary_map}
\caption{Position of sanctuary of Iuno Sospita at Lanuvium (square) with respect to features of the urban landscape. Left a representation of functional areas, right the actual remains (adapted from CHIARUCCI 1983, Tavv. XLII, XLIII).}
\end{figure}
Planning with an eye to viewing

Having established the possible predecessors of the late republican sanctuaries, the influence these earlier phases had on the monumental design and the effect of other factors, it is easy to see why scenography has been seen as a key characteristic of this group of sanctuaries. All sanctuaries can be said to have been built with their visual impact in the landscape in mind, and were clearly meant to be seen and attract the eye from the distance. This is especially clear in those instances where the orientation of the sanctuary clearly takes account of important roads in the vicinity. The sanctuaries of Gabii, Tusculum, Nemi, Tibur and Lanuvium all seem to have been placed so as to confront travellers, with Tibur perhaps the most extreme case by the incorporation of a road into the sanctuary itself. Other sanctuaries seem to have been built with their visibility from the urban area in mind. The sanctuary at Fregellae was oriented towards the urban plateau, and the sanctuary of Praeneste was probably built as the visual conclusion to the urban plateau and must have been visible from all parts of it. The last phase of the sanctuary on Monte S. Angelo at Terracina was also designed with the view from the town itself in mind, and the design seems to have been intent on maximising the visibility of the sanctuary from the far distance to both sides along the coast as well. Perhaps more importantly, the sanctuary also commanded a splendid view from the sea; while most other sanctuaries visually confronted the travellers on the roads, at Terracina the travellers by sea were emphatically included among the targeted audience of the first-century monumental sanctuary. While the building of temples and cult places on visually dominant locations was certainly not a new development, the sanctuaries of Latium are innovative in the sense that a lot of effort was made to compose the entire image of the sanctuary; we are not dealing with single temples, but with building complexes. The entire architectural mass was taken into account, thereby expanding the visual impact of the sanctuary.

It is also interesting that this view planning was for the most part concentrated on long-distance viewing over land and, in the case of Terracina, over sea as well. In virtually every case, the sanctuary as a whole architectural unit could only be grasped from afar; the closer one gets to the sanctuary, the less clear the relationship between the different architectural parts constituting the sanctuary becomes. Once inside, only rarely does the architecture of the sanctuary provide a synthetical image. The framed landscape of the highest terraces of the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia (fig. 37) is perhaps the only example of architecture actively directing the view. But even at Praeneste, as in other sanctuaries, the general rule is that once the visitor entered the sanctuary, the visual effect was moving from an organic whole to an experience of more or less separate, constituent parts. We must bear in mind that this aspect, the (intentionally) confusing internal ordering of spaces, was one of the main elements of the interpretation of the sanctuary at Praeneste as an example of Gegenarchitektur in Chapter Two. The general lack of central, monumental entrances to the sanctuaries may be interpreted in this light. What mattered was the distant view, the image of the sanctuary as a carefully composed element in the landscape, while the lateral entrances, guiding the visitor to a place in medias res, as it were, seem to abandon many of these unifying viewing principles.
Recurring architectural themes

We have established that the past and the present could have a profound influence on the way a monumental sanctuary is shaped, with the emphasis perhaps on the present. Within this shaped space, we encounter certain ‘standard’ features, elements which could be inserted in the general design framework, which were used for the establishment of the typology of Latial monumental sanctuaries as presented above in the Introduction. They include the use of substructions to create artificial terraces on which to build structures, the temple building itself, the inclusion of theatres or theatre-shaped structures in the monumental design, the existence of ‘sacred gardens’ or ‘sacred woods’ in the temenos area, and finally the use of colonnades in the monumental design. I will examine if these specific features were present in each monumental Latial sanctuary, and if so, how they were used to shape space. Finally, we will hopefully be able to establish to what extent we should regard the group of Latial monumental sanctuaries as a true and distinct sanctuary type, and thus see if there is justification in the extrapolation of structural features from one sanctuary to the other on the basis of inclusion within this sanctuary type, which often seems to be the case in scientific literature on Latial sanctuaries.

Substructures and terracing

In the literature on the monumental sanctuaries of Latium, perhaps the characteristic most often recounted aspect is the way in which the natural context of the sanctuary is transformed to create a specific scenographical effect. The use of substructures to create artificial terraces is apparently so defining that the Latial sanctuaries, or rather the specific typology of sanctuaries to which they are deemed to belong, have often simply been called terrace sanctuaries. While this terracing has often been seen as yet another example of Hellenistic influences on Italic architecture, Giorgio Gullini retains that the creation of terraces is an ‘instinctive’ reaction to accidentated terrain caused by human activities, especially agriculture, which subsequently becomes an architectural typology. The development of terracing in especially the second century should then be explained by the ‘happy union’ of this instinctive desire to order the landscape, done in previous periods with polygonal walling, to the technological advances in the use of caementa in large-scale architecture.

It is interesting to note that although terracing is considered a key characteristic of late republican monumental sanctuaries, the two earliest sanctuaries at Fregellae and Gabii display little or no signs of terracing, at least in the sense of creating platforms using retaining walls. While the remains of a wall have been found suggesting terracing on a lower level, although not necessarily related to the sanctuary as a built unit, the nucleus of structures forming the sanctuary of Aesculapius have been built on a natural location, which as far as we can tell was not altered to accommodate the sanctuary. At Gabii, there is evidence for the alteration of the

586 Gullini 1983, 123-124. Gullini states that this architectural typology, in Late Classical and Hellenistic architecture is used primarily for urbanistic interventions.
natural terrain, since the eastern part of the sanctuary was partially cut into the bedrock. There are thus no constructed terraces, but the natural terrain was transformed to create the necessary level building ground for the sanctuary, thereby probably also erasing traces of earlier phases in this area. While the sanctuary of Fregellae is inserted into the surrounding, natural terrain, in Gabii the terrain is adapted to the sanctuary, transforming it to create certain visual effects. These two forms of dealing with the natural surroundings, adaptation to and transformation of the surrounding terrain, are encountered in all sanctuaries built subsequently.

The requisite terraces needed for the construction of buildings at the sanctuaries at Tusculum, Praeneste, and Lanuvium all seem to have been created by following the natural slope of the terrain. While clearly changing it from a natural landscape into a built, artificial landscape, if we would remove the constructed layers the underlying terrain would appear more or less intact. All three successive phases of the sanctuary at Tusculum seem to have used the sloping landscape in this way; there is no evidence that the bedrock was cut back heavily to level the ground. The first terrace was relatively simple, consisting of a retaining wall in opus incertum to the front of the terrace. The second phase did little to alter this, adding some rooms to the northwest of this original platform. Only with the third and final phase did the
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588 Almagro Gorbea 1982, 610, 611.
terracing become technically demanding, with extensive vaulted substruction placed in front of the original terraces, thereby almost doubling the surface area of the terrace.

The sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia is certainly the most splendid example of the transformation of nature into culture while making use of the natural slope of the Monte Ginestro. As Fasolo and Gullini have demonstrated, the concrete substruction walls were extended until they rested on the bedrock, which in some cases is a considerable height (fig. 43).\(^{589}\) The choice for the construction of seven different terraces is probably the result of the desire of the architect to keep the steepness of the ascent under control and provide places of rest for those ascending, as well as providing sufficient support for the structures placed on top of the substructions. Observing the sections of the sanctuary, we can note that the slope of the built mass of the sanctuary is considerably less steep than the natural slope of the Monte Ginestro.\(^{590}\) More importantly, it provides seven plateaus which can be reached one at a time instead of having to climb continuously to the position of the *aedes*, while exploiting these flat surfaces functionally: each terrace seems to have its specific character, a functional differentiation within the building complex which is made visible by the level of physical self-containment of each terrace.

At the sanctuary of Lanuvium, the late republican monumental phase actually changes little with regard to available building space or the exploitation of this space. During this phase, the sanctuary occupied two promontories of the Colle S. Lorenzo. A road runs to the top of the hill in between these promontories, effectively dividing the sanctuary in two. A long and narrow terrace, as well as a long retaining wall, were built to the back of the temple building along the south-eastern slope of the hill. The exact function of these substructions is unclear, but they seem to have been built primarily to buttress this part of the hillside without creating more building space. The great two-storeyed portico to the northwest of the sanctuary, the most important structure of the late republican building phase, likewise follows the natural contours of the hill, framing an already existing natural plateau to this side of the road. While it is probable that this plateau was enlarged and regularised by the construction of the portico, its function as an essentially open space does not seem to change and the gain in functional space on the terrace is limited. We get the strong impression that the majority of the late republican building phase was primarily intended to serve as a new architectural façade for the sanctuary, largely obscuring its natural features, instead of as a true substructure for a terrace on which buildings could be constructed.

The sanctuary of Diana Nemorensis displays a lot of similarities with the three sanctuaries mentioned above, since it seems that it too was built making use of or adapting to the natural slope of the terrain. The downward force generated by the great main terrace, measuring 300 x 150 m, was retained by a series of 39 triangular spaces on the shore-side. A great retaining wall with semicircular niches was built in the western corner of the terrace to buttress the force of the higher-lying terrain, and was probably also used as a form of substructure for the higher terrace of the sanctuary. It seems that the natural terrain was altered somewhat on this side to make room for the main terrace, but in general the natural terrain was hardly altered.
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589 FASOLO/GULLINI 1953, 240-257.
590 Especially noticeable on FASOLO/GULLINI 1953, figs. 327-328, 332, partly reproduced here in figure 9.
As was suggested above, the general dimensions of the sanctuary of Hercules Victor at Tibur were determined by the course of the via Tiburtina and the slope of the terrain, both down towards the Aniene and up-hill. While the dimensions were chosen weighing the need for space against labour-intensiveness, the sanctuary in its final late republican form, arguably the optimal solution, still required large-scale transformation of the landscape, requiring both immense substructions on the side towards the Aniene and the cutting back of large parts of bedrock on the other side (fig. 44). Also clearly visible is the fact that the course of the via Tiburtina was artificially lowered in order to include it in the substructions of the sanctuary: if it had not been altered, it would have reached the level of the upper terrace at the point where it exits the sanctuary area on the north-eastern side. Although the execution in the sanctuary of Hercules is different, this articulation of the substructure on different levels probably also entailed a functional differentiation comparable to that found at Praeneste. The spatial separation between the road with associated structures on either side of it and the higher levels could be related to the desire to separate the religious and economic functions of the sanctuary. The rooms adjacent to the via tecta, especially those on the valley-side, have generally been connected to economic activities, related especially to transhumance and the possible collection of the tithe, or perhaps the salt trade.591 The upper levels, comprising the main temple terrace and the surrounding porticos, would be primarily connected to cult activity.

Lowering the level of the road was the only available option to achieve this spatial separation, since raising the entire terrace would have been impossible.

The three separate terraces constituting the sanctuary on Monte S. Angelo at Terracina are likewise placed to provide level platforms in a heavily accidentated terrain. Two of the three terraces present the viewer with an arched façade. The technical, or perhaps rather stylistic, differences between the arches of the terrace of the *piccolo tempio* and the main temple terrace have generally been interpreted as an indication of a chronological gap between the two. It is possible that these differences can be explained by the differences in height of the substructures, resulting in different technical executions and facings. For the construction of the main temple terrace, interpreted as part of the final first-century monumental phase, some of the same procedures were followed as at the sanctuary of Hercules Victor. The sections of this terrace drawn by Luigi Borsari show that the natural slope of the Monte S. Angelo was heavily cut back to make place for the terrace. This is especially noticeable for the substructures and the portico on the longitudinal section, but both sections suggest that the removal of the natural bedrock was necessary in order to construct a terrace of these dimensions as well as a stable foundation for its substructures. Unfortunately, the section does not show clearly how the temple podium is related to the surrounding bedrock, which would give us some indications about the relative chronology of the whole terrace; while the ground plan (fig. 34) and the transverse section seem to indicate that the level of bedrock was cut down somewhat further for the construction of the temple with respect to the ground level of the oracle area to the east, it is difficult to connect a chronological sequence to these observations.

It thus seems that only the construction activities at two relatively late sanctuaries, Tibur and the last monumental phase of the sanctuary at Terracina, involved large-scale removal of the natural terrain. The other sanctuaries, while occasionally reshaping this terrain slightly in order to realise the monumental complex, mostly make use of the natural slope of the terrain to shape building spaces. Apparently, the desired effect in the cases of Tibur and Terracina could only be achieved by altering the natural terrain, while the possibilities of concrete in substructures to provide level surfaces to build on had by then grown considerably. While the visual appearance of the landscape changed in all cases, these are the clearest instances of a permanent and irreversible transformation of the landscape by human intervention.

*The temple buildings of monumental sanctuaries*

The temple building is arguably the central element of the sanctuary. Since its very form seems to stem from Italic ritual exigencies, it has also been designated one of the more conservative architectural categories, retaining the same formal typology for long periods of time. In this section, I shall examine the temple buildings of the monumental sanctuaries of Latium, to see if this conservatism in temple architecture can also be observed in building complexes.

592 *Borsari* 1894, 100 figs. 2, 3.
which change so dramatically in the Late Republic (fig 45). On the basis of excavations and research, we can establish the plan of at least four temples with some confidence, although certain details remain unclear (Gabii, Tibur, Terracina and Lanuvium). In three cases (Fregellae, Praeneste and Tusculum), we can establish the general dimensions of the temple, even though the placement and dimensions of parts of the elevation (columns, walls and staircases) remain a matter of conjecture. Only the temple of Nemi poses real problems of identification.

The reconstructed ground plans included are adapted from the following sources: ALMAGRO GORBEA 1982, 95 fig. 2 (Gabii); RAKOBI 1990, Abb. 21 (Praeneste); GIULIANI 2004, fig. 74 (Tibur); LUGLI 1926, Tar. X fig. 6 (Terracina); QUELICI/QUELICI GIGLI 1995, fig. 37 (Tusculum); GAIETI 1928, 95 fig. 6 (Lanuvium). The reconstruction of the temple of Fregellae shown here uses the maximum dimensions for the building as indicated by Enzo Lippolis (Lippolis in C Aeberl 1986, 35). The reconstruction of cella walls, columns and staircase is purely conjectural, based on a regular division of the available space in the case of the pronaoi, since no archaeological data are available to support a reconstruction. Although identified as the temple building of the sanctuary of Diana Nemorensis, the so-called ‘building K’ from Nemi has not been included here, since in this case we are probably dealing with a rather than the cultic building of the sanctuary.
As mentioned above, the temple building of the sanctuary at Lanuvium is the only example we have of a mid-republican temple continuing to exist within the design framework of the late republican monumental building phase. Not surprisingly, it is also the most ‘traditional’ of all the temple buildings associated with monumental sanctuaries. The temple associated with the late republican phase was an Etrusco-Italic temple with a single central cella and alae, with two rows of four columns making up the pronaos (fig. 45a). While the temple may have been redecorated (see the section on architectural ornamentation below), the structure itself was not rebuilt nor made to ‘fit’ in the design. While the temple may have been a reference point for the placement and length of the portico (see below), the design of the sanctuary does not otherwise take it into account as a central element in a visual sense.

The temple of the sanctuary at Fregellae was newly constructed and in addition seems to stand at the basis of an entirely new typology of temple architecture, albeit one with a rather limited number of known examples: the temple with transverse cella, a temple type seemingly developed in Italy with a cella that is rotated 90 degrees with respect to the pronao. The temple of Aesculapius is almost certainly the earliest example of such a temple outside Rome. The reconstruction of the temple building is problematic, since its remains were almost entirely destroyed by modern building activities. Two stretches of tufa blocks have been found which give a general idea about the outline of the building, probably having borne the facing of the temple podium. Based on this idea, we have a temple building with a cella 18.20 m wide and 14.80 m long, at most, indeed placed transversally with respect to the pronao 13.85/13.95 m wide and 8 m long at most (fig. 45b). In the reconstruction drawing by Pier Giorgio Monti (fig. 46), the cella is considerably shorter, with the back wall of the temple in alignment with the columns of the lateral colonnades. This architectural solution would surely create problems
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595 Gros 1996, 133; Bozzone et al. 2006, 221. For a more in-depth analysis of this temple type, see Monti 1999; Roux 2007. The only temple exhibiting this particular architectural trait which possibly predates the temple at Fregellae is the temple of the Veiovis on the Capitol in Rome: it certainly had a transverse cella in the phase dated to the middle of the second century, but it is possible that the phase dated to the first decade of the second century already had one (Colini 1942, 48-50).

596 Lippolis in Coarelli 1986, 35.
with the continuous roof of the colonnades, which would slope towards the back wall of the temple and thus necessitate the inclusion of a gutter to avoid a build-up of water against the wall. Although Giorgio’s reconstruction is rather elegant in itself, since it would provide a space behind the temple which could be used for rituals associated with the cult of Aesculapius such as the *incubatio*, a *cella* with a back wall aligning with the back wall of the colonnades seems to be preferable structurally, with the roofs of the lateral colonnades attached to the side walls of the *cella*, thereby avoiding possible drainage problems. Unfortunately, this part of the sanctuary was affected most by the devastations caused by modern building activities on the site, thereby making it impossible to decide on a definitive reconstruction of the temple.

According to Vitruvius, the temple of Diana at Nemi had the same peculiar ground plan, but as of yet no remains that can be related to this particular temple have been found. The so-called ‘building K’, located on the main terrace, has been identified as a temple, and occasionally as the temple of Diana, but the eccentric placement of the temple and the fact that it does not exhibit the specific traits of a temple with transverse *cella* make this attribution questionable. There are two options: either Vitruvius was wrong in including the temple of Diana in this particular typology, or the actual temple of Diana was placed elsewhere. A plausible theory is that it was located on the upper terrace of the sanctuary. Recent excavations have revealed extensive building activity on this terrace, although as of yet no sure traces of the main temple building have been found and each new discovery of structures leave less room for the placement of a temple building on this terrace. As stated above, it is a distinct possibility that the temple of Diana with transverse cella was built in the mid-second century, in which case the terracotta decoration dated by Känel to this period would belong to this temple. The fact that we have no evidence for a new decorative phase which can be related to a temple building coinciding with the monumental restructuration of the sanctuary would then suggest that the temple continued to exist and that building activities concerned mostly secondary structures, in much the same way as at the sanctuary of Juno Sospita at Lanuvium.

The temples of Gabii and Tibur were of the *peripteros sine postico* type, a ‘hybrid’ temple type that probably originated in the mid-republican period, sporting colonnades along the front and lateral sides of the temple but maintaining a closed rear wall: almost a traditional *peripteros*, but not quite. Both temples represent considerably advanced forms of this temple type. In contrast to earlier temples of this type, displaying the virtually square ground plan characteristic of the Tuscanic temple, the temple of Gabii has a rather elongated plan, especially with regard
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598 Vitr., *De Arch.* 4.8.4 (see Gros 1992, 30). See also Monti 1999, 25-27; Monti 2004, 206-207; Roux 2007, 338. In general, Vitruvius’ descriptions of examples of Italic architecture are accurate, while sometimes errors slip in when he is discussing or interpreting Greek architecture. Although we cannot rule it out, it would be unlikely that he would have mistakenly included a temple in this particular typology if it did not display these characteristics, especially when located so close to Rome.
599 Coarelli 1987a, 172-173; Ghini 1993, 280; Ghini 1995, 153; Ghini 2000, 61. The idea of this particular placement of the temple is based on drawings made in the 19th century by Pietro Rosa, which clearly show a lower and higher terrace with the temple building located on the latter (Rosa 1856).
600 See Ghini 2006 for a report on these excavations. Subsequent excavations, the results of which were presented by Giuseppina Ghini during the conference *Sacra Nominis Latinis* held at Rome, 19-21 February 2009, to be published in the periodical Ostraka, have unearthed more structural remains on this terrace, although none of them can be related to a temple building.
to the *cella*: it is hexastyle with 9 columns and a half-column on both long sides (fig. 45c). This elongation of the ground plan may be explained by the fact that it was generated using mathematical principles; all parts of the plan seem to be variations and operations based on the Pythagorean theorem (fig. 47); the dimensions of the short and long sides of the podium (60 x 80 feet or 6 x 8 modules of 10 feet) are an expanded version of the basic Pythagorean triangle with sides of 3 x 4 x 5, and the placement of the *cella*, columns and other architectural features were established by various operations based on this basic triangle. In addition, the *pronaos* consists of a rather deep space without internal columns. This elongation of the plan, and the open *pronaos* without internal columns, seem to be the result of Hellenistic influences on Italic temple design.

The temple of Hercules Victor at Tibur, one and a half times the size of the temple of Gabii, is one of the most elaborate examples of a peripteral temple since postico (fig. 45c). It has been reconstructed as an octostyle temple with ten columns on the lateral sides, with the three foremost columns doubled. As at Gabii, the rest of the *pronaos* was left open. The *cella* had two internal lateral colonnades, as well as two antechambers flanking the aedicule or apse containing the cult statue. One of the antechambers, to the south of the *cella*, had a staircase leading to a sizeable subterranean space, which can perhaps be connected with the sanctuary’s oracular function. A unique feature of the temple of Hercules Victor is that it was placed on a second podium with its own central staircase flanked by two great fountains, raising it high above the surrounding *temenos* area. In this way, the temple building was elevated to the level of the upper portico, introducing a second spatial separation between a lower level consisting of the lower storey of the portico, the *temenos* area and the *cavea*, and a higher level consisting of the temple proper and the upper storey of the portico. Again, this spatial difference may imply cultic or functional differences between the levels.
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603 Gros 1996, 126.
The temple on Monte S. Angelo at Terracina provides us with an example of yet another adaptation of a traditional Etrusco-Italic temple type: the *pseudoperipteros*. This type probably developed by adding engaged or half-columns to the outside lateral and rear walls of the *cella* of a prostyle temple. While retaining several traditional characteristics, such as frontality and the placement on a podium, this temple type nonetheless exploits the plastic qualities of a peripteral temple. At Terracina the engaged columns attached to the *cella* wall were of the same material as the cella itself, namely concrete, while the columns of the *pronaos* were of stone quarried at Monte Circeo. It was a hexastyle temple with four columns on each of the lateral sides of the pronaos, five engaged columns on the lateral *cella* walls, two three-quarter columns on the corners of the lateral and rear walls of the *cella* and four engaged columns on the back wall of the *cella* (fig. 45f). As at Gabii and Tibur, the area in front of the *cella* was left open. Given the precarious state of preservation, we do not know if the modest temple of the sanctuary at Tusculum was perhaps also a *pseudoperipteros*. The remains of the temple podium consist of two separate concrete cores, both 3 m high and 12 m wide, while of different length: the front part 7 m, the latter part 13 m, obviously representing the relative proportions of *pronaos* and *cella*. Only one of the tufa blocks that must have originally faced the two cores remains *in situ*, on the eastern long side. While the proportions of the building make a reconstruction of a prostyle terastyle temple likely (fig. 45g), it is also possible that it was a *pseudoperipteros*, given the fact that the facing walls around the concrete core are sufficiently wide.

The only sanctuary without a ‘traditional’ rectangular temple building is that of Fortuna Primigenia. Behind the *porticus in summa cavea* and on a slightly higher level, a heavy foundation ring was found which must have supported some sort of circular *aedes*. Its distinctive placement, behind a porticus and largely (perhaps completely) hidden from view, combined with the heaviness of the foundations has led some scholars to hypothesise a two-storeyed building or a structure built on top of a high circular podium. The upper storey would then perhaps consist of an open *tholos*, at least visible from the higher parts of the sanctuary (possibly the *piazza della cortina*), thereby giving the *aedes* of the goddess a visible presence within the sanctuary. Friedrich Rakob, having studied the foundations and other remains carefully, opts for a single-storeyed structure in his reconstruction (fig. 45d). It consists of a domed space with an *oculus*, which perhaps finds confirmation in some drawings of the ruins of the sanctuary made before the construction of the Palazzo Barberini-Colonna on the remains of the *porticus in summa cavea* and the *aedes*. Rakob’s reconstruction provides an explanation for the heaviness of the foundations, since the construction of a dome with *oculus*, however small, warrants a strong foundation and heavy walls to support the ceiling. And while purely speculative, the daylight falling through the *oculus* would provide the gilded cult statue of Fortuna with a dramatic lighting effect. If Rakob is correct, the sanctuary of Fortuna would provide us with the earliest example of domed architecture of this nature, which would later be developed and perfected in structures such as the Baths at Baiae, and of course the Pantheon. The fact
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607 Quilici/Quilici Gigli 1995, 531; Ribaldi 2008, 55.
608 Kahler 1958, 239; Coarelli 1987a, 56-60.
that in this reconstruction the aedes remains hidden from view need not worry us: it could very well have been related to the nature of the goddess’ cult at Praeneste, highlighting her oracular functions and the ‘hidden’ nature of fate and fortune.

We can thus conclude that, based on the current state of our knowledge, the late republican monumental building phase of Latial sanctuaries was generally accompanied by the construction of a new temple building. There is clear evidence that this was the case in Fregellae, Gabii, Tusculum (last monumental phase), Terracina (last monumental phase), Tibur and Praeneste. Since there are no structural remains which can be related to a temple building which would allow dating on technical criteria, nor architectural decoration which can be attributed to a temple building, the question if a new temple was built when the sanctuary of Diana Nemorensis was monumentalised in the early first century or if the temple erected around the middle of the second century remained in use, must remain unanswered. The only certain case where an older temple was retained in the late republican monumental design is Lanuvium.

The theatre-temple typology

The subject of the inclusion of semicircular structures in the monumental sanctuaries of Latium has already come up in Chapter Two when I discussed the interpretation of the Prenestine sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia, and in particular the symbolic aspects attributed to this particular architectural element of the sanctuary. Praeneste was certainly not the only sanctuary to include a theatre or theatre-like structure in the monumental design, in Latium but also in other parts of Italy. The frequent combination of theatrical and temple structures has given rise to the architectural category of the theatre-temple, a term coined by John Arthur Hanson. Before turning to the interpretation of this close connection between temple and theatre, I will present a survey of the available evidence for such architectural combinations in monumental Latial sanctuaries.

The clearest case of an actual theatre incorporated into a monumental sanctuary complex can be found at Tibur. The open-air theatre, placed immediately to the front of the temple building, displays virtually all the features of traditional Roman theatre architecture (fig. 48): it has an orchestra, a scaenae frons (a stage building) of which only the foundations are preserved, an aulaeum (construction used to raise and lower the stage curtain), a pulpitum (a speaker’s platform in front of the scaenae), an aditus maximus (main entrance) to either side of the orchestra between the scaenae and the cavea, and a separation between the different sections of seating tiers (ima and summa cavea; given the size of the theatre it probably did not have a media cavea) by a praecinctio (walkway), with radial passages connecting the different wedge-shaped sections.
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611 Hanson 1959.

612 See Pintucci 2007 for a reconstruction of the scaenae frons in the Augustan period on the basis of its architectural decoration. This decoration must have replaced the original republican decoration, or perhaps belonged to a thorough restructuring of the theatre area in the Augustan period during which the scaenae area was completely rebuilt (Giuliani 2004, 50).
The presence of these architectural features can leave little doubt that the theatre of the sanctuary of Hercules Victor was a functioning theatre, where staged performances took place. An interesting fact is that a distance of only 7 m separates the front of the monumental staircase of the temple from the wall delimiting the summa cavea. This seems incongruous with the massive scale of the sanctuary as a whole, and has led Giuliani to hypothesise that the final form of the theatre in relation to the temple was the result of adjustments in the monumental design during construction, possibly to offset forces produced by the building mass of the sanctuary. This demonstrates that even during building activities, important changes could
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613 For a brief description of these terms, see Sear 2006, 1-3 (cavea, cunei, praecinctio), 6 (aditus maximus), 7 (orchestra, pulpitem), 8 (aulaeum; scena front), 24-36 (for a chapter on Roman theatre design in which several of these elements are discussed). See also Ten 2006 for recent investigations of the theatre at the sanctuary of Hercules Victor.

