LEABHARLANN CHOLÁISTE NA TRÍONÓIDE, BAILE ÁTHA CLIATH | TRINITY COLLEGE LIBRARY DUBLIN
Ollscoil Átha Cliath | The University of Dublin

Terms and Conditions of Use of Digitised Theses from Trinity College Library Dublin

Copyright statement

All material supplied by Trinity College Library is protected by copyright (under the Copyright and Related Rights Act, 2000 as amended) and other relevant Intellectual Property Rights. By accessing and using a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library you acknowledge that all Intellectual Property Rights in any Works supplied are the sole and exclusive property of the copyright and/or other IPR holder. Specific copyright holders may not be explicitly identified. Use of materials from other sources within a thesis should not be construed as a claim over them.

A non-exclusive, non-transferable licence is hereby granted to those using or reproducing, in whole or in part, the material for valid purposes, providing the copyright owners are acknowledged using the normal conventions. Where specific permission to use material is required, this is identified and such permission must be sought from the copyright holder or agency cited.

Liability statement

By using a Digitised Thesis, I accept that Trinity College Dublin bears no legal responsibility for the accuracy, legality or comprehensiveness of materials contained within the thesis, and that Trinity College Dublin accepts no liability for indirect, consequential, or incidental, damages or losses arising from use of the thesis for whatever reason. Information located in a thesis may be subject to specific use constraints, details of which may not be explicitly described. It is the responsibility of potential and actual users to be aware of such constraints and to abide by them. By making use of material from a digitised thesis, you accept these copyright and disclaimer provisions. Where it is brought to the attention of Trinity College Library that there may be a breach of copyright or other restraint, it is the policy to withdraw or take down access to a thesis while the issue is being resolved.

Access Agreement

By using a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library you are bound by the following Terms & Conditions. Please read them carefully.

I have read and I understand the following statement: All material supplied via a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of a thesis is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or for educational purposes in electronic or print form providing the copyright owners are acknowledged using the normal conventions. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone. This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

Expressions of Victory, Hellenism and Power:
The development of the Campus Martius from the foundation of Rome to the end of the Republic.

Volume 1: Text

Submitted in Fulfilment of the Requirements of Doctor of Philosophy

2009

Siobhán Hargis

TRINITY COLLEGE
12 MAY 2012
LIBRARY DUBLIN
9495.1

Declaration

This work has not been submitted as an exercise for a degree at this, or any other university. It is entirely my own work and I agree that the Library may lend or copy the thesis upon request.

Summary

The Campus Martius, Rome, was a flood plain to the north of the city of ancient Rome that was characterised by its extra-pomerial location and its overtly level, spacious, nature. The way in which the Campus Martius developed, from the foundation of Rome to the end of the Republic, is the focus of this thesis. In particular, the way in which military victory and its commemoration influenced the topography of the area, and how military victory was expressed through physical reminders of Greek culture, come in for particular attention.

In order to examine the physical development of this area of Rome a number of different ancient sources are examined, ranging from the literary tradition, epigraphic and numismatic sources, and the Marble Plan of Rome (Forma Urbis Romae). All of these sources aid in the clarification of the location, nature and form of many of the buildings that were constructed on the Campus Martius during the Republican period. In addition, finds from the archaeological record help in the reconstruction of the Campus Martius during this time period and are the basis for many theories as to how the Campus Martius developed and the way in which military victory was commemorated.

To be able to succinctly and clearly investigate the nature and development of the Campus Martius, and in order to examine the available material both thematically and chronologically, four phases of development have been applied to the Campus Martius in this work. In so doing the order in which the buildings were constructed, the way in which they relate to each other and the social, cultural and political context of the construction projects can be more precisely examined. These four phases highlight the trends in construction on the Campus Martius and trace the growing and evolving influence of the military triumph, the increasing power of the charismatic leader and the influence of Hellenism on the area. As a result, the four phases set out in this work aid in the contextualisation of the buildings of the Campus Martius and allow for a new interpretation of both the buildings themselves and the physical and social backdrop against which they were constructed.

