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Chapter Three
SANCTUARIES IN LATIUM:
ARCHITECTURE AND ORNAMENTATION

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

The act of monumentalisation: structural considerations

In order to correctly assess the visual impact of the monumentalisation process, we need to establish exactly what changed with respect to previous phases of sanctuaries. Were these monumental sanctuaries preceded by older religious structures, and if so, what form did these structures take? And if older structures did exist, can we ascertain if they were purposely incorporated in some way into the new design? Traditionalism, even archaism, has been pointed
out as an important aspect of Romano-Italic sacred architecture,\(^{528}\) which means that the way in which the new structure related to and dealt with the past is an interesting aspect of the transformation of cult places in the context of the monumentalisation process. Of course, whether earlier phases are attested or not, the wider surroundings of the sanctuary must be taken into account when explaining the monumental lay-out, especially in matters of overall dimensions and orientation. It is likely that in most cases, a combination of factors determined the general shape of the sanctuary, even if within that general shape there is still a considerable amount of room for manoeuvring and adjustment.

**What comes before: earlier building phases**

There are some sanctuaries that have not yielded any evidence for the existence of earlier religious structures on the site. While the sanctuary of Aesculapius at Fregellae, for instance, must have been in use as a cult site for at least one and a half century prior to the construction of the late republican monumental sanctuary, judging by the numerous votive terracottas found on the site, there are no archaeological indications that this earlier cult site was architecturally embellished.\(^{529}\) At the site of the extra-urban sanctuary of Tusculum, as of yet no remains predating the late republican monumental construction phases have been discovered, nor was any other material found proving the previous existence of a cult place at this location.\(^{530}\)

The systematic excavations undertaken from 1956 to 1969 at the sanctuary of Juno Gabina at Gabii by the Escuela Española de Historia y Arqueología en Roma brought to light many structures and material related to cult activity at the site predating the mid-second century monumental complex. The excavators have dated the beginning of the predominant use of the area as a cult site to the late sixth century, since the majority of the material dated to the preceding period can be related to a domestic or at least non-sacred context.\(^{531}\) The first sanctuary phase probably consisted of a systemisation of the area and possibly the construction of a *sacellum*, given the discovery of an archaic antefix dated to the end of the sixth century.

---


\(^{529}\) Coarelli 1987a, 26-27.

\(^{530}\) The existence of a pre-monumental phase is suggested by Diana Gorostidi Pi and Raffaela Ribaldi, even though they admit that no clear evidence for an earlier phase exists (Gorostidi Pi/Ribaldi 2008, 84).

\(^{531}\) Almagro Gorbea 1982, 604-605.
century, although no other structural remains have been discovered. To a later phase in the cultic life of the sanctuary belong several structures excavated to the west of the late republican temenos area.\textsuperscript{532} Immediately to the north of the steps leading up to the entrance of the late republican temenos, a small cult area was discovered comprising several cippi, a votive deposit, a pothole and a possible sacellum (fig. 29). All these elements have a notably different orientation than the late republican monumental phase, and the fact that the temenos wall of the late republican monumental complex cuts through an angle of the structure indicates that we are dealing with an earlier phase. This is confirmed by the material contained in the votive deposit, dating to the third and early second century. The cult area was probably dedicated to Fortuna, given the fact that the cippi record dedications to this goddess, and the identity of one of the dedicants, a certain Oppius, seems to indicate the involvement of citizens of Praeneste in the cult activities at Gabii.\textsuperscript{533} The structures to the north of this cult area, with the same general orientation, also seem to be connected to the mid-republican phase of the sanctuary, although their function cannot be established with certainty.

Particularly interesting is a square pit dug into the bedrock immediately behind the podium of the late republican temple (fig. 30).\textsuperscript{534} The excavators have recognised three distinct phases, two of which have a different orientation than the surrounding late republican structures and seem to belong to an earlier phase, the first of which probably at the very beginning of the sanctuary, not later than the sixth century. While the orientation of each phase differs from the others, the pit continuously occupies more or less the same spot, on the central axis of the late republican temple. The pit has been connected to another pit located at a distance of 1.50 m to the north-west of the temple, which has the same orientation as one of the earlier phases of the pit on the

\textsuperscript{532} Almagro Gorbea 1982, 606-607.
\textsuperscript{533} Basas Faure in Almagro Gorbea 1982, 221-222; Coarelli 1987a, 13.
\textsuperscript{534} Almagro Gorbea 1982, 54-55, 606; Coarelli 1987a, 19; Coarelli 1993, 50-51.
central axis of the temple. The two pits have been interpreted as parts of an early ‘sacred
garden’, predecessor of the regular system of pits of the late republican phase interpreted in
a similar manner, which will be discussed below. Given the continuity of at least the centrally
located pit, we are undoubtedly dealing with an especially revered and important feature of
the sanctuary.

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

At the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste hardly any structural traces of earlier
building phases can be noticed, at least not on the surface levels of the complex. It has been
suggested by Coarelli that the lowest part of the oracular pit on the \textit{terrazza degli emicicli} must
belong to an earlier phase of the sanctuary, since it is built in an \textit{opus quadratum} technique
with blocks of tufa instead of the \textit{opus incertum} used for the rest of the sanctuary (fig. 31).\(^{540}\)
Coarelli claims that the use of \textit{opus incertum} for the higher part of the pit, on top of a part of

\(^{535}\) Coarelli 1987a, 120-121.
\(^{537}\) Quilici 2005, 278 n.29.
\(^{538}\) Quilici 2005, 278.
\(^{539}\) Gullini 1983, 127, n. 9. Conversely, Coarelli considers the civil wars between the Marian and Sullan factions to
have been the motive for the construction of the walls (Coarelli 1987a, 123-124).
\(^{540}\) Coarelli 1987a, 50.
the pit constructed in *opus quadratum*, would have weakened rather than strengthened the construction, thereby rejecting the explanation given for the difference in building technique by the excavators, who state that the lower part in tufa did function as a foundation for the higher part in *opus incertum*.\(^541\) Fasolo and Gullini claim that tufa was relatively more elastic than the naked bedrock, which would explain the use of tufa as some sort of dampening device to protect the upper concrete structure. If we accept Coarelli’s assertion that these layers of tufa belonged to an older incarnation of the oracular pit, these would be the only tangible remains of the earlier phase of the sanctuary incorporated into the new design. Although not implausible in itself (the oracle was probably one of the most important aspects of the sanctuary, closely related to the sanctuary’s claim to fame in the Mediterranean world), it is very little to go on, and it is impossible to determine the extent of this earlier phase on the basis of the pit alone. If Fasolo and Gullini are correct in their interpretation of the layers of tufa blocks as ‘shock absorbers’, there is no need to assume that they are the remains of an earlier building phase and necessarily predate the monumental complex. This would mean that there are no structural remains whatsoever pertaining to the pre-monumental phase of the sanctuary.

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

---

\(^541\) FASOLO/GULLINI 1953, 148.

site of the sanctuary of Fortuna in the middle and late republican period, even though no structural traces of pre-monumental buildings have been discovered. The earlier terracottas consist of cortine pendule, revetments plaques, simas and cresting, dated to the third century, and two different types of antefixes, one of the potnia theron type and one of the despotes theron type, dated to the fourth or third century and therefore perhaps chronologically homogenous with the other terracotta pieces. Rudolf Känel has challenged the Pensabene’s early date of these pieces, maintaining that a late second-century date is far more likely.

If Känel’s proposed alterations of the dates of the pieces are correct, there would not be any solid evidence for a mid-republican building phase of the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia.

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

---

543 Pensabene 2001, 94.
544 I thank Dr. Känel for kindly sharing this information with me. A thorough analysis of the terracottas from the sanctuary of Fortuna will be included in his forthcoming book on Helenistic terracotta decoration in Italy.
the walls seem to have been cut through by the construction of the *cavea* at certain points. Excavations have brought to light remains of perpendicular walls branching off to each side of the westernmost wall. To the east of this first wall two other walls have been found with the same orientation, one of which displays a slight curve. The interpretation of these remains is somewhat problematic. We are certainly not dealing with walls relating to buildings, but rather with retaining walls, used to create one or more terraces. They could be related to an older phase of the sanctuary itself, thereby indicating either the presence of an earlier monumental structuring of the sacred area, even if the presence of these terracing walls do not necessarily imply the existence of actual buildings. On the other hand, the walls could have belonged to another form of systematisation of the area instead of to the cult place itself. Cairoli Fulvio Giuliani has suggested that the retaining walls could have been built to support the tract of a road connecting two of the principal entry routes into Tibur, which would perhaps account for the curve in one of the walls. While this does not preclude the existence of earlier building phases of the sanctuary itself, we have no other structural remains related to the cult place, and the absence of further attestations of an earlier religious site in the sanctuary area makes this impossible to prove.546

Material evidence for earlier building phases at the sanctuary of Diana at Nemi is relatively scanty, at least with regard to primary structural remains. The archaeological attestations of the two earliest phases of the sanctuary, a protohistoric and archaic phase, mostly consisting of votive material and sculptural remains, seem to imply a hypaethral cult site.547 Although no actual structural remains were discovered, the existence of an impressive mid-republican temple, possibly dating to the fourth or third century, has been deduced by scholars from terracotta temple models which supposedly depict this particular temple.548 Moreover, a range of terracotta sculpture belonging to the ornamentation of this particular temple has been discovered, dated on the basis of quality, technique and style to the years around 300. While fragmentary, the remaining elements of this decorative system reveal a richly and diversely ornamented temple roof. The pieces range from revetment plaques and antefixes to acroteria and the decoration belonging to the *column* and *mutuli*, and many of the pieces are of high artistic quality.549 While the decoration of the temple was completely replaced in the middle of the second century, including a new ‘fashionable’ closed pediment instead of *column*- and *mutulus*-plaques, we do not know if or to what degree this was accompanied by building activities.550 The fact that Vitruvius mentions that the temple of Diana Nemorensis has a transverse *cella* and the fact that none of the known examples of this temple type predate the second century, perhaps indicates that the new decorative phase accompanied the construction of a new temple with these particular architectural characteristics.551

---

546 The nearby cult area at Acquoria, on the banks of the Aniene below the monumental sanctuary, has rich votive deposits and shows cultic continuity from the eight until the second century, yet cannot be meaningfully related to the sanctuary of Hercules. See also Chapter One.

547 Ghini 1993, 278.


549 Kanel 2000, 131-133.


The construction phases preceding the late republican phase of the sanctuary of Juno Sospita at Lanuvium are relatively well known. The final phase of monumentalisation in the first century was the last of a series of five archaeologically attested construction phases at the site, spanning almost six centuries. The three earliest construction phases involve the temple building itself, while during the two later phases construction activities were undertaken in the wider area of the sanctuary precinct. The first sacred structure at the site consisted of a relatively simple *oikos*, dated to the mid-sixth century, of which a brief stretch of a foundation wall in small blocks of tufa with a south-western orientation remains.552 Some structures in peperino can be attributed to the second building phase, which consisted of a temple in Tuscanic style which was notably larger in scale than the preceding *oikos*.553 The temple had a western orientation and some structures in peperino can be attributed to this building phase. In a *favissa* near the temple some architectural terracottas were found on the basis of which it has been possible to date the temple to the end of the sixth century. In the mid-republican period, probably at the end of the fourth century, a new temple was constructed on top of the late-archaic one, of which roughly two thirds of the foundation walls still remain.554 No other building activities have been attested archaeologically until the first century.