614 Giuliani 2004, 53.
be made to the initial design in order to deal with unforeseen circumstances. The different building techniques used in the construction of the upper part of the theatre (opus incertum and opus reticulatum) suggest that this adjustment was probably made in a fairly early stage of construction. In contrast to the theatre of Tibur, the other theatre-like structures incorporated in Latial monumental structures do not have such clear theatrical architectural features.

The earliest example, the sanctuary of Gabii, actually preserves little structural features of its supposed theatre at all, a more or less semicircular depression in the landscape and a stretch of a semicircular wall delimiting the cavea-area being the only indications of its existence (fig. 49). On earlier drawings however, it is possible to see actual steps, and early publications mention these steps as well. Even if actual steps had been discovered, however, few other features associated with theatre architecture have been uncovered and the cavea seems to be undifferentiated, i.e. not separated into cunei or ima, media and summa cavea. Reconstruction drawings of the sanctuary from the 18th, 19th and 20th century sometimes show certain structures in addition to the cavea itself, perhaps a pulpium (actually designated by this name on a drawing by Luigi Canina from 1856), but the lack of systematic modern investigations unfortunately do not allow us to ascertain the reliability of these drawings, which means the reconstruction of this part of the sanctuary remains uncertain. A permanent stage building would have
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615 See Almagro Górre 1982, figs. 3b, 3d-e, 4c-d.
obscured the temple from view for those passing by the sanctuary along the via Prenestina, and it is possible that a provisional scena was temporarily erected when performances were staged. It therefore remains obscure if the ‘theatre’ at Gabii could have been used for actual staged performances. Another important difference between the sanctuaries of Gabii and Tibur is the relative disposition of important architectural elements. In Gabii, the theatre is physically separated from the rest of the temenos area by a wall with a central portal, which is not the case at Tibur, and perhaps suggesting that the theatre area was not part of the actual sacred, inaugurated area. In addition, between temple and theatre the altar of the sanctuary is placed, thereby separating these two structures by the insertion of an important cultic element.

The other example of a theatrical structure incorporated into the design of a sanctuary is the already mentioned sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia. There, we can observe an architectural solution different from Tibur and Gabii, with the cavea placed as a concluding part of the complex instead of in a frontal position. As at Gabii, structural features typically associated with theatre architecture apart from stone steps are absent. Moreover, the construction of a temporary scena is made more difficult by the height difference between the terrace on which the cavea is built and the lower piazza della cortina from which the cavea could be reached. It is therefore unlikely that actual theatrical performances were staged here.

These are the only three cases in which a cavea was incorporated into the sanctuary complex itself. A reconstruction drawing by Pier Giorgio Monti and a reconstruction model on display in the Archaeological Museum of Fregellae at Ceprano, as well as in promotional publications distributed by this museum, show the sanctuary of Fregellae reconstructed with a cavea in front of the temple. However, there are no structural remains that clearly indicate that this was the case and the reconstruction seems to have been inspired mainly by the projection of the ground plans of Tibur and Gabii onto the sanctuary of Fregellae. An actual, albeit rather small, theatre building was excavated near the sanctuary of Diana at Nemi, but it seems to be later in date than the late republican monumental phase. While possibly related to the sanctuary and its cult, it is not meaningfully connected to it in a structural sense, being placed outside the temenos area in a self-contained building which was orientated differently than the vast majority of the structures associated with the sanctuary.

The diversity of these structures, in the sense of their actual architectural characteristics and their placement within the complex, raises the question about their function and meaning. One of the most likely explanations is that the presence of theatre-like structures in sanctuaries can be explained by the phenomenon of so-called ritual dramas, performances related to the cult.

617 Gullini also notes the fact that the temenos-area was accessible from various other points, independent of the cavea area, and seems to conclude that the cavea did not belong to the actual temenos (Gullini 1991, 463).

618 GULLINI 1991, 463.

619 Gianluca Tagliamonte also mentions that the sanctuary of Aesculapius probably included a theatre situated in front of the temple, but he does not provide evidence supporting this claim (Tagliamonte 2007, 56-57 n.16).

620 Traces of a wall on a lower level than the structures of the sanctuary have been found on the south-eastern slope of the hill, possibly a retaining wall related to further terracing of the area and constituting an access area of the temple area, or belonging to an access road connecting this hill to the urban plateau of Fregellae (Coarelli 1986, 26-27, 37). However, there are no remains indicating the existence of a cavea.

621 Morpurgo 1931; Ghini 1993, 282

622 It has been suggested that a non-violent form of the succession ritual of the rex nemorensis took place there (Morpurgo 1931, 302-303; Ghini 1993, 282).
of the sanctuary that were probably performed at least annually.\textsuperscript{623} There is epigraphical and literary evidence from the late republican and imperial periods that such \textit{ludi} were organised in some Latial monumental sanctuaries, namely Gabii, Lanuvium and Praeneste.\textsuperscript{624} While these may have included actual staged performances, it is also possible that certain rituals did not need actual staging, perhaps explaining the absence of traditional theatrical features at Gabii and Praeneste.\textsuperscript{625} The semicircular form in these instances would have been used to provide a natural focus on the \textit{orchestra}, allowing the participation of large numbers of people in the same ritual with someone, perhaps a priest or magistrate, officiating in the central position. However, while \textit{ludi} are attested at Lanuvium, no theatrical structure has been found that can be associated with the sanctuary of Juno Sospita. This indicates that the fact that \textit{ludi} were organised in these sanctuaries does not automatically lead to the incorporation of such architectural features in the monumental design. Moreover, the presence of a theatre in a sanctuary does not imply an exclusive religious use of this structure, since a theatre such as the one at Tibur could have been used for ‘secular’ theatrical performances as well.

As has been mentioned in Chapter Two, the theatrical \textit{cavea} in sanctuaries has not been interpreted solely as a place where ritual performances or ceremonies could be organised, but also as a reference to the socio-political organisation of society. Hanson was the first to point out the possibility of a connection between the architectural type of the theatre-temple and the spatial juxtaposition of \textit{curia} and \textit{comitium} at Rome and certain colonies.\textsuperscript{626} The fact that the possible sources of this architectural category were two important political buildings, probably combined with the fact that these places of assembly had to be inaugurated spaces, \textit{templ\ae}, has led to the superimposition of this political aspect on the theatres found in sanctuaries, as is clearly demonstrated in the work of Matthias Hülsemann.\textsuperscript{627} It is also suggested as an explanation for the inclusion of a theatre in the monumental phase of the sanctuary at Gabii by the excavators.\textsuperscript{628} While they do not exclude the possibility of a cultic function of the theatre, they term it ‘vague and generic’ as an explanation for the incorporation of a \textit{cavea} in the monumental design and suggest that a more likely explanation is that we are dealing with a ‘Hellenistic rationalisation’ of the original function of the semicircular structure as a \textit{comitium}, a traditional place of assembly.\textsuperscript{629} Martín Almagro Gorbea thus clearly sees it as a functional structure, while the interpretation given for the \textit{cavea} at the sanctuary of Praeneste primarily regards it as an evocation of the \textit{comitium}, presenting it as a symbolic rather than a functional feature. The analogy with the \textit{curia-comitium} architectural scheme as an explanation for the presence of \textit{cavea}-structures in sanctuaries can therefore be typified either as a politically functional interpretation of the \textit{cavea}, or a politically symbolic interpretation, depending on

\textsuperscript{623} Nielsen 2002, 158-167.
\textsuperscript{624} CIL XIV 2794 (Gabii); CIL XIV 2121 (Lanuvium); Serv. Verg. Aen. 7.678 (Praeneste).
\textsuperscript{625} Inge Nielsen suggests that the emphasis on the orchestra indicates that music and choruses had an important role in what went on there (Nielsen 2002, 191).
\textsuperscript{626} Hanson 1959, 37-39. Hanson points to the the theatre-like architectural elements of the \textit{comitia} at Cosa and Rome, which are close in topographical and functional relationship to the \textit{curia} behind them.
\textsuperscript{628} Almagro Gorbea 1982, 591-592.
\textsuperscript{629} Almagro Gorbea 1982, 591, 612.
the question whether one believes actual popular political assemblies were organised in this space.\textsuperscript{630} 

Another extreme standpoint is taken by Giorgio Gullini, who considers the category of the theatre-temple “an example of a typology that has been, at least in part, artificially created by modern historiography”.\textsuperscript{631} Gullini interprets the caveae as spatial solutions foremost, used to obtain connections between terraces: the specific semicircular form is especially suited to pass from a situation with a central axis (such as a gate or staircase) to a much wider and diffuse space. Gullini does remark that on a functional level the form of the cavea provided a solution to the necessity for many people to participate in cultic ceremonies. According to him, the primarily functional use of the cavea is demonstrated by the fact that in all the Italic examples, the height of the steps is so limited that it would have been difficult to use them as seats, demonstrating a prevailing use as stairs or place of rest to participate, standing, in cultic ceremonies. Gullini thus seems to advocate a functional approach which has some similarities with the interpretation of the cavea as a possible comitium or an evocation thereof: the semicircular form is ideally suited for the assembly of people. However, the political connotation is completely absent in Gullini’s interpretation. We can thus typify it as a spatially functional interpretation of the cavea.

I have already expressed my doubts about the suitability of a political explanation, in either its symbolic or functional form, for the incorporation of caveae in Latial sanctuaries in Chapter Two. The main objections are a) that a meaningful connection between the curia-comitium scheme, the universality of which is itself perhaps open to criticism, and the connection between caveae and temples has not been convincingly proven, b) that in the Latial contexts in most cases a forum area existed in the urban centre to which the sanctuary belonged and that the sanctuary therefore had only modest political functions if at all,\textsuperscript{632} and c) that the diversity of placement and architectural solutions of the caveae included in monumental sanctuaries means that certain reservations are warranted in making universal claims. Reviewing the evidence, it seems to me that a combination of cultic and spatial considerations would explain the adoption of this specific form. While not denying that political gatherings could have taken place there, this was probably not the main reason for inclusion of the cavea in the monumental design of sanctuaries. Neither can it be seen as a simple staircase, as Gullini perhaps suggests, although it cannot be denied that the cavea-shape is uniquely suited to a transition from a concentrated, central point to a wider and more diffuse higher space. In Praeneste, at least, this quality of the semicircular shape was very important. An additional advantage is that this shape can make maximum use or necessitates the least modification of the natural terrain, which seems to have been a factor in Gabii, Tibur and Praeneste. While the cultic function can therefore be said to be fundamental to its incorporation, its spatially functional qualities should not be ignored.

\textsuperscript{630} Of course, if these structures were actually used for political assemblies it could still have a symbolic function. However, if these structures were non-functional in this sense, the only way in which they could refer to a comitium would have been symbolically.

\textsuperscript{631} GULLINI 1991, 463 (my translation).

\textsuperscript{632} This would be especially relevant in the case of Fregellae (as rightly noted in TAGLIAMONTE 2007, 56-57 n.16): if the sanctuary did include a cavea and if this inclusion would have to be explained by referring to its political functions, how would one explain the curia-comitium complex in the forum area of the town? It is most likely that political functionality and symbolism would be concentrated in the civic structures on the forum.
Another important structural element which can be used to shape space is the colonnade. In the ‘standard’ typology of the monumental Latial sanctuary, mentioned in the Introduction, one of the defining elements is the incorporation of a *porticus triplex* in the design: a typical late republican sanctuary should consist of a temple surrounded by a pi-shaped portico. Considering the ground plans of the different Latial sanctuaries, we can observe that four or possibly five sanctuaries include what looks like a *porticus triplex* in some form. However, the structural characteristics of these porticoes differ in each case, which may indicate functional differences between the various sanctuaries, even for those seemingly incorporating a ‘classical’ *porticus triplex*, such as Fregellae, Gabii, Praeneste and Tibur.

The only sanctuary that has a pi-shaped portico framing a large open space in which a temple building is placed in an axially symmetric position is the sanctuary of Juno Gabina (fig. 50). It is, in fact, a blue-print of the ideal form of the Latial sanctuary as presented in the Introduction. However, as far as we can tell, it is also the only one with such a perfect
constellation of constituent parts, no doubt owing to the genesis of the plan on the drawing table, as suggested above. While there are architectural differences between different sections of the portico, for instance the tabernae of the lateral wings which are lacking in the central section and the difference in width between the lateral wings and the central section, its visual effect as an architectural and spatial frame is uncompromised. In fact, the colonnades of the portico mask the architectural discrepancies of the porticoes that are visible on the plan, presenting a unified façade for those standing on the central court.

The plan of the sanctuary at Tibur at first sight seems like the over-sized mirror image of Gabii: a pi-shaped portico, in this case two-storeyed, framing a centrally placed temple. However, there is a significant difference between the two sanctuaries, namely the fact that the temple building in Tibur is placed against the central section of the portico, thereby making it impossible to move around the temple building on the level of the court. The sense of free space created by the porticoes would furthermore be compromised by the invasion of the cavea into the court. This suggests that the visual framing quality of the portico was more important than its spatial function, since the court it delimited was broken up by the gargantuan temple and its double podium. This visual function is highlighted by the fact that the portico is also designed to visually correct the slightly eccentric placement of the temple building; the temple is placed slightly to the south of the central axis of the area surrounded by the portico. This is probably caused by the need for stable support given the dimensions of the building, which is placed almost completely on solid bedrock (fig. 44). A more central position would have put extra pressure on the substructures on the side of the complex facing the Aniene river, which would probably have been structurally impossible given the inclusion of the via tecta in this part of the substructure. The portico compensated for this slight discrepancy by having the same number of arches on each side of the temple, with the width of the arches adjusted to fit the available space.633 Since the eye can hardly detect such spatial differences (no more than 2 meters on a total distance of roughly 160 m), the equal number of arches would have only added to the appearance of axiality. Both the lower portico and the upper portico seem to have been simple galleries without internal divisions, with a primary function as walkways. To the north part of the upper portico, an arched gallery was added, which opens on the gorge of the Aniene river, and incorporates examples of cross-vaulting, the first known instance of the use of this technique in classical antiquity.

At Fregellae, instead of a pi-shaped portico delimiting a court on which a central building, the temple, is placed, we actually have two L-shaped porticoes attached to either side of the temple building. While they visually frame and accentuate the temple building, the sense of open space they create is limited, and they do not allow free movement around the temple building, especially given the fact that the lateral wings probably did not project beyond the temple building itself.634 The rooms which probably adjoined these parts of the porticoes suggest additional functional aspects of the porticoes, perhaps relating to specific aspects of the Aesculapian cult such as the ritual incubatio, although no firm evidence has been found that this was practiced at the sanctuary, or used for the practice of regular medicine. Another

633 Coarelli 1987a, 91.
634 Unless we accept the reconstruction of the temple by Pier Giorgio Monti (see above), who placed the posterior wall of the cella to the front, creating a cryptoporticus of sorts behind it connecting the two porticoes.
possible explanation is that they had a commercial function related to the religious activities at the sanctuary.

Instead of a continuous portico surrounding a court on thee sides, the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia also had two L-shaped porticoes framing the piazza della cortina. These porticoes were attached to the substructures of the cavea and the porticus in summa cavea. However, in contrast to the sanctuaries of Tibur and Fregellae, the porticoes at Praeneste do have an important spatial function, delimiting a large open square allowing free movement. In addition, the two L-shaped porticoes are connected to each other through a cryptoporticus built into the central substructures for the higher terrace. Again, the porticoes have an important framing function, directing attention towards the central part of the square and the concluding structures of the sanctuary, a framing function which is underlined by placing the central structures just slightly forward. The semicircular porticus in summa cavea also had a framing and visual function, accentuating the shape of the cavea and providing a suitable optical conclusion to the upper part of the sanctuary, while hiding the aedes from view. At Praenese, we have a succession of two enclosed spaces, a rather more complex solution than found at other sanctuaries.

The situation at Terracina is rather complex. We do not know anything of the buildings which must have stood on the terrace of the piccolo tempio. While a portico is built behind the temple on the main temple terrace, it is not axially placed with respect to the temple, and given the limited opportunity of movement on this terrace and the fact that it surely could not have been seen from a distance, its function as a visual frame or backdrop for the temple building was limited. Instead, it must have been functionally related to the oracle site, providing a sheltered area between the entrance to the terrace and the entrance to the walled precinct of the oracle. It can also be suggested that this portico actually diverted attention from the temple in the direction of the area with the oracle. The highest terrace, the so-called campo trincerato, is surrounded on three sides by a structure with heavy foundation walls, suggesting a military function. It cannot be dated securely and seems to be related to the defensive walls connecting the sanctuary to the city rather than to the other sanctuary terraces, although it is connected to these by a staircase. We are not dealing with a traditional open portico; a row of bases placed along the middle of the structure on three sides indicates that it must have had an internal colonnade, and we must perhaps imagine portals or arches opening onto the central court. While it is a structure delimiting an area on three sides, we must ask ourselves if the primary reason for this form is the framing of the court, or rather the fact that these were the three sides most in need of defensive structures; the side that was left open is to the sea-side, with the steepest cliffs and therefore the side from which the potential for threats was minimal. Of course, the fact that religious structures were placed on this terrace, including a small temple or saeculum and a possible auguraculum, must have been important in the decision to leave this side of the terrace open.

At Nemi, only one corner of the colonnade has been excavated and as of yet its continuation along all three sides of the main terrace of the sanctuary has not been documented. If it did surround the temple terrace on three sides, it is one of the most versatile porticoes of all
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635 Corelli 1987a, 119.
636 The northern corner of the main terrace, where the proof for this continuation might be found, has not yet been subjected to new systematic scientific research, as the eastern corner was where this colonnade was discovered.
Latial sanctuaries, combining several different aspects. It would have visually unified the main sanctuary terrace with its various monuments and shrines of different sizes, hiding from view visual discrepancies between the main terrace and the surrounding area, such as the retaining wall with niches which was only placed in the western corner of the terrace. In addition, it would have framed, or provided a façade for the structure on the higher terrace, including the temple if it was placed here. Lastly, it would have served as a columnar screen for the staircase giving access to the higher terrace. In other words, the portico at Nemi would have been essential for the ability of people to experience it as a single architectural unit instead of just a group of individual buildings.

The sanctuary of Juno Sospita does not seem to have had porticoes of this kind at all. The great portico of the late republican phase does not delimit a central space, nor does it frame a centrally placed building or group of buildings. It is used here primarily as a monumental façade, essentially functioning as a substructure and portico at the same time. However, by hiding the natural landscape from view and presenting a uniform architectural plane in its place, it does have an important visual function. It provides a unifying façade for the entire sanctuary and the buildings placed on a higher level, a sort of monumental visual base presenting the sanctuary as an integral unit. This perhaps also explains the extension of the portico beyond the confines of the natural hill in southern direction, making a rather awkward turn (fig. 51); only by extending the portico in this way could it have served this particular function, with the approach from the west, the road from Ardua, in mind to which the temple and portico seem to have directed (fig. 42).

There seems to be an important structural and perhaps also functional difference between the porticoes of early sanctuaries at Fregellae and Gabii and later ones. The early porticoes were the only ones which had adjoining rooms (Fregellae) or tabernae (Gabii). The presence of these spaces suggests that they were used for activities relating to the cult or perhaps commercial or administrative activities related to the sanctuary. In later sanctuaries, especially those at Praeneste and Tibur, the porticoes do not have adjoining rooms and seem to have been used primarily as walkways. This difference is perhaps related to the increased mastery of the use of concrete and the ability to create functional spaces in the substructures of the building complex, most evident in the sanctuary at Tibur along the via tecta but also on the terrazza dei fornici a semicolonne at Praeneste. The limited opportunities for vertical spatial differentiation at Fregellae and Gabii probably result in a functional differentiation on a horizontal level, for which the possibilities offered by porticoes were used.

Porticoes were especially well suited to bring together separate building parts into a larger whole and creating an axial and symmetric appearance, and this is what we can observe, aesthetically at least, for most of the porticoes of these Latial sanctuaries. They are either used as a frame for the central building, regardless of the structural connection to this building (Fregellae, Gabii, Praeneste, Tibur and possibly Nemi), or perhaps by providing a unifying façade for separate buildings (Lanuvium). Although the possibility of a portico surrounding the temple of Tusculum, which would place it in the first category, must be kept open, we do not have evidence for its existence. At Terracina the situation is far from clear: the portico behind the temple in some way frames and accentuates the temple, yet does not relate it to the surrounding space, while the campo trincerato with its enclosed court does not relate meaningfully
in either an aesthetic or structural way to the temple terrace. I would like to suggest that in these two cases, it was the substructure, which through its arcaded appearance was accentuated far more in these two cases than at other sanctuaries, giving the complex, or parts of the complex, their unified appearance instead of porticoes. Given the characteristics of its substructures in the final monumental phase, this may have been true for Tusculum as well: the arcaded platform displays visual similarities to Lanuvium and especially Terracina. This would perhaps
provide an argument against the inclusion of a portico on the temple terrace at Tusculum, since this would not have been strictly necessary to provide a sense of architectural unity to those approaching the sanctuary. In addition to the functional relationship between porticoes and substructures mentioned above, in this case they can be placed in a visual relationship as complimentary elements of monumental building complexes, intended to convey a sense of structural and visual integrity to those viewing and experiencing them.

In summary, we can say that even in those cases where they served other purposes, these porticoes can be seen as the visual glue holding these monumental building complexes together. The use of colonnades is crucial to the whole achievement of architectural unity. Rather than a development unique to Italy, or Latial monumental sanctuaries for that matter, we see this happening all across the Mediterranean area in the Hellenistic period, especially in the second century. Architects seem increasingly interested in the organisation of space and presenting space itself as an architectural unit instead of buildings; a shift from buildings conceived as separate entities without strict formal relationship to the expression of a formal and hierarchical relationship between buildings and spaces.\footnote{Coulton 1976, 55, 74, 98, 169-170; Lauter 1986, 41-46, 290-292.} A growing interest in axial symmetry in especially the second century is one of the characteristics of this development, and rather than seeing this as a specific characteristic of Latial or Italic sanctuaries, we should perhaps understand it as Latium and Italy partaking in architectural developments involving the entire eastern Mediterranean area.\footnote{Coulton 1976, 63, 170-172; Coarelli 1983a, 194-195.} Some of the most important eastern Mediterranean examples of axial symmetry, such as the upper terrace of the sanctuary of Kos and the extension of the North Market at Miletos,\footnote{Coulton 1976, 62 (Kos), 63 (Miletos); Interdonato 2004, 242-244 (Kos).} can be dated to the middle of the second century, contemporaneous with the first axially symmetric sanctuaries in Latium, Fregellae and Gabii. This would seem to support an interpretation of the phenomenon as diffuse and contemporaneous in nature rather than demonstrative of linear lines of influence from the East to Italy.

\textit{Sacred gardens in Latial sanctuaries}

Although one could argue whether it actually constitutes an architectural element, one of the standard features connected to Latial monumental features is that of the so-called ‘sacred garden’ or ‘sacred wood’: the existence of groupings of trees within the sanctuary, either as a natural feature or artificially planted. Coarelli asserts that this was perhaps a normal feature of Latial monumental sanctuaries, given the fact that most of them have open spaces surrounding the temple, delimited by colonnades and that these spaces in general do not seem to have been paved and were provided with hydraulic installations.\footnote{Coarelli 1993, 51.} Ghini also seems to consider the presence of a sacred wood, either natural or artificial, one of the common characteristics of Latial monumental sanctuaries.\footnote{Ghini 1993, 289.} And yet, we only have firm evidence for the existence of such a wood or garden at the sanctuary of Juno Gabina.
There, in the *temenos* area between the temple building and the *porticus triplex*, two systems of square pits placed in a regular pattern were discovered (fig. 50). Although primarily found in the northern and eastern parts of this area, they probably occupied the whole area enclosed by the *porticus triplex*, though not extending beyond the line constituted by the front of the temple podium and the ends of the wings of the portico. The two systems probably belong to successive phases of the sanctuary, since each is geometrically consistent in itself and in relation to the surrounding space, but not with respect to each other. The first system, with pits which are slightly larger (1.50 x 1.60 m), consists of three rows of six pits to the north of the temple, and of four rows of two pits to each side of the temple, with the southernmost pits aligned with the front of the temple podium. The second system, with pits measuring 1.20 x 1.30 m, consists of four complete rows of ten pits to the north of the temple and five rows of three pits to each side of the temple, with the southernmost pits again more or less aligned with the front of the temple podium. The already mentioned pit just to the north of the temple, which belonged to an earlier phase of the sanctuary, fits in neither system, and therefore cannot be regarded as the point of origin of either system. Rather, the available space was taken as a starting point. This can be demonstrated for the first, presumably older system, which is almost perfectly laid out using mathematical principles. The pits themselves have dimensions of roughly 5 x 5 feet, are placed at a distance of 10 feet (3 m) from the edges of the colonnade and have a distance between them of 20 feet (6 m). The basis for this system of pits is thus a modular system comparable to that of the temple building itself, strongly suggesting that the first system of pits is contemporaneous to the monumental phase of the mid-second century.

The interpretation of these systems which is now widely accepted is that they constituted a sacred garden around the temple: the pits were used for planting (small) trees in, and in the case of the second system probably a smaller type of shrub. Coarelli takes the argument a step further, and has suggested that the sacred garden of Gabii was supposed to evoke the idea of a *lucus*, a term which is more or less synonymous for sanctuary in ancient literature and epigraphy. It originally meant a clearing in the woods but in the Late Republic can also mean the sacred wood itself. The original meaning of the word has been seen as the original form of many Italic sanctuaries, which consisted of a ritually cleared area in a wooded area; an artificial human intervention in a natural situation, marking it as sacred, analogous to the inauguration of a *templum*. In the case of Gabii, the trees planted in the pits would represent a rationalised version of the original wood, the *nemus*, while the temple building would represent the inaugurated space created within this wood, the actual *lucus* in its original meaning. As
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643 The second system does not adhere to a comparable regular mathematical system, and in general seems to have been placed so as to cut into the older pits as seldom as possible.
644 Hans Lauter was the first to suggest this possibility (Lauter 1968). Subsequent publications on the sanctuary of Gabii have taken up his interpretation: Gros 1976, 90 n. 86; Quilici 1979, 18; Almagro Gorbea 1980, 169; Jiménez in Almagro Gorbea 1982, 52-55; Coarelli 1987a, 16.
645 Coarelli 1987a, 16-17; Coarelli 1993, 47-48; Scheid 1993.
646 In the Roman religious system, the sacred was, properly speaking, not a divine quality which was discovered in a being or a thing, but a quality which men gave to it (Dubourdieu/Scheid 2000, 60). The creation of a *lucus* would seem to fit well in this idea of sacredness requiring human agency.
647 Coarelli 1987a, 17; Coarelli 1993, 50.
mentioned above, the late republican sacred garden would not have been the first, since the excavators have suggested that two pits belonging to an earlier phase of the sanctuary can perhaps be considered as a predecessor of the later garden.

