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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.\(^\text{244}\) 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.\(^\text{245}\) 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,\(^\text{246}\) or an indirect result of Roman expansionist policies in the form of intensified trade by Roman andItalic *negotiatores* and *mercatores* in the eastern parts of the Mediterraneane.\(^\text{247}\) Sanctuaries probably benefited from these newly gained riches in several ways. One possibility is active involvement in overseas trade on the part of sanctuaries,\(^\text{248}\) 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

\(^{244}\) Morel 1989-1990.

\(^{245}\) 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.

\(^{246}\) 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).

\(^{247}\) 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).

\(^{248}\) 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 manubuis}. 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.\footnote{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).} 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.\footnote{The \textit{monetizzazione} of votive religion noted by Torelli (see Chapter 1) could have been related by the intensification of trade and the monetary economy.} 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.\footnote{See Ziolkowski 1989-1990 for the idea of sacred structures as constituting votive offerings in their own right.} 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.\footnote{Lomas 1997, 27-29.} 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.\footnote{Cébeillac-Gervasoni 1990, 721-722.}

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.\footnote{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).} 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
sanctuaries on two of the Dodecanese isles, Kos and Rhodes, and the city of Pergamon. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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, observes the same strict axiality centred on the temple building as some of the central Italic examples.

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.
258 Lomas 1995, 108. See also Wallace-Hadrill 2008, esp. 17-28, connecting the processes of romanisation and hellenisation in Italy.
259 Calio 2001 (Kamiros); Lippolis 1988-1989 (Lindos).
260 Calio 2001, 106.
261 Coarelli 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.
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. 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.

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 RAKO 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 land marks 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.
Religion, community and collective memory

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 intertwining 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.\(^\text{269}\) 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”.\(^\text{270}\) 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.\(^\text{271}\) 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.\(^\text{272}\) 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.\(^\text{273}\) “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”.\(^\text{274}\) 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

\(^\text{269}\) The term ‘collective memory’ was coined by Maurice Halbwachs (\textit{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 (\textit{Assmann} 1997).

\(^\text{270}\) \textit{Holkeskamp} 2005, 251; \textit{Holkeskamp} 2006, 481.

\(^\text{271}\) The term ‘lieux de mémoire’ has been coined for such places by Pierre Nora.

\(^\text{272}\) \textit{Egelhaaf-Gaiser} 2000, 234.

\(^\text{273}\) \textit{Egelhaaf-Gaiser} 2000, 236.

\(^\text{274}\) \textit{Holkeskamp} 2006, 481.
into the collective consciousness. 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. 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”. 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.

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. 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 romanitas, out of a wish to participate in the empire, a model

---

275 It is this mechanism which lies at the root of what Eric Hobsbawm has termed the ‘invention of tradition’ (Hobsbawm/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.

276 Egelaaf-Gaiser 2000, 236.

277 Holkeskamp 2006, 481.

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 (Alcock 2001, esp. 323, 330).
that has been termed self-romanisation or *autoromanizzazione*.\textsuperscript{279} 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 *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.\textsuperscript{280} 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

\textsuperscript{279} For this concept, see Sherwin-White 1973, 222; Brunt 1976; Millett 1990a; Millett 1990b, 38; Torella/Lachenal 1992, xxxvii; Woolf 1998, 247; Curchin 2004, 13.

\textsuperscript{280} Webster 2001, 215-216.
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.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.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,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.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.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.

281 COHEN 1985, 50.
282 NAVA/CRACOLICI 2005, 103.
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).
284 PELGROM 2004, 27.
285 STEK 2004, 33-34.
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{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{286} Interestingly, the form of the theatre is typical of Greek-Sicilian theatre plans (Hülsemann 1987, 133).
\item \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).
\item \textsuperscript{288} Coarelli/La Regina 1984, 298; Stek 2009, 51-52.
\item \textsuperscript{289} Stek 2009, 51.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
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’.
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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 fornic a semicolonne, VI. piazza della cortina, VII. cavea and porticus in summa cavea (KÄHLER 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.²⁹²

Fig. 19. The urban area of late republican Praeneste with indications of the ancient remains (QUILICI 1980, 172 Fig. 1).

²⁹² 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.  