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

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

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

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

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

Examples of the visible incorporation of earlier construction phases of the sanctuary would be those where the design of the sanctuary was visibly altered to accommodate some, presumably older, structure. In other words: where a seemingly illogical or perhaps less ‘aesthetically pleasing’ structural solution was employed to include some elements that were deemed significant enough to encapsulate in the overall design and thus monumentalise. However, in the only case where this would seem to be the case, the sanctuary of Juno Gabina, we are dealing with a later addition to the sanctuary, according to the excavators. In the southeastern corner of the temenos area, the strict axiety of the design is compromised: the wall is placed outward, creating a corner where the remains of a small structure in *lapis gabinus* have been discovered (fig. 33). Because this structure is built on top of a paved area, from which a

---

555 See first note of this chapter.
paved path runs to the front of the temple podium, the excavators have concluded that the structure must at least be later in date than this path. There are no convincing grounds to conclude that this paved area and the path to the temple must be contemporaneous with the phase of monumental restructuring of the sanctuary, since there are no technical characteristics on the basis of which the paving can be dated. The differences in orientation are obvious, and the length of the path could have been manipulated in order to fit with the new temple. Can this paved area and the structure built on top of it, possibly the lower part of an altar, be remnants of earlier phases of the sanctuary? If this was the case, the awkward extension of the temenos area can be explained by the desire to include within the enclosure of the monumental sanctuary an earlier structure, which perhaps had a special cultic significance. The paved road running along this side of the sanctuary connecting the road along the shore of the lake to the via Prenestina is an important feature, since it takes this extension of the temenos area into consideration: if the road was constructed here during the late republican monumental phase, it would mean that the extension of the precinct disrupting its perfect axial symmetry was done at the time of monumentalisation, hinting at the desire to incorporate some earlier feature, whatever that may have been. The absence of other stratigraphical data and the concise description of this particular part of the sanctuary in the final excavation publication do not allow us to establish a clear chronological sequence. We therefore cannot do anything other than observing that this part of the sanctuary is remarkable given the strict axially and regularity of its general ground plan, and that further research and perhaps excavation of this area would give us important insights in the religious life of the complex and the factors influencing the design of the monumental complex.

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

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

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

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

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

---

560 *Almagro Gorbea* 1982, 55. In addition, the pit seems to be located at the approximate centre of the area enclosed by the *porticus triplex*, i.e. the *temenos* area north of the area centred on the altar.
Influences on the monumental framework

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

---

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

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

A second example of a sanctuary determined, at least to some extent, by the application of a modular design grid is that of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste. Coarelli and others have claimed that the original sanctuary displayed a cultic bipolarity, with the two poles being the aedes itself and the oracle. If we accept this theory, it will become clear that these two locations were the principal points to take into consideration when determining the lay-out of the new sanctuary if the object was to unite them into a single architectural framework as
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563 Almagro Gorbea 1982, 51, 610.
565 For this idea of the ‘bipolarity’ of the cult place of Fortuna Primigenia, see Kähler 1958, 241-243; Coarelli 1987a, 72-74.
The position of the *aedes* was probably taken as a starting point and the position of the oracular pit as a second important focal point. With these two fixed points in mind, Coarelli has argued that a regular grid can be superimposed on the ground plan of the sanctuary (fig. 36). Within this grid, a strict axial symmetry was observed, thereby placing emphasis on the central axis of the sanctuary. These three elements - the *aedes*, a regular grid and observance of axial symmetry - determined the distribution of spaces within the general dimensions of the sanctuary as a whole, which leaves the question of orientation. What was used to ‘direct’ the central axis of the sanctuary? If we look at the relationship of the sanctuary
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566 Of course, it must be remembered that there are no architectural remains of earlier phases of the *aedes*.

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

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

---

569 Brendel 1960; Coarelli 1987a, 74-79 Riemann 1987, esp. 139-140; Riemann 1988.
570 Coarelli 1987a, 78-79.
571 Several of the most important measurements do seem to fit ‘perfectly’ in the modular system, such as the dimensions of the aedes (foundations and narrow free space around it), the cavea, the centres of the hemicycles, and the width of the entire complex (the terrazza degli emicicli, the piazza della cortina including external ramps).
572 Coarelli 1987a, 43.
design of the monumental sanctuary, and there are no other features on the terrazza degli emicicli that would explain why this exact measurement was used. While it was not exactly 400 feet, the distance between aedes and oracle could easily have been extended towards the nearest, most convenient round number. Once the general dimensions of the grid were established, application and multiplication of a basic module of 25 feet (approximately the radius of the aedes) and the observance of axial symmetry in individual parts of the sanctuary determined the final design of the ground plan and partly of the elevation.\(^{573}\) It is interesting to note that the oracular pit was not placed in the geometrical centre of the eastern hemicycle, where instead
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\(^{573}\) **Coarelli** 1987a, 42-44, fig. 12 (ground plan), 44-45, fig. 13 (elevation). We can observe, for instance, that the centre of the axial staircase and the centres of both hemicycles on the terrazza degli emicicli divide this terrace into four equal parts measuring 100 feet each.
a statue was placed. The centre of the pit is located on an imaginary circle encompassing the
colonnade of the hemicycle, suggesting that while dimensions were manipulated in order to
fit certain elements into a geometric pattern, the overarching modular system and the axial
symmetry of individual parts of the sanctuary was more important than placing the oracular

tholos
in the geometric centre of the terrace. In any case, its slightly eccentric placement was
probably not unwelcome, since it could have served to indicate that it existed before the
monumental sanctuary and thus highlight its antiquity and venerability. The progressive
compression of space in both the ground plan and the elevation which can be observed
for at least the higher terraces required a final vanishing point, which was without question
constituted by the

aedes
underlining its importance in the genesis of the entire design.

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

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

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

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

---

578 Giuliani 2004, 32.
the limitations imposed on the extent of the sanctuary by the surrounding landscape. To the southeast of the sanctuary, another access road to Tibur was located, which probably limited the extension of the monumental complex to this side, since the nature of the terrain on this side would have made it difficult to incorporate this road in the sanctuary as well. The terrain climbs rather steeply to the east of the sanctuary, which limits the available space, or would have required cutting back the bedrock even more extensively. To the north of the sanctuary the gorge of the Aniene river is located, which means that the terrain falls off sharply in this direction which means that extension to this side would be limited as well. The orientation that was chosen for the sanctuary ensures a maximum amount of relatively level ground to build the sanctuary on. Because of these limitations imposed by the accidentation of the terrain the route of the via Tiburtina could not be altered greatly to fit into the complex, although the part of the road incorporated as a via tecta was probably significantly lowered. In contrast to the road to the north of the sanctuary of Gabii which was diverted to make room for the monumental complex, here we clearly have a case of a pre-existing stretch of road conditioning the design of the sanctuary instead of the other way around. The orientation and extent of the sanctuary were thus determined by the presence of the via Tiburtina, a second access road and
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580 Coarelli 1987a, 91.
581 The via Tiburtina, like many ancient roads, follows the optimum route considering the relief in the surrounding terrain, avoiding ascents which are too steep.
582 See the section on substructures and terracing below.
the natural terrain; the optimal spatial solution was chosen given these constraints in order to maximise the surface area of the building complex.

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

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

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

The sanctuary at Lanuvium seems to have developed rather ‘organically’. It is in some ways delimited by structures on most sides, but these structures belong to different phases.
of the sanctuary; each new phase of the sanctuary was added onto earlier ones. The area occupied by the sanctuary follows the natural terrain closely: little attempt was made to enlarge it or change its characteristics. While the temple building faces the road running in front of it, it is not exactly aligned with it, nor are other structures of the sanctuary except for those directly associated with it such as a gate building and the pylons of a supposed arch spanning the road. The orientation of the different parts of the sanctuary, especially the temple and the late republican portico, seems to have been primarily determined by its visibility from a distance. The dominant façade of the late republican sanctuary and the front of the temple seem to suggest that it was built with an approach from the west in mind, where the important road connecting Lanuvium with Ardea was located (fig. 42). The importance of this road in the republican period seems to be confirmed by the large number of tombs from that period flanking it, just outside the urban area.  
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584 CHIARUCI 1983, 222-223 (road), 245 (necropolis). This particular burial area seems to have been the main necropolis of the city during the republican period.
Having established the possible predecessors of the late republican sanctuaries, the influence these earlier phases had on the monumental design and the effect of other factors, it is easy to see why scenography has been seen as a key characteristic of this group of sanctuaries. All sanctuaries can be said to have been built with their visual impact in the landscape in mind, and were clearly meant to be seen and attract the eye from the distance. This is especially clear in those instances where the orientation of the sanctuary clearly takes account of important roads in the vicinity. The sanctuaries of Gabii, Tusculum, Nemi, Tibur and Lanuvium all seem to have been placed so as to confront travellers, with Tibur perhaps the most extreme case by the incorporation of a road into the sanctuary itself. Other sanctuaries seem to have been built with their visibility from the urban area in mind. The sanctuary at Fregellae was oriented towards the urban plateau, and the sanctuary of Praeneste was probably built as the visual conclusion to the urban plateau and must have been visible from all parts of it. The last phase of the sanctuary on Monte S. Angelo at Terracina was also designed with the view from the town itself in mind, and the design seems to have been intent on maximising the visibility of the sanctuary from the far distance to both sides along the coast as well. Perhaps more importantly, the sanctuary also commanded a splendid view from the sea; while most other sanctuaries visually confronted the travellers on the roads, at Terracina the travellers by sea were emphatically included among the targeted audience of the first-century monumental sanctuary. While the building of temples and cult places on visually dominant locations was certainly not a new development, the sanctuaries of Latium are innovative in the sense that a lot of effort was made to compose the entire image of the sanctuary; we are not dealing with single temples, but with building complexes. The entire architectural mass was taken into account, thereby expanding the visual impact of the sanctuary.

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

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

*Substructures and terracing*

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

It is interesting to note that although terracing is considered a key characteristic of late republican monumental sanctuaries, the two earliest sanctuaries at Fregellae and Gabii display little or no signs of terracing, at least in the sense of creating platforms using retaining walls. While the remains of a wall have been found suggesting terracing on a lower level, although not necessarily related to the sanctuary as a built unit, the nucleus of structures forming the sanctuary of Aesculapius have been built on a natural location, which as far as we can tell was not altered to accommodate the sanctuary. At Gabii, there is evidence for the alteration of the
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586 Gullini 1983, 123-124. Gullini states that this architectural typology, in Late Classical and Hellenistic architecture is used primarily for urbanistic interventions.
natural terrain, since the eastern part of the sanctuary was partially cut into the bedrock. There are thus no constructed terraces, but the natural terrain was transformed to create the necessary level building ground for the sanctuary, thereby probably also erasing traces of earlier phases in this area. While the sanctuary of Fregellae is inserted into the surrounding, natural terrain, in Gabii the terrain is adapted to the sanctuary, transforming it to create certain visual effects. These two forms of dealing with the natural surroundings, adaptation to and transformation of the surrounding terrain, are encountered in all sanctuaries built subsequently.