The fact that the sacred garden is related to the idea of a *lucus*, which is considered an archetypical form of early (Latial) sanctuaries, and therefore more or less a universal religious phenomenon, probably combined with the tendency, described in the Introduction, to extrapolate individual characteristics of monumental Latial sanctuaries to the group as a whole, has led to the assumption mentioned above that other sanctuaries must have had similar features. Coarelli has even suggested that the systematic repetition of systems such as the one at Gabii prove that we are dealing with a cultic necessity, and that all such open courts with colonnades, a central element of Latial sanctuaries, must be interpreted at *luci*.

However, archaeological evidence in the form of pits, such as at Gabii, has not been found. Excavations at the sanctuary at Tibur, mentioned as one of the sanctuaries with a possible sacred garden, have brought to light the original surface level and some of the paving which originally covered the *temenos* area around the temple. This pavement seems to have been the original walking level, which contradicts the assertion that on this central court of Tibur earth was placed on top of an impermeable concrete layer which would then be suitable for the planning of trees. Although only a small part of the pavement has been unearthed, it will be interesting to see what further excavations reveal about the possibility of a *lucus* at Tibur. The sanctuary of Diana Nemorensis has been mentioned as another possible example of the existence of a sacred wood in a Latial sanctuary. We know that the ritual of the Rex Nemorensis involved a sacred tree, and the sanctuary itself was referred to as the *lucum Dianium in nemore Aricino* in a fragment of Cato’s *Origines*. However, during the excavations at the sanctuary no regular system of pits was found, which suggests that if a sacred wood was present, it was natural rather than artificial, which makes it difficult to archaeologically establish its extent. Other sanctuaries have not yielded any evidence of the existence of *luci*, whether archaeological, epigraphical or literary.

The universality of the presence of a sacred garden, wood or *lucus* in Latial sanctuaries can thus be doubted. The fact that open spaces seem to be an important part of these sanctuaries cannot be taken as evidence for their existence, since we see the same phenomenon in the entire Mediterranean area in a variety of contexts, urban and non-urban. While it is certainly
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648 Coarelli 1987a, 90. The ‘systematic repetition’ actually comprises just three sanctuaries with certainty: Gabii, the sanctuary of Munigua in Spain and the sanctuary of Dea Dia just to the south of Rome. The latter is only attested epigraphically by an inscription dated to the Antonine period, while the sanctuary of Munigua is Flavian in date. While the sanctuary seems to imitate or echo the great Latial sanctuaries, especially Praeneste and Tibur (Coarelli 1987b), the different social, historical and religious context makes it difficult to accept this sanctuary as a proof for the thesis of inclusion of a *lucus* as a universal feature of *Italic* sanctuaries.


650 Coarelli bases his assertion mainly on a passage written in 1800 by abbot Angelo Uggeri, who describes a layer of *opus signinum* and a layer of stucco, and suggests the use of this area as a “*giardinaggio a contener terra vegetabile*”, although he offers an alternative function for the drainage of water (Uggeri 1800, 70). However, numerous trenches dug along the entire length of the preserved lower portico in the early 1980s have not yielded any evidence for the features described by Uggeri (Gigliani 2004, 60). Neither have the recent excavations in the area around the temple building, as yet unpublished, provided any indication that the area was used as a sacred garden.

651 Ghini 1993, 280, 289.

652 Cato, *Orig. fr.* 58.
possible that some sanctuaries developed from an open-air sanctuary such as a clearing in a
wood, this by no means dictates an evocation of this original setting in the architecture of later
phases. The setting of Gabii, with the trees planted around the temple that would represent
the clearing, does not correspond with the spatial lay-out of the other sanctuaries, as has
been remarked above with respect to temple buildings and colonnades. The temple of Tibur,
for instance, was not surrounded by open space, but was only flanked by open space, while
other sanctuaries may have had open spaces surrounded by porticoes (Praeneste and Nemi),
but in these cases the symbolic clearing in the form of a temple was not present. While it is
possible to suggest that in these cases the court itself might represent the cleared area and the
surrounding portico the wood, this would make the situation at Gabii somewhat complicated,
with both colonnade and artificial garden representing the nemus. Based on these observations
and the general lack of firm evidence to the contrary, it seems to me that we cannot accept
the existence of a sacred garden or wood within the temenos area as a standard feature of
monumental Latial sanctuaries.

Monumental Latial sanctuaries: a standard type?

What then, can we say, is the essence of the late republican monumental sanctuary? Is there truth
to the assertion, implicit in so many publications on these monuments, that the architectural
typology is so clear that characteristic structural elements of some monuments are used to ‘fill
out’ the plans of others? From the preceding analysis of various structural elements, it will
be quite clear that a healthy amount of caution is warranted. Many of the structural elements
which have been interpreted as standard characteristics of Latial monumental sanctuaries on
closer inspection do not appear standard at all. The majority includes artificial terracing, yet the
extent and function of terracing differs; many have centrally placed temples, yet other positions
of the temple are just as probable and perhaps just as desirable; the function and placement
of the cavea suggests differentiation even within a relatively small group of sanctuaries that
includes this architectural feature; porticoes are just about the most flexible and adaptable
architectural category of all, being used and placed in many different ways; a true sacred
garden has been attested archaeologically in only one sanctuary, and the mere possibility of
the existence of this feature in other sanctuaries is hardly enough to justify regarding it as a
characteristic element of late republican sanctuaries. All in all, there is very little evidence to
suggest that we are dealing with a standard typology. Yes, these sanctuaries are all big, and yes,
they all seem to have been carefully designed with respect to the surrounding landscape, but
these rather generic similarities are just about the only characteristics which are shared by all
monumental sanctuaries in Latium.

This makes it so dangerous to expect certain features. It seems that when architectural remains
tick two or more boxes of the standard monumental typology, the other boxes immediately
follow. Thus, when we have an artificial terrace dated to the late republican period, we can
immediately add a central temple surrounded by a portico. I hope to have shown that these
expectations are not based on the reality provided by the excavated remains of monumental
sanctuaries in Latium. While there seem to be some developments over time in the way in
which space is shaped in the sanctuaries, there is no clear ‘before’ and ‘after’ to provide a
rule which determines what elements are most likely to be encountered. For instance, I have suggested that at the sanctuaries of Terracina and Lanuvium substructures and porticoes were used to provide a visual base for the buildings on the terrace instead of the visual frame provided by the porticoes of many other sanctuaries. The final phase of the sanctuary of Tusculum postdates these, and was provided with an arched substructure in the final phase. In other words, we could again be dealing with a visual base for the temple on the terrace. This does not mean, however, that it could not also have had a portico on this terrace, providing an additional visual frame. What it does demonstrate is that the sanctuary of Tusculum did not necessarily have to be provided with a portico in order to fit within a standard typology. The known monumental Latial sanctuaries display various different spatial and visual solutions. While some elements, such as centrally placed temple buildings, seem to be represented in greater numbers, this does not mean that this was a hard-and-fast rule. Even when there seem to be similarities, closer examination may reveal important spatial and functional differences. The architectural possibilities are endless, which is why it is useless to adhere to a standard typology in order to be able to extrapolate architectural features from one sanctuary to another. The simple truth is that there is no such thing as standard in these cases.

The ornamentation of Latial sanctuaries

In order to fully appreciate the appearance of temples and sanctuaries in antiquity, it is not enough to simply look at plans and reconstruct elevations; architectural space is only a part of the visual dimension of sacred structures. Parts of building can be highlighted using polychromy or decoration, and the appearance of the temenos area itself can be altered using statues or plants, thereby altering the impression of the entire building complex in ways that are not immediately apparent when the analytic focus is on architecture alone. We must reconstruct the ‘unity out of plurality’, as Torsten Mattern calls it, the way in which the individual elements of architecture and decoration form a meaningful whole. An obvious first place to start the examination of the decorative aspects of Latial monumental sanctuaries is the most traditional category of temple and sanctuary decoration: decorative systems ornamenting parts of the roof in the form of sculpture or slabs, often of terracotta. Next, another type of decoration which forms an integral part of the structure itself will be discussed: stucco and wall painting. Finally, I will give an overview of the various pieces of sculpture found in Latial sanctuaries, being the most ‘movable’ of decorative categories. Having done this, the relation between these ornamental categories and the structures of the sanctuary will be examined, before comparing the evidence from Latial sanctuaries with general trends and development in the use of ornamentation at Rome and the rest of Italy.

653 Mattern 1999.
Our examination of the decorative aspects of the monumental sanctuaries of Latium starts at the highest point: the roof. The development of temple architecture in the late seventh and early sixth century was accompanied by the production of tiles and plaques to protect the wooden construction of the roof and often the walls of the temple itself, which were often constructed of mud brick or other materials susceptible to deterioration and damage by the elements. This type of decoration of temple buildings was maintained and further developed over the course of the following centuries. The monumental sanctuaries of Latium are thus built at a relatively late stage in this development, and can provide us with interesting information about the use of roof decoration during the late republican period, especially since all of them, with the exception of the sanctuary at Tusculum, have yielded examples of terracotta roof decoration, although the types and quantities vary greatly between them. I shall give a description of the general decorative systems which can be reconstructed for the monumental sanctuaries of Latium, not by giving an exhaustive catalogue of individual pieces but by treating categories as a whole. Special attention will be paid to figurative decoration and the possible narrative programs to which these belonged.

In the course of the excavations at Fregellae, to the south of the central section of the sanctuary a thick layer of material was discovered, especially rich in architectural terracottas. The layer has been identified as a dump, and given the extremely fragmented nature of the material discovered there it has been associated with the clearing of the area after the methodical and thorough dismantlement of the sanctuary, probably related to the events of 125 leading to the destruction of the entire city. The fact that the fragments were intentionally disposed and did not simply collapse is also attested by the fact that pieces fitting together were sometimes found at a considerable distance from one another, which implies that the location in which the pieces were found does not reflect their original placement on the buildings. The weathering of the recovered objects before the interment seems to indicate that they had been exposed to the elements during a substantial period.

The wide variety of types discovered has led to the assumption that the terracottas may have belonged to several buildings, which are nevertheless rather homogenous with regard to date and almost certainly belong to a single constructive phase. Given the fact that the plateau on which the sanctuary was built did not offer room for more extensive buildings, we can perhaps conclude that the decoration must be divided between the temple building and the lateral colonnades. Another hypothesis is that the peculiar nature of the temple building, probably possessing a transverse cella, necessitated a diversification of the decorative system. In any case, the highly fragmented nature of the material and the fact that it has not been found in a meaningful spatial relation to the parts of the building to which they were attached has

---

654 I would like to extend my sincerest thanks to Dr. Rudolf Känel for sharing his thoughts on the terracotta decoration of the late republican Latial sanctuaries with me. His treatise on Hellenistic terracotta decoration in general, which will contain most of his analyses of the material in question, is forthcoming.

655 Pagliardi 1979, 209, 211; Crawford 1981, 198.

656 Manca de Mores/Pagliardi 1986, 63.

657 Pagliardi 1979, 211; Manca de Mores/Pagliardi 1986, 62.

658 Pagliardi 1979, 211; Manca de Mores/Pagliardi 1986, 63.
made reconstruction and attribution of the different types very difficult. The reconstruction of the decorative system is therefore necessarily based on the possible relationships between the various types and their relative numbers, the dimensions of the building as evidenced from the excavated remains, and, when dealing with decorative syntax, by parallels with other contemporaneous temple buildings. 659

The Doric porticoes on either side of the temple were probably decorated with simas with lion heads. Two antefixes with female heads have also been attributed to the decoration of the porticoes, although these were possibly used as acroteria instead of antefixes. 660 Since the porticoes had a stone entablature, no terracotta decoration was needed for these parts of the elevation. The entablature of the temple was covered with revetment plaques of palmetes connected to each other by ribbons in the form of an eight. This type of decoration probably covered both the front and the sides of the temple building, given the fact that it has been recovered in the largest numbers. The sides of the temple were also decorated by a row of terminal tiles, which projected to such an extent that the lower parts, painted with red and black meanders, were visible from below. To the edges of these tiles, cortine pendule were attached, while the cover tiles were decorated with potnia theron antefixes, possibly alternating with two other types of antefixes which have been recovered in lesser quantity. The pediment

659 MANCA DE Mores/Pagliardi 1986, 54.
660 MANCA DE Mores/Pagliardi 1986, 62.
was framed by a raking sima and cresting, the latter of which contained separate fictile floral decorations attached to it by lead clamps. Belonging to the parts at the top of the pediment, fragments of cresting with the remains of a tail have been found, suggesting the placement of some sort of mythical animal, possibly marine, in this central part of the composition. The pediment was crowned with a plant-shaped central acroterion, and Giuseppina Manca de Mores and Maria Nicoletta Pagliardi retain that no evidence for lateral acroteria have been found. Pier Giorgio Monti has suggested that the slabs representing a winged Victory riding a quadriga (fig. 52), interpreted by Manca de Mores and Pagliardi as possible ex votos pro victoria, probably formed the lateral acroteria, pointing out that given the fact that this type is presented by two examples with the horses running in opposite decorations and since both slabs are slightly curved enhancing the visibility of the pieces in a position high on the roof, an interpretation as lateral acroteria would seem extremely plausible.662

Among the terracotta fragments found in the dump many belonged to figured sculptures in high relief or in the round. Just several of the pieces found were life-size, which could be divided into two different groups on the basis of the colour and quality of the clay. The two life-size figures have been interpreted as Aesculapius, as one of the figures was clearly a bare-footed bearded man wearing a garment with heavy drapes following the familiar iconography of the god, and a female deity who cannot be easily identified but perhaps represents Hygieia, a frequent companion of the god. Manca de Mores and Pagliardi interpret the two standing figures as the central pieces of the pedimental decoration. If this interpretation is correct, considering the size of the figures we would almost certainly be dealing with a closed pediment. However, Rudolf Känel suggests that the two life-sized figures did not belong to the temple’s decorative system, but were the cult statues, placed inside the cella. Considering the fact that the terracotta fragments were found in a dump layer without any meaningful relation to the part of the building to which the fragments belonged, both interpretations are possible.

Numerous fragments have been found that did belong to the pedimental decoration. The majority of the pieces had dimensions half life-size or slightly less. While some pieces can be fitted together entire figures cannot be reconstructed. At least four male figures can be distinguished on the basis of recovered heads, two young and crowned with laurel branches and two bearded and somewhat older, and at least three female figures, while a seated robed figure may be either male or female. Among the male figures, one head stands out for its relative complete state of preservation and the fact the bearded figure is wearing a distinctive Phrygian cap (fig. 53). The torso of another male figure is interesting because his hands seem to be tied behind his back to a vertical object, possibly a tree (fig. 54). A standing female figure was probably holding an infant in her arms, given the presence of a hand, in smaller dimensions, resting on her breast. Given the difficulty of proposing individual reconstructions for these figures, an interpretation of the represented scene is well-nigh impossible.

661 Manca de Mores/Pagliardi 1986, 62.
663 For the iconography of the bearded Aesculapius, see LIMC 2.1, 893-897.
664 Manca de Mores/Pagliardi 1986, 60-61.
Manca de Mores and Pagliardi have cautiously proposed a scene from the cycle of the Argonauts as its subject, primarily based on the figure bound to a tree and the fact that Aesculapius/Asklepios is generally considered to be one of the participants of the Argo’s journey. Of course, this interpretation depends on the inclusion of the only figure which can be identified with any degree of certainty, Aesculapius, in the pedimental group. If, as Känel suggests, we are dealing with a cult statue of Aesculapius instead of a pedimental statue, the represented scene does not necessarily have to refer to a mythical cycle which includes Aesculapius, making its identification and interpretation even more problematic. Manca de Mores and Pagliardi try to strengthen their proposed interpretation of the pedimental group by tentatively attributing the construction of the entire monumental complex to Lucius Mummius, the destroyer of Corinth. The Argo is linked to the city of Corinth, explaining this particular choice for the pedimental group, and Lucius Mummius seems to have had a special relationship with the colony of Fregellae or the wider area. An inscription was found at Fabrateria Nova, the settlement to which the surviving inhabitants of Fregellae were relocated after the destruction of the town, on which Mummius is mentioned.

If Mummius was in fact responsible for the construction of the sanctuary, this would mean that 145 - the year Mummius returns to Rome - is a terminus post quem for the Fregellan sanctuary, which seems rather late considering the conventional date. According to Känel, the terracotta fragments found indicate a phase of restoration to the decorative system. A
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665 Manca de Mores/Pagliardi 1986, 60-61.
667 Bizzarri 1973. The inscription reads \( L(ucius) \ Mumm\(i\)\(nus\) \( L(ucii)\ j\(uvi\)\(i\) / co\(n\)\(i\)\(n\)) and probably belonged to the base of a statue of Mummius. It is possible that the statue was erected before Mummius became censor in 142 and was thus originally erected in Fregellae and later transported to Fabrateria Nova (Bloy 1998-1999, 60).
construction date after 145 and a destruction date of 125 would certainly produce a time span which is too constricted to include such a restoration phase. Furthermore, it seems less likely that the Roman troops would desecrate a victory monument erected by one of the most illustrious men in recent Roman history. According to Monti, the bearded figure with Phrygian cap would seem to point to a setting in Asia Minor for the scene or at least should be seen as a specific geographical reference, thus possibly alluding to one of the Eastern campaigns of Rome in which Fregellan troops participated. In both cases, the building would have had strong triumphal connotations, which would have been strengthened if the slabs representing Nike were indeed the lateral acroteria of the temple.

The systematic excavations of the sanctuary of Juno Gabina have also yielded large amounts of architectural terracotta decoration. The state of preservation and the number of fragments found has enabled the excavators to convincingly reconstruct at least two successive decorative systems that must have adorned the temple building of the sanctuary. Revetment plaques, as well as the lateral, raking simas and cresting all seem to have been exclusively decorated with floral or vegetal motifs: no figurative decoration has been found belonging to these elements. Among the discovered antefixes those representing a potnia theron predominate, constituting roughly two thirds of the total number of antefixes found. The majority of the other antefixes consists of female busts and busts with the head of a young satyr or faun. Thirteen fragments of terracotta sculpture, all formed by hand and in high relief, belong to relief plaques which, according to the excavators, must have decorated the temple podium, where holes have been found which were used for the fixation of these plaques. Finally, a single female head, a third life-size, has been found which probably belonged to the pedimental decoration of the temple (fig. 55). The dimensions of this head do not allow us to state with certainty whether we are dealing with a ‘traditional’ pedimental decoration of columnen- en mutulus-plaques, or if the figure belonged to a closed pediment.

\[668\] Monti 1999, 47-48.
\[669\] Almagro Gorbea 1982, 131-194.
\[670\] Almagro Gorbea 1982, 174.
\[671\] Almagro Gorbea 1982, 195-196. Carlos Basas Faure, who gives the description of this terracotta head, also considers some of the sculpture to have been part of the pedimental decoration which according to Xavier Dupré belong to the relief plaques attached to the temple podium.
The two main decorative phases discerned by the excavators are the original decoration of the temple at the moment of its construction c. 150 (the excavators date the decorative system to 150-125) and a phase of redecoration dated to the first decades of the following century, which involved the almost complete replacement of the original decoration. However, the general style of the decoration was maintained, as well as the use of potnia theron antefixes. Given the fact that these antefixes were somewhat smaller in the redecorative phase, it is probable that the moulds were taken of the original antefixes which were then used as matrices to produce the new pieces, explaining the diminished dimensions. Interestingly, the new generation of antefixes was also provided with the epigraph IV-N, clearly referring to the titular deity of the sanctuary. No mention is made of the possible placement on the temple building or other parts of the sanctuary of the antefixes of female and satyr/faun heads, which are dated stylistically to the second half of the second century. The pieces in high relief belonging to the relief plaques of the temple podium and the pediment are unfortunately too fragmentary to identify a true narrative program for the sanctuary. The rest of the architectural decoration seems to have been relatively unexceptional, consisting of standard types (the potnia theron antefixes) or rather generic floral and vegetal motifs, so the relatively poor preservation of these distinctive decorative and figurative elements is especially lamentable.

Terracotta decoration has been found during the excavations of the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste some of which may be attributed to the monumental sanctuary itself, while other pieces are far too small to have been part of the sanctuary itself, and have been interpreted by the excavators as belonging to votive structures such as aediculae.672 The parts of the sanctuary that seem to have been decorated are the tetrastyle colonnades at the beginning of the rampe porticate, which are the only structures to use wood in their roofing, while the great double colonnades of the piazza della cortina and the porticus in summa cavea, which had concrete barrel vaulting instead of wooden roofing, were also decorated with fictile decoration.673 The decoration of the tetrastyle colonnades was straightforward and, as far as we can tell, non-figurative. A great number of polychromous revetment plaques decorated with palmettes, alternately right side up and upside down, connected by ribbons and surmounted by a ribbed
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672 FASOLO/GULLINI 1953, 262; GULLINI 1973, 770.
673 GULLINI 1973, 770-778.
frieze, were found in the area of the colonnades.\footnote{Fasolo/Gullini 1953, 261-262, fig. 348; Gullini 1973, 771.} Given the concentration of the fragments in this area and the fact that they are uniquely suited to the decoration of roofs with wooden elements, found only in this part of the sanctuary, we can be sure that these revetment plaques once decorated these colonnades.

The only figurative architectural decoration is found on the upper terraces, used for the revetment of the roofs of the double colonnade around the \emph{piazza della cortina}, the great open court occupying the fifth terrace, and of the \emph{porticus in summa cavea}. Both colonnades had concrete barrel vaulting, yet the exterior of these vaults were hidden from view by covering them with a ‘traditional’ ridge-roof, consisting of pan and cover tiles, the terminal tiles of the latter category being decorated with antefixes. Of the latter, two different types were used. The first is a traditional type, attached to the terminal \emph{imbrex}, with an additional strut and fired together. Two groups of this antefix-type were found during the excavation of the sanctuary. One group consists of relatively small antefixes in the shape of palmettes\footnote{Gullini 1973, 774-775, fig. 27.} the other of antefixes representing the figure of a winged Victory, of which only the upper part is preserved (fig. 56).\footnote{Gullini 1973, 775; Pensabene 2001, 94, Tar. K, 3.}

The second type displays a remarkable and as of yet unique technique used to attach the antefixes to the cover tiles. Terminal cover tiles were produced with a rectangular surface at the end, provided with a series of holes, which were made before firing.\footnote{Gullini 1973, 772, fig. 17.} Figurative pieces, executed in the round, were found in the sanctuary, which had a smoothened surface with holes in their lower parts,\footnote{Gullini 1973, 773, figs. 18, 20a-b, 21; Pensabene 2001, 94, Tar. L, 1; L, 3; L, 4.} evidently to be fastened to the special terminal cover tiles with nails (fig. 57).\footnote{Gullini 1973, 772, fig. 19; Pensabene 2001, Tar. L, 2} Some fragments of figurative terracottas perhaps also belong to this type of antefix on the basis of similarities in clay type and modelling even if the flattened surface to attach the pieces to the cover tiles has been lost.\footnote{Gullini 1973, 773-774, figs. 22-26.}

According to Gullini, the two types of antefixes should be related to different parts of the sanctuary. The \emph{porticus in summa cavea} would have been decorated with antefixes of the first type, the simpler palmette antefixes perhaps decorating the side of the roof facing

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.8\textwidth]{Fig_57}
\caption{Terracotta antefix representing a robed figure attached to a special terminal tile from the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste (Pensabene 2001, Tar. L, Fig. 2)}
\end{figure}
the mountainside and the winged Victories on the side facing the cavea. The roof of the double colonnade surrounding the piazza della cortina would then have sported the second, more interesting antefix type. Although these antefixes are too fragmentary to reconstruct specific subjects, it is obvious that a varied range of types was represented, among them warriors (fig. 58), flute players and figures with toga. On the basis of this typological variety, Gullini thinks that we must be dealing with an overarching subject or narrative cycle rather than with a single subject for each individual antefix. Of course, this hypothesis depends heavily on the idea that we are dealing with narrative decoration, while it is also possible that the decoration was purely representational or allegorical in nature, displaying archetypes rather than actors in a narrative sense. Rudolf Känel considers both antefix types to have been part of the same more or less homogenous group based on the quality of execution and clay types, and does not consider the difference in attachment technique a reason to attach them to different parts of the building. Känel’s suggestion thus creates more possibilities for the placement of pieces on the building and more possibilities for the combination of subjects and motifs.

Mention must also be made of another category of sculpted architectural decoration that was probably used at Praeneste. While it does not belong in the category of fictile decoration, and while it was not attached to the actual roof of a structure, it is nonetheless sculpted decoration which forms an integral part of the structures of the sanctuary, and is therefore included here. Although the reconstruction is not completely certain, the analemmata covering the sides of the cavea were probably decorated with marble caryatids or telamons supporting the upper plinths. If this reconstruction is correct, it would present yet another unique feature of the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia.

There are only two distinct categories of fictile decoration which can be attributed to the late republican monumental phase of the sanctuary of Diana Nemorensis. The first category is represented by a series of highly distinctive antefixes with a triangular shape in two different types; this type of antefix is known only from Nemi. The first represents shows a female bust, wearing a tunic and with a crescent-shaped diadem on her head. A quiver can be seen behind her right shoulder and a strung bow in front of her left one. Given the attributes, this antefix
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obviously represents the goddess Diana herself. The second type again shows a female bust, without attributes but wearing a mantle fastened in the centre and the hair dressed in a topknot. This type has also been identified as a representation of Diana.

The second category of fictile decoration dated to the same period as the monumental restructuring of the sanctuary are two types of revetment plaques which seem to be in the manner of the so-called lastre Campana. The first type, represented by two subtypes, shows a central winged figure with a polos on her head, dressed in a short tunic and wearing boots, who can thus again be identified as Diana/Artemis, grasping tendrils of foliage and flowers in each hand. The upper frieze of the plaque has the head of a lion on either side of another lion on one subtype and of a panther on the other. The undulating lower border is decorated with paterae, rosettes and human faces, and on one of the fragments of the subtype with the panther in the upper frieze, a sacrificial jug. Känel considers the possibility that these revetment plaques belonged to a renovation of the temple decoration.\textsuperscript{684} Given the fact that both types were found in and during excavation activities in the vicinity of the so-called cella donarie, Ghini attributes both categories of decoration, antefixes and revetment plaques, to the late republican ornamentation of these specific rooms,\textsuperscript{685} while Känel attributes the triangular antefixes to the great portico surrounding (part of) the temenos area.\textsuperscript{686}

While the excavation of the temple of Juno Sospita at Lanuvium has shown that the late republican monumental phase did not include the construction of a new temple, the mid-republican temple still standing in the later period was probably (partially) redecorated during this phase. Architectural terracottas have been found that have been dated on the basis of style and technique to the first century,\textsuperscript{687} and could therefore very well have been part of activities related to the monumental restructuring of the sanctuary. They consist of rather small antefixes with representations of Medusa and antefixes of the so-called Persian Artemis type, as well as fragments of terminal tiles, cresting and revetment plaques. No evidence was found for larger figured pieces.

Of the fictile decoration of the sanctuary of Hercules Victor virtually nothing is known. A single terracotta antefix, representing the head of Hercules, has been found near the so-called Tempio della Tosse, at some distance downhill from the sanctuary.\textsuperscript{688} Given the fact that Hercules is represented, and the painted inscription on the antefix reading C. [M]ani C. f., presumably the same person mentioned in one of the building inscriptions connected to the sanctuary, this piece of decoration probably belonged to the sanctuary’s monumental phase. However, the find spot at the Tempio della Tosse leaves open the possibility that the antefix adorned a different building in the vicinity. If it did belong to the fictile decoration of the sanctuary, it would most likely be to that of the upper half of the porticus triplex, since the dimensions of the antefix make it unlikely that it adorned the temple building itself.