The creation of seven artificial 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. Rather, the use of visible substructions in Roman and Italic architecture has a symbolic aspect and is generally accorded a militant and controlling character. 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, 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. 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. 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. 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). Since the cavea probably could not be used as an actual theatre because of the lack of a scænæ 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. 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.
295 DRERUP 1966.
296 LEY/STRUSS 1982, 123.
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 Vit. *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.\textsuperscript{304} 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 Preneistine 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.\textsuperscript{305} 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.\textsuperscript{306} 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.\textsuperscript{307}

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 Preneistine society.\textsuperscript{308}

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 Preneistine \textit{gentes}, carried out by Attilio Degrassi, has been particularly important in deciding on a construction date.\textsuperscript{309} 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

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{304} 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.
\item \textsuperscript{305} 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}).
\item \textsuperscript{306} LEY/STRUSS 1982, 128-129.
\item \textsuperscript{307} LEY/STRUSS 1982, 129.
\item \textsuperscript{308} LEY/STRUSS 1982, 117.
\item \textsuperscript{309} 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.
\end{itemize}
after 82. In addition, the only magistrates mentioned by title in the inscriptions (censores) 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.⁴¹⁰

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.⁴¹¹ 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.⁴¹² 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 268.⁴¹³ 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.⁴¹⁴

*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
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⁴¹⁰ See Caputo 1990-1991, 228-231 (mural decoration); Coarelli 1987, 50 (sculpture); Lauter 1979, 392-394 (architectural and stylistic aspects).
⁴¹¹ Ley/Struss 1982, 129-130.
⁴¹³ Magoffin 1908, 71.
⁴¹⁴ 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.\footnote{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).}

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 \textit{tholos} marking the site of the oracle on the \textit{terrazza degli emicicli}, 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 \textit{terrazza degli emicicli}. 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

\footnotetext[317]{\textit{tholos} marking the site of the oracle on the \textit{terrazza degli emicicli}, 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 \textit{terrazza degli emicicli}. 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}
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 scaenae frons, although the construction of a temporary scaenae 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.318 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 Preneistine 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, 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. 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. 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. The introduction of the cult in Rome in 204 perhaps makes her a less suitable figure-head of Preneistine opposition to Rome in any case. 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: Orceuia Numeri [uxor] / nationu cratia / Fortuna Diano filia / Primo cenia / donum dedi). 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 Preneistine 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.\textsuperscript{324} 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.\textsuperscript{325} 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 \textit{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.

\textsuperscript{324} King Prusias of Bithynia asked the Roman Senate for permission to sacrifice at Praeneste, and moreover did so in fulfillment of a vow made for the victory of Rome (Liv. 45.44)

\textsuperscript{325} CONOLE 1981; COARELLI 1998, 34-45.
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 scenaes 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{Ais[i]o[la]pi[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. 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. A final, literary reference concerns a mention of the cult of Juno in relation to Gabii in Vergil’s *Aeneis*, 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. 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. The cult of the goddess was fairly complex, and under the name of *Trivia* or *Diana triplices* seems to have incorporated triple aspects of the goddess as ruler of the spheres of the netherworld, earth and heaven. 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. The late republican sanctuary at Lanuvium was dedicated to Juno Sospita, also a popular goddess in the wider area during the republican period. 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. 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.
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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 Spineto 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 Greek world (Alföldi 1960, 142). See Guldager Bilde 1997 for a general description of Diana’s cult at Nemi.
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.
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 turnus bellieus temporius desivere fieri, nulla non eorum fulmine dirata*”). See Quilici 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.
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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 Pt/Ribaldi 2008, 78-79. An inscription from Capua perhaps mentions the sacra tuscolana of the god (CIL I 1582: [Herc]ole (?) / 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.


340 Gorostidi Pt/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 Tuscan 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, Origines, 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 (DREUP 1966).

345 Coarelli in ALMAGRO-GORBEA 1982, 125-130.
here with the *gens* Cornelia. Unfortunately, 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: [...] *Aesculapio*.
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.353 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.354 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,355 although Lorenzo Quilici has raised objections against this date, arguing that an early first-century date is just as feasible.356 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.357 The great sanctuary of Diana

353 [Author] 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. Howere, 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 Giorgi 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.\footnote{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.\footnote{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.

\footnote{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 Känel 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 Huiusce Diei 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*. Coarelli’s reading of this passage has recently been called into question, quite convincingly, by Lorenzo Quilici. This leaves us with only stylistic characteristics, which are not very specific and indicate a date after the first decades of the first century. 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. The sanctuary of Juno Sospita at Lanувium can probably be dated to the second quarter of the first century, more specifically the years 66-62. 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.

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
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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 statue 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 (Andréen 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.\textsuperscript{366} 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”.\textsuperscript{367} 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 \textit{and} communities, with differing backgrounds: Latin \textit{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 \textit{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

\textsuperscript{366} Coarelli stressed the Roman background of most of the Latial monumental sanctuaries during a contribution to a recent conference in Rome (Sacra Nominis Latinì, 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 (\textsc{Coarelli 1983, 198}).