By applying these four phases to the development of the Campus Martius during the Republican period it has become apparent that the area facilitated a great range of activities. While during its earliest phase of development the Campus Martius was

associated with agriculture and military drills, it evolved in Phase Two to become intimately associated with the physical and symbolic commemoration of military victory. This association was due in part to the route of the triumphal procession which arranged itself and set out from the central Campus Martius. This route had a profound impact on the type of buildings that were constructed in this area in Phases Two, Three and Four, as victorious military generals expressed the desire to locate their victory monuments close to the triumphal route and in so doing associate their military victory with the future victories that would pass by as part of the triumphal procession.

The extra-pomerial location of the Campus Martius also had a huge impact on the area as architectural formats and construction materials that were imported from abroad, and particularly from the eastern Mediterranean, that were deemed unsuitable for display in the centre of Rome, were incorporated into the victory monuments of the Campus Martius. Often these materials were used in the construction of victory monuments in order to draw attention to the provider of the building and his recent military victory. In particular Pentelic marble and the first marble temple of Rome were displayed on the Campus Martius.

By the 1st century BC (Phase Four) the Campus Martius had been a location synonymous with victory and the display of Greek culture for more than three centuries. With the failings of the Republican governing system even more apparent in Phase Four, charismatic leaders with their eye on the role of sole ruler of Rome used the Campus Martius as a location for vast construction projects with the aim of advertising their political astuteness and their awareness of their social responsibilities. Buildings such as the theatre complex of Pompey the Great, Caesar's Saepta Julia and Augustus and Agrippa's monumentalisation of the central Campus Martius were all used as demonstrations of political capability and were constructed with the aim of appealing to the Roman masses and fostering public support for their planned rule. The fact that the Campus Martius was used for such construction projects exemplifies how the area had evolved into a space that could accommodate many different types of buildings, with many different cultural overtones, in a location that was still close to the political heart of the city.

Acknowledgements

The writing of this thesis would not have been possible were it not for the help and support of a number of people.

Firstly, Dr. Hazel Dodge who, over the past ten years, has provided guidance and support and who has helped not only in all matters academic, but who has been personally supportive and encouraging.

Secondly, my family, Jim, Maria and James Hargis, who have supported me in innumerable ways, not least with their time, their encouragement, their suggestions and their unfaltering love and belief in me. Without their enduring and unshakable love and support this work would never have been started and would never have reached fruition. To them I am eternally grateful.

Thirdly, my friends, both from Trinity College and from home, who have stood by me, offered support and reading skills, and forgiven my neglect of all social duties for the past year and half as I wrote up my thesis. Namely, Aoife Fitzgerald, Emma Saunders, Jennifer Bourke, Pamela Crehan, James Buckley, Dave Healy, Genevieve Coonan, Brian Foley, Niall J. Sloane, Emily Lefebvre, Jessica Evans, Amanda Kelly, Niamh McDonnell and Brendan Lonergan.

I would like to thank St. Andrew's Resource Centre for their support. Particular help was provided by John Fitzsimons and Shay Barry for which I am incredibly grateful.

Finally, for hours of companionship and unwavering love, Sammy and Mopsey.

Table of Contents

Volume One

INTRODUCTION **1**

CHAPTER 1. METHODOLOGY AND SOURCES **6**

Introduction 6
1.1 The Working Divisions Applied in this Study 8
1.1.1. The Utilisation of Phases *9*
1.1.2. Application of Phases to the Campus Martius *10*
1.2. Roman Political and Cultural Interaction 15
1.2.1 Geographical Terms *15*
1.2.2. Cultural Terms *16*
1.2.3. Peer Polity, Koine and Diffusionism *18*
1.3 Sources of Evidence 21
1.3.1 Literary and Epigraphic Sources *21*
1.3.2. Archaeological Evidence *26*
1.3.3. The Forma Urbis Romae *28*
1.3.4. The Regionary Catalogues *29*
1.4. Introduction to the Building Appendix 32
Conclusion 34