Some terracotta material has been found at the sanctuary on top of Monte S. Angelo at Terracina, among which parts of a raking sima and antefixes with a young satyr’s head and

\textsuperscript{684} Känel 2000, 136-137.
\textsuperscript{685} Ghini in Moltesen 1997, 181.
\textsuperscript{686} Känel 2000, 136.
\textsuperscript{687} Andréén 1940, 432-436.
\textsuperscript{688} Although located at some distance from the sanctuary, other material which can be related to the sanctuary with certainty has been recovered there, sometimes re-used in the structure itself (Giuliani 1970, 200-201, 210).
a despotes theron. The latter antefix type is an exact parallel of the same type of antefix found at Praeneste, which were dated by Pensabene to the third century but which Känel dates to the late second century, more specifically to 130-120. If we accept this date, it could perhaps prove the existence of a temple at this sanctuary before the construction of the temple on the main terrace. This would lay to rest any speculations about the possibility of a non-sacred function of the complex of the piccolo tempio, as suggested by Quilici. It would moreover provide additional chronological evidence to further pinpoint the construction of this first late republican monumental phase.

Architectural ornamentation: stucco decoration and wall painting

We have seen that with regard to the ‘traditional’ decoration of temples and sanctuaries in the form of sculpted elements permanently attached to a part of the building, the monumental sanctuaries of Latium have yielded only limited evidence, and in some cases it seems that such decoration was absent altogether. However, some sanctuaries preserve traces of other forms

---

689 Quilici 2005, 278. Quilici suggests that we could be dealing with substructures for a villa in the case of the piccolo tempio, considering the similarities in terracing techniques to create platforms for both sanctuaries and villas during this period.
of decoration, namely stucco and wall painting, the development of which is a particular feature of this period and which sheds an interesting light on the types of decoration chosen and the possible intentions behind these choices.

The first monumental complex in which this form of decoration is preserved is the sanctuary of Aesculapius at Fregellae. During the excavation of the L-shaped porticoes of the complex, fragments of plaster were found which have been reconstructed as a wall decoration in the First Style (fig. 59). The decoration consists of a red plinth and a yellow dado, followed by a row of orthostates and two rows of yellow and red isodomes. Above these runs a white and yellow frieze and at the top of the wall we find a pseudo-gallery of small pilasters framing dark blue panels. The latter can perhaps be seen as the imitation of a mini-colonnade. This decorative system from the sanctuary of Fregellae is one of the earliest attestations of First Style painting in existence. It is certainly the earliest example in Latium and the first known instance of the use of this type of wall decoration in sacred structures.

The sanctuaries at Terracina and Praeneste have also yielded evidence of First Style wall decoration, yet in both cases the decoration was predominantly found in less-prestigious contexts. At Terracina, the vaulted spaces forming the front of the substructions of the terrace of the so-called piccolo tempio complex were decorated. Years of neglect, exposure to the elements, and vandalism by visitors eager to profess their ephemeral affections on millennia-old cultural landmarks have left the wall decoration badly damaged. It can still be recognised


Fig. 60. First Style stucco decorations of the substructures of the piccolo tempio at Terracina.
today in at least the two spaces placed at the northwestern end of a series of five, although it is probably safe to assume that the other spaces were decorated in a similar fashion. Interestingly, the decoration in these two spaces is not exactly the same, suggesting variation between the spaces. The best-preserved decoration consists of four tiers of yellow isodomes 25 cm high and a fifth tier of red isodomes 15 cm high, while the bands separating the blocks were coloured red, blue and green (fig. 60). The other space, where the wall decoration is not nearly as well preserved, has traces of a decoration containing orthostates. Although almost all traces of stucco and painted decoration have now disappeared, in an excavation report from 1894 it is mentioned that the portico behind the temple also had stucco decoration in the colours red and yellow.⁶⁹³ No mention is made of the style of the decoration, probably because even at that point it was too poorly preserved to identify the details of the decoration correctly. Since these are also the colours primarily used in the First Style decoration of the piccolo tempio, this perhaps strengthens Quilici’s assertion, mentioned earlier, that the two building complexes are closer in date than sometimes assumed, as well as suggesting an earlier date for the construction of temple and portico than the post-Sullan one usually adhered to. If instead

⁶⁹³ Borsari 1894, 104.
it was a decoration in a more advanced First Style or Second Style, the traditional chronology of the complexes is unaffected.

Wall decorations were discovered at the sanctuary of Fortuna at Praeneste in the structures excavated at the bottom of the western access ramp, adjoining the portico with fountain built there. It remains to be seen if these structures, sometimes identified as dwellings for the priests connected to the sanctuary, were actually part of the sanctuary proper. In any case, one of the rooms of this structure, a rectangular barrel-vaulted space, contained traces of a double layer of plaster on its walls. The bottom layer presents a decoration of wide orthostates on a dado, characteristic of First Style decorations. We have only some remnants of the second, top layer, which presents green, red and yellow bands, the exact composition of which cannot be reconstructed on the basis of the few pieces left. An adjoining rectangular hall also had notable traces of First Style decoration, which were still fairly well preserved at the time of the systematic excavations carried out after World War II, especially on the north wall. According to the excavators, the decoration consisted of a narrow plinth with orthostates with stripes in several colours on top, perhaps imitating polychromous marble. A narrow frieze then separates this lower orthostatic course from a zone of blocks laid in stretchers (in yellow, red and green) and in headers (red and yellow). A square room to the west of this hall must have been decorated in a similar manner, although there only the lower zone with the polychromous marble imitation was partly preserved.

The sanctuary of Diana Nemorensis presents a more advanced style of wall decoration. Within the great portico surrounding the main terrace, on the walls facing the central court,
traces have been found of painted decoration (fig. 62). These present the bases of dark (half-)columns, rendered in perspective against a red background. These columns or pilasters have the same distance between them as the actual columns of the colonnade in front of it, thereby creating the illusion of a double colonnade. The paintings are examples of early Second Style decorations.

These examples are essentially an advanced form of the revetment of walls that must have been used in the majority of sanctuaries; since opus incertum was rarely left uncovered, the sanctuaries which had elevations in this technique must have had extensive surfaces covered in simple stucco in addition to the more elaborate wall decoration described above. Unfortunately, little remains of the top layers, which makes it virtually impossible to ascertain what colours the walls of sanctuaries had. In two instances, remains have been found of stucco that once covered the columns of porticoes. At Fregellae, fragments of coloured stucco have been found that must have belonged to the shafts of the columns of the lateral porticoes. As reconstructed, the lower third of the length of these columns was covered with smooth, green stucco, the upper two-thirds covered in a cannelated, red stucco. A the sanctuary of Diana Nemorensis, stucco was found still on the shafts of the concrete columns of the great portico; here, the shafts seem to have been covered completely in red stucco.

In general, we can conclude that the wall decorations found at Latial monumental sanctuaries were intended to enhance the monumentality of the building complex. This is especially clear in the cases of Fregellae and Nemi, where the most conspicuous architectural monumental elements, the porticoes, were enhanced by wall decorations. At Terracina, there is the decoration of the portico behind the temple, following the pattern encountered in the cases of Fregellae and Nemi, but here less prestigious parts of the sanctuary, the vaulted substruction spaces of the piccolo tempio, were also decorated. Perhaps the enhancing quality of the decoration was precisely the reason to apply it to these ‘inferior’ spaces. The purpose of the decorations at Praeneste, at least in relation to the public and religious functions of the complex, is less clear. It has been suggested that the two structures on either side of the rampe porticate functioned as preparatory spaces, to be used by pilgrims entering the sanctuary for actions such as changing clothes and ritual cleansing. In this case, the First Style paintings would have a similar prestige-enhancing function, aimed at those visiting the sanctuary, as the decorations in the other building complexes. The use of polychromy in the two known instances also suggests a desire to emphasise architectural elements by the use of colour.

Non-architectural ornamentation: free-standing sculpture in the sanctuary

The last decorative category, non-architectural ornamentation, can have a profound effect on the visual effect of architectural space, since scultural groups can be used to attract or divert the eye and support or contradict architectural settings. It is perhaps also the most

---

697 Lip p o l i s in Coarelli 1986, 36-37.
698 Ghini 1993, 284.
699 Coarelli 1987a, 45. Even though only the western one has been excavated, the axial symmetry of the entire complex probably permits the reconstruction of a similar structure at the eastern end.
problematic, since sculpture can be added to the sanctuary at virtually any point in the course of its existence. It is therefore important to try to ascertain which sculptures were connected to the phase of monumental restructuring, and if these sculptures were an intended part of the sanctuary’s overall visual appearance. Although mobile (to a certain degree), free-standing sculpture was as much a part of the sanctuary’s visual imagery as the architectural ornamentation and deserves our attention. While perhaps not always intended as part of the master plan underlying the architectural transformation of the cult places, statuary that was erected around the same time does tell us something about the use and perception of these religious spaces. Of the eight sanctuaries under consideration, the sanctuaries at Fregellae and Terracina have not yielded any evidence of free-standing sculpture, if we leave out actual cult statues.\textsuperscript{700} Sculptures recovered in or near the sanctuary of Tusculum, such as the statue of Jupiter reworked into a statue of Tiberius, are late in date and cannot be connected to the late republican monumental building phases.

A great quantity of sculpture was found in the area of Gabii, part of which could well have come from the sanctuary area.\textsuperscript{701} One of the most famous is a nearly complete statue of Eros stringing his bow.\textsuperscript{702} However, reliable information about the conditions in which the sculptures were found do not allow us to make certain attributions. During the Spanish excavations at the site, only fragments of sculpture were found. Based on some architectural features we can perhaps conjecture the existence of sculptural displays around the temple and inside the \textit{porticus triplex}. A low continuous base of \textit{lapis gabinus} was placed along three sides of the temple podium (all except the side with the staircase), in which cavities were found, frequently in the shape of human feet.\textsuperscript{703} Obviously, these were intended for the placement of sculptures. However, the excavators have concluded that this statue base was constructed later than the temple itself, although no suggestions are made about how much later this would have been. Certainly contemporaneous with the late republican monumental phase are rows of shallow cavities found in the eastern and northern colonnades.\textsuperscript{704} They are far too shallow to have been used for the planting of trees or shrubs, and a plausible hypothesis has been presented that we are dealing with foundation trenches for statue bases. Nothing further can be concluded on the basis of the available evidence.

The sanctuary of Diana Nemorensis has yielded by far the largest amount of sculptures, with the added advantage that many of them have been reasonably well preserved.\textsuperscript{705} Most of these have been found in the so-called ‘\textit{celle donarie}’, a series of rooms located in the central part of the main terrace, built against the back wall retaining the terrain above. The date of construction

\textsuperscript{700} As noted above, some fragments of terracotta sculpture from Fregellae can perhaps be reconstructed as cult statues of Aesculapius and Hygieia/Salus, while the main temple of the sanctuary at Terracina preserves a base in the centre of the back wall, clearly meant for the cult statue.

\textsuperscript{701} \textit{Blanco} 1958; \textit{Carietta} et al. 1978.

\textsuperscript{702} \textit{Acuña Fernández in Almagro Gorbea} 1982, 253-258. The statue of Eros, probably a copy of a bronze original by Lysippos, is dated to the second century AD (\textit{Blanco} 1958, 59-62; \textit{Acuña Fernández in Almagro Gorbea} 1982, 253-254). It was not found during the Spanish excavations; it was discovered during ploughing activities in the vicinity of the temple in 1953.

\textsuperscript{703} \textit{Jiménez in Almagro Gorbea} 1982, 73-74.

\textsuperscript{704} \textit{Jiménez in Almagro Gorbea} 1982, 49-50, 51-52.

\textsuperscript{705} The Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek in Copenhagen possesses the majority of the Nemi sculptures, with smaller collections at the Castle Museum in Nottingham and the University of Pennsylvania Museum in Philadelphia.
of these rooms is uncertain,\textsuperscript{706} and it is also uncertain when the sculptures found in the rooms were placed there and with what purpose. A considerable amount of sculpture is from the Imperial period and cannot be related to the late republican phase of the sanctuary,\textsuperscript{707} but there are several pieces which can be dated to the period of monumentalisation. Although the goddess Diana is featured among those represented, a large number of other divinities are represented as well.\textsuperscript{708} At least three large acrolithic statues were found, probably cult statues placed in the temple of Diana or one of the other shrines of the sanctuary.\textsuperscript{709} One of the heads of the acroliths can certainly be identified as Diana, and perhaps a second female head as well. A head and upper torso of a bearded male figure probably represents Aesculapius, perhaps in his local guise as the deified hero Virbius. One of the more unusual and interesting finds are the eight marble vases, four amphorae and four griffin cauldrons, dedicated by a certain Chio.\textsuperscript{710} In addition to these sculptures, which are either large-scale (the acroliths) or unusual (the vases), the sculptures which can be dated to the period coinciding with the monumentalisation of the sanctuary are mostly small-scale marble votive statuettes.\textsuperscript{711} Given the fact that the sculptures which can probably be related to the monumental phase are all cult-related, the contrast with the predominance of portrait sculpture in the later period is striking.

\textsuperscript{706} Guldager Bilde 2000, 101-102. A date after the initial late republican monumentalisation is suggested (Ghini 1993, 280). It is certain that the rooms were altered or strengthened several times after they were constructed.

\textsuperscript{707} Among these the famous finds in room A of the \textit{celle donarie} of the full-size marble statue of an actor, Gaius Fundilius Doctus, and a full-size statue and a herm of his former \textit{patrona} Fundilia Rufa, as well as several other portraits identified by inscriptions, all dating to the first half of the first century AD (Poulsen 1941; Poulsen 1962, 112-117; Moltesen 2000, 113-116). The number of portraits among the sculptures of the Imperial period is striking: in addition to portraits of private individuals, portrait statues of Tiberius and perhaps of Drusus and Germanicus were also found.

\textsuperscript{708} Guldager Bilde 2000, 103-104, 105-106 Table 1.

\textsuperscript{709} Guldager Bilde 1995; Moltesen 2000, 116.

\textsuperscript{710} Guldager Bilde 1997.

\textsuperscript{711} Guldager Bilde/Moltesen 2002, 24-38.
it is possible, or even likely, that these portrait statues were meant as ex-votos, the change in
the form and nature of the dedications may signify an important change in the religious
life and use of the sanctuary.\footnote{Møltesen 2000, 116-117.}

Several pieces of sculpture, none of them complete, have been related to the sanctuary
of Fortuna Primigenia.\footnote{Fasolo/Gullini 1953, 259-261; Gullini 1973, 765-770.} One of the largest
pieces consists of two large fragments of grey marble belonging to an acrolith of a female
figure.\footnote{Gullini 1973, 766; Zevi 1979, 20-21; Coarelli 1987a, 81-82; Agnoli 2002, 31-40.}
Gullini attributes it to the sanctuary, and even considers it to be the cult statue of Fortuna placed in the circular aedes.\footnote{Gullini 1973, 766.} Others have insisted that the statue was not one of the
sculptures set up in the monumental sanctuary and that it was originally placed in the lower
part of the city and represents Isis.\footnote{Zevi 1979, 20-21; Coarelli 1987a, 81-82.} A piece
which can almost certainly be attributed to the sculptural decoration of the sanctuary is
a marble head, slightly larger than life-size, found among the material contained in the
well on the terrazza degli emicicli.\footnote{Gullini 1973, 768.} Coarelli, who dates the head to the end of the second century,
considers it as the head of Fortuna, part of a statue of the goddess nursing the infants Jupiter
and Juno mentioned by Cicero, which was placed on the square base located in the centre of
the eastern hemicycle.\footnote{Zevi 1979, 20-21; Coarelli 1987a, 81-82; Agnoli 2002, 40-52.} On the piazza della cortina three other marble sculptures were found,\footnote{Gullini (1973, 767-768) considers the attribution of the head to this particular statue possible, although he retains
that it can date no later than 140, and that the identification of this statue at this particular place necessarily proves that this is the location of the sortes, as described by Cicero (De div. 2.41.85-86), giving the statue as an important marker: “…locus saeptus religiosae propter Iovis puere, qui lactens, cum Junone Fortunae in gremio sedens, mammae adpectens…”.
} where they were presumably also set up. They represent three female figures dressed in chiton
and himation (fig. 63), and on the basis of certain technical and stylistic characteristics, Gullini
considers them to have been produced by Italic, although strongly Hellenised, workshops.
The backs of two of the statues were very summarily executed, suggesting that they were placed
against a wall or inside a niche. One of the statues demonstrates clearly that the head was
produced separately from the body (fig. 64), possibly consisting of a different type of stone,

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig64.png}
\caption{Close-up of a fragmentary female statue from the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste, showing the space for the insertion of a separate head (Gullini 1973, fig. 15a).}
\end{figure}

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \footnote{Møltesen 2000, 116-117.}
\item \footnote{Fasolo/Gullini 1953, 259-261; Gullini 1973, 765-770.}
\item \footnote{Gullini 1973, 766; Zevi 1979, 20-21; Coarelli 1987a, 81-82; Agnoli 2002, 31-40.}
\item \footnote{Gullini 1973, 766.}
\item \footnote{Zevi 1979, 20-21; Coarelli 1987a, 81-82. Pliny explicitly mentions a famous gilded statue of Fortuna from Praeneste (Plin. Nat. Hist. 33.61), and although he does not specifically mention it was the cult statue of the sanctuary, it would be the most logical setting. Nadia Agnoli suggests that the statue was placed in the so-called ‘santuario inferiore’, buildings belonging to the forum, where fragments of sculpture in the same style and material were found (Agnoli 2002, 31).}
\item \footnote{Fasolo/Gullini 1953, 261; Gullini 1973, 767-768; Coarelli 1987a, 50-51, 68; Agnoli 2002, 52-55.}
\item \footnote{Gullini (1973, 767-768) considers the attribution of the head to this particular statue possible, although he retains
that it can date no later than 140, and that the identification of this statue at this particular place necessarily proves that this is the location of the sortes, as described by Cicero (De div. 2.41.85-86), giving the statue as an important marker: “…locus saeptus religiosae propter Iovis puere, qui lactens, cum Junone Fortunae in gremio sedens, mammae adpectens…”.
} \footnote{Gullini 1973, 768-770; Agnoli 2002, 40-52.}
\end{itemize}
and later inserted. On the basis of the characteristics of the sculptures, we cannot establish if they represented female divinities or if they were portrait statues. If an identification as portrait statues is accepted, considering their high-profile setting we are probably dealing with ex-votos or honorary statues of wealthy individuals, erected by themselves or by others, possibly priestesses or matronae although the absence of distinctive attributes makes a more detailed identification impossible.

Surely the most famous sculpture to have been recovered at the sanctuary of Hercules Victor is the so-called ‘General of Tivoli’ (fig. 65). The sculpture was found in 1925 in the area where the great collection tanks were built of the power plant occupying a large part of the sanctuary area in that period. The original location of the statue cannot be established with absolute certainty, but a likely suggestion is that it was placed on one of the honorary bases attached to the pilasters decorating the façade of the upper portico of the sanctuary. The statue is a perfect example of the marriage between Roman and Hellenistic stylistic languages. The body is a variation on the heroic nudity typical of the statuary associated with Hellenistic monarchs: in this case, the idealised body is partly covered by a carefully draped mantle. The military connotations of the statue are reflected in the removed cuirass, placed at the left leg and serving as a support. Contrasting strongly with the ideal rendering of the body, the head of the statue is a portrait in the veristic tradition, which shows an older man with all the lines, creases and sagging skin associated with his age. Given the date of the statue, at least in the first half of the first century, it was probably set
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720 Agnoli 2002, 51 fig. 4c.
721 Agnoli 2002, 43-44.
723 Kleiner 1992, 36 (75-50); Nista in La Regina 1998, 34 (90-70); Hallett 2005, 120-121 (late second century or early first century).
up at the sanctuary shortly after the completion of the late republican building phase. We do not know whether the statue was erected by the person depicted or by others to honour him, but its prominent placement inside the sanctuary precinct suggests a person of considerable social status.\(^{224}\)

One of the most remarkable statuary groups recovered in these sanctuaries is the equestrian group from Lanuvium. The vast majority of the fragments belonging to this group were found during the excavations at the sanctuary of Juno Sospita conducted by Lord Savile between 1884 and 1890, although during later investigations additional fragments were found. Although in the original publication of the sculptures by Arthur Woodward in 1914 and 1929 the pieces were considered mediocre works of the mid-second century AD and made of Italic marble,\(^{225}\) subsequent studies have shown that we are dealing with a late-Hellenistic sculptural group made of Greek marble.\(^{226}\) Most of the pieces were found among the ruins of the great late republican portico, but the level of fragmentation suggests that this was not the original location of the group. Material was found dispersed throughout the sanctuary, and the recovery of a marble head probably belonging to the statuary group in the area of the temple suggests the placement of the group on the upper sanctuary terrace, possibly in the vicinity of or directly across from the temple itself.\(^{227}\)

The group portrays several warriors on horseback, and consists of at least eight or nine individuals.\(^{228}\) Of the seven torsos that have been found, two are clearly of a higher quality than the remaining five. In addition, one of the qualitatively superior torsos is dressed differently: instead of the short cuirass worn by the other horsemen, this individual wears a tight tunic and wide mantle (fig. 66). It seems that care was taken to differentiate individuals within the group, probably according to hierarchical status, with at least one, unarmed individual given

Christopher Hallett considers it “more likely that the statue honours a local leader” rather than “an important Roman general” (Hallett 2005, 121). Of course, one does not necessarily preclude the other.

Woodward 1914; Woodward 1929.

Roques de Maumont 1958, 42-47; Siegentopf 1968, 73-75; Coarelli 1981, 234. Coarelli suggested that the marble was from the Greek isles, but recent analysis of some of the pieces has led to the conclusion that the group was sculpted from Pentelic marble (Attenni 2004a, 111, 112-113).

On the marble head, see Coarelli 1981, 249-250; Coarelli 1987a, 153. It was kept at the Museo Civico at Lanuvio, and was badly damaged during allied bombings in 1944. Pieces of the head have been rediscovered in 1998 (Attenni 2004a, 110-111, 115, figs. 3-6).

Coarelli 1981, 250; Coarelli 1987a, 153. Seven different torsos and seven different heads of horses were found. However, more fragments of horses were found than can be assigned to just these seven. In addition, the head found in the temple did not fit with any of the known torsos, and thus constitutes a separate individual.
an especially eminent, heroised position. Several details of the figures, such as the typically Hellenistic cuirass, the open sandals which are typically Greek, the rendering of the horses (fig. 67), and the recovered head with distinctly classicistic features (fig. 68), have led to the conclusion that we are dealing with a marble copy of an originally bronze sculptural group from the second half of the fourth century, by or influenced by Lysippos.

It has been suggested that the sculptural group which inspired the Lanuvian one was the famous group of 26 bronze statues representing the turma of Alexander the Great and his companions at the Battle at the Granicus River, originally erected and dedicated at the sanctuary of Dion in Macedonia but taken to Rome by Metellus Macedonicus in 146 and displayed in his Porticus Metelli. According to Coarelli, the equestrian group of Lanuvium should thus be seen as an imitatio Alexandri. The sculptural group and the late republican monumentalisation of the sanctuary must be part of the same project by the same patron, who according to Coarelli should be recognised in Lucius Licinius Murena, the first person from Lanuvium to become consul. He has been associated with Lucius Licinius Lucullus, consul of 74, who was likened to Alexander the Great in the political propaganda in the context of the Second Mithridatic War. It is thus possible that the Lanuvian statuary group indeed represented the famous Lysippan group, perhaps with the head of Alexander replaced with a portrait of Lucullus, while one of the companions was provided with a portrait of Murena.
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729 Coarelli 1981, 243-244.
730 Coarelli 1981, 235-239 (cuirass), 239-243 (sandals), 245-246 (horses), 249-250 (head), 250 (general conclusion about date of the copy and nature and date of original); Coarelli 1987a, 147 (cuirass), 147-149 (sandals), 150 (horses), 153 (head), 153 (general conclusion about date of the copy and nature and date of original). Coarelli’s chronological analysis is supported by Luca Attenni (Attenni 2004a, 111-113).
731 Siedentopf 1968, 73-75.
732 Coarelli 1981, 250-261; Coarelli 1983a, 198-199 Coarelli 1987a, 155-159. Coarelli’s interpretation, elaborating on earlier authors, of the group has been challenged by some, ranging from differences of opinion on stylistic details (Moreno 1983-1984, 32, 36) and the extent of Lysippan inspiration (Calcani 1984) to complete dismissal (Gualandi 1980). It has also found acceptance (Ridgway 1990, 120; Stewart 1993, 123; Attenni 2004a, 113), and seems a plausible suggestion given the historical context.
733 Coarelli 1981, 253; Coarelli 1987a, 155. See also the section on the patrons of Latial sanctuaries in Chapter Two. The first to attribute the sculptural group to Licinius Murena was Harald von Roques de Maumont (Roques de Maumont 1958, 42-47).
This interpretation of the group and its possible placement in front of the temple of Juno Sospita leads to a number of interesting observations. First of all, if the relationship between the sculptural group and Murena and Lucullus is accepted, it would clearly demonstrate the ties between the two branches of the gens Licinia, the Licinii Luculli and the Licinii Murenæ, and thereby the ties between Rome and Lanuvium on a social level. Second of all, the erection of the group and the monumentalisation of the sanctuary, both related to successes in the Second Mithridatic War, would in this case demonstrate the continued involvement of domi nobles active in the Roman political scene with their hometowns. Related to this point is the fact that these sanctuaries were apparently actively used for political propaganda: the group itself as an imitatio Alexandri sends out a clear message of following in the footsteps of illustrious predecessors, especially when combined with epic poetry composed by Aulus Licinius Archias to celebrate Lucullus, conveying the same message of an imitatio Alexandri in the form of verse; apparently, the comparison between Lucullus and Alexander was part of a carefully planned propaganda strategy. In addition, by associating the group with the temple of Juno Sospita, the goddess is claimed as a personal patroness, an increasingly frequent phenomenon in the first century.

In conclusion, we can say that a large part of the sculptures found at monumental sanctuaries is essentially cult-related. Images of the gods and goddesses worshipped at these sites are frequent, and a lot of the remaining sculpture is clearly meant as an ex-voto. However, by providing these gifts to the gods with inscriptions, and in some cases by the chosen form itself, such as a portrait, the intention behind the gift has a social as well as a religious function. If we are dealing with portraits in the case of the female statues set up, for example, at the piazza della cortina at Praeneste, the women represented are honoured as well as the goddess to whom the statues are presented. In the cases of the Tivoli General and the Lanuvian equestrian group, the social dimensions of the sculptures also have strong political connotations. Instead of religious virtues being advocated, these statues celebrate individuals,
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734 Coarelli 1981, 254-257; Coarelli 1987a, 158-159.
often with strong military overtones, once again highlighting the suitability of sanctuaries as a locus for aristocratic political propaganda.