\textsuperscript{367} \textsc{Lomas 2003, 29}. 
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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.\(^{368}\) 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.\(^{369}\) 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’)
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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”.  

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.

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. 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. 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

379 This last form of cultural capital probably cannot be translated to the Roman context, since there were no school diplomas or other official documents issued by generally acknowledged institutes, such as schools or universities, ‘proving’ an individual’s possessions of a certain amount of cultural capital. It will therefore not be considered further.
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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382 Bourdieu 1986, 249; Bourdieu 1997, 52.
384 Bourdieu 1986, 250; Bourdieu 1997, 52.
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. 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, 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. 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”.

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. Bourdieu distinguishes many different, and independent, fields within the larger social field, which are each determined by the prominence of a specific

388 Anheier et al. 1995, 862.
389 Bourdieu 1985b, 724.
390 Bourdieu 1977, 183.
type of capital within that field. 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. 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”. 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. 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. 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 doxa. With this term Bourdieu indicates a social world which is seen as self-evident and undisputed, a natural given. 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 undisputed, 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; doxa becomes orthodoxy. 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”. There are three basic strategies agents pursue within fields: 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

392 Anheier et al. 1995, 863.
393 Bourdieu 1984, 114, 131, 315; Bourdieu 1989, 17; Schwartz 1997, 123.
395 Bourdieu 1984, 258. “The dominant class have only to let the system they dominate take its own course in order to exercise their domination” (Bourdieu 1977, 190).
396 Bourdieu 1979, 82-83. “Adapting to a dominated position implies a form of acceptance of domination” (Bourdieu 1984, 386).
397 Bourdieu 1977, 164-168; Bourdieu 1984, 471.
398 Bourdieu 1977, 169.
400 Schwartz 1997, 125.
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

401 BOURDIEU 1984, 164.
403 “An unintentional consequence of engaging in field competition is that actors, through they may contest the legitimacy of rewards given by fields, nonetheless reproduce the structure of fields” (SCHWARTZ 1997, 126).
404 BOURDIEU 1977, 164-165.
405 BOURDIEU 1991, 58: “The game is over when people start wondering if the cake is worth the candle.”
406 Example are the field of cultural production, which assumes independence on the part of artists, and which probably did not exist as such in ancient societies, and the political field, which sees politics as a profession.
407 The field of power is, in a sense, the broadest of all fields. All other fields are related to it and those who occupy the dominant positions within their respective fields confront each other within the field of power (BOURDIEU 1996, 264-270). Since it is difficult to speak of different, independent fields within Roman society, I will use the term field of power to denote the field of struggle for access political power.
auspicia, and the possession of imperium, the highest form of command.\textsuperscript{409} 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.\textsuperscript{410} 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”.\textsuperscript{411} 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”.\textsuperscript{412}

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.\textsuperscript{413} 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,\textsuperscript{414} 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

\textsuperscript{409} Hölkeskamp 1993, 23.

\textsuperscript{410} “[plebeian] aspirations were to be directed immediately at equal participation in these functions and powers – undiminished and undivided” (Hölkeskamp 1993, 21). “The constitutional reform of 367 was to remove the civil disabilities suffered by the plebeians, rather than to abolish the privileges enjoyed by the patricians” (Cornell 1989a, 342; Cornell 1995, 341).

\textsuperscript{411} Hölkeskamp 1993, 23.

\textsuperscript{412} Hölkeskamp 1993, 23.

\textsuperscript{413} See Lintott 1999, 71, for a discussion on property qualifications for membership of the Senate. For the relation of political rights to property, for instance in the voting procedures of the comitia centuriata, see Cornell 1989a, 337; Cornell 1995, 343, 379-380; Lintott 1999, 55; Williamson 2005, 212-227.

\textsuperscript{414} Humphreys 1990, 295. Bourdieu 1991, 152: “It is through the ‘elevated’ style of a discourse that its status in the hierarchy of discourses and the respect due to its status are invoked.”
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. 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. 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 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 *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 *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. 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. The members of established consular families thus would appear to have had an inherent capital endowment and *habitus* that was ideally suited to success in the Roman politics.

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
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416 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.
417 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 *gentes*.
418 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 (*homines novi*) had sons who would also become consul (Lintott 1994, 47).
419 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.”
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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420 Holkeskamp 1993, 36.
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427 There are some documented cases when the Senate came into conflict with the delegate (Lintott 1999, 66-67), but direct conflict seems to have been the exception rather than the rule.
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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. \(^{429}\) 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. \(^{430}\) 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. \(^{431}\) 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”. \(^{432}\) 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 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”. \(^{433}\) 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.