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

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

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

The sanctuary of Diana Nemorensis displays a lot of similarities with the three sanctuaries mentioned above, since it seems that it too was built making use of or adapting to the natural slope of the terrain. The downward force generated by the great main terrace, measuring 300 x 150 m, was retained by a series of 39 triangular spaces on the shore-side. A great retaining wall with semicircular niches was built in the western corner of the terrace to buttress the force of the higher-lying terrain, and was probably also used as a form of substructure for the higher terrace of the sanctuary. It seems that the natural terrain was altered somewhat on this side to make room for the main terrace, but in general the natural terrain was hardly altered.
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589 FASOLO/GULLINI 1953, 240-257.
590 Especially noticeable on FASOLO/GULLINI 1953, figs. 327-328, 332, partly reproduced here in figure 9.
As was suggested above, the general dimensions of the sanctuary of Hercules Victor at Tibur were determined by the course of the via Tiburtina and the slope of the terrain, both down towards the Aniene and up-hill. While the dimensions were chosen weighing the need for space against labour-intensiveness, the sanctuary in its final late republican form, arguably the optimal solution, still required large-scale transformation of the landscape, requiring both immense substructions on the side towards the Aniene and the cutting back of large parts of bedrock on the other side (fig. 44). Also clearly visible is the fact that the course of the via Tiburtina was artificially lowered in order to include it in the substructions of the sanctuary: if it had not been altered, it would have reached the level of the upper terrace at the point where it exits the sanctuary area on the north-eastern side. Although the execution in the sanctuary of Hercules is different, this articulation of the substructure on different levels probably also entailed a functional differentiation comparable to that found at Praeneste. The spatial separation between the road with associated structures on either side of it and the higher levels could be related to the desire to separate the religious and economic functions of the sanctuary. The rooms adjacent to the via tecta, especially those on the valley-side, have generally been connected to economic activities, related especially to transhumance and the possible collection of the tithe, or perhaps the salt trade.\footnote{Bonetto 1999, esp. 297-304.} The upper levels, comprising the main temple terrace and the surrounding porticos, would be primarily connected to cult activity.
Lowering the level of the road was the only available option to achieve this spatial separation, since raising the entire terrace would have been impossible.

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

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

*The temple buildings of monumental sanctuaries*

The temple building is arguably the central element of the sanctuary. Since its very form seems to stem from Italic ritual exigencies, it has also been designated one of the more conservative architectural categories, retaining the same formal typology for long periods of time. In this section, I shall examine the temple buildings of the monumental sanctuaries of Latium, to see if this conservatism in temple architecture can also be observed in building complexes.
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592 Borsari 1894, 100 figs 2, 3.
which change so dramatically in the Late Republic (fig. 45). On the basis of excavations and research, we can establish the plan of at least four temples with some confidence, although certain details remain unclear (Gabii, Tibur, Terracina and Lanuvium). In three cases (Fregellae, Praeneste and Tusculum), we can establish the general dimensions of the temple, even though the placement and dimensions of parts of the elevation (columns, walls and staircases) remain a matter of conjecture. Only the temple of Nemi poses real problems of identification.

Fig. 45. Reconstructed ground plans of the temple buildings of the monumental sanctuaries of Latium. a. Lanuvium, b. Fregellae, c. Gabii, d. Praeneste, e. Tibur, f. Terracina, g. Tusculum.

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

The temple of the sanctuary at Fregellae was newly constructed and in addition seems to stand at the basis of an entirely new typology of temple architecture, albeit one with a rather limited number of known examples: the temple with transverse *cella*, a temple type seemingly developed in Italy with a *cella* that is rotated 90 degrees with respect to the *pronaos*. The temple of Aesculapius is almost certainly the earliest example of such a temple outside Rome. The reconstruction of the temple building is problematic, since its remains were almost entirely destroyed by modern building activities. Two stretches of tufa blocks have been found which give a general idea about the outline of the building, probably having borne the facing of the temple podium. Based on this idea, we have a temple building with a *cella* 18.20 m wide and 14.80 m long, at most, indeed placed transversely with respect to the *pronaos* 13.85/13.95 m wide and 8 m long at most (fig. 45b). In the reconstruction drawing by Pier Giorgio Monti (fig. 46), the *cella* is considerably shorter, with the back wall of the temple in alignment with the columns of the lateral colonnades. This architectural solution would surely create problems...
with the continuous roof of the colonnades, which would slope towards the back wall of the temple and thus necessitate the inclusion of a gutter to avoid a build-up of water against the wall. Although Giorgio’s reconstruction is rather elegant in itself, since it would provide a space behind the temple which could be used for rituals associated with the cult of Aesculapius such as the *incubatio*, a *cella* with a back wall aligning with the back wall of the colonnades seems to be preferable structurally, with the roofs of the lateral colonnades attached to the side walls of the *cella*, thereby avoiding possible drainage problems. Unfortunately, this part of the sanctuary was affected most by the devastations caused by modern building activities on the site, thereby making it impossible to decide on a definitive reconstruction of the temple.

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

The temples of Gabii and Tibur were of the *peripteros sine postico* type, a ‘hybrid’ temple type that probably originated in the mid-republican period, sporting colonnades along the front and lateral sides of the temple but maintaining a closed rear wall: almost a traditional *peripteros*, but not quite. Both temples represent considerably advanced forms of this temple type. In contrast to earlier temples of this type, displaying the virtually square ground plan characteristic of the Tuscanic temple, the temple of Gabii has a rather elongated plan, especially with regard

598 Vitr., De Arch. 4.8.4 (see Gros 1992, 30). See also Monti 1999, 25-27; Monti 2004, 206-207; Roux 2007, 338. In general, Vitruvius’ descriptions of examples of Italic architecture are accurate, while sometimes errors slip in when he is discussing or interpreting Greek architecture. Although we cannot rule it out, it would be unlikely that he would have mistakenly included a temple in this particular typology if it did not display these characteristics, especially when located so close to Rome.
599 Coarelli 1987a, 172-173; Ghini 1993, 280; Ghini 1995, 153; Ghini 2000, 61. The idea of this particular placement of the temple is based on drawings made in the 19th century by Pietro Rosa, which clearly show a lower and higher terrace with the temple building located on the latter (Rosa 1856).
600 See Ghini 2006 for a report on these excavations. Subsequent excavations, the results of which were presented by Giuseppina Ghini during the conference Sagra Nominis Latinis held at Rome, 19-21 February 2009, to be published in the periodical Ostraka, have unearthed more structural remains on this terrace, although none of them can be related to a temple building.
601 Castagnoli 1955; Gros 1996, 126; Bozzi et al. 2006, 217.
to the *cella*, it is hexastyle with 9 columns and a half-column on both long sides (*fig.* 45c). This elongation of the ground plan may be explained by the fact that it was generated using mathematical principles; all parts of the plan seem to be variations and operations based on the Pythagorean theorem (*fig.* 47); the dimensions of the short and long sides of the podium (60 x 80 feet or 6 x 8 modules of 10 feet) are an expanded version of the basic Pythagorean triangle with sides of 3 x 4 x 5, and the placement of the cella, columns and other architectural features were established by various operations based on this basic triangle. In addition, the *pronaos* consists of a rather deep space without internal columns. This elongation of the plan, and the open *pronaos* without internal columns, seem to be the result of Hellenistic influences on Italic temple design.

The temple of Hercules Victor at Tibur, one and a half times the size of the temple of Gabii, is one of the most elaborate examples of a peripteral temple *since postico* (*fig.* 45e). It has been reconstructed as an octostyle temple with ten columns on the lateral sides, with the three foremost columns doubled. As at Gabii, the rest of the *pronaos* was left open. The *cella* had two internal lateral colonnades, as well as two antechambers flanking the aedicule or apse containing the cult statue. One of the antechambers, to the south of the *cella*, had a staircase leading to a sizeable subterranean space, which can perhaps be connected with the sanctuary’s oracular function. A unique feature of the temple of Hercules Victor is that it was placed on a second podium with its own central staircase flanked by two great fountains, raising it high above the surrounding *temenos* area. In this way, the temple building was elevated to the level of the upper portico, introducing a second spatial separation between a lower level consisting of the lower storey of the portico, the *temenos* area and the *cavea*, and a higher level consisting of the temple proper and the upper storey of the portico. Again, this spatial difference may imply cultic or functional differences between the levels.

---


603 **GROS** 1996, 126.

604 **ALMAGRO GORBEA** 1982, 614.
The temple on Monte S. Angelo at Terracina provides us with an example of yet another adaptation of a traditional Etrusco-Italic temple type: the *pseudoperipteros*.\(^{605}\) This type probably developed by adding engaged or half-columns to the outside lateral and rear walls of the *cella* of a prostyle temple. While retaining several traditional characteristics, such as frontality and the placement on a podium, this temple type nonetheless exploits the plastic qualities of a peripteral temple. At Terracina the engaged columns attached to the *cella* wall were of the same material as the cella itself, namely concrete, while the columns of the *pronaos* were of stone quarried at Monte Circeo. It was a hexastyle temple with four columns on each of the lateral sides of the *pronaos*, five engaged columns on the lateral *cella* walls, two three-quarter columns on the corners of the lateral and rear walls of the *cella* and four engaged columns on the back wall of the *cella* (fig. 45f). As at Gabii and Tibur, the area in front of the *cella* was left open. Given the precarious state of preservation, we do not know if the modest temple of the sanctuary at Tusculum was perhaps also a *pseudoperipteros*. The remains of the temple podium consist of two separate concrete cores, both 3 m high and 12 m wide, while of different length: the front part 7 m, the latter part 13 m, obviously representing the relative proportions of *pronaos* and *cella*.\(^{606}\) Only one of the tufa blocks that must have originally faced the two cores remains *in situ*, on the eastern long side. While the proportions of the building make a reconstruction of a prostyle terastyle temple likely (fig. 45g),\(^{607}\) it is also possible that it was a *pseudoperipteros*, given the fact that the facing walls around the concrete core are sufficiently wide.

The only sanctuary without a ‘traditional’ rectangular temple building is that of Fortuna Primigenia. Behind the *porticus in summa cavea* and on a slightly higher level, a heavy foundation ring was found which must have supported some sort of circular *aedes*. Its distinctive placement, behind a porticus and largely (perhaps completely) hidden from view, combined with the heaviness of the foundations has led some scholars to hypothesise a two-storeyed building or a structure built on top of a high circular podium.\(^{608}\) The upper storey would then perhaps consist of an open *tholos*, at least visible from the higher parts of the sanctuary (possibly the *piazza della cortina*), thereby giving the *aedes* of the goddess a visible presence within the sanctuary. Friedrich Rakob, having studied the foundations and other remains carefully, opts for a single-storeyed structure in his reconstruction (fig. 45d).\(^{609}\) It consists of a domed space with an *oculus*, which perhaps finds confirmation in some drawings of the ruins of the sanctuary made before the construction of the Palazzo Barberini-Colonna on the remains of the *porticus in summa cavea* and the *aedes*. Rakob’s reconstruction provides an explanation for the heaviness of the foundations, since the construction of a dome with *oculus*, however small, warrants a strong foundation and heavy walls to support the ceiling. And while purely speculative, the daylight falling through the *oculus* would provide the gilded cult statue of Fortuna with a dramatic lighting effect. If Rakob is correct, the sanctuary of Fortuna would provide us with the earliest example of domed architecture of this nature, which would later be developed and perfected in structures such as the Baths at Baiae,\(^{610}\) and of course the Pantheon. The fact

---

\(^{605}\) Gros 1996, 131; Bussing 2000; Bozzoni et al. 2006, 217-221.
\(^{606}\) Ghini 2002, 198.
\(^{607}\) Quilici/Quilici Gigli 1995, 531; Ribaldi 2008, 55.
\(^{608}\) Kähler 1958, 239; Coarelli 1987a, 56-60.
\(^{610}\) Rakob 1988.
that in this reconstruction the aedes remains hidden from view need not worry us: it could very well have been related to the nature of the goddess’ cult at Praeneste, highlighting her oracular functions and the ‘hidden’ nature of fate and fortune.