CHAPTER 2: EARLY SITES OF THE CAMPUS MARTIUS (PHASE ONE) **35**

Introduction 35
2.1 Defining the Campus Martius 36
2.1.1. Natural Boundaries *38*
2.1.2. Artificial Boundaries *39*
2.1.3. Flooding *43*
2.2. The Early Functions of the Campus Martius 49
2.2.1. Mars and Agriculture *49*
2.3. Cult and the Early Campus 54
2.3.1. Dis Pater, Proserpina and the Tarentum *54*
2.3.2. Trigarium *59*
2.3.3. Caprae Palus *61*
2.3.4. Temple of Apollo Medicus *63*
2.4. The Army and the Campus 67
2.4.1. The Altar of Mars *67*
2.4.2. The Ovile *68*
2.4.3. Villa Publica *71*
Conclusion 74

CHAPTER 3: THE TEMPLES OF THE CAMPUS MARTIUS (PHASE TWO) **76**

Introduction 76
3.1 Triumph, the Circus Flaminius and Victory Temples 79
3.1.1. Origin and Development of Triumph *80*
3.1.2. The Route *85*
3.1.3. The Circus Flaminius *91*
3.2. The Early Temples of the Campus Martius 96
3.2.1. L'Area Sacra *96*
3.2.2. Temple of Juturna *99*
3.2.3. Temple of Fons *101*
3.2.4. Temple of Lares Permarini *103*
3.3. Temples, Triumph and Politics 107
3.3.1. 'In Circo' and 'Ad Circum' *107*
3.3.2. Temple of Bellona *110*
3.3.3. Temple of Pietas *113*
3.3.4. Temple of Hercules Musarum *116*

3.3.5. Temples of Diana and Juno Regina *120*
3.3.6. Temple of Fortuna Equestris *124*
Conclusion 128

CHAPTER 4: THE PORTICOES OF THE SOUTHERN CAMPUS MARTIUS (PHASE THREE) 130

Introduction 130
4.1. The Portico Format 133
4.1.1. Form and Terminology *134*
4.1.2. Porticoes of the Campus Martius *136*
4.2. Single-Sided Porticoes 139
4.2.1 M. Aemilius Lepidus and M. Fulvius Nobilior *139*
4.2.2. Porticus Post Spei *142*
4.2.3. Porticus Post Navalia *144*
4.3. Four-Sided Quadroporticoes 148
4.3.1. Porticus Octavia *148*
4.3.2. Porticus Metelli and the Temple of Jupiter Stator *153*
4.3.3. Porticus Minucia Vetus *158*
Conclusion 163

CHAPTER 5: THE LATE REPUBLIC (PHASE FOUR) 165

Introduction 165
5.1. Self promotion on the Campus Martius; Temples and Tombs 167
5.1.1. Temple of Fortuna Huiusce Diei *169*
5.1.2. Temple of Hercules Custos *173*
5.1.3 Tomb of Sulla *175*
5.1.4. Tumulus Juliae *177*
5.1.5. Temple of Isis and Serapis *179*
5.1.6. Tombs of Pansa and Hirtius *184*
5.2. Pompey's Theatre Complex. 187
5.2.1. The Theatre *190*
5.2.2. Temple of Venus Victrix *195*
5.2.3. The Portico *196*
5.3. Agrippa's Building Programme 204
5.3.1. Aqua Virgo *206*
5.3.2. Pons Agrippae *210*
5.3.3. Thermae Agrippae *212*
5.3.4 Stagnum Agrippae *215*
5.3.5. Euripus *217*
5.3.6 Horti Agrippae *220*
5.3.7. Pantheon *222*
5.3.8. Basilica Neptuni *227*
5.3.9. Saepta Julia and the Diribitorium *230*
5.3.10. Tomb of Agrippa *234*
5.4. Theatrical Displays on the Campus 237
5.4.1. Amphitheatre of Statilius Taurus. *237*
5.4.2. Theatre and Crypt of Balbus *239*
5.4.3. Theatre of Marcellus *243*
Conclusion 248

CHAPTER 6. HELLENISM AND THE CAMPUS MARTIUS 250

Introduction 250
6.1 The Development of Hellenism in Phases 252
6.1.1 Phase One *254*
6.1.2. Phase Two *256*
6.1.3. Phase Three *263*
6.1.4. Phase Four *267*
6.2. The Evolution of Hellenism on the Campus Martius; An Overview 273
6.2.1. Roman anti-Hellenism? *273*
6.2.2. Hellenism and Republican Instability *276*
Conclusion 278