*Visual systems: architecture and ornamentation*

The previous sections contained an overview of the ornamental aspects of Latial sanctuaries in their late republican monumental phase. Now it is time to interpret this evidence, especially in the light of broader developments with regard to the decoration of temples and architecture in the late republican period. Architectural decoration is, of course, closely and uniquely related to the structures which they adorned, and therefore a consideration of the architectural form of the sanctuaries under discussion in the context of their possible decorations is desirable. The very fact that during the late republican period, constructions completely built in stone gained prominence is an important factor in the contemporaneous changes and developments of architectural decoration, since to build in stone, especially with regard to the superstructure of buildings, means that the architectural decoration lost its traditional functional use as protective covering for perishable building materials. Maria José Strazzulla has noted that from the late second century onwards, the use of architectural terracottas is progressively abandoned because of technical developments in temple construction, most importantly the fact that temples were increasingly constructed completely in stone.\(^{736}\)

However, this statement is perhaps too straightforward and does not take into account the range of possibilities still available in the Late Republic. As I have stressed above, the simple availability of an option does not necessarily mean that this option should be used. An element of choice is always involved, since one can either: (a) continue building in ‘traditional’ ways, in which architectural decoration retains its functional and ornamental aspects; (b) build in stone but retain architectural decoration, in which case it would only serve ornamental needs; and (c) build in stone without any form of decoration. The last option is extremely rare, and even if we do find temples built in stone seemingly devoid of decoration, we cannot be sure if this was the case in antiquity. The fact that no trace of decoration was found does perhaps make it less likely that this decoration was particularly abundant. With regard to the first two options, we find an interesting mix of material evidence for the late republican Latial sanctuaries.

The temples of Lanuvium, Fregellae and Gabii had roofs which were provided with a full range of terracotta decoration associated with wooden superstructures. Of course, these are also the earliest dated temples, which perhaps implies that there is some truth to the statement that this decoration was abandoned later in the second century. However, we have a fascinating example of terracotta decoration combined with construction in stone, in this case, concrete, at Praeneste. There, the barrel vaults of the porticoes of the highest terraces were covered with ridged roofs, with cover tiles ending in antefixes. Here, terracotta decoration clearly did not have a protective function, which means that the figurative decoration was the result of a conscious choice. A similar situation, where the single piece of terracotta decoration associated with roofs is probably related to the porticoes instead of the temple building, is at Tibur. Here too, we may assume from comparison to other parts of the sanctuary that the porticoes were

\(^{736}\) **Strazzulla** 1977, 45.
covered with barrel vaults, while no remains of actual tiles have been found. A similar solution to the roofs of the Praenestine porticoes may well have been adopted at Tibur. At Nemi, where the terracotta decoration which can be related to the late republican monumental phase can be attributed to the great portico of the main sanctuary terrace, we have a curious mixture of stone architecture in the form of the columns and entablature, while the beams supporting the tiled roof were probably made of wood, which means that the terracotta decoration did have a protective function, at least in part. Dated in the period between the construction of the sanctuaries at Praeneste and Tibur, this presents an example of the lack of a clear linear development in roofing and associated decoration. An interesting fact is that the portico of the sanctuary at Fregellae also had an entablature completely in stone, while the decoration of the temple, as noted above, clearly belongs to a wooden roof.\textsuperscript{737} This demonstrates that even in single sanctuaries, building techniques used for various parts of the complex could differ. We must note that we are dealing, in all these cases, with the decoration of porticoes, which may differ, in its importance and visual impact, from the decoration of the main temple building. No decoration of the roof has been found for the first-century temple at Terracina, nor at Tusculum. If terracotta decoration had been found, these two temples would have been interesting cases for comparison since they are the last in the series of temple structures, chronologically, and could have provided valuable evidence for the development of roofing and decoration used for first-century temple buildings.

Overall, it seems that roof decoration becomes less prominent, at least in these sanctuaries. While the temples of Fregellae and Gabii, and to a lesser extent Lanuvium, are still decorated with figurative pieces, including pedimental sculpture, the decoration related to the other sanctuaries is far less abundant and increasingly generic: floral and vegetal motifs predominate, and the figurative terracottas all seem to be cult-related, representing the main divinity of the sanctuary. It is possible that the decoration of the sanctuary of Praeneste must be interpreted, at least partly, in the same manner; many pieces that have been recovered seem to point towards the representation of a procession. Mention must also be made of the suitability of the structures themselves for figurative decoration with a narrative content. The temple at Terracina, for instance, is placed in a manner that virtually precludes the ability to fully view any pedimental decoration; if someone wanted to fully appreciate any sculpture, which would require viewing them at a sufficient angle and thus some distance from the temple building, he would end up more than 200 m below, since the temple was placed so close to the edge of the terrace (\textit{figs.} 34, 41). Similarly, sanctuaries such as the one at Praeneste did not provide a single architectural focus, in the form of a temple with pediment on which the most important figurative decoration could be concentrated, perhaps making such decoration less effective. Decorating the porticoes with, we must assume, at least partly repetitive pieces would, especially given the relatively small dimensions of the pieces, only underline the architectural monumentality of the sanctuary instead of highlighting the narrative content of the decoration itself.

This seems to be one of the important shifts in emphasis that can be observed in the late republican period, at least as far as these sanctuaries are concerned. While earlier temples

\textsuperscript{737} Verzar Bass in Coarelli 1986, 45-49.
certainly were buildings on a grand or even monumental scale, they also sported elaborate systems of figurative terracotta decoration. The message that was conveyed by the temple depended on the symbiosis between architecture and ornamentation. In the late republican period, architectural mass seems to become more important. The gargantuan dimensions and innovative architectural elements of sanctuaries such as Praeneste and Tibur would have made a deep impression on visitors, much more so than any decorative programs which might have adorned these sanctuaries. In earlier temples, architectural decoration and architecture were put on a more equal footing than in the late republican monumental sanctuaries that seemed more intent on exploring the communicative possibilities of architecture. Furthermore, we see that other forms of decoration, such as wall painting, are specifically used to enhance the monumental aspects of the sanctuaries. Instead of relying on decoration for propagandistic purposes, religious structures now employ architectural mass itself as a carrier of messages. These messages may have been more diffuse or ambiguous than the ones expressed by figurative decoration, but it is a message nonetheless.

This emphasis on monumentality itself, the overall generic quality of much architectural decoration and a certain amount of inwardness or self-reference in the cult-related decoration of many sanctuaries stands in marked contrast to a second important development in the nature of decoration in these sanctuaries. We can observe an increased prominence of individual representation in the sanctuary; the Tivoli General and the Lanuvian equestrian group are clear examples of aristocrats introducing their own image in religious space, emphasising individual achievements and ambition. While it was certainly possible for individuals to present themselves in the sanctuary through the dedication of prestigious votive gifts, the introduction of actual portrait statues with a strong militaristic and political content is probably a new development. Given the fact that these two examples are dated to the first half of the first century and thus relatively late, we can probably interpret it as a specific phenomenon of this period. It remains to be seen how we must relate and understand these two phenomena, which seem to be at two extremes of the spectrum of representation: one a new form of emphasised individuality, the other rather image-less and non-specific.

Images in religious space during the Late Republic

The propagandistic potential of public, and especially religious, architecture has long been recognised, both in ancient and in modern times. Making a virtue out of necessity, the imposing qualities of the architecture itself were invariably complemented by the use of decorative systems, primarily fictile decoration serving a practical function of protecting the building and its structural elements against the elements and a representational function in the use of images in general understood as conveying religious or socio-political messages. Although the decoration of temple buildings was probably far richer than we can now imagine, including
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738 Although the representational content of temple decoration can and often does allude to the divinity to which the temple is dedicated, it has been pointed out that from the very beginning the use of architectural decoration can be interpreted as a reflection of the socio-political system of the society which produced it. See, for instance, WINTER 2008 (Archaic period); PAIRAUT-MASSA 1999, 521-532 (Late Archaic period); STRAZZULLA 2007, 140 (mid-republican period).
at least painted panels which have been lost, the fictile decorations of temples give us a fair idea about the representational possibilities offered by this material category.739 Perhaps not surprisingly, architectural decoration, like architecture and other visual arts, was highly influenced by the rise of Rome as a Mediterranean superpower, leading to an increasingly secure hegemonic position in Italy and a profound change in relations with other political entities in the Mediterranean region. The period in which the monumental sanctuaries of Latium were constructed is characterised by a number of important developments in the ways temples and sanctuaries were ornamented. One of those, the increase of construction in stone, has already been mentioned above, but this is certainly not the only important change during the period.

A relatively large amount of attention has been given to the appearance of the closed pediment in Italic sacred architecture, replacing the traditional decoration of this triangular area of the temple with separate mutulus- and columna-plaques, protecting the main horizontal beams supporting the roof. Although closed pediments already begin to appear in the late fourth century or even earlier, in the second century this decorative formula becomes more common.740 Our evidence for the city of Rome is limited, with just two sculptural groups used as the decoration of a closed temple pediment: the famous via San Gregorio group and the slightly earlier via Latina sculptures.741 Outside of Rome, we have a greater diversity of material. Reconstruction of entire groups remains problematic, however, and it is possible that the tradition of decorating temples with columna- and mutulus-plaques, instead of providing temples with a closed pediment, continued in some cases. While some of the pedimental groups on a larger scale are dated to the late fifth, fourth or third century,742 most of the Hellenistic pedimental groups are dated to the period after the Second Punic War. The vast majority of these decorative groups are dated to the first half of the second century,743 or

739 Torelli considers the plastic decoration of temples to have been less rich in narrative possibilities than painted panels or friezes, yet given their close narrative relationship the sculpted decoration can be used to reconstruct the logic of ancient propaganda using visual means (Torelli 1993, 271; Torelli 1999, 121).

740 Pairet-Massa 1985, 131-134; Gros 1996, 126-127. Gros dates the start of the phenomenon to the late fourth century, while Maria José Strazzulla rightly points to the pedimental sculptures of the Belvedere temple at Orvieto as the first examples of a closed pediment (Strazzulla 1977, 41). The fact that closed pediments started to appear this early means that it this feature is difficult to maintain as the defining criterion of the so-called ‘third’ and final phase of architectural decoration as defined by Alessandro Della Seta and adhered to by Arvid Andrén (Della Seta 1918; Andrén 1940), since this phase would then span more than four centuries, far longer than the other two phases (Strazzulla 1977, 41).

741 For the via San Gregorio Group, see Strazzulla et al. 1990-1991; Strazzulla 1993a, esp. 317-334; Ferrea 2002 (Ferrea’s proposed new reconstruction of the pedimental group has been, rightly, criticised by Torelli and Strazzulla; see Torelli 2004; Strazzulla 2006a). The via Latina sculptures unfortunately have not enjoyed the same amount of scholarly attention. For a description and illustrations, see Andrén 1940, 360-363 (presented as figures from the via Appia Nuova rather than the via Latina); Coarelli 1976, 26, 42-43 figs. 7-11.

742 Examples include the decoration of the Belvedere temple in Orvieto, the terracotta groups found at the localities of Lo Scasato (Comella 1993) and Vignale (Carlucci 1995) at Civitá Castellana and the terracotta group from Tivoli (Roncalli 1983).

743 Dates in the first half of the second century are given for the group from località Catona at Arezzo (Strazzulla 1977, 41; Ducci 1987-1988), a sanctuary from the urban area of Bolsena (Pairet-Massa/Pailley 1979), località Fucoli at Chianciano (Rastrelli 1993), the temples B and D and the Capitolium at Cosa (Taylor 2002), the various terracotta groups from Luni (Banti 1937, 44-52; Strazzulla 1992), the Talamonaccio temple at Orbetello (von Vacano/von Freytag Loringhoff 1982), a sanctuary in the Hellenistic urban area of Vetulonia (Esposito 1985, 138-139), Temple A at Volterra (Cristofani 1973, 43; Esposito 1985, 139-140) and a sanctuary in the Camposcala locality at Vulci (Buranelli 1992).
around the middle of the second century. Only a few examples of pedimental sculpture can be dated to the late second century. This suggests that the decoration of temple pediments with figurative groups is tied to a specific period, with a concentration of attested examples in the first half of the second century.

The composition of the decoration of these closed pediments can roughly be divided into two groups: the first has a marked 'pictorial' quality, filling the entire pediment with figures in various degrees of relief at different heights, sometimes superimposed, while the second had a distinct 'statuary' character, presenting isolated figures modelled in the round, or almost in the round, placed on the base of the pediment. Stylistically, the pedimental decoration can also be divided into two groups: the first group draws on a classicistic neo-attic visual language, the second shows a preference for example from Asia Minor, especially Pergamon. The pediments of neo-attic inspiration are relatively infrequent though by no means inconsequential, while the majority of late republican pedimental decoration and large figurative friezes belonging to temples take their inspiration from Pergamene visuals schemes. The preference for one visual language or the other is frequently related to the subject matter of the decoration, which is predisposed towards one figurative language or the other. Neo-attic decoration tends to have a strong representational character, while Pergamene tends to be more dramatic and narrative.

It has been noted that the driving role of Rome was an important factor in the genesis of the late republican decorative programs and the choice of the subject depicted. Although certainly not in all cases, this is reflected in the subjects depicted on pediments. Particularly popular are stories from the Trojan cycle. The period in which this happened is significant: Magna Mater had been introduced at Rome only years or at most decades before, and the transferral of the cult to Rome had involved the intensification of diplomatic contacts with Pergamon. Erich Gruen has argued that the introduction of the cult of Magna Mater must be interpreted in the light of the cultivation by Rome of her Trojan origins, thereby positioning herself in the Greek-Hellenistic world which she increasingly came to dominate. The Trojan legend had a double significance for Rome: it gave her a place in the cultural milieu of the Greek world, while at the same time signalling her distinctiveness in this world.

---

744 Dates around the middle of the second century are given for the group from the various temples at Chieti (Liberatore 2006; Campanelli 2008; Liberatore forthcoming), the terracottas from Civitalba (Zuffa 1957; Landolfi 1990; Landolfi 1994), and the pedimental group from Nemi (Kanel 2000; Moltensen 2009). The two Roman groups (via San Gregorio and via Latina) are also generally dated to this period.

745 An example from Latium is the pedimental decoration of the Juno Moneta temple at Segni (Cifarelli 2003, 173-174, 183; Cifarelli 2006), while outside Latium the terracottas from the Monastero area at Aquileia are dated to the late second century (Strazzulla 1987; Kanel 2005).

746 Strazzulla 1977, 45.


748 Strazzulla 2007, 152. Strazzulla notes that there are also instances of contamination between these two figurative languages.

749 Strazzulla 2007, 152. Examples include the Capitolium of Cosa, the pediment of Aquileia and the pediment representing the Capitoline Triad from Chieti.

750 Strazzulla 2007, 152-157. For the importance of the cultural links between Rome and Pergamon in general, see Deubner 1949-1950; Kuttner 1995.


752 Gruen 1990, 5-33.

of Trojan myths on architectural decorative programs in this period cannot be interpreted and understood without referring to this fundamental historic occasion.

Besides decorative cycles inspired by the Trojan legend, the subject chosen for decorative programs often had themes that were particular favourites of the Attalid dynasty, again underlining the nexus between style, subject and socio-political circumstances. Celtomachies and gigantomachies were especially popular, and it is clear that in the second century a symbolic layer was superimposed on these legendary or mythical battles. The depiction of celtomachies called to mind Rome’s victory over the Gauls in the not-too-distant past. The theme of a Gigantomachy had the function to evoke the glorious victory of the forces of Good over the forces of Evil, and had been used many times before in Greek, Hellenistic and Italic contexts to allude to historical victors and their defeated foes, in this particular historical context undoubtedly to be equated with Rome and Carthage respectively.

A specific characteristic of the Hellenistic period with regard to the subject matter of roof decoration is the rediscovery or reasserting of local roots. The celebration of local legends and heroes has been hypothesised as the subject for numerous temple decorations. Interestingly, this is also true for colonial foundations, in which case we must surely be dealing with an invention of tradition. While this preference for local myths may signal the revival of local cultures in reaction to the growing power and influence of Rome, as has been suggested in Chapter Two for the construction of monumental sanctuaries in Samnium and Lucania, it can also be understood in the wider framework of the Italic world fully entering the Mediterranean stage in the wake of Roman expansion. It has been suggested above that Rome itself also began to stress her Trojan heritage during this period, and many of the local legends ultimately find a reference in greater narrative cycles in which Rome also plays a role. As a rule, strong anti-Roman messages cannot be detected in the figurative decoration of Italic temples during the late third and second centuries. Moreover, the Greek stylistic language used to portray these myths and legends are strongly related to cultural developments in the capital, suggesting that at least in matters of style there was no attempt to distinguish between local and metropolitan. Greek myth is used and reinterpreted to accommodate the functions needed by the societies that adopt it, by either directly altering an original scheme and emphasizing details or substituting certain characters, or by picking and choosing elements from different iconographic contexts and recomposing them to illustrate a local legend, demonstrating the flexibility and adaptability of Greek myth in Italic narrative contexts.
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755 Hölscher 1992, 473-475. Some examples include the north frieze of the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi (Moore 1977; Watrous 1982, 160-167), the east metopes of the Parthenon (Brommer 1967, 22-38) and the late archaic temple of Satricum (Lulof 1996). An example contemporaneous with, or perhaps only slightly earlier than the second century pedimental groups is the famous altar of Zeus at Pergamon (Whitaker 2005), which may have served as a direct impetus for the frequent adoption of the theme.
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The influence of Rome has been stressed for the diffusion of architectural terracottas throughout the Italian peninsula; especially in the area of the Po-region, fictile decoration follows Roman expansion and colonialisation in the region closely in a geographic and chronological sense.\footnote{S\'trazzulla 1987, esp. 15-27; Torelli 1993, 272-294; Torelli 1999, 121-131; Strazzulla 2006b.} The main difference with the category of terracotta votive offerings, for which a similar driving role for Rome has been postulated (see Chapter One), is that in the case of architectural terracottas, we are dealing with prestigious religious buildings commissioned by the elites of the various towns, including a great number of colonies. Whereas the ideological motivation for an active diffusion by Rome of terracotta votive offerings is difficult to prove, the ideological aspects of official temples are perhaps easier to accept. While we must remain careful in making claims about colonies being ideological staging posts of Roman expansion, there are more indications in this case for official ties between Rome and her colonies and a possible influence, albeit possibly indirect, of Rome in matters such as temple building and decoration.

In addition to these developments in the figurative content of architectural decoration in the late republican period, there are important changes in the production and distribution of decoration types. In the period before the second century, terracottas were produced in several large centres, among which Orvieto and Civita Castellana occupy a prominent place. These great production centres of architectural terracottas were progressively abandoned during the second century, replaced by Rome itself.\footnote{S\'trazzulla 1977, 45; Anselmino 1981, 211; Strazzulla 1981, 192; Tortorella 1981a, 219.} The fact that Rome became a centre producing new types which can be identified and mapped perhaps also makes it more feasible to accept Roman influence on subject matters. Clearly, a leading role of the capital in architectural decoration can be attested in the later republican period, which still left enough room for local variations and creativity.\footnote{Mansuelli 1992, 32.} Perhaps as a result of this concentration and the larger demand for products, architectural decoration in the late republican period becomes increasingly schematic: while there is still room for artistic invention, a lot of the pieces are standardised, albeit in a variety of decorative motifs.\footnote{For instance, repetitive decorative systems are enhanced by the insertion of individual pieces, and some regional types do not have parallels in the Etrusco-Latial area (Strazzulla 2006b, 38-39).} A striking change is that their use is no longer restricted to sacred buildings; architectural decoration is increasingly attested in this period on public buildings, such as porticoes, forum buildings, baths, theatres and nymphae, and even on private residences, such as large domus and villas.\footnote{See, on this particular category of fictile decoration: Strazzulla 1977, 47-48; Tortorella 1981a; Tortorella 1981b; Strazzulla 1990; Strazzulla 1991; Strazzulla 1993b.} This means that in the late republican period we can no longer automatically equate the presence of architectural terracottas with the function of a structure as a sacred, or even necessarily a public, building, which had been true for the greater part of the Classical and early Hellenistic period.\footnote{Anselmino 1981, 209; Tortorella 1981a, 219; Strazzulla 1991, 241; Strazzulla 1993b, 299.} An important decorative category which developed during this period are the so-called Campana slabs, by which name we mean fictile architectural slabs formed with matrices with a predominant figurative decoration.\footnote{Strazzulla 1993b, 299.}

Although the start of large-scale production of this type of decoration can be dated to the Sullan and especially the Augustan periods, we see predecessors displaying similar motifs from
the late second century onwards. As noted above, at Nemi two distinct types of decorative slabs were found which could be said to be early forms of Campana slabs, even though the figurative element is missing on one of those types. The ‘new’ type of decoration in a way exemplifies the different trends and developments with respect to architectural decoration in the late republican period. On the one hand, it signals a return to figurative representation with a narrative mythological content, yet on the other it seems that these slabs did not decorate the temple building but secondary structures such as porticoes. This shift in decorative emphasis is perhaps comparable to the situation we encountered at Praeneste and Tibur, where the architectural decoration was also limited to the porticoes. Furthermore, the Campana slabs are not the work of high-level artisans, such as the architectural terracottas of earlier periods, but were probably manufactured by *figilinae* that produced bricks, for which these slabs were a subsidiary activity. They were mass-produced, standardised and serviced a wide market; while the slabs did decorate some sanctuaries, for the most part they were used for the decoration of external and internal walls of closed spaces or colonnades of non-sacred buildings and private dwellings. This fact is rather important, for it shows that in an age where architecture in stone was by now probably the norm, decorative slabs with figurative representations were still being used to decorate them. The diminished importance and even disappearance of figurative decoration in sanctuaries is thus not strictly the consequence of technical developments, but of changing perceptions and socio-historical developments.

Although our evidence is highly fragmentary, the general picture emerging from the situation in Latial sanctuaries conforms to that of Rome and other sites in Italy: a general lack of large-scale figurative programs from the late second century onwards, architectural decoration that seems to be concentrated on secondary structures such as porticoes and a decrease in quality and use of architectural decoration in general. The lack of sophisticated figurative programs decorating temple buildings from the second half of the second century onwards and the overall decline in the use of images ornamenting sacred structures can perhaps be related to developments in the use of representational art in general, especially at Rome. While this type of art had been the expression of a relatively homogenous state interest in earlier times, in much the same manner as has been observed for temple construction in Chapter Two, in the second and first centuries this communal orientation is increasingly abandoned and replaced by an orientation on social equals, furthering the interests of families and individuals. We must perhaps interpret the changes in the use of architectural terracottas in the late republican period in the same light. It has already been noted that many of the architectural terracottas previously reserved for the ornamentation of sacred architecture in the late republican period also began to be used for non-sacred structures, among them private residences. This may signify the greater importance the private residence acquired in the late republican period as a *locus* for aristocratic competition. The increased emphasis on the individual is perhaps also visible in the sculptures set up at Tibur and Lanuvium. Sacred space is increasingly used
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by ambitious individuals for self-promotion, while private space in the form of residences increasingly adopts visual traits which were previously associated with public structures and especially sanctuaries. Instead of referring to society as a whole, visual display is now used to promote private ambition.

It is not until the Augustan age that we again see a truly successful and ambitious fusion of a monumental architectural language with meaningful figurative content which transcends the individual. The Forum Augustum is a prime example of this revival of the use of images for propagandistic purposes which were directed not only at the fulfilment of personal ambition but sought to convey a message about the community as a whole, integrated into a monumental public building complex, something rarely encountered in late republican contexts in Rome and Latium. Of course, the whole Augustan cultural agenda has been analyzed extensively. In the context of what we are discussing here, it is interesting to note that the Augustan visual propaganda is a synthesis of many aspects of republican visual culture. Not only does it harken back to happier times in Rome’s history in its content, but the very form chosen for the message is a reflection of developments already visible in earlier periods, namely the representational or allegorical character of certain late republican decorative schemes. In the Augustan age, we again encounter decorated closed pediments, once again proving that the reasons for their absence are not technical, since the temples which are decorated in this fashion are built in stone, but rather reflect socio-historical circumstances.

**Conclusion: planned perception**

There is one important characteristic that we can discern for every single sanctuary traditionally placed within the group of late republican monumental sanctuaries in Latium, and that is the fact that each and every one of them was apparently meant to be seen. Either the architectural form was carefully adapted to fit into the surrounding landscape or when this did not yield the desired results, the landscape itself was altered to ensure that the architectural ambitions of patrons and builders could be fulfilled. The architectural complexes which were thus created imposed themselves on visitors and viewers by their setting and their size. We can be fairly sure that in each case, the desired effect of the end result preceded planning and design, since many of the sanctuaries which were built are far too complex to have been the product of on-the-spot decision making. Preparation of the building grounds themselves must have been extensive in order to ensure structural stability, which means that the appearance of the finished product was already established, even if during the construction process, adjustments sometimes had to be made. In these cases, secondary structures could be used to visually correct these adjustments, ensuring that the end result was in almost every case a unified architectural whole.

---

773 See Zanker 1968 for a description and analysis of the decoration of the Forum of Augustus.
774 For instance, the pediment of the temple of Mars Ultor on the Forum Augustum (Zanker 1968, 14, 18; Spannagel 1999, esp. 195-197) and the pediment of the Apollo Sosianus temple (La Rocca 1985). While the latter uses original Greek sculptures to decorate the pediment instead of sculpture specifically commissioned for the temple, it is a clear example of a choice being made to decorate the temple in this specific way.
The orientation on features in the landscape which ensured that a lot of people would daily be confronted with the image of the sanctuary, such as important roads or densely populated urban areas, perhaps suggests that these sanctuaries were not just exercises in obscure elite propaganda and representation aimed at their peers. The architecture certainly speaks, but it does not speak solely to those with enough education to understand the subtler architectural allusions and symbolism. Undoubtedly forms and details conveyed a message to those who were capable of deciphering it, but this is only the topmost layer of the meaning of these monuments. By their dimensions and mass, these buildings make a permanent statement that is hard, even impossible, to ignore. Building mass itself thus assumes a role of signifier in the late republican period. Temples had always been an important monumental presence in the landscape, but monumental sanctuaries take this presence to a new extreme; these sanctuaries are so big that only from a distance their full splendour can be appreciated.

It is not surprising that with respect to the dimensions of the architecture itself, architectural decoration assumes a less important place. While terracotta decoration is still used, even for those buildings completely built in stone for which it is no longer a functional necessity, in general it is the architecture that is highlighted. Large-scale figurative programs become increasingly rare; architectural decoration is usually related to the cult of the sanctuary, or so generic that it is unlikely that a specific message was aimed at in its use. Nonetheless, even in the application of decoration on the structures we see that the viewer is taken into account: the parts of the sanctuary that are decorated are often those parts where people are most likely to be found in large numbers, such as central courts. Architectural decoration is increasingly concentrated on structures such as porticoes framing such open spaces. Again, the importance of the visitor in the visual program which is the sanctuary as a whole is underlined, even if the visual program is generally non-specific. Specific messages are increasingly conveyed by sculptural display, in which the individual assumes an ever more prominent position. In these cases, we can also detect multi-layered meanings, ranging from a general aura of importance and accomplishment conveyed to the general public, to a more complex game of allusion to historic and contemporary circumstances played with social peers. In any case, the setting in a sanctuary provides an additional privileged and high-status context.