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

The theatre-temple typology

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

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

---

611 Hanson 1959.
612 See Pintucci 2007 for a reconstruction of the scaenae frons in the Augustan period on the basis of its architectural decoration. This decoration must have replaced the original republican decoration, or perhaps belonged to a thorough restructuring of the theatre area in the Augustan period during which the scaenae area was completely rebuilt (Giuliani 2004, 50).
The presence of these architectural features can leave little doubt that the theatre of the sanctuary of Hercules Victor was a functioning theatre, where staged performances took place. An interesting fact is that a distance of only 7 m separates the front of the monumental staircase of the temple from the wall delimiting the summa cavea. This seems incongruous with the massive scale of the sanctuary as a whole, and has led Giuliani to hypothesise that the final form of the theatre in relation to the temple was the result of adjustments in the monumental design during construction, possibly to offset forces produced by the building mass of the sanctuary. This demonstrates that even during building activities, important changes could take place.

For a brief description of these terms, see SEAR 2006, 1-3 (cavea, cunei, praecinctio), 6 (aditus maximus), 7 (orchestra, pulpitum), 8 (aulaeum; scena e front), 24-36 (for a chapter on Roman theatre design in which several of these elements are discussed). See also TEN 2006 for recent investigations of the theatre at the sanctuary of Hercules Victor.

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

The earliest example, the sanctuary of Gabii, actually preserves little structural features of its supposed theatre at all, a more or less semicircular depression in the landscape and a stretch of a semicircular wall delimiting the cavea-area being the only indications of its existence (fig. 49). On earlier drawings however, it is possible to see actual steps, and early publications mention these steps as well. Even if actual steps had been discovered, however, few other features associated with theatre architecture have been uncovered and the cavea seems to be undifferentiated, i.e. not separated into cunei or ima, media and summa cavea. Reconstruction drawings of the sanctuary from the 18th, 19th and 20th century sometimes show certain structures in addition to the cavea itself, perhaps a pulpitum (actually designated by this name on a drawing by Luigi Canina from 1856), but the lack of systematic modern investigations unfortunately do not allow us to ascertain the reliability of these drawings, which means the reconstruction of this part of the sanctuary remains uncertain. A permanent stage building would have

---

615 See Almagro Garbea 1982, figs. 3b, 3d-e, 4c-d.
obscured the temple from view for those passing by the sanctuary along the via Prenestina, and it is possible that a provisional scena was temporarily erected when performances were staged. It therefore remains obscure if the ‘theatre’ at Gabii could have been used for actual staged performances. Another important difference between the sanctuaries of Gabii and Tibur is the relative disposition of important architectural elements. In Gabii, the theatre is physically separated from the rest of the temenos area by a wall with a central portal, which is not the case at Tibur, and perhaps suggesting that the theatre area was not part of the actual sacred, inaugurated area.\textsuperscript{617} In addition, between temple and theatre the altar of the sanctuary is placed, thereby separating these two structures by the insertion of an important cultic element.\textsuperscript{618}

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

These are the only three cases in which a cavea was incorporated into the sanctuary complex itself. A reconstruction drawing by Pier Giorgio Monti and a reconstruction model on display in the Archaeological Museum of Fregellae at Ceprano, as well as in promotional publications distributed by this museum, show the sanctuary of Fregellae reconstructed with a cavea in front of the temple.\textsuperscript{619} However, there are no structural remains that clearly indicate that this was the case and the reconstruction seems to have been inspired mainly by the projection of the ground plans of Tibur and Gabii onto the sanctuary of Fregellae.\textsuperscript{620} An actual, albeit rather small, theatre building was excavated near the sanctuary of Diana at Nemi, but it seems to be later in date than the late republican monumental phase.\textsuperscript{621} While possibly related to the sanctuary and its cult,\textsuperscript{622} it is not meaningfully connected to it in a structural sense, being placed outside the temenos area in a self-contained building which was orientated differently than the vast majority of the structures associated with the sanctuary.

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

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

\textsuperscript{618} Gullini 1991, 463.

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

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

\textsuperscript{621} Morpurgo 1931; Ghini 1993, 282

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

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

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

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

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

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


632 This would be especially relevant in the case of Fregellae (as rightly noted in TAGLIAMONTE 2007, 56-57 n.16):
if the sanctuary did include a cavea and if this inclusion would have to be explained by referring to its political
functions, how would one explain the curia-comitium complex in the forum area of the town? It is most likely that
political functionality and symbolism would be concentrated in the civic structures on the forum.
The use of colonnades in Latial sanctuaries

Another important structural element which can be used to shape space is the colonnade. In the ‘standard’ typology of the monumental Latial sanctuary, mentioned in the Introduction, one of the defining elements is the incorporation of a *porticus triplex* in the design: a typical late republican sanctuary should consist of a temple surrounded by a pi-shaped portico. Considering the ground plans of the different Latial sanctuaries, we can observe that four or possibly five sanctuaries include what looks like a *porticus triplex* in some form. However, the structural characteristics of these porticoes differ in each case, which may indicate functional differences between the various sanctuaries, even for those seemingly incorporating a ‘classical’ *porticus triplex*, such as Fregellae, Gabii, Praeneste and Tibur.

The only sanctuary that has a pi-shaped portico framing a large open space in which a temple building is placed in an axially symmetric position is the sanctuary of Juno Gabina (*fig. 50*). It is, in fact, a blue-print of the ideal form of the Latial sanctuary as presented in the Introduction. However, as far as we can tell, it is also the only one with such a perfect

*Fig. 50. Excavated remains of the temenos area of the sanctuary of Juno Gabina at Gabii, with the remains of the porticus triplex and the two systems of pits (ALMACRÓ GORBEA 1982, 53 Fig. 9).*
constellation of constituent parts, no doubt owing to the genesis of the plan on the drawing table, as suggested above. While there are architectural differences between different sections of the portico, for instance the *tabernae* of the lateral wings which are lacking in the central section and the difference in width between the lateral wings and the central section, its visual effect as an architectural and spatial frame is uncompromised. In fact, the colonnades of the portico mask the architectural discrepancies of the porticoes that are visible on the plan, presenting a unified façade for those standing on the central court.

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

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

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

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

The situation at Terracina is rather complex. We do not know anything of the buildings which must have stood on the terrace of the piccolo tempio. While a portico is built behind the temple on the main temple terrace, it is not axially placed with respect to the temple, and given the limited opportunity of movement on this terrace and the fact that it surely could not have been seen from a distance, its function as a visual frame or backdrop for the temple building was limited. Instead, it must have been functionally related to the oracle site, providing a sheltered area between the entrance to the terrace and the entrance to the walled precinct of the oracle.635 It can also be suggested that this portico actually diverted attention from the temple in the direction of the area with the oracle. The highest terrace, the so-called campo trincerato, is surrounded on three sides by a structure with heavy foundation walls, suggesting a military function. It cannot be dated securely and seems to be related to the defensive walls connecting the sanctuary to the city rather than to the other sanctuary terraces, although it is connected to these by a staircase. We are not dealing with a traditional open portico; a row of bases placed along the middle of the structure on three sides indicates that it must have had an internal colonnade, and we must perhaps imagine portals or arches opening onto the central court. While it is a structure delimiting an area on three sides, we must ask ourselves if the primary reason for this form is the framing of the court, or rather the fact that these were the three sides most in need of defensive structures; the side that was left open is to the sea-side, with the steepest cliffs and therefore the side from which the potential for threats was minimal. Of course, the fact that religious structures were placed on this terrace, including a small temple or sacellum and a possible auguraculum, must have been important in the decision to leave this side of the terrace open.

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

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

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

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

Fig. 51. Plan of the material remains of the sanctuary of Juno Sospita at Lanuvium (Bendinelli 1921).
provide an argument against the inclusion of a portico on the temple terrace at Tusculum, since this would not have been strictly necessary to provide a sense of architectural unity to those approaching the sanctuary. In addition to the functional relationship between porticoes and substructures mentioned above, in this case they can be placed in a visual relationship as complimentary elements of monumental building complexes, intended to convey a sense of structural and visual integrity to those viewing and experiencing them.

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

Sacred gardens in Latial sanctuaries

Although one could argue whether it actually constitutes an architectural element, one of the standard features connected to Latial monumental features is that of the so-called ‘sacred garden’ or ‘sacred wood’: the existence of groupings of trees within the sanctuary, either as a natural feature or artificially planted. Coarelli asserts that this was perhaps a normal feature of Latial monumental sanctuaries, given the fact that most of them have open spaces surrounding the temple, delimited by colonnades and that these spaces in general do not seem to have been paved and were provided with hydraulic installations. Ghini also seems to consider the presence of a sacred wood, either natural or artificial, one of the common characteristics of Latial monumental sanctuaries. And yet, we only have firm evidence for the existence of such a wood or garden at the sanctuary of Juno Gabina.
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638 Coulton 1976, 63, 170-172; Coarelli 1983a, 194-195.
639 Coulton 1976, 62 (Kos), 63 (Miletos); Interdonato 2004, 242-244 (Kos).
640 Coarelli 1993, 51.
641 Ghini 1993, 289.
There, in the *temenos* area between the temple building and the *porticus triplex*, two systems of square pits placed in a regular pattern were discovered (fig. 50). Although primarily found in the northern and eastern parts of this area, they probably occupied the whole area enclosed by the *porticus triplex*, though not extending beyond the line constituted by the front of the temple podium and the ends of the wings of the portico. The two systems probably belong to successive phases of the sanctuary, since each is geometrically consistent in itself and in relation to the surrounding space, but not with respect to each other. The first system, with pits which are slightly larger (1.50 x 1.60 m), consists of three rows of six pits to the north of the temple, and of four rows of two pits to each side of the temple, with the southernmost pits aligned with the front of the temple podium. The second system, with pits measuring 1.20 x 1.30 m, consists of four complete rows of ten pits to the north of the temple and five rows of three pits to each side of the temple, with the southernmost pits again more or less aligned with the front of the temple podium. The already mentioned pit just to the north of the temple, which belonged to an earlier phase of the sanctuary, fits in neither system, and therefore cannot be regarded as the point of origin of either system. Rather, the available space was taken as a starting point. This can be demonstrated for the first, presumably older system, which is almost perfectly laid out using mathematical principles. The pits themselves have dimensions of roughly 5 x 5 feet, are placed at a distance of 10 feet (3 m) from the edges of the colonnade and have a distance between them of 20 feet (6 m). The basis for this system of pits is thus a modular system comparable to that of the temple building itself, strongly suggesting that the first system of pits is contemporaneous to the monumental phase of the mid-second century.