CONCLUSION 280

Volume Two

APPENDIX

Introduction to Appendix 1
List of Appendix Entries 2
Alphabetical Index of Appendix Entries 51

BIBLIOGRAPHY **53**

List of Abbreviations 54
Ancient Sources 55
Modern Authors 59
Websites 84

Volume Three

FIGURES

(*Fig. 1 – Fig. 217*)

Introduction

The Campus Martius, the flat level floodplain in the bend of the River Tiber to the north of the ancient city of Rome, was an exceptional and unique area (Fig. 1). Set apart from the rest of the city of Rome symbolically by the *pomerium,* and topographically by its flat, level nature, it evolved in a manner quite dissimilar to the Palatine Hill and Forum Romanum.[1] This evolution is due, in large part, to the active utilisation of the area by ambitious Roman Republican politicians and statesmen who came to see the area as a canvas for personal promotion and Roman military commemoration. While the Palatine Hill witnessed development from as early as the 10th century BC, the Campus Martius remained devoid of physical structures for a much greater period of time.[2] This was partly because of the topography of the land, its extra-pomerial location and its frequent flooding as well as the manner in which it was used for military training, religious worship and recreation.

Over time the Campus Martius went on to make way for some of the most important buildings of Rome, and to accommodate some of Rome's most lavish and monumental construction projects; for example, the Saepta Julia, Theatre of Pompey and the Pantheon (Fig. 2).[3] The construction of these buildings stemmed from the fact that throughout the Republican period the Campus Martius had been used as a veritable trophy cabinet of Rome, containing victory temples, decorated gardens and porticoes and the renowned triumphal procession. As such, the development of the Campus Martius reflected the expansion of Roman power in Italy and the Mediterranean. The triumphal procession, which set out from the Campus Martius, exhibited to the inhabitants of the city Rome's military and political victories abroad, while physical reminders of these victories were provided by the construction of victory monuments in the form of temples and quadroporticoes. The increasing size of Rome's empire was reflected by the expansion of the urban profile of the Campus Martius, with building projects which were initially confined to the southern Campus Martius moving to the central and northern areas of the

[1] Richardson, 1992, 152; Rehak, 2006, 10; Aldrete, 2007, 33.
[2] Coarelli, 1997, 11; Rehak, 2006, 9-11.
[3] For Saepta Julia: *LTUR* IV, 228 (Gatti); For Theatre of Pompey: *LTUR* IV, 54-6 (Ziolkowski) For Pantheon: *LTUR* V, 35-8 (Gros).

floodplain. The Campus Martius was so renowned as a location for statements of triumph, politics and victory commemorations that by the end of the 1st century BC Strabo wrote a brief description of the marvels of the area and concluded that the Campus Martius presented to the eye '*the appearance of a stage-painting*' and added that it afforded '*a spectacle that one can hardly draw away from*' (Strabo, 5.3.8). Rome's domestic and foreign triumphs and their commemoration in the city of Rome had created a multi-functional area that was unsurpassed for visual stimulation, cultural progression and architectural development.

The physical evolution of the Campus Martius became representative of the expansion of Roman power and territory in Italy and throughout the wider Mediterranean as artworks, construction materials and other cultural elements were displayed from defeated territories. As an extra-pomerial location the Campus Martius was not subject to as many of the religious and political restrictions and laws that governed areas such as the Capitoline, Palatine and Forum Romanum, resulting in a freedom that facilitated multi-cultural expression and promotion. As a result materials, deities and architectural formats that could not be facilitated by pomerial Rome found a home in the more liberal setting of the Campus Martius.[1] For example, large quantities of Greek sculpture, deities such as Isis, and marble from Greek quarries were all displayed side by side on the Campus Martius. Meanwhile, activities that were deemed inappropriate for the centre of Rome were also accommodated by the Campus Martius. Theatrical performances, political voting, military exercise and religious practices associated with the underworld, were all carried out on the Campus Martius, adding to its multi-functional nature and aiding in its evolution into a unique and culturally progressive area.