We can thus see that all aspects of Latial monumental sanctuaries – location, architecture and decoration – are part of a carefully considered process, sometimes contrasting with each other and sometimes complementing each other. Even if we are only able to reconstruct part of what the impact of these sanctuaries must have been in a visual sense, we are still capable of appreciating the intricate layers of meaning they must have conveyed, changing over time and in accordance with the background of every individual who approached and entered the sanctuary. If we are to establish one characteristic which binds these sanctuaries as a group, it is the great extent to which the perception of them was carefully planned.
The late republican period is a time of significant changes, in a political, social, religious, and cultural sense. After the Second Punic War, Rome established herself as the hegemonic power in the Mediterranean region. This position was further strengthened by the many military campaigns in the eastern Mediterranean area, and in Italy, her influence was extended across the entire peninsula. The expansion of the empire around the Mediterranean offered new opportunities for Rome and her Italic allies and ensured that vast amounts of wealth, in the form of war booty and the proceeds of trade, flowed into Italy as a result. Inequalities between powerful elites and the urban and rural lower classes increased, while competition between individual members of the elite became fiercer and more disruptive to political stability than before. A decrease in the number of cult places is noticeable, and offerings which had traditionally been given to the gods largely disappeared, presumably supplanted by other, less distinctive forms of votive offerings. Greek architectural and decorative forms became increasingly prominent, causing new variations in and adaptations to familiar building types such as temples, while new building techniques such as opus caementicium made new feats of architectural daring possible.

During this particular period at least eight sanctuaries located in Latium underwent a phase of construction activities resulting in grand monumental complexes. These monuments seem to exemplify all the changes mentioned above. Their construction was made possible by the availability of vast resources and the new building techniques; their use as cult places was probably affected by the changes in votive religion and the declining number of sanctuaries in the vicinity; and their social and political significance should be seen in the light of the relationship of local communities with Rome and of the position of Rome and her allies in the Mediterranean world. Moreover, architectural styles and developments visible in the entire Mediterranean area are reflected in their design. The monumentalisation of sanctuaries in Latium can therefore be said to have been a child of its time.

The principal aim of this study was to analyse this group of sanctuaries and determine if the image that exists of them in modern scientific literature holds up to close scrutiny. In addition, an important goal was to further our knowledge of these cult places and the late republican monumentalisation process. The geographical and chronological limits of this process have given rise to a conception of these monuments as a closed group; the standard typology of Latial monumental sanctuaries that has been discussed several times in the course of this study. It demonstrates that by emphasising sameness over difference, a homogenous group of architectural complexes appears that can be used as a benchmark. In doing so, however, one glosses over the heterogeneity of the individual monuments all too easily. Is it valid to favour similarity over difference, and if so, what information is lost in the process? In
the course of this study, I have tried to strike a balance between the general and the specific, providing models in an attempt to explain broad phenomena affecting large areas, while remaining attentive to individual characteristic and peculiarities.

The title of this study, “triumphs of compromise”, refers to a characterisation by Pierre Gros of the fusion of the Romano-Italic temple architecture with Hellenistic elements at the end of the Republic as marking “le triomphe du compromis”. By this, Gros means that the new temple forms strike a middle ground between two different traditions. Although the word can have a negative connotation, suggesting that something other was aimed for but could not be reached, in its original meaning it designates a middle position, something intermediate between or blending qualities of two different things. It is this concept of being positioned in between which is especially relevant for our interpretation and understanding of Latial monumental sanctuaries. Throughout this study, it has been argued that the development of these monuments and the specific form they assumed can perhaps be reduced to a series of middle positions. The role assumed by monumental sanctuaries should be imagined as the result of the influences of religion and representation; of local and metropolitan perspectives; of individuals and collectives; of popular appeal and elite preoccupations; and of tradition and innovation.

**Between religion and representation**

What was the principal function of monumental sanctuaries? Were they exceptionally large places of worship, or were they monuments used for the self-representation of aristocrats? In all probability, they were both. We cannot deny the fact that although sacred architecture had always been used by elites for propagandistic purposes, the religious function underlying it was never marginalised by such political uses. In fact, it is precisely because of the fact that religion and politics were so closely interwoven in the Roman world that this political use was made possible; it was completely normal to use religious means to political ends. Sacred structures, while undoubtedly having religious functions, were especially important elements in the “symbolic economy” of communities, “demonstrating a city’s piety, power, and wealth to foreigners”. This statement presupposes a strong relationship between sanctuaries and urban centres, and a high degree of intertwinement between religion and socio-political circumstances. In order to understand the process of monumentalisation, we need to understand relevant developments in these different, yet related, contexts.

With respect to the religious context, we can typify the Late Republic as a period of profound change (Chapter One). The material manifestations of (popular) religious sentiments in the form of votive offerings undergo a transformation. While in the previous period gifts to the gods could be easily recognised as such, in the last two centuries BC votive offerings become more difficult to identify. This change is accompanied by a decrease in the number of cult places and a spatial concentration on urban centres and important roads. It seems likely that the two phenomena are related, yet a direct causal relationship cannot be established.
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with certainty. While several explanations have been proposed for the late republican religious ‘crisis’, I have suggested that we might perhaps interpret it as a result of cost-benefit weighing behaviour by people resulting in fewer cult places concentrated at those locations with a high number of services on offer, primarily urban centres, and the roads connecting these centres. Religion would thus have to be regarded as one of those services instead of a special activity which should be placed outside the realm of instrumental rationality.

A religious market model which explains the survival or even flourishing of cult places as a result of popular appeal and level of attendance would seem to be able to explain building activity and monumentalisation as well. More people making dedications would mean an increase of revenues for the sanctuary, which could be invested in the beautification and expansion of cult places. However, we do not see a one-to-one relationship between the spatial and chronological developments on a practical religious level (the offering of votive material) and building activity at cult places, nor is there an objective way in which to compare popularity levels between individual cult places given the limitations of the quantitative and qualitative analysis of our material. We do see a concentration of building activity in those cult places in or near urban centres and along major traffic arteries, but this seems to have been the case for as long as sacred structures had existed, instead of a development specific to the late republican period. The organisation of cult places in general seems to have been important in this respect as well; while it is probably true that the sanctuaries’ revenues should be used for the benefit of the sanctuary itself, discretionary power of how to spend these resources probably resided with those in control of the sanctuary, most often civic magistrates. In addition, there is evidence that construction activities at sanctuaries were also financed by private funds of individuals or groups, and not solely out of the sacred coffers.

This introduces a different, and certainly no wholly religious factor in our consideration of building activity and monumentalisation: the desire for self-representation through the construction of sacred structures by members of the aristocracy. It is a well known fact that temple construction was an important element in aristocratic competition in Rome itself, and this idea of sacred structures as representations of socio-political relations can probably be extended to Latium as well. By building sanctuaries, the achievements of individuals and groups could be set in stone. They were testaments to their qualities as leaders; since some monuments were erected as monuments to celebrate military victories, they could be interpreted as permanent reminders of success, and at the very least demonstrated the ability to mobilise and concentrate resources in order to construct such magnificent buildings.

And yet, even in their capacity as giant stone advertisements for aristocrats, the religious element continued to play a very important role. It was precisely because of their function as places of worship that cult places were so eminently suitable as objects for elite propaganda. By advocating strong, or even individual ties, with the divine, the position of aristocrats could be strengthened; keeping the gods pleased was important for the well-being of society as a whole. While this is perhaps a rather abstract notion, we can observe the importance of religion in the monumentalisation of sanctuaries on a very concrete level in some architectural choices. Care was taken to include important religious features, such as oracles, in the monumental design, clearly demonstrating that the religious functionality of the complex was an important consideration. The fact that inscriptions and votive offerings attest the continuation of
religious activities after the monumentalisation of the sanctuary also clearly indicates that these building complexes were not just symbolic entities; they continued to be places of worship. The intertwining between religion on the one hand and politics and representation on the other hand is thus clearly demonstrated by the construction of sacred structures. The venerability of cult places increased the potential for aristocratic prestige, while elite patronage could in turn confer political significance on cult places and thus underline the importance of the cult and religion in general for the well-being of the community.

Between popular and elite

The building or expanding of sanctuaries is foremost an elite activity, especially in the case of architectural complexes of the magnitude of the monumental sanctuaries of Latium. We have more than enough epigraphic evidence to show that these sanctuaries were built by aristocrats, either local or Roman nobles. The simple fact is that most of these projects cost a great deal of money, and especially in the late republican period wealth was concentrated in the hands of the ruling elite. The rise of permanent (stone) structures at cult places can therefore be primarily connected to the elites responsible for their construction. However, this does not mean that other social groups were irrelevant in the planning and construction of the building complexes. The very fact that monumental sanctuaries were designed with perception and the view from a distance in mind, and placed at locations that attracted a lot of people underlines the dual nature of the monuments; on the one hand these characteristics stress their representational qualities, on the other hand they demonstrate the necessity of the presence of people to view them. It would have made little sense to invest in the monumentalisation of sanctuaries if no one was around to appreciate the effort.

Monumental sanctuaries brought people together: in sanctuaries people worshipped together and dedicated votive offerings (albeit of different intrinsic value) to the gods. Sanctuaries could represent and shape communities, at the same time transcending social boundaries in the act of collective worship and affirming hierarchical power relations in society. By being presented with building inscriptions, for example, people were faced with the fact that the building in which they found themselves at that moment was built by their social superiors, the ruling elite that occupied positions of power in their society and was thus able to build and expand sacred structures. People were confronted with the divinities to which these monuments directly alluded, with the people who had built the monuments, and with the circumstances which had made the construction possible; the sanctuary was a microcosm of historic reality and existing social relationships.

These two sides of the sanctuary, the popular and the elite, are also represented in the sanctuary’s architecture and decoration. At least some part of every sanctuary probably had functions that were not strictly tied to representation, but to the popular use of these places. Areas with a commercial function predominate. Commercial activities at sanctuaries could be related to its religious functions, but could also be profane in character. Examples of religious commerce include the sale of votive objects within the sanctuary. Often, secondary structures of the sanctuary such as porticoes have been interpreted in this light, especially when separate spaces, such as tabernae, were included. It was also possible that commercial activities were
concentrated on an entirely different level of the sanctuary, such as the *terrazza dei fornici a semicolumne* at Praeneste and the area along the *via tecta* at Tibur. It is interesting to note that in general, the representational qualities of these areas are less noticeable; they are either located in different, slightly marginal sections of the sanctuary, or were hidden from view by colonnades, preserving a unified appearance from the central parts of the sanctuary. Thus, while the sanctuary could cater to the needs of the different social strata of its public, it seems that an active attempt at differentiation was made in the design of the monumental complex.

It also seems that less attention was lavished on such non-representational areas with respect to decoration. Ornamentation was another important aspect of the sanctuary in which the popular and the elite meet *and* separate. In some respects, ornamentation affected everyone entering and experiencing the sanctuary, since it was an integral part of the sanctuary’s appearance. On a basic level, ornamentation in the form of architectural decoration, wall painting and sculptures enhanced the monumentality of the complex, on the one hand by adding to a sense of richness and variety and on the other by enhancing certain architectural features or enhancing spatial perception. Ascending the social ladder and the associated cultural experience and education, one could have interpreted the increasingly subtle references made in the decorative choices of the sanctuary. Specific and intricate historical or mythical allusions would have been understood by just a small part of those viewing images in the sanctuary, while relatively simple binary oppositions used in the visual imagery, representing a relatively simple semiotic scheme, would have had been more widely understood. Depending on their social background, visitors of the sanctuary would have experienced the sanctuary on different levels.

This idea of a sliding scale in the perception of the monument and its meanings is probably also true for the architectural form itself. On a basic level the sheer size and monumentality of the sanctuaries would have impressed the casual onlooker. The more sophisticated viewer would have been able to link the sanctuary to the wider phenomenon of monumentalisation and noted similarities and differences between the building complexes, in Latium and at Rome, and would probably have been acquainted with the members of the nobility responsible for their construction. In addition, some people would have been aware of the monumental building complexes in the Greek-Hellenistic East, allowing them to place the Latial sanctuaries not only in their proper Romano-Italic context but in a wider Mediterranean context.

**Between individual and collective**

One of the characteristics of monumental sanctuaries sometimes used to separate them from temple construction at Rome was the fact that Latial sanctuaries were communal projects in contrast to the temples at Rome erected by individuals. However, both assertions are not entirely correct. At Rome, each individual temple contributed to a monumental townscape of temples and monuments which could be interpreted as a statement of collective achievement and a general point of reference for ambitious nobles. Of the Latial monumental sanctuaries, only those at Praeneste and Tibur are demonstrably communal in that there is evidence that a collective of civic magistrates constructed these sanctuaries on the decree of the local senate. Yet even in these two cases, it was possible for nobles to ‘use’ the sanctuary individually,
for instance by referring to it on coins, and communal sanctuaries can become symbols expressing or referring to certain values which subsequently reflected on individuals in some way connected to it. It is even possible that sanctuaries which had been communal were in some ways appropriated by individuals, which surely was the case at Lanuvium where older parts of the sanctuary were supplemented with additional structures which was probably the work of one man and a sculptural group which directly referred to him and his achievements, thereby effectively hijacking the sanctuary’s representational potential for personal ends.

One can never define a sanctuary as entirely communal or entirely individual in character. The sanctuary of Gabii, while built by a single individual, undoubtedly served the community of which it was a part in various ways. Sanctuaries, as central places, had a wider appeal and especially monumental sanctuaries, as conspicuous markers in the landscape, may have been associated with different social groups than just those responsible for the construction. Conversely, sanctuaries built on the decree of local senates by magistrates serving the community could be used by individuals. The very fact that sanctuaries built by groups or communities could be used by individuals must have had important consequences for the perception of the monument, since these rarely represented completely homogenous groups with common interests; each group was composed of individuals with different perspectives and goals. This means that in each case, emphasis was probably placed on those aspects of the sanctuary that were particularly relevant to the individual using the image of the sanctuary.

In the religious use of the sanctuary, a similar phenomenon can probably be observed. While sanctuaries were potent symbols and arenas of communal religious sentiments, it is probably that at some level, individual concerns and the need for self-promotion also manifested themselves. Votive offerings, while in a sense standardised and grounded in a collective religious sensibility, convey clear messages about personal preoccupations for which divine assistance was sought. Differences in quality, size and the chosen material would furthermore have demonstrated differences in social status, introducing individual differentiation into an otherwise collective undertaking. Thus, the religious functions of the monumental sanctuaries can also be said to have oscillated between the individual and collective. A clear dividing line cannot be established, and our interpretation of sanctuaries should be adjusted accordingly. People moulded the sanctuary into whatever specific form they wanted it to assume, by those actively using it for their personal ambitions and by those perceiving the sanctuary, which may have lead to diverging experiences of the same monument.

**Between local and metropolitan**

Traditionally, by stressing the collective aspect of monumental sanctuaries, they have been primarily interpreted as a local phenomenon. Especially the scale of the building complexes, which would not be encountered in Rome itself, implied a concerted effort by local nobles with interests that differed from Roman nobles. By constructing impressive building complexes, communities and their elites asserted their local identity and competed within a regional hierarchy, which excluded Rome. However, as we have seen not every sanctuary was as collective as sometimes has been thought, and even communal sanctuaries could be used for individuals’ ends. In addition, there are examples in Rome itself of more extensive sacred structures, such
as the *Porticus Metelli* and the so-called *Tabularium*, far exceeding the scale and impact of single temples, which implies that scale is not a particularly distinctive feature. Moreover, the specific characteristics of the Latial monumental sanctuaries seem to link them firmly to Rome, which would argue against a separation between the *Urbs* itself and the area around it (Chapter Two). While it is certainly so that commonality does not necessarily imply communality, the ties seem to be numerous and significant enough to interpret building activity at Rome and in the rest of Latium as parts of the same overarching system. Architectural characteristics of Greek-Hellenistic inspiration, the divinities to which the sanctuaries were dedicated, the geographical location of the sanctuaries and the identity of the patrons responsible for construction all seem to point towards some degree of commonality and communality.

While many of the divinities to which the monumental sanctuaries were dedicated can be considered local or even poliadic divinities, official cults of these same gods or equivalents existed at Rome. Sometimes these cults had been introduced only shortly before the monumentalisation of the divinity’s sanctuary in Latium, sometimes by natives of the Latial towns. These cults thus can hardly be seen as a feature by which local connotations can be clearly distinguished from metropolitan ones. Geographically, the monumental sanctuaries are also closely tied to Rome. The majority is located in the area known as the Suburbium, belonging to the extended hinterland of Rome and described by various ancient authors as a zone between city and non-city. The proximity to the Urbs and the intensity of the ties of this area to it certainly necessitates the consideration of Rome when explaining the monumentalisation process, rather than leaving it out altogether. This is strengthened by the fact that Roman nobles were directly involved in the construction of several of these sanctuaries. Those sanctuaries that were not built by Roman nobles were erected by local nobles, some of whom had vested political interests in the capital. In general, contacts between these communities and Rome were intense, even if not all domi nobles strove for a political career at Rome. These three factors, religious, geographical and socio-political, all seem to suggest a positioning of monumental sanctuaries in force field between local and metropolitan, without completely belonging to either of them.

This in-between position may be explained by the fact that Roman and local nobles were part of the same social system. Whichever way one looks at it, the communities of Latium were continually confronted with Rome; while in some areas they retained a certain degree of autonomy, in many ways they were dependent on the policies set out by the Roman authorities. Rome was the dominant political power in Italy and the Mediterranean, which means that relations with other communities were by definition asymmetric. We can describe the dynamics of the relations of social actors in different positions of power by using the sociological work of Pierre Bourdieu. He specifies that actors operating in the same social field occupy dominant and dominated positions, and that participation in this field is accompanied by a specific set of stakes and rules, invariably dictated, albeit implicitly, by those in dominant positions. The positions in the field are determined by the forms and quantities of capital each actor possesses. We can distinguish three types of capital: economic, social, and cultural capital. Especially this last form of capital is significant in the context of this study, since it means that knowledge of a culture and its specific codes can be valuable in obtaining positions of power. If one displays traits that are deemed desirable by those in power, it will benefit political advancement; knowledge of cultural codes can be interpreted as signals which are
used to exclude people with the ‘wrong’ kind of capital from certain status groups, and to include others which are seen as displaying desirable behaviour. Cultural capital can thus be interpreted as a result of and a stake in a social game. In this game, both Roman and Italic nobles could join, provided they submitted to its rules.

The construction of public buildings, including temples, can be interpreted as part of this power game. By building temples, aristocrats could celebrate victory and success, adding to their status and setting examples for others to follow. Temples represented the success of the Roman state and the men in power who had contributed to this success. Temples could become calling cards for aristocrats and their families, clearly showing that they had what it took to play a leading role in the Roman state. It is a distinct possibility that building activities outside Rome can also be interpreted in this light. Several sanctuaries were built by Roman aristocrats, and in the case of Lanuvium it is likely that military success and political advancement were prime concerns in the monumentalisation of the sanctuary. By building monumental sanctuaries dedicated to gods whose cults were also celebrated at Rome, and which could be said to be the result of the success of Roman imperialism in which the dominoles shared even if overt militaristic references are often absent, local aristocrats perhaps attempted to show that they too possessed characteristics which could benefit the Roman state and which would hopefully help them in attaining positions of power at the capital where the decisions affecting Rome and her allies were being made. This need not have been a universal desire, and positions of power in local or regional hierarchies may also have been at stake in the monumentalisation process. However, it is important to note that both attitudes can be explained within a single model, avoiding a strict dichotomy between local and metropolitan interests of individuals and groups. By interpreting the monumentalisation of sanctuaries in a Bourdieuan framework of social relations with associated cultural signals, we can effectively bridge the local-metropolitan dichotomy and research and explain the phenomenon as something in which both aspects are represented.

Between tradition and innovation

The middle position between tradition and innovation comes, at least in an architectural sense, closest to Gros’ *triomphe du compromis*. It has been demonstrated in Chapter Three that the prime characteristic which binds this group of sanctuaries together, aside from the scale of the building complexes, is the attention given to the perception of the sanctuaries. The complexes were situated and designed with an a distant view in mind; only in approaching the sanctuary could the full complex be grasped. While the choice for impressive and highly visible sites for temples is not a new development, the amount of effort and the means used to achieve a true scenographical effect are a new development that can be placed firmly in the late republican period, and in this sense constitutes an innovative element in sanctuary architecture. Never before had an attempt been made in Italy to construct building complexes comprising temples and secondary structures which formed a more or less organic whole. By making use of and altering the natural landscape, these sanctuaries were visually composed. In this respect, the Latial sanctuaries can be placed in a wider development in the Greek-Hellenistic area displaying similar tastes. The preference for axial symmetry, visible in some but not all Latial
sanctuaries, can also be observed in several building complexes in the eastern Mediterranean. However, rather than drawing direct lines of influence from the East to Italy, we can interpret these similarities as examples of contemporaneous developments demonstrating the close contacts between the two areas, especially in the period after the Roman conquest.

In the choice of the form of the temple building, we see similar developments as in Rome, with several temple buildings forming true hybrid forms between Greek and Etrusco-Italic styles. Of the eight temples, only the temple at Lanuvium is a truly traditional temple, while the circular, domed aedes at Praeneste is a completely novel creation. The other temples all display elements of traditional temple architecture combined with new elements, either stylistic or structural. The innovative architectural aspects need not always be Greek-Hellenistic in origin; the development of the transverse cella, for instance, seems to be an Italic development that does not have direct parallels in the Greek world. The choice of materials and building techniques, for the temple as well as the other structures constituting the sanctuary, is also a curious mixture of old and new, often used simultaneously. The use of polygonal walling and opus quadratum was continued throughout the late republican period, while opus caementicium was increasingly used for substructures and elevations. The use of travertine and marble for facings and mouldings also increased, while traditional materials such as tufa and lapis gabinus remained as popular building materials, for structural and decorative purposes. This clearly demonstrates that we cannot simply see technical and stylistic characteristics as stages in a linear development, but rather as options which remained open to builders throughout the period, and as such the use of such options should be seen as manifestations of deliberate choices, made for aesthetic or symbolic reasons.

These architectural and stylistic developments can probably be related to socio-political developments, and novel ways in which buildings were used in the late republican period. The most important changes were undoubtedly brought about by Roman expansion and its effects on the way the republican political system functioned. From the mid-republican period onwards, a system rooted in practice had been developed in which aristocrats strove for power, competing with their peers. The system was designed to prevent excessive concentration of power in the hands of individuals for long periods of time, striking a balance between the power of the collective and the delegation of this power in the hands of supreme magistrates. At the same time, this system of service in office allowed individuals to accumulate power and prestige within certain limits without disrupting the continuity of the Roman state. However, since it was rooted in practice and in general was not codified, it was also vulnerable to disruption of the status quo, and this is exactly what happened during the Late Republic.

The emphasis on the welfare of the state, which had always been a fundamental aspect of the political game, increasingly shifted to individual accumulation of wealth and power without regard for the implications for the state and power balances. The more prominent position of individuals is illustrated by an increase in the scale of building projects in Rome itself, such as the Porticus Metelli and the structures of the Tabularium; apparently, the need to adhere to unwritten rules and operate within certain limited parameters was less keenly felt. Outside of Rome, the activities of individuals at the sanctuaries of Gabii and Lanuvium may be understood in the same light, although here the restrictions imposed by the balancing act in Rome itself would have been less stringent in any case. The prominence of the individual
aristocrat is perhaps also visible in the sculptural displays at certain sanctuaries; in the first century, we see portrait statues appearing in the sanctuaries of Tibur and Lanuvium which clearly demonstrate a desire for self-promotion, and in the latter case possibly claiming the sanctuary’s divinity as a personal protectress.

The shift in the balance of power was accompanied by a discussion about the relevant qualities of leadership, or in the terms of Bourdieu, the forms of capital an individual needed to possess to assume a dominant position and be admitted into the ruling elite. After a period of broad agreement of what was an effective mark of distinction and a demonstration of a suitability to rule, the influx of wealth as a result of Roman expansion and new forms of culture and learning flowing into Rome from the Greek-Hellenistic East raised the question if knowledge of and the ability to manipulate these new styles and media could also count as a valuable asset in political competition. The consensus about the basic requirements of admission into the circle of power was thus slowly weakened during the late republican period.

This state of flux in the republican political system, itself poised between the tradition of a balanced power-sharing on one side and the increasing prominence of powerful individuals and new forms display and knowledge on the other, possibly offered new opportunities to those who were systematically disadvantaged by the traditional practice of selection and advancement. Since group consensus weakened, it was now possible for individuals who would previously not have been considered for positions of power to penetrate the ranks of the Roman nobility with greater ease than before, or at the very least it is possible to expect that this opportunity was felt by some even if it did not result in actual success. We can indeed see a particular concentration of political involvement of local nobles at Rome in the last decades of the second and the first decades of the first century, which I have tried to relate to the socio-political changes of the late republican period. It was this sense of opportunity, magnificently illustrated by the rapid political advancement of domi nobilis and homo novus Marius, led to the use of local sanctuaries as signs of their fitness to be included in the charmed inner circle of power.

These sanctuaries, as we have seen, constituted a bridge between local communities and Rome itself, symbolising the bond between the two. While the use of temples as exempla, constructed by worthy predecessors whose qualities and achievements served as a model for others to follow, was well-established, the individual use of communal sanctuaries would have constituted a novel variation on this theme in the competitive system. However, the break-down of consensus might have made this use of sanctuaries acceptable as a mark of distinction and worthiness in political competition. While located outside of Rome and not necessarily alluding to achievements of individual aristocrats, they nevertheless constituted powerful cultural statements, celebrating the success and opportunities of Roman imperialism, and showing a preference for and knowledge of Greek-Hellenistic culture which, as we have seen, was fast becoming a sign of distinction itself.

The paradox of this situation is that while the system was changing, conservative individuals continued to occupy positions of power who would not accept the validity of such signals. In this sense, traditional values were still upheld that could function as barriers to outsiders claiming the positions of insiders. Moreover, we can ask the question if the innovations, the
changes to the system, did not cause it to cease functioning as it had before; the system had always relied on consensus, which was increasingly abandoned. Instead of service in office, powerful individuals progressively took control and disregarded common political practices which had been obeyed for centuries. Perhaps the domini nobili were building sanctuaries that were to be used in a game which was changing beyond recognition and in which building activities no longer had the function of exempla which they had before. Thus, tradition and innovation could case the misinterpretation of the signals some local aristocrats were trying to send, and it is even possible that they not only were deemed correct signals, but that they were no longer regarded as signals at all. The new power game required new rules and new stakes.

**Conclusion**

As far as the monumentalisation of Latial sanctuaries in the late republican period is concerned, one size does not fit all. Of course, the monumental sanctuaries of Latium can be understood as a product of a specific period in time in a specific area; the phenomenon itself has a limited chronological and geographical range, which suggests that the monumentalisation process itself can probably be explained by referring to key developments of this specific period and area. In addition, on some level there is a strong sense of commonality between the sanctuaries; the way in which they are placed in the landscape and are built to attract the eye seems to be a feature underlying all monumental sanctuaries. There is thus something that undeniably binds these monuments together as representatives of a consistent process. However, it is just as clear that each of these sanctuaries should be examined on its own merits, and that it is not enough to simply consider them as ‘variations on a common theme’ if these variations are then systematically neglected in favour of the common. The study of monumental sanctuaries ultimately boils down to a double compromise: the modern compromise scholars have to make in their interpretations due to the limits imposed by the availability of evidence and the ancient compromise that produces the monumental sanctuary and which the specific form of that sanctuary ultimately reflects. Unfortunately, rather than leading to a careful examination of the evidence that is available and weighing the general developments against individual idiosyncrasies, the latter have been largely neglected.