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

The fact that the sacred garden is related to the idea of a *lucus*, which is considered an archetypical form of early (Latial) sanctuaries, and therefore more or less a universal religious phenomenon, probably combined with the tendency, described in the Introduction, to extrapolate individual characteristics of monumental Latial sanctuaries to the group as a whole, has led to the assumption mentioned above that other sanctuaries must have had similar features. Coarelli has even suggested that the systematic repetition of systems such as the one at Gabii prove that we are dealing with a cultic necessity, and that all such open courts with colonnades, a central element of Latial sanctuaries, must be interpreted at *luci*. However, archaeological evidence in the form of pits, such as at Gabii, has not been found. Excavations at the sanctuary at Tibur, mentioned as one of the sanctuaries with a possible sacred garden, have brought to light the original surface level and some of the paving which originally covered the *temenos* area around the temple. This pavement seems to have been the original walking level, which contradicts the assertion that on this central court of Tibur earth was placed on top of an impermeable concrete layer which would then be suitable for the planning of trees. Although only a small part of the pavement has been unearthed, it will be interesting to see what further excavations reveal about the possibility of a *lucus* at Tibur. The sanctuary of Diana Nemorensis has been mentioned as another possible example of the existence of a sacred wood in a Latial sanctuary. We know that the ritual of the Rex Nemorensis involved a sacred tree, and the sanctuary itself was referred to as the *lucum Dianum in nemore Aricino* in a fragment of Cato's *Origines*. However, during the excavations at the sanctuary no regular system of pits was found, which suggests that if a sacred wood was present, it was natural rather than artificial, which makes it difficult to archaeologically establish its extent. Other sanctuaries have not yielded any evidence of the existence of *luci*, whether archaeological, epigraphical or literary.

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


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

651 Ghini 1993, 280, 289.

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

**Monumental Latial sanctuaries: a standard type?**

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

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

The ornamentation of Latial sanctuaries

In order to fully appreciate the appearance of temples and sanctuaries in antiquity, it is not enough to simply look at plans and reconstruct elevations; architectural space is only a part of the visual dimension of sacred structures. Parts of building can be highlighted using polychromy or decoration, and the appearance of the temenos area itself can be altered using statues or plants, thereby altering the impression of the entire building complex in ways that are not immediately apparent when the analytic focus is on architecture alone. We must reconstruct the ‘unity out of plurality’, as Torsten Mattern calls it, the way in which the individual elements of architecture and decoration form a meaningful whole. An obvious first place to start the examination of the decorative aspects of Latial monumental sanctuaries is the most traditional category of temple and sanctuary decoration: decorative systems ornamenting parts of the roof in the form of sculpture or slabs, often of terracotta. Next, another type of decoration which forms an integral part of the structure itself will be discussed: stucco and wall painting. Finally, I will give an overview of the various pieces of sculpture found in Latial sanctuaries, being the most ‘movable’ of decorative categories. Having done this, the relation between these ornamental categories and the structures of the sanctuary will be examined, before comparing the evidence from Latial sanctuaries with general trends and development in the use of ornamentation at Rome and the rest of Italy.
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Our examination of the decorative aspects of the monumental sanctuaries of Latium starts at the highest point: the roof. The development of temple architecture in the late seventh and early sixth century was accompanied by the production of tiles and plaques to protect the wooden construction of the roof and often the walls of the temple itself, which were often constructed of mud brick or other materials susceptible to deterioration and damage by the elements. This type of decoration of temple buildings was maintained and further developed over the course of the following centuries. The monumental sanctuaries of Latium are thus built at a relatively late stage in this development, and can provide us with interesting information about the use of roof decoration during the late republican period, especially since all of them, with the exception of the sanctuary at Tusculum, have yielded examples of terracotta roof decoration, although the types and quantities vary greatly between them. I shall give a description of the general decorative systems which can be reconstructed for the monumental sanctuaries of Latium, not by giving an exhaustive catalogue of individual pieces but by treating categories as a whole. Special attention will be paid to figurative decoration and the possible narrative programs to which these belonged.

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

The wide variety of types discovered has led to the assumption that the terracottas may have belonged to several buildings, which are nevertheless rather homogenous with regard to date and almost certainly belong to a single constructive phase. Given the fact that the plateau on which the sanctuary was built did not offer room for more extensive buildings, we can perhaps conclude that the decoration must be divided between the temple building and the lateral colonnades. Another hypothesis is that the peculiar nature of the temple building, probably possessing a transverse cella, necessitated a diversification of the decorative system. In any case, the highly fragmented nature of the material and the fact that it has not been found in a meaningful spatial relation to the parts of the building to which they were attached has
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654 I would like to extend my sincerest thanks to Dr. Rudolf Känel for sharing his thoughts on the terracotta decoration of the late republican Latial sanctuaries with me. His treatise on Hellenistic terracotta decoration in general, which will contain most of his analyses of the material in question, is forthcoming.
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made reconstruction and attribution of the different types very difficult. The reconstruction of the decorative system is therefore necessarily based on the possible relationships between the various types and their relative numbers, the dimensions of the building as evidenced from the excavated remains, and, when dealing with decorative syntax, by parallels with other contemporaneous temple buildings.659

The Doric porticoes on either side of the temple were probably decorated with simas with lion heads. Two antefixes with female heads have also been attributed to the decoration of the porticoes, although these were possibly used as acroteria instead of antefixes.660 Since the porticoes had a stone entablature, no terracotta decoration was needed for these parts of the elevation. The entablature of the temple was covered with revetment plaques of palmettes connected to each other by ribbons in the form of an eight. This type of decoration probably covered both the front and the sides of the temple building, given the fact that it has been recovered in the largest numbers. The sides of the temple were also decorated by a row of terminal tiles, which projected to such an extent that the lower parts, painted with red and black meanders, were visible from below. To the edges of these tiles, cortine pendule were attached, while the cover tiles were decorated with potnia theron antefixes, possibly alternating with two other types of antefixes which have been recovered in lesser quantity. The pediment
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was framed by a raking sima and cresting, the latter of which contained separate fictile floral decorations attached to it by lead clamps. Belonging to the parts at the top of the pediment, fragments of cresting with the remains of a tail have been found, suggesting the placement of some sort of mythical animal, possibly marine, in this central part of the composition. The pediment was crowned with a plant-shaped central acroterion, and Giuseppina Manca de Mores and Maria Nicoletta Pagliardi retain that no evidence for lateral acroteria have been found. Pier Giorgio Monti has suggested that the slabs representing a winged Victory riding a quadriga (fig. 52), interpreted by Manca de Mores and Pagliardi as possible ex votos pro victoria,661 probably formed the lateral acroteria, pointing out that given the fact that this type is presented by two examples with the horses running in opposite decorations and since both slabs are slightly curved enhancing the visibility of the pieces in a position high on the roof, an interpretation as lateral acroteria would seem extremely plausible.662

Among the terracotta fragments found in the dump many belonged to figured sculptures in high relief or in the round. Just several of the pieces found were life-size, which could be divided into two different groups on the basis of the colour and quality of the clay. The two life-size figures have been interpreted as Aesculapius, as one of the figures was clearly a bare-footed bearded man wearing a garment with heavy drapes following the familiar iconography of the god,663 and a female deity who cannot be easily identified but perhaps represents Hygieia, a frequent companion of the god.664 Manca de Mores and Pagliardi interpret the two standing figures as the central pieces of the pedimental decoration. If this interpretation is correct, considering the size of the figures we would almost certainly be dealing with a closed pediment. However, Rudolf Känel suggests that the two life-sized figures did not belong to the temple’s decorative system, but were the cult statues, placed inside the cella. Considering the fact that the terracotta fragments were found in a dump layer without any meaningful relation to the part of the building to which the fragments belonged, both interpretations are possible.

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

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

If Mummius was in fact responsible for the construction of the sanctuary, this would mean that 145 - the year Mummius returns to Rome - is a terminus post quem for the Fregellan sanctuary, which seems rather late considering the conventional date. According to Känel, the terracotta fragments found indicate a phase of restoration to the decorative system. A
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667 Bizzarri 1973. The inscription reads L(lucius) Mummi(us) L(luci) f(ilius) / co(n)s(ul) and probably belonged to the base of a statue of Mummius. It is possible that the statue was erected before Mummius became censor in 142 and was thus originally erected in Fregellae and later transported to Fabrateria Nova (Bloy 1998-1999, 60).
construction date after 145 and a destruction date of 125 would certainly produce a time span which is too constricted to include such a restoration phase. Furthermore, it seems less likely that the Roman troops would desecrate a victory monument erected by one of the most illustrious men in recent Roman history. According to Monti, the bearded figure with Phrygian cap would seem to point to a setting in Asia Minor for the scene or at least should be seen as a specific geographical reference, thus possibly alluding to one of the Eastern campaigns of Rome in which Fregellan troops participated.\footnote{Monti 1999, 47-48.} In both cases, the building would have had strong triumphal connotations, which would have been strengthened if the slabs representing Nike were indeed the lateral acroteria of the temple.

The systematic excavations of the sanctuary of Juno Gabina have also yielded large amounts of architectural terracotta decoration. The state of preservation and the number of fragments found has enabled the excavators to convincingly reconstruct at least two successive decorative systems that must have adorned the temple building of the sanctuary.\footnote{Almagro Gorbea 1982, 131-194.} Revetment plaques, as well as the lateral, raking simas and cresting all seem to have been exclusively decorated with floral or vegetal motifs: no figurative decoration has been found belonging to these elements. Among the discovered antefixes those representing a \textit{potnia theron} predominate, constituting roughly two thirds of the total number of antefixes found.\footnote{Almagro Gorbea 1982, 174.} The majority of the other antefixes consists of female busts and busts with the head of a young satyr or faun. Thirteen fragments of terracotta sculpture, all formed by hand and in high relief, belong to relief plaques which, according to the excavators, must have decorated the temple podium, where holes have been found which were used for the fixation of these plaques. Finally, a single female head, a third life-size, has been found which probably belonged to the pedimental decoration of the temple (fig. 55).\footnote{Almagro Gorbea 1982, 195-196.} The dimensions of this head do not allow us to state with certainty whether we are dealing with a ‘traditional’ pedimental decoration of \textit{columnen- en mutulus}-plaques, or if the figure belonged to a closed pediment.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.45\textwidth]{fig55.png}
\caption{Terracotta female head. Part of the pedimental decoration of the temple of Juno Gabina at Gabii (Almagro Gorbea 1982, Lámina XXIX).}
\end{figure}

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

Terracotta decoration has been found during the excavations of the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste some of which may be attributed to the monumental sanctuary itself, while other pieces are far too small to have been part of the sanctuary itself, and have been interpreted by the excavators as belonging to votive structures such as aediculae.672 The parts of the sanctuary that seem to have been decorated are the tetrastyle colonnades at the beginning of the rampe porticate, which are the only structures to use wood in their roofing, while the great double colonnades of the piazza della cortina and the porticus in summa cavea, which had concrete barrel vaulting instead of wooden roofing, were also decorated with fictile decoration.673 The decoration of the tetrastyle colonnades was straightforward and, as far as we can tell, non-figurative. A great number of polychromous revetment plaques decorated with palmettes, alternately right side up and upside down, connected by ribbons and surmounted by a ribbed

Fig. 56. Terracotta antefix representing a winged victory from the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste (Perneabene 2001, Tav. K Fig. 3).