The development of the Campus Martius is set out in this work both thematically and chronologically. Following an explanation of the methodology and sources relevant for the study of the development of the Campus Martius, the area is examined according to four chronological phases of development. These phases commence with the foundation of Rome and terminate at the end of the 1st century BC with the foundation of Imperial rule in Rome. It was at the end of the 1st century BC that the ethos of the Campus Martius began to change and it became an area for large scale Imperial construction projects. As such the themes and influences that were influential for the Republican development of

[1] Beard, North & Price, 1989a, 177; Richardson, 1992, 294; Patterson, 2000a, 86.

the Campus Martius were significantly altered. This chronological and thematic approach allows the literary and archaeological information available for the Campus Martius to be studied in relation to the relevant social and political backdrops of each particular phase. By studying the area both chronologically and thematically the reasons behind the evolution of the Campus Martius can be more easily identified and the physical buildings constructed in the area can be better contextualised, both in relation to the social and political backdrop and in relationship to the other buildings that surrounded them.

The examination of the four phases of development of the Campus Martius, from the foundation of Rome until the end of the Republican period, culminates in an analysis of Rome's cultural interactions and examines the reasons why Greek culture was particularly influential for the development of the Campus Martius. Both the literary sources and the archaeological record highlight the fact that Greek culture had a greater impact on the Campus Martius than it did on central Rome. This is due in part to the extra-pomerial location of the Campus Martius, and because the area was used as a location for the commemoration of Roman military victory. While there were a number of cultural influences physically expressed on the Campus Martius during the Republican period, it was Hellenism that came in for the most comment from the literary sources and which found the greatest expression in the archaeological record. Also, the associations of Greek culture with the expression of victory and triumph in Rome renders the theme of Hellenism a particularly important topic to be investigated bringing together as it does a great many of the factors that influenced the Campus Martius in the Republican period.

For at least the past century and a half the Campus Martius has been the focus of both direct and indirect scholarly examination. Coarelli's topographical examination of the Campus Martius in the Republican period provides the most informative and comprehensive guide to the development of the area, though in an attempt to identify as many sites as possible on the Campus Martius the work, on occasion, suggests some interpretations of the available information that are open to debate.[2] Coarelli's work in this field is particularly useful as more often than not scholarly examinations of the Campus Martius are relegated to an examination of individual buildings without any care taken to explore the topographical, social and political development of the wider setting. For example, the Pantheon, Stadium of Domitian, Baths of Nero and Theatre of Pompey

[2] Coarelli, 1997

have all been investigated individually within the past fifty years with only the briefest of mentions of the Campus Martius and the effect the area had on the design and development of the buildings.[3] While such buildings are, of course, worthy of individual study these works contribute little to a greater understanding of this region. Coarelli is not the only scholar to devote his attention to the Campus Martius, as La Rocca, Rehak and Olinder have all produced studies, albeit with a narrower remit, focusing respectively on the western Campus Martius, the Augustan Campus Martius and the Circus Flaminius.[4]

The literary sources of the late Republic and early Imperial period aid greatly in forming a picture of the development of the Campus Martius and the social and political influences exerted upon it. Unfortunately the archaeological record is particularly difficult to interpret for this region of Rome and it often hinders the identification of buildings and sites. This is due in part to the habitation of the Campus Martius following the invasion of the city by the Goths and the subsequent fall of Rome.[5] Those inhabitants who remained in the city chose to relocate to the Campus Martius, re-using the available construction materials to create residential buildings within the dilapidated ruins of the Republican and Imperial buildings. The habitation of these sites continued into the medieval and modern periods, rendering the Campus Martius a constantly populated area of the city. Even today the warren of streets to the west of the Via del Corso is packed with apartment buildings, shops and businesses. This continued use of the area has meant that there have been very few organised and systematic excavations of the Campus Martius and the study of archaeological remains has been reliant upon the recording of those fragments made visible during building remodelling, road widening or relatively small construction projects. With the exception of the Crypta Balbi, Largo Argentina and the Theatre of Pompey no large excavation projects have been carried out on the Campus Martius. Where possible this work will refer to available excavation reports. However, as many of the remains were only visible during a very short period of time during the late 19th and 20th centuries and were only noted as 'observations', the original records are often of little help.[6] Later works such as those by Rehak, Coarelli and La Rocca, as well as the indispensible *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae,* which draw together many of the different observations, recordings and sightings, are frequently of more assistance as they