The first compromise is probably an important factor in the establishment of the standard typology of Latial monumental sanctuaries. The apparent lack of clear evidence indicating substantial differences between sanctuaries has lead to the idea of uniformity. Observed similarities on one level are progressively and uncritically extrapolated by projecting similarities on all levels. This tendency seems to demonstrate that faced with the limits of the material we study, we must content ourselves with generalities. A standard sanctuary type is distilled based on apparent similarities between several individual monuments of a group first defined on the basis of other aspects. The standard type is then used to supplement missing information about other building complexes deemed to be part of this perceived group. I hope to have shown that whatever these sanctuaries have in common in the way of function, use, placement and genesis, on an architectural level they cannot be regarded as a homogenous group with interchangeable structural characteristics.
The second compromise is, in this sense, the one that has been neglected by research that stresses the uniformity of sanctuaries. This difference can be explained by the fact that we are dealing with human undertakings. These sanctuaries were built by people, who invested valuable resources in order to construct them and presumably wanted to convey something about themselves or their community by doing so. Studying architecture, and especially monumental architecture, one can all too easily forget that these are social constructs; buildings play an important role in society, and express desires and interests of groups and individuals. These desires and interests may be broadly similar in some respects, just like the monuments they build, yet differ in other important respects. As a result of the first compromise, we do not have every piece of information which would allow us to relate with certainty the varying and divergent attitudes of the people involved in the monumentalisation process to the end result, the monumental sanctuary we study. What we can do, and what I have tried to do in the course of this study, is suggest ways to look at objects which can incorporate both the general and the specific using the information we do have. We can single out some general developments which must have affected the process, directly or indirectly, but there will always be sanctuaries which do not seem to ‘fit the bill’; the proposed models, for instance, fit the available evidence of certain sanctuaries better than others. This does not directly invalidate the models which do fit other sanctuaries, but it does alert us to the fact that there may be subtle, or even not so subtle differences underlying a perceived similarity, which should not be ignored.

This second level of compromise can perhaps be envisioned best as a multi-dimensional matrix encompassing all binary pairs mentioned above, on which these sanctuaries can be placed according to the available evidence. If we understand compromise as a middle position, between two extremes of judgement or opinion, the term ‘triumphs of compromise’ to describe the late republican monumental sanctuaries of Latium could not be more apt. Not only are they constructs caught between Italic tradition and Hellenistic innovation in an architectural sense, they also occupy a middle position with regard to their catchment area, which includes both the metropolitan political world of Rome and the local communities to which they belonged; their primary function, which is neither exclusively religious or purely representative; and their social relevance, since both aristocrats and people of lower social strata make use of and identify with these sanctuaries, and do so individually and as groups.

However, no single sanctuary occupied the exact same position as another in this matrix of seemingly opposed binary pairs; the apparent general characteristics are superficial and cannot be directly translated to a standardisation on all levels; homogeneity on some levels can, and often is, accompanied by heterogeneity on other levels. This is also the case for the late republican monumental sanctuaries of Latium. Although occupying a position between two extremes, there is no sanctuary that achieved a perfect middle position; they are all shifted somewhat in one direction or the other, and because of these shifts they acquired their specific shape and function. The fact that these monuments have continued to stimulate the imagination from the medieval period up to the present day merits their label as triumphs, at the very least in an architectural sense. They deserve to be continuously studied, instead of merely fossilised as a standard type that I hope to have shown to be anything but standard.
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De laatrepublikeinse periode wordt gekenmerkt door belangrijke veranderingen in politieke, sociale, religieuze en culturele zin. Na de Tweede Punische Oorlog bevestigde Rome zijn status als belangrijkste machtsblok in het Middellandse Zeegebied, een positie die verder werd uitgebreid door de vele militaire campagnes in het oostelijke Mediterrane gebied. In Italië breidde Rome zijn machtsgebied uit over het hele schiereiland. De expansie buiten Italië bood nieuwe mogelijkheden voor Rome en zijn Italische bondgenoten en het optimaal benutten van deze mogelijkheden zorgde ervoor dat grote rijkdommen Italië binnenstromden in de vorm van oorlogsbruit en de opbrengst van handel. Ongelijkheden tussen machtige elites en de urbane en rurale armen werden groter. De concurrentiestrijd tussen de individuele leden van de elite werd heviger en vormde een grotere bedreiging voor de politieke stabiliteit dan in de voorgaande periode. Een afname van het aantal cultusplaatsen is zichtbaar, en giften die traditioneel aan de goden werden gegeven, verdwenen vrijwel geheel en werden wellicht vervangen door andere vormen van votiefgiften die minder makkelijk als zodanig herkenbaar zijn. Griekse architectonische en decoratieve vormen namen een steeds prominentere plaats in en hadden variaties en aanpassingen in traditionele gebouwtypes als tempels tot gevolg, terwijl op hetzelfde moment de toepassing van nieuwe bouwtechnieken zoals *opus caementicum* nieuwe staaltjes van architectonische durf mogelijk maakte.

Tijdens deze turbulente periode ondergingen ten minste acht heiligdommen in Latium een fase van grootschalige bouwactiviteit die resulteerde in de oprichting van grootse, monumentale complexen. Deze monumenten worden gekenmerkt door alle veranderingen die hierboven beschreven zijn. De constructie van de complexen werd mogelijk gemaakt door de beschikbaarheid van geld en nieuwe bouwtechnieken; hun functie als cultusplaats werd waarschijnlijk beïnvloed door de veranderingen in votiefligie en de afname van het aantal heiligdommen in de omgeving; en hun sociale en politieke betekenis moet verbonden worden aan de relatie van lokale gemeenschappen met Rome en aan de positie van Rome en zijn bondgenoten in de Mediterrane wereld. Daarnaast vertoont het ontwerp van de monumentale heiligdommen architectonische stijlen en ontwikkelingen die ook elders in het Middellandse Zeegebied zichtbaar zijn.

De belangrijkste drijfveer van deze studie is het beantwoorden van de vraag of het beeld dat van deze groep heiligdommen bestaat in de moderne wetenschappelijke literatuur na kritische bestudering en analyse overeind blijft. Daarnaast was een belangrijk doel het bevorderen van onze kennis over deze cultusplaatsen en het laatrepublikeinse monumentaliseringsproces. De geografische en chronologische begrenzing van dit proces heeft geleid tot het beschouwen van deze monumenten als een gesloten groep. In dit proefschrift is verschillende malen de zogenaamde standaardtypologie van Latiale monumentale heiligdommen ter sprake gekomen.
Een ‘typisch’ laatrepublikeins monumentaal heiligdom zou bestaan uit een axiaal symmetrisch complex dat op verschillende (artificiële) terrassen is aangelegd, met een centraal tempelgebouw dat aan drie zijden omgeven werd door zuilengalerijen, voorzien van een theater-cavea en een natuurlijke of aangelegde heilige tuin of bos. Door in plaats van verschil juist de gelijkenis te benadrukken is een homogene groep van architectonische complexen ontstaan die als referentiepunt kan worden gebruikt. Maar door dit te doen gaat men te snel voorbij aan de heterogeniteit van de afzonderlijke monumenten. Is het verkiezen van overeenkomsten boven verschillen te verdedigen, en zo ja, welke informatie gaat dan in dit proces verloren? In de loop van deze studie heb ik geprobeerd om een balans te vinden tussen het algemene en het specifieke. Ik heb interpretatiemodellen gepresenteerd in een poging om brede ontwikkelingen die grote gebieden betreffen, te verklaren, maar op hetzelfde moment heb ik geprobeerd om alert te blijven op afzonderlijke kenmerken en eigenaardigheden.

De titel van deze studie, “triumphs of compromise”, refereert aan een karakterisering van architectuurhistoricus Pierre Gros van de fusie van Romeins-Italiaanse tempelarchitectuur met Griekse elementen aan het einde van de Republiek als “le triomphe du compromis”. Hiermee bedoelt Gros dat de nieuwe tempelvormen tussen twee verschillende tradities in staan. Hoewel het woord compromis een negatieve bijklank kan hebben in de zin dat het kan slaan op een niet-ideale uitkomst die voorkomt uit het niet bereiken van de doelen die oorspronkelijk gesteld waren, betekent het in feite niets anders dan een middenpositie tussen twee uitersten dat bepaalde eigenschappen van twee zijden in zich verenigt. Het is dit concept van een positionering tussen twee situaties dat vooral van belang is voor de interpretatie en het begrip van Latiale monumentale heiligdommen. Het is mogelijk de ontwikkeling van deze heiligdommen zoals die beschreven is in de loop van dit proefschrift, te reduceren tot een serie middenposities. De functie die de monumentale heiligdommen vervullen, kan opgevat worden als het resultaat van invloeden van religie enerzijds en representatie anderzijds; van lokale en grootstedelijke perspectieven; van het individu en het collectief; van populaire aantrekkingskracht en aristocratische drijfveren; en van traditie en innovatie.

Tussen religie en representatie

Wat was de voornaamste functie van monumentale heiligdommen? Waren het uitzonderlijk grote plekken om de goden te eren, of waren het monumenten die gebruikt werden voor de zelfrepresentatie van aristocraten? Zeer waarschijnlijk waren zij beide. Ondanks het feit dat religieuze architectuur al sinds jaar en dag door de elite gebruikt werd voor propagandadoeleinden, werd de religieuze functie van de gebouwen nooit gemarginaliseerd door het politieke gebruik ervan. We zouden zelfs kunnen zeggen dat juist omdat politiek en religie zo met elkaar verweven waren in de Romeinse wereld, een dergelijke situatie kon ontstaan; het was volkomen normaal om religieuze middelen voor politieke doeleinden te gebruiken. Gewijde gebouwen, die ongetwijfeld religieuze functies hadden, waren belangrijke elementen in de ‘symbolische economie’ van gemeenschappen, waarmee een stad zijn piëteit, zijn macht en zijn rijkdom kon tonen aan vreemdelingen. Dit veronderstelt een sterke relatie tussen heiligdommen en stedelijke centra, en een hoge mate van verwevenheid tussen religie en sociaal-politieke omstandigheden. Om het proces van monumentalisering te begrijpen,
moeten we dus de relevante ontwikkeling begrijpen van deze verschillende, maar verwante, contexten.

Wat betreft de religieuze context kunnen we de Late Republiek kenmerken als een periode van ingrijpende veranderingen (Hoofdstuk Een). De materiële uitingen van (populaire) religieuze gevoelens in de vorm van votiefgiften ondergaan een transformatie; terwijl het in de voorgaande periode relatief makkelijk was giften aan de goden als zodanig te herkennen, worden deze in de laatste twee eeuwen voor Christus moeilijk te identificeren. Deze verandering gaat gepaard met een afname van het aantal cultusplaatsen en een ruimtelijke concentratie in en om urbane centra en langs belangrijke wegen. Het is waarschijnlijk dat deze fenomenen gerelateerd zijn, maar een direct oorzakelijk verband kan niet met zekerheid worden gelegd. Verschillende verklaringen zijn voorgesteld voor deze laatrepublieke religieuze ‘crisis’. In dit proefschrift heb ik gesuggereerd dat we de oorzaak misschien moeten zoeken in rationeel religieus gedrag van mensen dat uitgaat van het wegen van kosten en baten (instrumentele rationaliteit), en dat uiteindelijk zou resulteren in een lager aantal cultusplaatsen die geconcentreerd zijn op die plekken waar een groot aantal diensten aangeboden wordt: urbane centra en de wegen die deze centra verbinden. Religie zou dus beschouwd moeten worden als een van die diensten die worden aangeboden in plaats van een speciale activiteit die buiten het bereik van de instrumentele rationaliteit moet worden geplaatst.

Een religieus marktmodel dat het voortbestaan of zelfs de bloei van cultusplaatsen koppelt aan de aantrekkingsslag op gelovigen en daaruit voortvloeiende bezoekersaantallen, zou ook gebruikt kunnen worden om bouwactiviteit en monumentalising te verklaren. Hoe meer mensen offeren op een bepaalde plek, hoe groter de inkomsten voor het heiligdom. Deze inkomsten zouden vervolgens geïnvesteerd kunnen worden in de verfraaiing en uitbreiding van cultusplaatsen. Helaas is een een-op-eenrelatie tussen de ruimtelijke en chronologische ontwikkeling op een praktisch religieus niveau (het offeren van votiefgiften) en bouwactiviteiten in heiligdommen niet zichtbaar. Ook kunnen we de populariteit van afzonderlijke cultusplaatsen niet objectief met elkaar vergelijken gezien de beperkingen in de analyse van het votiefmateriaal. We zien wel degelijk een concentratie van bouwactiviteit op die plaatsen in of bij urbane centra en langs belangrijke verkeersaders, maar het lijkt erop dat dit altijd al het geval was en dus niet een nieuwe ontwikkeling kan worden gesproken in de laatrepublieke periode. De organisatie van cultusplaatsen in het algemeen lijkt daarbij een belangrijke rol te spelen; hoewel in de regel waarschijnlijk inkomsten van heiligdommen gebruikt moeten worden voor het heiligdom zelf, ligt de bevoegdheid over deze tegoeden en de manier waarop ze gebruikt moeten worden bij diegenen die verantwoordelijk zijn voor het heiligdom, vaak civiele magistraten. Daarnaast is er bewijs dat bouwactiviteiten in heiligdommen ook gefinancierd werden uit de eigen zak van individuen of groepen en dus niet alleen uit de heilige schatkist.

Dat brengt ons bij een andere, en zeker niet geheel religieuze factor in het bouw- en monumentaliseringsproces: de behoeftte van leden van de aristocratie om naamsbekendheid te krijgen door het neerzetten of verfraaien van religieuze gebouwen. Het is een bekend gegeven dat tempelbouw in Rome een belangrijk onderdeel was van de aristocratische concurrentiestrijd, en dit idee van religieuze gebouwen die sociaal-politieke verhoudingen weerspiegelden geldt zeer waarschijnlijk ook voor Latium. Door heiligdommen te bouwen was het mogelijk om de verrichtingen van individuen en groepen in steen te vereeuwigen. Zo werden heiligdommen een
permanent aandenken aan hun kwaliteiten als leiders; aangezien veel monumenten opgericht werden als gedenktekens voor militaire overwinningen, vormden zij een blijvende getuigenis van succes, en op zijn minst toonden deze monumenten het vermogen om hulpbronnen te mobiliseren en te concentreren om zo dergelijke magnifieke bouwwerken te laten verrijzen.

Zelfs als we heiligdommen beschouwen als reusachtige stenen billboards voor aristocraten, dan nog blijft het religieuze element echter een belangrijke rol spelen. Juist door de functie als plaatsen van verering waren deze zo uitzonderlijk geschikt als objecten van elitepropaganda. Door sterke, soms zelfs persoonlijke, banden met het goddelijke te benadrukken kon de positie van aristocraten versterkt worden; het welbehagen van de goden was immers van groot belang voor het goed functioneren van de maatschappij als geheel. Hoewel dit misschien een wat abstract idee is, kunnen we het belang van religie op een concreet niveau ook zien in sommige architectonische keuzes die gemaakt worden bij de monumentaliserings van heiligdommen. Belangrijke religieuze elementen, zoals orakelplaatsen, werden met zorg in het monumentale ontwerp opgenomen, wat duidelijk laat zien dat de religieuze functionaliteit van een dergelijk complex wel degelijk een rol speelde. Het feit dat inscripties en votiefgiften blijk geven van de continuïteit van religieuze activiteiten na de monumentaliserings van het heiligdom laat eveneens duidelijk zien dat deze bouwcomplexen niet alleen een symbolische rol vervulden; het bleven plaatsen van godendiensten. De verwevenheid van religie en politiek wordt dus duidelijk weerspiegeld in de bouw van sacrale complexen. De eerbiedwaardigheid van cultusplaatsen vergrootte het potentieel voor aristocratisch prestige, terwijl het feit dat leden van de elite hun naam verbonden aan bepaalde heiligdommen deze cultusplaatsen politiek belang gaf en zo het belang van de cultus en religie in het algemeen voor het welvaren van de gemeenschap onderstreepte.

**Tussen volk en elite**

Het bouwen of uitbreiden van heiligdommen is in de eerste plaats een elite-activiteit, in het bijzonder in het geval van bouwcomplexen met de omvang van de monumentale heiligdommen van Latium. We hebben meer dan genoeg epigrafisch bewijs om aan te tonen dat deze heiligdommen werden gebouwd in opdracht van aristocraten; hetzij lokale, hetzij Romeinse notabelen. Het is een simpel feit dat dit soort bouwprojecten een grote hoeveelheid geld kostten, en zeker in de laatrepublikeinse periode was rijkdom geconcentreerd in de handen van de heersende klasse. De opkomst van permanente (stenen) gebouwen bij cultusplaatsen kan dus in de eerste plaats verbonden worden met de elites die verantwoordelijk waren voor de bouw ervan. Dit betekent echter niet dat andere sociale groepen irrelevant waren met betrekking tot de planning en de bouw van deze complexen. Juist vanwege het feit dat monumentale heiligdommen werden ontworpen met de ervaring en waarneming van een afstand in het achterhoofd, en dat zij op locaties werden gebouwd die grote aantallen mensen aantrokken, onderstreept het dubbele karakter van deze monumenten; aan de ene kant benadrukken deze eigenschappen het representatieve karakter van de gebouwen, aan de andere kant tonen zij eveneens aan dat de aanwezigheid van mensen noodzakelijk was voor een optimaal effect. Het zou weinig zin hebben gehad om zoveel te investeren in de monumentaliserings van heiligdommen als niemand deze inspanningen zou kunnen zien.
Monumentale heiligdommen brachten mensen samen: in deze heiligdommen vereerde men gezamenlijk de goden en offerde giften aan ze, waarvan de waarde echter waarschijnlijk weer gebonden was aan de sociale status van de gever. Heiligdommen waren in staat om gemeenschappen te representeren en te vormen. Zij zorgden ervoor dat sociale grenzen werden doorbroken door gezamenlijke verering, terwijl op hetzelfde moment de hiërarchische machtsrelaties binnen de gemeenschap werden bevestigd. Door de plaatsing van bouwinscripties werd men bijvoorbeeld continu geconfronteerd met het feit dat de ruimtes waarin men zich op dat moment bevond, gebouwd waren door hun sociale superieuren, de heersende elite die de belangrijke maatschappelijke machtsposities innamen en hierdoor in staat waren om dit soort gebouwen neer te zetten en uit te breiden. Men werd dus geconfronteerd met de godheden die de maatschappij beschermden waarnaar de monumenten direct verwezen, met diegenen die het heiligdom hadden gebouwd, en met de omstandigheden die de constructie mogelijk hadden gemaakt. Het heiligdom kan in dit opzicht opgevat worden als een microkosmos van de historische werkelijkheid en bestaande sociale verhoudingen.

Deze twee kanten van het heiligdom, op hetzelfde moment volks én elitair, zijn misschien ook terug te vinden in de architectuur en decoratie. In ieder geval een deel van elk heiligdom had waarschijnlijk functies die niet direct met representatie te maken hadden, maar met het gebruik van de ruimte door een bredere laag van de bevolking, in het bijzonder economische activiteiten. Commercie in heiligdommen had vaak te maken met religie, zoals de productie en verkoop van votiefgiften, maar ‘gewone’ handel werd er ook gedreven. De aanwezigheid van zuilengalerijen in heiligdommen wordt vaak geïnterpreteerd met het oog op deze economische functie, zeker wanneer hieraan aparte ruimtes, zoals tabernae, zijn toegevoegd. Het is ook mogelijk dat commerciële activiteiten geconcentreerd waren op een aparte verdieping in het heiligdom, zoals de terrazza dei fornici a semicolonne in Praeneste en de ruimtes langs de overdekte weg die door de funderingsstructuur van het heiligdom in Tibur liep. Het is interessant om te zien dat over het algemeen de representatieve eigenschappen van deze gebieden minder opvallen; commerciële ruimtes bevinden zich ofwel in enigszins marginale delen van het heiligdom, of waren aan het zicht onttrokken door zuilengalerijen, die het uniforme uiterlijk van het heiligdom, gezien vanuit de centrale delen, in stand hielden. Hoewel het heiligdom dus door verschillende lagen van de bevolking gebruikt werd, lijkt het erop dat een actieve poging werd gedaan om delen met verschillende (sociale) functies van elkaar te scheiden.

Het lijkt er ook op dat aan dergelijke niet-representatieve delen van het heiligdom minder aandacht werd besteed wat betreft decoratie. Ook dat is een categorie binnen het heiligdom waarin het volkse en het elitaire samenkomen én gescheiden worden. Op een bepaalde manier beroerde decoratie iedereen die het heiligdom betrad, aangezien het een integraal onderdeel was van de verschijningsvorm van het heiligdom. Op een basaal niveau droeg versiering in de vorm van architectonische decoratie, muurschilderingen en standbeelden bij aan de monumentaliteit van het complex, door het algemene beeld van overdaad kracht bij te zetten, maar ook door bepaalde architectonische elementen te benadrukken of de ruimtelijke ervaring te bevorderen. Diegenen die hoger op de sociale ladder stonden en dus een hogere mate van culture ervaring en opvoeding hadden genoten, waren waarschijnlijk beter in staat om bepaalde subtiele verwijzingen te begrijpen die verwerkt waren in de decoratie van het heiligdom. Specifieke en ingewikkelde historische of mythische allusies werden maar door
een klein deel van de bezoekers van het heiligdom begrepen, terwijl relatief simpele binaire tegenstellingen die gebruikt werden in de beeldtaal door een veel groter deel van het publiek werden begrepen. Afhankelijk van hun sociale achtergrond ervoeren bezoekers het heiligdom dus op verschillende niveaus.

Dit idee van een glijdende schaal in de perceptie van monumenten en hun betekenis gaat waarschijnlijk ook op voor de architectonische vorm zelf. De omvang en monumentaliteit van heiligdommen zouden indruk hebben gemaakt op zelfs de meest onopgeleide en onvoorbereide beschouwer. De meer scherpzinnige kijker zou in staat zijn geweest om het heiligdom koppelen aan het bredere fenomeen van monumentalisering en overeenkomsten en verschillen hebben gezien tussen de verschillende bouwcomplexen, in Latium en Rome, en waren zeer waarschijnlijk bekend met de aristocrenaten of families die verantwoordelijk waren geweest voor de bouw. Tenslotte zouden sommige mensen zich bewust zijn geweest van vergelijkbare bouwcomplexen in het Grieks-Hellenistische Oosten, zodat zij in staat waren om de Latiale heiligdommen niet alleen in de juiste Romeins-Italische context te plaatsen, maar ook in een bredere Mediterrane context.

**Tussen individu en collectief**

Een van de eigenschappen van monumentale heiligdommen die vaak gebruikt wordt om ze te onderscheiden van tempelbouw in Rome is het feit dat Latiale heiligdommen vaak communale projecten waren, in tegenstelling tot Romeinse tempels die door individuen werden opgericht. Nadere bestudering van de monumenten leert echter dat geen van deze beide beweringen helemaal juist is. In Rome droeg elke afzonderlijke tempel bij aan een monumentaal stadsgezicht van tempels en andere monumenten dat geïnterpreteerd zou kunnen worden als een uiting van collectief succes en als gezamenlijk referentiepunt voor ambitieuze aristocrenatenn. Van de Latiale monumentale heiligdommen zijn alleen de heiligdommen van Praeneste en Tibur aantoonbaar communaal: er bewijs is dat een collectief van stadsmagistraten verantwoordelijk waren voor de bouw van de heiligdommen, op last van een besluit van de lokale senaat. Zelfs in deze twee gevallen was het echter mogelijk voor aristocrenaten om het heiligdomen op individuele basis te ‘gebruiken’, bijvoorbeeld door naar het heiligdom te verwijzen op munten. Communale heiligdommen werden soms symbolen die uiting gaven en refereerden aan bepaalde waarden die vervolgens afstraalden op individuen die op een of andere manier met het heiligdom verbonden waren. Het is zelfs mogelijk dat heiligdommen die weliswaar een gemeenschappelijk karakter hadden hadden, werden geclaimd door individuen. Dit zou bijvoorbeeld het geval kunnen zijn geweest in Lanuvium, waar oudere delen van het heiligdom werden aangevuld met nieuwe structuren die in opdracht van één man werden gebouwd. Tegelijkertijd werd een beeldengroep opgesteld die direct verwees naar hem en zijn verrichtingen, waardoor hij op een effectieve manier de representatieve mogelijkheden van het heiligdom kaapte voor eigen doeleinden.

We kunnen heiligdommen nooit als volledig gemeenschappelijk of volledig individueel karakteriseren. Het heiligdom van Gabii werd bijvoorbeeld door een individu gebouwd, maar vervulde ongetwijfeld een belangrijke rol voor de gemeenschap waarvan het een deel uitmaakte. Heiligdommen hadden als centrale plaatsen een grote uitwerking op de omgeving en vooral
monumentale heiligdommen, als opzichtige herkenningspunten in het landschap, werden misschien geassocieerd met meerdere sociale groepen dan alleen degene die verantwoordelijk was voor de bouw. Zoals gezegd was het ook mogelijk om gemeenschappelijke heiligdommen te gebruiken als individu. Het feit dat dit mogelijk was moet belangrijke consequenties hebben gehad voor de perceptie van het monument, aangezien deze zelden een volledig homogene groep vertegenwoordigden met gemeenschappelijke belangen; elke groep was samengesteld uit individuen met verschillende ambities en doelen. Dit betekent dat in elk afzonderlijk geval die aspecten van het heiligdom benadrukt werden die relevant waren voor het individu dat het beeld van het heiligdom op dat moment gebruikte.

In het religieus gebruik van het heiligdom kan een vergelijkbaar fenomeen worden waargenomen. Hoewel heiligdommen krachtige symbolen waren van gemeenschappelijke religieuze sentimenten, is het aannemelijk dat op een bepaald niveau individuele belangen en de behoeften aan propaganda ook tot uiting kwamen. Votiefgiften, die in zeker zin gestandaardiseerd waren en gegrond in een collectieve religieuze sensibiliteit, dragen duidelijk boodschappen uit over persoonlijke preoccupaties waarvoor goddelijke steun werd gezocht. Verschillen in kwaliteit, grootte en materiaalkeuze zouden daarnaast verschillen in sociale status hebben getoond en zo individuele differentiatie hebben ingebracht in een activiteit die verder als gemeenschappelijk gezien kan worden. Ook in de religieuze functie van monumentale heiligdommen is dus een wisselwerking tussen individu en collectief zichtbaar. Een duidelijke scheidslijn kan niet getrokken worden en deze onzekerheid zou tot uiting moeten komen in onze interpretatie van heiligdommen. Men kneedde het heiligdom in de specifieke vorm die voor hen van belang was. Dit werd gedaan door zowel diegenen die het heiligdom actief voor eigen ambities gebruikten als de bezoekers die zich een beeld vormden van de betekenis van het heiligdom. Dit moet geleid hebben tot zeer uiteenlopende ervaringen van hetzelfde monument.