---

672 Fasolo/Gullini 1953, 262; Gullini 1973, 770.
673 Gullini 1973, 770-778.
frieze, were found in the area of the colonnades. Given the concentration of the fragments in this area and the fact that they are uniquely suited to the decoration of roofs with wooden elements, found only in this part of the sanctuary, we can be sure that these revetment plaques once decorated these colonnades.

The only figurative architectural decoration is found on the upper terraces, used for the revetment of the roofs of the double colonnade around the piazza della cortina, the great open court occupying the fifth terrace, and of the porticus in summa cavea. Both colonnades had concrete barrel vaulting, yet the exterior of these vaults were hidden from view by covering them with a ‘traditional’ ridge-roof, consisting of pan and cover tiles, the terminal tiles of the latter category being decorated with antefixes. Of the latter, two different types were used. The first is a traditional type, attached to the terminal imbrex, with an additional strut and fired together. Two groups of this antefix-type were found during the excavation of the sanctuary. One group consists of relatively small antefixes in the shape of palmettes, the other of antefixes representing the figure of a winged Victory, of which only the upper part is preserved (fig. 56). The second type displays a remarkable and as of yet unique technique used to attach the antefixes to the cover tiles. Terminal cover tiles were produced with a rectangular surface at the end, provided with a series of holes, which were made before firing. Figurative pieces, executed in the round, were found in the sanctuary, which had a smoothened surface with holes in their lower parts, evidently to be fastened to the special terminal cover tiles with nails (fig. 57). Some fragments of figurative terracottas perhaps also belong to this type of antefix on the basis of similarities in clay type and modelling even if the flattened surface to attach the pieces to the cover tiles has been lost.

According to Gullini, the two types of antefixes should be related to different parts of the sanctuary. The porticus in summa cavea would have been decorated with antefixes of the first type, the simpler palmette antefixes perhaps decorating the side of the roof facing
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675 GULLINI 1973, 774-775, fig. 27.
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the mountainside and the winged Victories on the side facing the cavea.681 The roof of the double colonnade surrounding the piazza della cortina would then have sported the second, more interesting antefix type. Although these antefixes are too fragmentary to reconstruct specific subjects, it is obvious that a varied range of types was represented, among them warriors (fig. 58), flute players and figures with toga. On the basis of this typological variety, Gullini thinks that we must be dealing with an overarching subject or narrative cycle rather than with a single subject for each individual antefix.682 Of course, this hypothesis depends heavily on the idea that we are dealing with narrative decoration, while it is also possible that the decoration was purely representational or allegorical in nature, displaying archetypes rather than actors in a narrative sense. Rudolf Känel considers both antefix types to have been part of the same more or less homogenous group based on the quality of execution and clay types, and does not consider the difference in attachment technique a reason to attach them to different parts of the building. Känel’s suggestion thus creates more possibilities for the placement of pieces on the building and more possibilities for the combination of subjects and motifs.

Mention must also be made of another category of sculpted architectural decoration that was probably used at Praeneste. While it does not belong in the category of fictile decoration, and while it was not attached to the actual roof of a structure, it is nonetheless sculpted decoration which forms an integral part of the structures of the sanctuary, and is therefore included here. Although the reconstruction is not completely certain, the analemmata covering the sides of the cavea were probably decorated with marble caryatids or telamons supporting the upper plinths.683 If this reconstruction is correct, it would present yet another unique feature of the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia.

There are only two distinct categories of fictile decoration which can be attributed to the late republican monumental phase of the sanctuary of Diana Nemorensis. The first category is represented by a series of highly distinctive antefixes with a triangular shape in two different types; this type of antefix is known only from Nemi. The first represents shows a female bust, wearing a tunic and with a crescent-shaped diadem on her head. A quiver can be seen behind her right shoulder and a strung bow in front of her left one. Given the attributes, this antefix
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681 Gullini 1973, 775.
682 Gullini 1973, 777.
683 Fasolo/Gullini 1953, 190-191, 259-261, figs. 345-346; Gullini 1973, 768.
obviously represents the goddess Diana herself. The second type again shows a female bust, without attributes but wearing a mantle fastened in the centre and the hair dressed in a top-knot. This type has also been identified as a representation of Diana.

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

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

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

Some terracotta material has been found at the sanctuary on top of Monte S. Angelo at Terracina, among which parts of a raking sima and antefixes with a young satyr’s head and
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a *despotes theron*. The latter antefix type is an exact parallel of the same type of antefix found at Praeneste, which were dated by Pensabene to the third century but which Känel dates to the late second century, more specifically to 130-120. If we accept this date, it could perhaps prove the existence of a temple at this sanctuary before the construction of the temple on the main terrace. This would lay to rest any speculations about the possibility of a non-sacred function of the complex of the *piccolo tempio*, as suggested by Quilici. 689 It would moreover provide additional chronological evidence to further pinpoint the construction of this first late republican monumental phase.

**Architectural ornamentation: stucco decoration and wall painting**

We have seen that with regard to the ‘traditional’ decoration of temples and sanctuaries in the form of sculpted elements permanently attached to a part of the building, the monumental sanctuaries of Latium have yielded only limited evidence, and in some cases it seems that such decoration was absent altogether. However, some sanctuaries preserve traces of other forms
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689 Quilici 2005, 278. Quilici suggests that we could be dealing with substructures for a villa in the case of the *piccolo tempio*, considering the similarities in terracing techniques to create platforms for both sanctuaries and villas during this period.
of decoration, namely stucco and wall painting, the development of which is a particular feature of this period and which sheds an interesting light on the types of decoration chosen and the possible intentions behind these choices.

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

The sanctuaries at Terracina and Praeneste have also yielded evidence of First Style wall decoration, yet in both cases the decoration was predominantly found in less-prestigious contexts. At Terracina, the vaulted spaces forming the front of the substructions of the terrace of the so-called piccolo tempio complex were decorated. Years of neglect, exposure to the elements, and vandalism by visitors eager to profess their ephemeral affections on millennia-old cultural landmarks have left the wall decoration badly damaged. It can still be recognised
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today in at least the two spaces placed at the northwestern end of a series of five, although it is probably safe to assume that the other spaces were decorated in a similar fashion. Interestingly, the decoration in these two spaces is not exactly the same, suggesting variation between the spaces. The best-preserved decoration consists of four tiers of yellow isodomes 25 cm high and a fifth tier of red isodomes 15 cm high, while the bands separating the blocks were coloured red, blue and green (fig. 60). The other space, where the wall decoration is not nearly as well preserved, has traces of a decoration containing orthostates. Although almost all traces of stucco and painted decoration have now disappeared, in an excavation report from 1894 it is mentioned that the portico behind the temple also had stucco decoration in the colours red and yellow.\(^\text{693}\) No mention is made of the style of the decoration, probably because even at that point it was too poorly preserved to identify the details of the decoration correctly. Since these are also the colours primarily used in the First Style decoration of the *piccolo tempio*, this perhaps strengthens Quilici’s assertion, mentioned earlier, that the two building complexes are closer in date than sometimes assumed, as well as suggesting an earlier date for the construction of temple and portico than the post-Sullan one usually adhered to. If instead

\(^{693}\) BORSARI 1894, 104.
it was a decoration in a more advanced First Style or Second Style, the traditional chronology of the complexes is unaffected.

Wall decorations were discovered at the sanctuary of Fortuna at Praeneste in the structures excavated at the bottom of the western access ramp, adjoining the portico with fountain built there. It remains to be seen if these structures, sometimes identified as dwellings for the priests connected to the sanctuary, were actually part of the sanctuary proper. In any case, one of the rooms of this structure, a rectangular barrel-vaulted space, contained traces of a double layer of plaster on its walls. The bottom layer presents a decoration of wide orthostates on a dado, characteristic of First Style decorations. We have only some remnants of the second, top layer, which presents green, red and yellow bands, the exact composition of which cannot be reconstructed on the basis of the few pieces left. An adjoining rectangular hall also had notable traces of First Style decoration, which were still fairly well preserved at the time of the systematic excavations carried out after World War II, especially on the north wall (fig. 61). According to the excavators, the decoration consisted of a narrow plinth with orthostates with stripes in several colours on top, perhaps imitating polychromous marble. A narrow frieze then separates this lower orthostatic course from a zone of blocks laid in stretchers (in yellow, red and green) and in headers (red and yellow). A square room to the west of this hall must have been decorated in a similar manner, although there only the lower zone with the polychromous marble imitation was partly preserved.

The sanctuary of Diana Nemorensis presents a more advanced style of wall decoration. Within the great portico surrounding the main terrace, on the walls facing the central court,
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traces have been found of painted decoration (fig. 62).\textsuperscript{696} These present the bases of dark (half-)columns, rendered in perspective against a red background. These columns or pilasters have the same distance between them as the actual columns of the colonnade in front of it, thereby creating the illusion of a double colonnade. The paintings are examples of early Second Style decorations.

These examples are essentially an advanced form of the revetment of walls that must have been used in the majority of sanctuaries; since opus incertum was rarely left uncovered, the sanctuaries which had elevations in this technique must have had extensive surfaces covered in simple stucco in addition to the more elaborate wall decoration described above. Unfortunately, little remains of the top layers, which makes it virtually impossible to ascertain what colours the walls of sanctuaries had. In two instances, remains have been found of stucco that once covered the columns of porticoes. At Fregellae, fragments of coloured stucco have been found that must have belonged to the shafts of the columns of the lateral porticoes. As reconstructed, the lower third of the length of these columns was covered with smooth, green stucco, the upper two-thirds covered in a cannelated, red stucco.\textsuperscript{697} At the sanctuary of Diana Nemorensis, stucco was found still on the shafts of the concrete columns of the great portico; here, the shafts seem to have been covered completely in red stucco.\textsuperscript{698}

In general, we can conclude that the wall decorations found at Latial monumental sanctuaries were intended to enhance the monumentality of the building complex. This is especially clear in the cases of Fregellae and Nemi, where the most conspicuous architectural monumental elements, the porticoes, were enhanced by wall decorations. At Terracina, there is the decoration of the portico behind the temple, following the pattern encountered in the cases of Fregellae and Nemi, but here less prestigious parts of the sanctuary, the vaulted substruction spaces of the \textit{piccolo tempio}, were also decorated. Perhaps the enhancing quality of the decoration was precisely the reason to apply it to these ‘inferior’ spaces. The purpose of the decorations at Praeneste, at least in relation to the public and religious functions of the complex, is less clear. It has been suggested that the two structures on either side of the \textit{rampe porticate} functioned as preparatory spaces, to be used by pilgrims entering the sanctuary for actions such as changing clothes and ritual cleansing.\textsuperscript{699} In this case, the First Style paintings would have a similar prestige-enhancing function, aimed at those visiting the sanctuary, as the decorations in the other building complexes. The use of polychromy in the two known instances also suggests a desire to emphasise architectural elements by the use of colour.