**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. \(^{434}\) 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. \(^{435}\) 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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\(^{429}\) Although it is unclear what the rules for membership of the Senate were, it is almost certain that at least all former curule magistrates became members after their term of office (Cornell 1995, 370; Lintott 1999, 68-69).


\(^{431}\) Cornell 1989a, 341; Cornell 1995, 340.

\(^{432}\) Hökseskamp 1993, 34.

\(^{433}\) Hökseskamp 1993, 38.

\(^{434}\) See, for example, Degrassi 1986, 146; Gruen 1990, 5-33.

\(^{435}\) North 1976; Orlin 2002.
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 manubiis, 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. 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. 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. 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. 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 furthermore 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.

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, Stambaugh 1978, 557; Pietila-Castrén 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.
440 The fact that there is no evidence for this should raise doubts about the validity of the theory of manubial building. The availability of large sums of money did not necessarily lead to the construction of temples; there does not seem to be a correlation between those who brought back large amounts of war booty and those who vowed and built temples (Orlin 1997, 128-129).
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- en 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
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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’, unbeautifified 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

450 Cornell 2000, 53.
451 Liv. 40.5.7.
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.\textsuperscript{452} 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”.\textsuperscript{453} 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 \textit{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 \textit{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 \textit{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”,\textsuperscript{454} 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

\textsuperscript{452} \textit{Walter} 2001, 258.
\textsuperscript{453} \textit{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.
\textsuperscript{454} \textit{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.

455 Lomas 2003, 41.
456 Keller 2007, 44.
457 Keller 2007, 45.
458 Keller 2007, 47: “Their political perspective was limited to their local sphere at the time when their economic horizon was expanding across the Mediterranean”.
459 Keller 2007, 50-54.
460 Keller 2007, 47: “allied elite identity was defined by economic prosperity and locally based socio-political power”.
461 Besides Lomas (cited above), this basic view is also expressed, citing only some recent examples, in Farney 2007, 72 (“symbols of parochial town pride”) and Wallace-Hadrill 2008, 115 (“an enormous investment in local religiosity and local pride”).
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. 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
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*Fig. 25. Chronology and overall dimensions of monumental sanctuaries in Latium (indicated by either the first three letters of their locality or the first two letters of the locality and a number to indicate the relevant building phase).*

---

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.\(^{464}\) 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.\(^{465}\) 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,\(^{466}\) 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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\(^{464}\) *LTUR* 4, 130-132 (with bibliography); *Gros* 1996, 98-99.
\(^{465}\) Anselmino 2006.
\(^{466}\) Anselmino 2006, 237-238; Strazzulla 2006, 263-264.
Moreover, given the early date in the first half of the second century,⁴⁶⁷ 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

⁴⁶⁷ Anselmino 2006, 235.
is not the *Tabularium* itself, but a *substructio*.\(^{468}\) 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.\(^{469}\) 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.\(^{470}\) 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 a 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,\(^{471}\) built in the late second century was another example of a truly
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\(^{468}\) Tucci 2005, 7-9.

\(^{469}\) The identification of the temples is uncertain. Pier Luigi Tucci has suggested the temple of Juno Moneta as the most likely candidate (Tucci 2005), while Filippo Coarelli maintains that it supported no fewer than three temples, dedicated to the Genius Publicus, Fausta Felicitas and Venus Victrix (as suggested by him at several lectures, such as recently at the conference *Sacra Nominis Latini* held at Rome, 19-21 February 2009, to be published in the periodical *Ostraka*).

\(^{470}\) See Bergmann 1995 and Gazda 1995 for excellent critiques of the traditional approach to Greek-inspired Roman art dubbed ‘copies’ in the fields of (mural) painting and sculpture.

\(^{471}\) 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”,472 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

472 Welch 2006, 497.

<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 *suburbanum* include Saca Rubra, Fidenae, Nomentum, Ficulae, Tibur, Gabii, Praeneste, Tusculum, Bovillae, Aricia, Velitrae, 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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473 Cic. Phil. 12.24; Scholia in Iuvenalem 4.7.
474 See Mayer 2005, 43-148, for a thorough treatment of the literary references to the term.
476 It is probably because it is used to express a ‘state of mind’ that it defies precise geographical definition (Chamil 1982, 97; La Regina 2001, 2).
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. 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.