**Tussen lokaal en grootstedelijk**

Door het gemeenschappelijke aspect van heiligdommen te benadrukken zijn zij traditioneel vooral geïnterpreteerd als een lokaal fenomeen. Vooral gezien de grote omvang van de bouwcomplexen, die niet voor zou komen in Rome zelf, zouden zij een gezamenlijke inspanning symboliseren van lokale aristocraten met andere belangen dan de Romeinse aristocratie. Door imposante bouwcomplexen neer te zetten bevestigden gemeenschappen en de elites in die gemeenschappen hun lokale identiteit en concurreerden zij binnen een regionale hiërarchie waar Rome buien viel. We hebben echter gezien dat niet elk heiligdom als gemeenschappelijk te beschouwen is, en zelfs communale heiligdommen werden gebruikt voor individuele doeleinden. Daarnaast zijn in Rome zelf voorbeelden te vinden van zeer uitgebreide sacrale bouwcomplexen, zoals de Porticus Metelli en het zogenaamde Tabularium, die de schaal en impact van afzonderlijke tempels verre moeten hebben overtroffen. Dit suggereert dat omvang alleen niet een doorslaggevend criterium is om onderscheid te maken tussen Rome en de gebieden daarbuiten. Bovendien lijken verschillende specifieke eigenschappen de Latiale monumentale heiligdommen duidelijk te verbinden met Rome, wat een scheiding tussen de Urbs en het gebied eromheen lijkt tegen te spreken (Hoofdstuk Twee). Hoewel (uiterlijke)
overeenkomsten niet direct een bepaalde mate van gemeenschappelijkheid impliceren, lijken de banden tussen Rome en Latium zo talrijk en significant te zijn dat we kunnen spreken van hetzelfde overkoepelend systeem dat de bouwactiviteit bepaalt. Op Grieks-Hellenistische voorbeelden gestoelde architectonische kenmerken, de godheden aan wie de heiligdommen gewijd waren, de geografische ligging van de bouwcomplexen en de identiteit van diegenen die verantwoordelijk waren voor de bouw lijken alle te wijzen op een bepaald mate van overeenkomst én gemeenschappelijkheid.

Hoewel verschillende godheden aan wie de heiligdommen waren gewijd beschouwd kunnen worden als lokale of zelfs stadsgoden, bestonden officiële erediensten voor dezelfde of vergelijkbare goden ook in Rome. Soms was de cultus in Rome nog maar kort voor de monumentalisering van het heiligdom van die god in Latium ingesteld, en in sommige gevallen werd de god in Rome geïntroduceerd door inwoners van de desbetreffende Latiale gemeenschap. Deze wijdingen kunnen dus nauwelijks gezien worden als een kenmerk waardoor lokale connotaties duidelijk gescheiden kunnen worden van grootstedelijke (Romeinse) connotaties. In geografisch opzicht zijn deze heiligdommen ook nauw verbonden met Rome. De meerderheid is gelegen in het gebied dat we als het Suburbium kunnen classificeren, waarmee het uitgebreide ommeland van Rome bedoeld wordt, dat door verschillende klassieke auteurs wordt beschreven als een zone tussen stad en niet-stad. De nabijheid van Rome en de intensiteit van de banden van dit gebied met de stad maakt het noodzakelijk om Rome als factor te betrekken in de interpretatie van monumentalisering in plaats van de stad volledig buiten beschouwing te laten. Dit idee wordt nog eens versterkt door het feit dat Romeinse nobles direct betrokken waren bij de bouw van verschillende van deze heiligdommen. De overige heiligdommen werden gebouwd door lokale aristocraten, die vaak politieke belangen in Rome zelf hadden. Contact tussen de gemeenschappen in Latium en Rome waren in deze periode intens, zelfs als niet alle leden van lokale elites een politieke carrière in Rome ambiëerden. Deze drie factoren, die religious, geografisch en sociaal-politiek van aard zijn, lijken alle te suggereren dat de bouw van monumentale heiligdommen in een krachtveld geplaatst moet worden tussen lokaal en grootstedelijk, zonder volledig bij een van beide te horen.

Deze tussenpositie kan verklaard worden vanuit het feit dat Romeinse en lokale aristocraten deel uitmaakten van hetzelfde sociale systeem. Hoe men er ook naar kijkt, de gemeenschappen van Latium werden continu geconfronteerd met Rome; hoewel bepaalde gemeenschappen in sommige opzichten een zekere mate van autonomie behielden, waren zij in de regel afhankelijk van beleid dat werd uitgezet door de Romeinse autoriteiten. Rome was de dominante politieke macht in Italië en het Middellandse Zeegebied, wat inhield dat betrekkingen met andere gemeenschappen per definitie asymmetrisch waren. We kunnen de dynamiek van de relaties die sociale actoren op verschillende machtsposities met elkaar onderhielden beschrijven aan de hand van het sociologische werk van Pierre Bourdieu. Hij beweert dat actoren die zich in hetzelfde sociale veld bevinden dominante en gedomineerde posities innemen, en dat participatie in een dergelijk veld gehaard gaat van een specifieke verzameling van belangen en regels, die altijd, hoewel vaak impliciet, bepaald worden door diegenen in dominantie posities. De posities die actoren innemen in het veld worden bepaald door de verschillende vormen en hoeveelheid van kapitaal die elke actor bezit. We kunnen drie vormen van kapitaal onderscheiden: economisch, sociaal en cultureel kapitaal. Zeker de laatste vorm is belangrijk
in de context van deze studie, aangezien het begrip inhoudt dat kennis van een cultuur en de specifieke codes van die cultuur waardevol kunnen zijn om machtsposities te bereiken. Als men voldoet aan de eisen die gesteld worden door de actoren in een dominante positie, kan dit betekenen dat een politieke carrière bevorderd wordt; kennis van culturele codes, die tot uiting komt in het gedrag van mensen, kan gebruikt worden als een signaal waarmee mensen die de ‘verkeerde’ kapitaalvormen bezitten worden uitgesloten van bepaalde statusgroepen, terwijl anderen, die wel gewenst gedrag vertonen, worden opgenomen in de groep. Cultureel kapitaal kan op deze manier geïnterpreteerd worden als zowel het resultaat en de inzet van een sociaal spel. Aan dit spel kan iedereen deelnemen, Romeins of Italisch, met het voorbehoud dat men zich onderwierp aan de (impliciete) regels.

De bouw van openbare gebouwen, waaronder tempels, kan geïnterpreteerd worden als onderdeel van dit machtsspel. Het bouwen van tempels stelde aristocraten in staat om overwinningen en succes te vieren, waardoor zij hun eigen prestige vergrootten en een voorbeeld stelden voor anderen. Tempels representeerden de succes van de Romeinse staat en de leiders van die staat die aan dit succes hadden bijgedragen. Tempels ontwikkelden zich zo tot visitekaartjes van aristocraten en hun families, die lieten zien dat deze mensen in huis hadden wat nodig was om een leidende rol te spelen binnen de Romeinse staat. Het is goed mogelijk dat ook bouwactiviteiten buiten Rome in dit licht moeten worden geïnterpreteerd. Verschillende heiligdommen werden gebouwd door Romeinse aristocraten, en in het geval van Lanuvium is het aannemelijk dat militair succes en politiek gewin belangrijke drijfveren waren voor de monumentaliserings van het heiligdom. Door monumentale heiligdommen te bouwen, die aan goden gewijd waren wier cultus ook in Rome gevestigd was, en die het resultaat waren van het succes van het Romeinse imperialisme waaraan ook de lokale aristocraten een bijdrage leverden, hoewel duidelijke militaristische verwijzingen vaak ontbraken, leken sommige lokale aristocraten misschien op het gehele heiligdom te willen aangeven dat ook zij eigenschappen bezaten die tot voordeel van de Romeinse staat zouden kunnen zijn. De bouw van de heiligdommen zou hen kunnen helpen om machtsposities te bereiken in Rome, waar het gros van de beslissingen die ook de lokale gemeenschappen aangingen werden gemaakt. Het is belangrijk om in het achterhoofd te houden dat dit geen universeel verlangen geweest hoeft te zijn, en machtsposities in lokale of regionale hiërarchieën kunnen ook op het spel hebben gestaan tijdens het monumentaliseringsproces. Beide houdingen kunnen echter binnen hetzelfde model worden verklaard, waardoor een strikte dichotomie tussen lokale en grootstedelijke belangen van individuen en groepen vermeden kan worden. Door de monumentaliserings van heiligdommen te interpreteren binnen een kader dat geënt is op het gedachtegoed van Bourdieu, waarin sociale banden verbonden worden met culturele signalen, kunnen we de kloof tussen lokaal grootstedelijk overbruggen en het fenomeen van monumentaliserings onderzoeken en verklaren als een verschijnsel waarin beide aspecten zijn vertegenwoordigd.

**Tussen traditie en innovatie**

De positie tussen traditie en innovatie komt, in ieder geval vanuit een architectonisch standpunt, het dichts in de buurt van Gros’ *triumphe du compromis*. In Hoofdstuk Drie is aangetoond dat de voornaamste eigenschap die deze groep heiligdommen met elkaar verbindt, buiten de
monumentaliteit zelf, de aandacht is die geschonken wordt aan de perceptie en ervaring van deze heiligdommen. De bouwcomplexen werden geplaatst en ontworpen met de beschouwing vanaf een afstand in het achterhoofd; alleen wanneer het heiligdom vanuit de verte benaderd werd kon het volledige complex beschouwd en begrepen worden. Hoewel de keuze voor imposante en zeer zichtbare locaties voor tempels geen nieuwe ontwikkeling was, is de moeite en middelen die gestoken worden in het bereiken van een echt scenografisch effect wel degelijk een ontwikkeling die voornamelijk aan de Late Republiek te koppelen is, en vertegenwoordigt het als zodanig een innovatief element in de architectuur van heiligdommen. Nooit tevoren was een poging gedaan in Italië om bouwcomplexen te realiseren die bestonden uit tempels en secundaire structuren die samen een min of meer organisch geheel vormden. Door gebruik te maken van het landschap en waar nodig het landschap aan te passen, werden de heiligdommen duidelijk gecomponeerd, in visuele zin. In dat opzicht zijn de Latiale heiligdommen te plaatsen in een bredere ontwikkeling in het Grieks-Hellenistische gebied waaruit dezelfde soort voorkeuren blijken. De nadruk op axiale symmetrie, die zichtbaar is in sommige maar lang niet alle Latiale heiligdommen, is ook terug te vinden in verschillende bouwcomplexen in het oostelijke Mediterrane gebied. In plaats van dit gegeven te zien als een bewijs voor de directe beïnvloeding van Italië vanuit het Oosten, kunnen we deze overeenkomsten zien als een voorbeeld van gelijktijdige ontwikkelingen die de nauwe banden tussen de twee gebieden illustreer, vooral in de periode na de Romeinse verovering.

Wat betreft de vorm van de tempelgebouwen in Latiale heiligdommen zien we vergelijkbare ontwikkelingen als in Rome: verscheidene tempels zijn een hybride vorm waarin Griekse en Etrusco-Italische stijlen vermengd zijn. Van de acht tempels is alleen de tempel van Lanuvium een echt traditionele tempel, terwijl het ronde tempelgebouw van Praeneste, mogelijk voorzien van koepelgewelf, een volledig nieuwe creatie is. De andere tempels vertonen alle bepaalde traditionele elementen gecombineerd met nieuwe stilistische of structurele aspecten. Daarbij moet opgemerkt worden dat het innovatieve architectonische aspect niet altijd uit Grieks-Hellenistische hoek hoeft te komen; de ontwikkeling van de transversale **cella** bijvoorbeeld, waarbij deze laatste 90 graden gedraaid is ten opzicht van het voorhof, lijkt een Italische vinding te zijn die geen directe parallelle heeft in de Griekse wereld. De keuze voor bepaalde bouwmateriaal en -technieken, voor zowel de tempel als andere structuren binnen het heiligdom, wordt ook gekenmerkt door een curieuze mengeling van oud en nieuw, gelijktijdig gebruikt in hetzelfde complex. Zo bleef men polygonaal muurwerk en **opus quadratum** gebruiken gedurende de hele laatrepublikeinse periode, terwijl opus caementicum steeds vaker gebruikt werd voor de onder- en opbouw van gebouwen. Het gebruik van travertijn en marmer voor de bekleding van gebouwen neemt toe, maar ook traditionele steensoorten als tufsteen en **lapis gabinus** bleven veelvuldig gebruikt worden voor structurele en decoratieve doeleinden. Dit laat duidelijk zien dat we technische en stilistische eigenschappen niet zomaar kunnen beschouwen als stadia in een lineaire ontwikkeling, maar dat we rekening moeten houden met de beschikbaarheid van talrijke opties waaruit bouwers de keuzen hadden, en dat het gebruik van specifieke materialen en technieken wellicht gezien zou moeten worden als een bewuste keuze waarachter duidelijke esthetische of symbolische overwegingen schuilgaan.

Deze architectonische en stilistische ontwikkelingen kunnen waarschijnlijk verbonden worden met sociaal-politieke ontwikkelingen, en nieuwe manieren waarop gebouwen gebruikt
werden in de laatrepublikeinse periode. De belangrijkste veranderingen werden ongetwijfeld veroorzaakt door de Romeinse expansie en de effecten hiervan op de manier waarop het republikeinse politieke systeem functioneerde. Vanaf de midrepubliekse periode was een systeem ontwikkeld, geworteld in de praktijk in plaats van gecodificeerd, waarin aristocraten met hun sociale gelijken streden om de macht. Het systeem had zich zodanig ontwikkeld dat excessieve concentratie van macht in de handen van individuen gedurende langere perioden voorkomen werd. Zo ontstond een balans tussen de macht van het collectief en de delegatie van deze macht aan de hoogste magistraten van de staat. Tegelijkertijd stelde dit systeem van dienstbaarheid tijdens het ambt individuen in staat om een zekere, beperkte mate van macht en prestige te vergaren zonder dat dit het voortbestaan van de Romeinse staat in gevaar zou brengen. Maar juist omdat het systeem grotendeels geworteld was in de praktijk en niet was gecodificeerd, was het ook kwetsbaar voor verstoringen van de status quo, en dat laatste is nu precies wat er gebeurde in de Late Republiek.

De nadruk op het welvaren van de staat, altijd een van de fundamentele aspecten van het politieke spel, verschoof geleidelijk naar de individuele accumulatie van macht en rijkdom waarbij de implicaties voor de staat en de machtsbalans genegeerd werd. De steeds prominentere positie van individuen werd geïllustreerd door de grotere schaal van bouwprojecten in Rome, zoals de Porticus Metelli en het zogenaamde Tabularium; kennelijk nam de behoefte om gehoor te geven aan ongeschreven regels en binnen bepaalde parameters te opereren af. Buiten Rome kunnen de bouwactiviteiten van individuen in de heiligdommen van Gabii en Lanuvium op dezelfde manier beschouwd worden, hoewel de beperkingen die aan aristocraten binnen Rome werden opgelegd door de behoefte de precaire machtsbalans te behouden hier sowieso minder dwingend zouden zijn geweest. De prominente positie van de individuele aristocraat is wellicht ook zichtbaar in de opgestelde standbeelden in bepaalde heiligdommen. In de eerste eeuw voor Christus zien we portretten verschijnen in de heiligdommen van Tibur en Lanuvium die duidelijk de behoefte tonen van aristocraten om zich te tonen. In het geval van Lanuvium zou het zelfs zo geweest kunnen zijn dat de godin werd opgeëist als een persoonlijke schutspatrones.

De verschuiving in de machtsbalans van collectief naar individu ging gepaard met een discussie over relevante kwaliteiten van leiders, of in de terminologie van Bourdieu, de vormen van kapitaal die een individu nodig had om een dominante positie in te nemen binnen het Romeinse machtsveld en opgenomen te worden binnen de heersende klasse. Na een periode van brede overeenstemming over wat in dit opzicht een effectief teken van onderscheiding en geschiktheid om te besturen was, zorgden de toestroom van rijkdom ten gevolge van de Romeinse expansie en nieuwe vormen van cultuur en kennis die Rome bereikten vanuit het Grieks-Hellenistische Oosten ervoor dat men zich af ging vragen of het vermogen om deze nieuwe stijlen en media te manipuleren net ook beschouwd kon worden als een waardevolle eigenschap in het kader van de politieke concurrentie. De consensus over de basisvereisten voor opname in de heersende elite brokkelder dus langzaam af tijdens de laatrepublikeinse periode.

Deze staat van verandering waarin het republikeinse politieke systeem verkeerde, op zichzelf dus al gekenmerkt door een positie tussen de traditie van het delen van de macht en de ‘innovatie’ van de toenemende prominentie van machtige individuen en nieuwe vormen van
vertoon en kennis, bood wellicht nieuwe kansen aan diegenen die in de voorgaande periode systematisch benadeeld werden door de traditionele praktijk van selectie en bevordering binnen de Romeinse staat. Aangezien groepsconsensus wankelde, was het nu mogelijk voor individuen die tevoren niet zouden zijn overwogen voor bepaalde machtsposities om gemakkelijker door te dringen in de rangen van de Romeinse nobilitas dan eerst. Op zijn minst zou het gevoel van nieuwe mogelijkheden aanwezig zijn geweest, ook al zou dit niet altijd in daadwerkelijk politiek succes resulteren. Inderdaad zien we een zekere concentratie van politieke deelname van lokale notabelen in Rome in de laatste decennia van de tweede en de eerste decennia van de eerste eeuw voor Christus, die mogelijk gekoppeld kan worden aan de sociaal-politieke veranderingen van de laatrepublikeinse periode. Dit gevoel van gelegenheid, dat niet mooier geïllustreerd kan worden dan de politieke bliksemcarrière van domi nobilis en homo novus Marius, resulteerde wellicht in het gebruik van lokale heiligdommen als een signaal dat werd gegeven door lokale aristocraten dat hun geschiktheid om opgenomen te worden in de Romeinse heersende elite moest tonen.

Deze heiligdommen vormden, zoals we hebben gezien, een brug tussen lokale gemeenschappen en Rome en symboliseerden de band tussen hen. Hoewel het gebruik van tempels als exempla, gebouwd door waardige voorgangers wier kwaliteiten en verdiensten als voorbeeld dienden voor anderen, een bekend gegeven was, zou het individuele gebruik van gemeenschappelijke heiligdommen een nieuwe variatie op dit thema betekenen binnen het competitieve politieke systeem. Het zou echter zo kunnen zijn dat de verzwakking van de consensus in Rome dit specifieke gebruik van heiligdommen acceptabel maakte als een teken van onderscheiding en geschiktheid. De heiligdommen waren weliswaar buiten Rome gelegen en verwezen niet direct naar de verdiensten van afzonderlijke magistraten, toch waren het krachtige culturele uitingen die het succes en de mogelijkheden van het Romeinse imperialisme vieren, en een voorkeur voor en een kennis van Grieks-Hellenistische cultuur demonstreerden die, zoals hierboven al is opgemerkt, in Rome in deze periode steeds meer als een waardig teken van onderscheiding werd gezien.

Het paradoxale van deze situatie is dat terwijl het systeem veranderde conservatieve individuen in machtsposities bleven zitten die dit soort signalen niet als geldig zouden hebben ervaren. Traditionele waarden werden nog steeds hooggehouden en gebruikt om buitenstaanders te weren die de positie van insider opeisten. Daarnaast kun je je afvragen of de innovaties, de veranderingen van het systeem, er niet ook voor zorgden dat het ophield effectief te functioneren; het systeem was altijd afhankelijk geweest van consensus, waarvan steeds minder sprake was. In plaats van de ethische code dienstbaarheid tijdens het ambt vierde individualisme hoogtij; individuen trokken de macht naar zich toe en legden gangbare politieke mores die eeuwenlang in stand waren gehouden naast zich neer. Het is mogelijk dat de domi nobiles, de lokale aristocraten, hun heiligdommen bouwden om ze te gebruiken in een spel dat onherkenbaar veranderd was en waarin bouwactiviteiten niet meer de rol van exempla vervulden zoals in de periode daarvoor. Traditie en innovatie zouden op deze manier een verkeerde interpretatie in de hand hebben gewerkt van de signalen gestuurd door sommige lokale aristocraten. Het is zelfs mogelijk dat zij in de laatste fase van de Republiek niet alleen werden beschouwd als incorrecte signalen, maar dat zij überhaupt niet meer als signalen werden herkend. Het nieuwe machtsspel vereiste nieuwe regels, en een nieuwe inzet.
Conclusie

Het moge duidelijk zijn dat als we het hebben over de monumentalisering van Latiale heiligdommen in de laatrepublikeinse periode, er sprake is van een enorme variatie. Natuurlijk kunnen de monumentale heiligdommen van Latium beschouwd worden als een product van een specifieke periode en een specifiek gebied. Het fenomeen heeft immers een beperkt chronologische en geografisch bereik, wat suggereert dat het monumentaliseringsproces verklard zou kunnen worden aan de hand van belangrijke ontwikkelingen tijdens deze periode in dit gebied. Daarnaast is er op een bepaald niveau een sterk gevoel van overeenkomst tussen de heiligdommen; de manier waarop zij in het landschap geplaatst zijn geplaatst en gebouwd zijn om de blik te trekken lijkt een eigenschap te zijn die gedeeld wordt door alle heiligdommen. In dat opzicht is er dus iets wat deze monumenten onlosmakelijk met elkaar verbindt, als representanten van een gedeeld proces. Het is echter net zo duidelijk dat elk heiligdom op zichzelf zou moeten worden bestudeerd, en dat het niet genoeg is om deze monumenten te zien als ‘variaties op een gemeenschappelijk thema’ als deze variaties vervolgens genegeerd worden en nog slechts gekeken wordt naar het gemeenschappelijke. De studie van monumentale heiligdommen draait uit op een dubbel compromis: het moderne compromis van wetenschappers die beperkt worden in hun interpretaties door de onvolledigheid van het bewijsmateriaal, en het antieke compromis, of serie compromissen, waarvan deze heiligdommen het product zijn en waarvan de specifieke vorm van elk heiligdom getuigt. Helaas is het zo dat in plaats van te resulteren in de nauwkeurige bestudering van het bewijs dat wel voorhanden is en het afwegen van algemene ontwikkelingen tegen afzonderlijke eigenaardigheden, het gros van publicaties de algemeenheid verkiest boven het afzonderlijke, dat volledig genegeerd wordt.

Het eerste, moderne compromis heeft waarschijnlijk een belangrijke rol gespeeld in het vaststellen van de standaardtypologie van Latiale monumentale heiligdommen. Het kennelijke gebrek van duidelijk bewijs dat substantiële verschillen aantoont tussen heiligdommen heeft geleid tot een idee van uniformiteit. Overeenkomsten die op een bepaald niveau worden vastgesteld worden vervolgens steeds vaker en steeds minder kritisch op alle niveaus geprojecteerd op andere heiligdommen. Deze neiging lijkt te suggereren dat wanneer we geconfronteerd worden met de beperkingen van ons materiaal, we genoegen moeten nemen met algemeenheden. Een standaard heiligdomtype wordt gedestilleerd uit oppervlakkige overeenkomsten tussen een aantal heiligdommen dat behoort tot een groep die daarvoor op heel andere gronden als groep zijn gedefinieerd. Dit standaardtype wordt vervolgens gebruikt om ontbrekende informatie aan te vullen van andere heiligdommen die geacht worden deel uit te maken van deze groep. Ik hoop dat ik heb aangetoond dat op een architectonisch niveau deze heiligdommen niet gezien kunnen worden als een homogene groep met inwisselbare structurele eigenschappen, wat ze verder ook met elkaar gemeen hebben wat betreft functie, gebruik, plaatsing en ontstaan.

Het tweede, antieke compromis is in deze zin het compromis dat teveel over het hoofd is gezien in het onderzoek dat vooral de uniformiteit van heiligdommen benadrukt. De tussenposities die de heiligdommen kenmerken kunnen waarschijnlijk verklaard worden.
door het feit dat we hier te maken hebben met zeer menselijke projecten. De heiligdommen werden gebouwd en gebruikt door mensen, die waardevolle reserves investeerden om deze complexen te realiseren en klaarblijkelijk op deze manier een boodschap over zichzelf of over de gemeenschap waartoe zij behoorden wilden overbrengen. Tijdens het bestuderen van architectuur, en vooral monumentale architectuur, wil men nog wel eens over het hoofd zien dat we hier te maken hebben met sociale constructen; gebouwen spelen een belangrijke rol in de maatschappij, en drukken verlangens en belangen van groepen en individuen uit. Deze verlangens en belangen kunnen aardig overeen komen maar op bepaalde punten zeer van elkaar verschillen, net als de monumenten die er het product van zijn. Ten gevolge van het moderne compromis missen we bepaalde informatie, informatie die ons wellicht in staat zou stellen om de gevarieerde en uiteenlopende houdingen van de mensen die betrokken zijn bij het monumentaliseringsproces in verband te brengen met het eindresultaat, de heiligdommen die we bestuderen. Wat we wel kunnen doen, en wat ik geprobeerd heb te doen in dit proefschrift, is manieren aandragen om naar objecten te kijken die zowel het algemene als het afzonderlijke in zich dragen en die de beschikbare informatie optimaal benutten. Hoewel het mogelijk is om algemene ontwikkelingen te onderscheiden die het monumentaliseringsproces mogelijk hebben beïnvloed, direct of indirect, zullen er ook altijd heiligdommen zijn die niet aan het geschepte beeld voldoen. De modellen die in dit proefschrift zijn voorgesteld passen beter bij bepaalde heiligdommen dan bij andere. Dat betekent niet dat het model dat wel lijkt op te gaan voor andere heiligdommen niets meer waard is, maar het zou ons wel moeten wijzen op het feit dat er wellicht subtiere, of misschien niet eens zo subtiere verschillen kunnen schuilen onder vermeende overeenkomsten, verschillen die niet genegeerd zouden moeten worden.

Dit tweede compromis, de tussenposities van heiligdommen in de oudheid, kan misschien het beste worden omschreven als een multidimensionale matrix waarin alle tegenstellingen zijn opgenomen die hierboven zijn behandeld. Elk heiligdom zou in deze matrix geplaatst kunnen worden op basis van de beschikbare informatie. Als we een compromis opvatten als een tussenpositie, tussen twee extremen van opvatting of beoordeling, is er geen betere term denkbaar dan ‘trionfen van het compromis’ om de laatrepublikeinse monumentale heiligdommen van Latium mee te kenschetsen. Niet alleen zijn het gebouwen die tussen Italische traditie en Grieks-Hellenistische innovatie in staan in architectonisch opzicht, ook nemen zij een tussenpositie in wat betreft hun gebied van invloed, die zowel de grootstedelijke politieke wereld van Rome omvat als de lokale gemeenschappen waar de heiligdommen bij hoorden; hun primaire functie, die noch volledig religieus is, noch zuiver representatief; en hun sociale relevantie, aangezien zowel aristocraten als mensen van lagere sociale status het heiligdom gebruiken en zich met het heiligdom identificeren, en dit doen als individu maar ook als groep.

Geen enkel heiligdom nam exact dezelfde positie als een andere in binnen deze matrix van schijnbaar tegengestelde paren; de ervaren algemene overeenkomsten zijn tamelijk oppervlakkig en kunnen niet direct vertaald worden naar een standaardisering op alle niveaus. Homogeniteit in bepaalde opzichten gaat vaak gepaard van heterogeniteit in andere. Dit is ook van toepassing op de laatrepublikeinse monumentale heiligdommen van Latium. Hoewel zij een positie innemen tussen twee uitersten, is er waarschijnlijk geen enkel heiligdom dat een perfecte middenpositie inneemt; in alle gevallen neigen zij meer naar de ene kant dan de andere,
en door deze verschuivingen verkregen zij hun specifieke vorm en functie. Het feit dat deze heiligdommen onophoudelijk de verbeelding hebben gestimuleerd vanaf de Middeleeuwen tot de dag van vandaag toont aan dat zij de karakterisering als 'triumfen' waardig zijn, in ieder geval in architectonisch opzicht. Ze verdienen het om continu bestudeerd te worden, in plaats van te verstenen tot een standaardtype, dat, naar ik hoop te hebben duidelijk gemaakt, alles behalve standaard is.