\textit{Non-architectural ornamentation: free-standing sculpture in the sanctuary}

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

\textsuperscript{696} \textsc{Ghini} \textit{in Molte\-sen} 1997, 181; \textsc{Ghini} 2000, 55-57.
\textsuperscript{697} \textsc{Lippoli} in \textsc{Coarelli} 1986, 36-37.
\textsuperscript{698} \textsc{Ghini} 1993, 284.
\textsuperscript{699} \textsc{Coarelli} 1987a, 45. Even though only the western one has been excavated, the axial symmetry of the entire complex probably permits the reconstruction of a similar structure at the eastern end.
problematic, since sculpture can be added to the sanctuary at virtually any point in the course of its existence. It is therefore important to try to ascertain which sculptures were connected to the phase of monumental restructuring, and if these sculptures were an intended part of the sanctuary’s overall visual appearance. Although mobile (to a certain degree), free-standing sculpture was as much a part of the sanctuary’s visual imagery as the architectural ornamentation and deserves our attention. While perhaps not always intended as part of the master plan underlying the architectural transformation of the cult places, statuary that was erected around the same time does tell us something about the use and perception of these religious spaces. Of the eight sanctuaries under consideration, the sanctuaries at Fregellae and Terracina have not yielded any evidence of free-standing sculpture, if we leave out actual cult statues. Sculptures recovered in or near the sanctuary of Tusculum, such as the statue of Jupiter reworked into a statue of Tiberius, are late in date and cannot be connected to the late republican monumental building phases.

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

The sanctuary of Diana Nemorensis has yielded by far the largest amount of sculptures, with the added advantage that many of them have been reasonably well preserved. Most of these have been found in the so-called ‘celle donarié’, a series of rooms located in the central part of the main terrace, built against the back wall retaining the terrain above. The date of construction
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of these rooms is uncertain, and it is also uncertain when the sculptures found in the rooms were placed there and with what purpose. A considerable amount of sculpture is from the Imperial period and cannot be related to the late republican phase of the sanctuary, but there are several pieces which can be dated to the period of monumentalisation. Although the goddess Diana is featured among those represented, a large number of other divinities are represented as well. At least three large acrolithic statues were found, probably cult statues placed in the temple of Diana or one of the other shrines of the sanctuary. One of the heads of the acroliths can certainly be identified as Diana, and perhaps a second female head as well. A head and upper torso of a bearded male figure probably represents Aesculapius, perhaps in his local guise as the deified hero Virbius. One of the more unusual and interesting finds are the eight marble vases, four amphorae and four griffin cauldrons, dedicated by a certain Chio. In addition to these sculptures, which are either large-scale (the acroliths) or unusual (the vases), the sculptures which can be dated to the period coinciding with the monumentalisation of the sanctuary are mostly small-scale marble votive statuettes. Given the fact that the sculptures which can probably be related to the monumental phase are all cult-related, the contrast with the predominance of portrait sculpture in the later period is striking.
it is possible, or even likely, that these portrait statues were meant as ex-votos, the change in the form and nature of the dedications may signify an important change in the religious life and use of the sanctuary.\textsuperscript{712}

Several pieces of sculpture, none of them complete, have been related to the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia.\textsuperscript{713} One of the largest pieces consists of two large fragments of grey marble belonging to an acrolith of a female figure.\textsuperscript{714} Gullini attributes it to the sanctuary, and even considers it to be the cult statue of Fortuna placed in the circular \textit{aedes}.\textsuperscript{715} Others have insisted that the statue was not one of the sculptures set up in the monumental sanctuary and that it was originally placed in the lower part of the city and represents Isis.\textsuperscript{716} A piece which can almost certainly be attributed to the sculptural decoration of the sanctuary is a marble head, slightly larger than life-size, found among the material contained in the well on the \textit{terrazza degli emicicli}.\textsuperscript{717} Coarelli, who dates the head to the end of the second century, considers it as the head of Fortuna, part of a statue of the goddess nursing the infants Jupiter and Juno mentioned by Cicero, which was placed on the square base located in the centre of the eastern hemicycle.\textsuperscript{718} On the \textit{piazza della cortina} three other marble sculptures were found,\textsuperscript{719} where they were presumably also set up. They represent three female figures dressed in \textit{chiton} and \textit{himation} (fig. 63), and on the basis of certain technical and stylistic characteristics, Gullini considers them to have been produced by Italic, although strongly Hellenised, workshops. The backs of two of the statues were very summarily executed, suggesting that they were placed against a wall or inside a niche. One of the statues demonstrates clearly that the head was produced separately from the body (fig. 64), possibly consisting of a different type of stone,
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\caption{Close-up of a fragmentary female statue from the sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste, showing the space for the insertion of a separate head (Gullini 1973, 138 fig. 15a).}
\end{figure}
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On the basis of the characteristics of the sculptures, we cannot establish if they represented female divinities or if they were portrait statues. If an identification as portrait statues is accepted, considering their high-profile setting we are probably dealing with ex-votos or honorary statues of wealthy individuals, erected by themselves or by others, possibly priestesses or *matronae* although the absence of distinctive attributes makes a more detailed identification impossible.

Surely the most famous sculpture to have been recovered at the sanctuary of Hercules Victor is the so-called ‘General of Tivoli’ (fig. 65). The sculpture was found in 1925 in the area where the great collection tanks were built of the power plant occupying a large part of the sanctuary area in that period. The original location of the statue cannot be established with absolute certainty, but a likely suggestion is that it was placed on one of the honorary bases attached to the pilasters decorating the façade of the upper portico of the sanctuary. The statue is a perfect example of the marriage between Roman and Hellenistic stylistic languages. The body is a variation on the heroic nudity typical of the statuary associated with Hellenistic monarchs: in this case, the idealised body is partly covered by a carefully draped mantle. The military connotations of the statue are reflected in the removed cuirass, placed at the left leg and serving as a support. Contrasting strongly with the ideal rendering of the body, the head of the statue is a portrait in the veristic tradition, which shows an older man with all the lines, creases and sagging skin associated with his age.

Given the date of the statue, at least in the first half of the first century, it was probably set
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up at the sanctuary shortly after the completion of the late republican building phase. We do not know whether the statue was erected by the person depicted or by others to honour him, but its prominent placement inside the sanctuary precinct suggests a person of considerable social status.\textsuperscript{724}

One of the most remarkable statuary groups recovered in these sanctuaries is the equestrian group from Lanuvium. The vast majority of the fragments belonging to this group were found during the excavations at the sanctuary of Juno Sospita conducted by Lord Savile between 1884 and 1890, although during later investigations additional fragments were found. Although in the original publication of the sculptures by Arthur Woodward in 1914 and 1929 the pieces were considered mediocre works of the mid-second century AD and made of Italic marble,\textsuperscript{725} subsequent studies have shown that we are dealing with a late-Hellenistic sculptural group made of Greek marble.\textsuperscript{726} Most of the pieces were found among the ruins of the great late republican portico, but the level of fragmentation suggests that this was not the original location of the group. Material was found dispersed throughout the sanctuary, and the recovery of a marble head probably belonging to the statuary group in the area of the temple suggests the placement of the group on the upper sanctuary terrace, possibly in the vicinity of or directly across from the temple itself.\textsuperscript{727}

The group portrays several warriors on horseback, and consists of at least eight or nine individuals.\textsuperscript{728} Of the seven torsos that have been found, two are clearly of a higher quality than the remaining five. In addition, one of the qualitatively superior torsos is dressed differently: instead of the short cuirass worn by the other horsemen, this individual wears a tight tunic and wide mantle (fig. 66). It seems that care was taken to differentiate individuals within the group, probably according to hierarchical status, with at least one, unarmed individual given

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{724} Christopher Hallett considers it “more likely that the statue honours a local leader” rather than “an important Roman general” (Hallett 2005, 121). Of course, one does not necessarily preclude the other.
\item \textsuperscript{725} Woodward 1914; Woodward 1929.
\item \textsuperscript{726} Roques de Maumont 1958, 42-47; Siedentopf 1968, 73-75; Coarelli 1981, 234. Coarelli suggested that the marble was from the Greek isles, but recent analysis of some of the pieces has led to the conclusion that the group was sculpted from Pentelic marble (Attenni 2004a, 111, 112-113).
\item \textsuperscript{727} On the marble head, see Coarelli 1981, 249-250; Coarelli 1987a, 153. It was kept at the Museo Civico at Lanuvio, and was badly damaged during allied bombings in 1944. Pieces of the head have been rediscovered in 1998 (Attenni 2004a, 110-111, 115, figs. 3-6).
\item \textsuperscript{728} Coarelli 1981, 250; Coarelli 1987a, 153. Seven different torsos and seven different heads of horses were found. However, more fragments of horses were found than can be assigned to just these seven. In addition, the head found in the temple did not fit with any of the known torsos, and thus constitutes a separate individual.
\end{itemize}
an especially eminent, heroised position. Several details of the figures, such as the typically Hellenistic cuirass, the open sandals which are typically Greek, the rendering of the horses (fig. 67), and the recovered head with distinctly classicistic features (fig. 68), have led to the conclusion that we are dealing with a marble copy of an originally bronze sculptural group from the second half of the fourth century, by or influenced by Lysippos.

It has been suggested that the sculptural group which inspired the Lanuvian one was the famous group of 26 bronze statues representing the turma of Alexander the Great and his companions at the Battle at the Granicus River, originally erected and dedicated at the sanctuary of Dion in Macedonia but taken to Rome by Metellus Macedonicus in 146 and displayed in his Porticus Metelli. According to Coarelli, the equestrian group of Lanuvium should thus be seen as an imitatio Alexandri.

The sculptural group and the late republican monumentalisation of the sanctuary must be part of the same project by the same patron, who according to Coarelli should be recognised in Lucius Licinius Murena, the first person from Lanuvium to become consul. He has been associated with Lucius Licinius Lucullus, consul of 74, who was likened to Alexander the Great in the political propaganda in the context of the Second Mithridatic War. It is thus possible that the Lanuvian statuary group indeed represented the famous Lysippan group, perhaps with the head of Alexander replaced with a portrait of Lucullus, while one of the companions was provided with a portrait of Murena.

---

729 Coarelli 1981, 243-244.
730 Coarelli 1981, 235-239 (cuirass), 239-243 (sandals), 245-246 (horses), 249-250 (head), 250 (general conclusion about date of the copy and nature and date of original); Coarelli 1987a, 147 (cuirass), 147-149 (sandals), 150 (horses), 153 (head), 153 (general conclusion about date of the copy and nature and date of original). Coarelli’s chronological analysis is supported by Luca Attenni (Attenni 2004a, 111-113).
731 Siedentopf 1968, 73-75.
732 Coarelli 1981, 250-261; Coarelli 1983a, 198-199 Coarelli 1987a, 155-159. Coarelli’s interpretation, elaborating on earlier authors, of the group has been challenged by some, ranging from differences of opinion on stylistic details (Moreno 1983-1984, 32, 36) and the extent of Lysippan inspiration (Calcani 1984) to complete dismissal (Gualandi 1980). It has also found acceptance (Ridgway 1990, 120; Stewart 1993, 123; Attenni 2004a, 113), and seems a plausible suggestion given the historical context.
733 Coarelli 1981, 253; Coarelli 1987a, 155. See also the section on the patrons of Latial sanctuaries in Chapter Two. The first to attribute the sculptural group to Licinius Murena was Harald von Roques de Maumont (Roques de Maumont 1958, 42-47).
This interpretation of the group and its possible placement in front of the temple of Juno Sospita leads to a number of interesting observations. First of all, if the relationship between the sculptural group and Murena and Lucullus is accepted, it would clearly demonstrate the ties between the two branches of the gens Licinia, the Licinii Luculli and the Licinii Murenæ, and thereby the ties between Rome and Lanuvium on a social level. Second of all, the erection of the group and the monumentalisation of the sanctuary, both related to successes in the Second Mithridatic War, would in this case demonstrate the continued involvement of domi nobiles active in the Roman political scene with their hometowns. Related to this point is the fact that these sanctuaries were apparently actively used for political propaganda: the group itself as an imitatio Alexandri sends out a clear message of following in the footsteps of illustrious predecessors, especially when combined with epic poetry composed by Aulus Licinius Archias to celebrate Lucullus, conveying the same message of an imitatio Alexandri in the form of verse; apparently, the comparison between Lucullus and Alexander was part of a carefully planned propaganda strategy.\(^{734}\) In addition, by associating the group with the temple of Juno Sospita, the goddess is claimed as a personal patroness, an increasingly frequent phenomenon in the first century.\(^{735}\)

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

\(^{734}\) Coarelli 1981, 254-257; Coarelli 1987a, 158-159.