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. 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
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477 Champlin 1982, 97.
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.\(^{480}\)

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,\(^{481}\) 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,\(^{482}\) 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
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\(^{480}\) According to Strabo, the towns of Praeneste, Tibur and Tusculum were visible from Rome (5.3.11-12).
\(^{481}\) Champlin 1982, 104.
\(^{482}\) Bodei Giglioni 1977, 62; Mayer 2000; Mayer 2005.
among the targeted audience.\textsuperscript{483} 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.\textsuperscript{484} 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,\textsuperscript{485} it does suggest that Romans were among the targeted audience of the visual message conveyed by them.

\textit{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 \textit{Urbs}, is at its most intense.\textsuperscript{486} 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 \textit{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.\textsuperscript{487} 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,\textsuperscript{483}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{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 (\textsc{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 (\textsc{Mayer} 2005, 84), which would make it contemporaneous or even later than the construction of the sanctuary.
\item \textsuperscript{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 (\textsc{Mayer} 2005, 103) and a precocious start of the phenomenon in the Colli Albani (especially near Tusculum) in the third century (\textsc{Mayer} 2005, 106), antedate the construction of both monumental sanctuaries.
\item \textsuperscript{485} Edward Champlin argues that Roman suburban landowners hardly played any local role (\textsc{Champlin} 1982, 104) while others suggest that the involvement of Roman landowners with local sanctuaries was more intense (\textsc{Bodei Giglioni} 1977, 62; \textsc{Mayer} 2005).
\item \textsuperscript{486} \textsc{Cébeillac-Gervasoni} 1978; \textsc{Licordari} 1982; \textsc{Cébeillac-Gervasoni} 1998.
\item \textsuperscript{487} \textsc{Zevi} 1996, esp. 241.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
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 *nobilites*. 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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488 Lamont/Lareau 1988, 156; Kingston 2001, 90.
489 Lamont/Lareau 1988, 156.
490 Holkeskamp 2005, 270.
491 Holkeskamp 2005, 270.
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 manubii*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.\textsuperscript{496} 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.\textsuperscript{497} He points out that a Latin origin, especially one from the communities of \textit{Latium vetus} that had enjoyed old and close associations with Rome, could translate into substantial (political) advantages.\textsuperscript{498} 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.\textsuperscript{499} 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.\textsuperscript{500} 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 (\textit{tresviri monetalis}) as a stepping stone for their further political careers,\textsuperscript{501} 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 \textit{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,\textsuperscript{502} according to Farney “symbols of parochial town pride”.\textsuperscript{503} 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.\textsuperscript{504}

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

\textsuperscript{496} De Grassi 1969. Of the four families mentioned on the inscription, at least the Saufeii (Harvey 1975, 45-48 Zevi 1996, 241) and the Magulnii (Zevi 1996, 241) are known entities in Roman politics.

\textsuperscript{497} Farney 2007, esp. 39-77 for Latium.

\textsuperscript{498} Farney 2007, 45-49.

\textsuperscript{499} Farney 2007, 49-50

\textsuperscript{500} “For ambitious Roman families of Latin descent, we have seen that the purpose of advertising their origin… was to show that your family was most like the traditional Roman aristocracy and therefore an integral part of Rome’s political culture” (Farney 2007, 74).

\textsuperscript{501} Cereilliac-Gervasoni 1978, 238-239; Licordari 1982, 12.

\textsuperscript{502} Farney 2007, 52-53.

\textsuperscript{503} Farney 2007, 72.

\textsuperscript{504} Farney 2007, 68-69 (Juno Sospita at Lanuvium), 70 (Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste, Hercules Victor at Tibur, Jupiter Anxur at Terracina and Diana Nemorensis at Aricia). There are also coins referring to the cult of the Dioscuri at Tusculum (Farney 2007, 70), but as we have seen above we cannot connect this cult with certainty to the monumental sanctuary outside the Western gate. Reference is also made to the double cult of Fortuna Felix et Victrix at Antium (Farney 2007, 70), but physical remains of this sanctuary have not yet been discovered.
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. 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.

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. Millett provided a basic outline of the progression of the romanisation of native societies:

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.

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, 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. 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”. 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”. 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,\textsuperscript{514} and furthermore that it supposes that emulation was the general norm but fails to account satisfactorily for the lack of emulation when encountered.\textsuperscript{515} 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.\textsuperscript{516} 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 specificity of iron-age societies is crucial if we are to understand its diversity”.\textsuperscript{517} The fact that earlier characteristics of native societies were crucial to the

\textsuperscript{514} “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” (WEBSTER 2001, 216).

\textsuperscript{515} “[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... (WEBSTER 2001, 216).

\textsuperscript{516} DOWNS 2000, 202-203.

\textsuperscript{517} WOOLF 1992, 352.
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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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.\textsuperscript{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 of 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”:\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{527} SHERWIN-WHITE 1973, 108