\(^{735}\) Coarelli 1981, 259-260; Coarelli 1983a, 198-199; Coarelli 1987a, 160.
often with strong military overtones, once again highlighting the suitability of sanctuaries as a locus for aristocratic political propaganda.

**Visual systems: architecture and ornamentation**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Images in religious space during the Late Republic

The propagandistic potential of public, and especially religious, architecture has long been recognised, both in ancient and in modern times. Making a virtue out of necessity, the imposing qualities of the architecture itself were invariably complemented by the use of decorative systems, primarily fictile decoration serving a practical function of protecting the building and its structural elements against the elements and a representational function in the use of images in general understood as conveying religious or socio-political messages. Although the decoration of temple buildings was probably far richer than we can now imagine, including

---

738 Although the representational content of temple decoration can and often does allude to the divinity to which the temple is dedicated, it has been pointed out that from the very beginning the use of architectural decoration can be interpreted as a reflection of the socio-political system of the society which produced it. See, for instance, WINTER 2008 (Archaic period); PAIRIUT-MASSA 1999, 521-532 (Late Archaic period); STRAZZULLA 2007, 140 (mid-republican period).
at least painted panels which have been lost, the fictile decorations of temples give us a fair idea about the representational possibilities offered by this material category.739 Perhaps not surprisingly, architectural decoration, like architecture and other visual arts, was highly influenced by the rise of Rome as a Mediterranean superpower, leading to an increasingly secure hegemonic position in Italy and a profound change in relations with other political entities in the Mediterranean region. The period in which the monumental sanctuaries of Latium were constructed is characterised by a number of important developments in the ways temples and sanctuaries were ornamented. One of those, the increase of construction in stone, has already been mentioned above, but this is certainly not the only important change during the period.

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

746 Strazzulla 1977, 45.


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

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

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


752 Gruen 1990, 5-33.

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

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

A specific characteristic of the Hellenistic period with regard to the subject matter of roof decoration is the rediscovery or reasserting of local roots. The celebration of local legends and heroes has been hypothesised as the subject for numerous temple decorations. Interestingly, this is also true for colonial foundations, in which case we must surely be dealing with an invention of tradition. While this preference for local myths may signal the revival of local cultures in reaction to the growing power and influence of Rome, as has been suggested in Chapter Two for the construction of monumental sanctuaries in Samnium and Lucania, it can also be understood in the wider framework of the Italic world fully entering the Mediterranean stage in the wake of Roman expansion. It has been suggested above that Rome itself also began to stress her Trojan heritage during this period, and many of the local legends ultimately find a reference in greater narrative cycles in which Rome also plays a role. As a rule, strong anti-Roman messages cannot be detected in the figurative decoration of Italic temples during the late third and second centuries. Moreover, the Greek stylistic language used to portray these myths and legends are strongly related to cultural developments in the capital, suggesting that at least in matters of style there was no attempt to distinguish between local and metropolitan. Greek myth is used and reinterpreted to accommodate the functions needed by the societies that adopt it, by either directly altering an original scheme and emphasizing details or substituting certain characters, or by picking and choosing elements from different iconographic contexts and recomposing them to illustrate a local legend, demonstrating the flexibility and adaptability of Greek myth in Italic narrative contexts.

755 HOLSCHER 1992, 473-475. Some examples include the north frieze of the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi (MOORE 1977; WATROUS 1982, 160-167), the east metopes of the Parthenon (BROMMER 1967, 22-38) and the late archaic temple of Satricum (ULLOF 1996). An example contemporaneous with, or perhaps only slightly earlier than the second century pedimental groups is the famous altar of Zeus at Pergamon (WHITAKER 2005), which may have served as a direct impetus for the frequent adoption of the theme.
756 TORELLI 1993, 270; TORELLI 1999, 120.
758 STRAZZULLA 2007, 150.
760 PAIRAULT-MASSA 1999, 545.
761 TORELLI 1993, 283; PAIRAULT-MASSA 1999; TORELLI 1999, 133; STRAZZULLA 2006a, esp. 264; STRAZZULLA 2007, 147-148. That this adaptibility of Greek myth to Italic contexts is not an entirely new phenomenon is shown in PAIRAULT-MASSA 2000, esp. 428-430.
The influence of Rome has been stressed for the diffusion of architectural terracottas throughout the Italian peninsula; especially in the area of the Po-region, fictile decoration follows Roman expansion and colonialisation in the region closely in a geographic and chronological sense.762 The main difference with the category of terracotta votive offerings, for which a similar driving role for Rome has been postulated (see Chapter One), is that in the case of architectural terracottas, we are dealing with prestigious religious buildings commissioned by the elites of the various towns, including a great number of colonies. Whereas the ideological motivation for an active diffusion by Rome of terracotta votive offerings is difficult to prove, the ideological aspects of official temples are perhaps easier to accept. While we must remain careful in making claims about colonies being ideological staging posts of Roman expansion, there are more indications in this case for official ties between Rome and her colonies and a possible influence, albeit possibly indirect, of Rome in matters such as temple building and decoration.

In addition to these developments in the figurative content of architectural decoration in the late republican period, there are important changes in the production and distribution of decoration types. In the period before the second century, terracottas were produced in several large centres, among which Orvieto and Civita Castellana occupy a prominent place. These great production centres of architectural terracottas were progressively abandoned during the second century, replaced by Rome itself.763 The fact that Rome became a centre producing new types which can be identified and mapped perhaps also makes it more feasible to accept Roman influence on subject matters. Clearly, a leading role of the capital in architectural decoration can be attested in the late republican period, which still left enough room for local variations and creativity.764 Perhaps as a result of this concentration and the larger demand for products, architectural decoration in the late republican period becomes increasingly schematic: while there is still room for artistic invention, a lot of the pieces are standardised, albeit in a variety of decorative motifs.765 A striking change is that their use is no longer restricted to sacred buildings; architectural decoration is increasingly attested in this period on public buildings, such as porticoes, forum buildings, baths, theatres and nymphaeum, and even on private residences, such as large domus and villas.766 This means that in the late republican period we can no longer automatically equate the presence of architectural terracottas with the function of a structure as a sacred, or even necessarily a public, building, which had been true for the greater part of the Classical and early Hellenistic period.767 An important decorative category which developed during this period are the so-called Campana slabs, by which name we mean fictile architectural slabs formed with matrices with a predominant figurative decoration.768

Although the start of large-scale production of this type of decoration can be dated to the Sullan and especially the Augustan periods, we see predecessors displaying similar motifs from

764 For instance, repetitive decorative systems are enhanced by the insertion of individual pieces, and some regional types do not have parallels in the Etrusco-Latial area (Strazzulla 2006b, 38-39).
765 Mansuelli 1992, 32.
767 Strazzulla 1993b, 299.
768 See, on this particular category of fictile decoration: Strazzulla 1977, 47-48; Tortorella 1981a; Tortorella 1981b; Strazzulla 1990; Strazzulla 1991; Strazzulla 1993b.
the late second century onwards. As noted above, at Nemi two distinct types of decorative slabs were found which could be said to be early forms of Campana slabs, even though the figurative element is missing on one of those types. The ‘new’ type of decoration in a way exemplifies the different trends and developments with respect to architectural decoration in the late republican period. On the one hand, it signals a return to figurative representation with a narrative mythological content, yet on the other it seems that these slabs did not decorate the temple building but secondary structures such as porticoes. This shift in decorative emphasis is perhaps comparable to the situation we encountered at Praeneste and Tibur, where the architectural decoration was also limited to the porticoes. Furthermore, the Campana slabs are not the work of high-level artisans, such as the architectural terracottas of earlier periods, but were probably manufactured by *figilinae* that produced bricks, for which these slabs were a subsidiary activity. They were mass-produced, standardised and serviced a wide market; while the slabs did decorate some sanctuaries, for the most part they were used for the decoration of external and internal walls of closed spaces or colonnades of non-sacred buildings and private dwellings. This fact is rather important, for it shows that in an age where architecture in stone was by now probably the norm, decorative slabs with figurative representations were still being used to decorate them. The diminished importance and even disappearance of figurative decoration in sanctuaries is thus not strictly the consequence of technical developments, but of changing perceptions and socio-historical developments.

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

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

**Conclusion: planned perception**

There is one important characteristic that we can discern for every single sanctuary traditionally placed within the group of late republican monumental sanctuaries in Latium, and that is the fact that each and every one of them was apparently meant to be seen. Either the architectural form was carefully adapted to fit into the surrounding landscape or when this did not yield the desired results, the landscape itself was altered to ensure that the architectural ambitions of patrons and builders could be fulfilled. The architectural complexes which were thus created imposed themselves on visitors and viewers by their setting and their size. We can be fairly sure that in each case, the desired effect of the end result preceded planning and design, since many of the sanctuaries which were built are far too complex to have been the product of on-the-spot decision making. Preparation of the building grounds themselves must have been extensive in order to ensure structural stability, which means that the appearance of the finished product was already established, even if during the construction process, adjustments sometimes had to be made. In these cases, secondary structures could be used to visually correct these adjustments, ensuring that the end result was in almost every case a unified architectural whole.
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The orientation on features in the landscape which ensured that a lot of people would daily be confronted with the image of the sanctuary, such as important roads or densely populated urban areas, perhaps suggests that these sanctuaries were not just exercises in obscure elite propaganda and representation aimed at their peers. The architecture certainly speaks, but it does not speak solely to those with enough education to understand the subtler architectural allusions and symbolism. Undoubtedly forms and details conveyed a message to those who were capable of deciphering it, but this is only the topmost layer of the meaning of these monuments. By their dimensions and mass itself, these buildings make a permanent statement that is hard, even impossible, to ignore. Building mass itself thus assumes a role of signifier in the late republican period. Temples had always been an important monumental presence in the landscape, but monumental sanctuaries take this presence to a new extreme; these sanctuaries are so big that only from a distance their full splendour can be appreciated.

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

We can thus see that all aspects of Latial monumental sanctuaries – location, architecture and decoration – are part of a carefully considered process, sometimes contrasting with each other and sometimes complementing each other. Even if we are only able to reconstruct part of what the impact of these sanctuaries must have been in a visual sense, we are still capable of appreciating the intricate layers of meaning they must have conveyed, changing over time and in accordance with the background of every individual who approached and entered the sanctuary. If we are to establish one characteristic which binds these sanctuaries as a group, it is the great extent to which the perception of them was carefully planned.