[3] For example: De Fine Licht, 1966.
[4] Olinder, 1974; La Rocca, 1984; Rehak, 2006
[5] Richardson, 1992, 67; Coulston and Dodge, 2000, 6
[6] Including *BullCom* from the late 19th century which often does not provide a reference to the author. As such when referenced within this work the author of the work is cited simply as *BullCom.*

bring together what are often disjointed pieces of archaeological information to provide a more accessible and useful account of the known remains of the Campus Martius.[7]

A chronological and thematic critical analysis of the Campus Martius is an insightful way to investigate how the area developed and changed and how it was used by the inhabitants of the city of Rome. In addition it also facilitates the examination of how Rome interacted with the Hellenised areas of the eastern Mediterranean and how Rome came to accept, manipulate and utilise aspects of Greek culture. The period of time from the foundation of Rome to early Imperial Rome saw the Campus Martius transformed from a swampy floodplain to reach a pinnacle of multi-cultural expression and become a statement of victory. Augustus may have boasted that he found the city made of brick and transformed it into marble (Suetonius, *Aug.* 28.3), but this transformation was only made possible as a result of Rome's interaction with the eastern Mediterranean and the pivotal role played by the Campus Martius in the expression and manifestation of these interactions and influences.

[7] *LTUR,* La Rocca, 1981; Coarelli, 1997, 2007; Rehak, 2006

Chapter 1. Methodology and Sources

Introduction

In order to fully comprehend the nature of the development of the Campus Martius and the reasons behind its evolution, a clear methodology must first be set out. There are many ways in which historical and archaeological information for the Campus Martius can be approached and ordered, with the most common methods either thematic or chronological. The nature of the material under scrutiny demands that the Campus Martius be investigated from a chronological perspective so as to associate the development of the Campus Martius with the wider social, political and physical evolution of the city of Rome. At the same time there are a number of issues and topics that influenced the development of the Campus Martius which are best explored thematically, for example construction techniques, religion and cultural exchange. In order that this thesis can facilitate both a chronological and thematic approach, the development of the Campus Martius has been broken down into four chronological phases, each with its own thematic characteristics.

Other important methodological issues are also clarified in this chapter, including the vocabulary used for modern investigations of Roman Republican history and the theoretical models applied to the issue of inter-cultural relations between Rome, Italy, Greece and the wider Mediterranean. As it is frequently the case that the sources of information for the development of the Campus Martius are complex in nature and are not necessarily obviously applicable, the sources of information, their dates, usefulness and application is also explored under the heading of methodology.

By dividing the evolution of the Campus Martius into four chronological phases, while also exploring its development thematically, the effect that Rome's interaction with the eastern Mediterranean had on the Campus Martius can be better understood within the wider social and political context of the Roman Republic. The information provided by this chapter sets parameters and terms of references for a study of the Campus Martius

during the Republican period and allows for an exploration of the influence Greek culture had on the development of the area.

1.1 The Working Divisions Applied in this Study

The evolution of the Campus Martius covers a long period of time. From early in Rome's history the area was used for cultic activities such as the worship of Dis Pater and Proserpina (Valerius Maximus, 2.4.5; Zosimus, 2.1-7; Festus, 440L, 441L), while from the 5th century BC permanent buildings such as voting precincts and the Villa Publica (2.4.3) were constructed in the area (Livy, 5.22.7).[1] Throughout the Republican period development continued with the construction of numerous military victory monuments such as the temples surrounding the Circus Flaminius from the 3rd century BC onwards (Plutarch, *Rom.* 66).[2] The Campus Martius was so renowned as a prime location for construction that by the 1st century BC large monuments like the Baths of Agrippa (5.3.3) (Livy, 29.4; Dio, 54.29.4) and the Pantheon (5.3.7) (Dio, 53.27.1-2) were constructed in the central Campus Martius, leading the way for Imperial construction projects such as the vast Mausoleum of Augustus (Suetonius, *Aug.* 100; Dio, 53.30.5).[3] This rich and dense developmental history requires a clear methodology to allow the pertinent information to be brought to the fore.

There are many factors which add to the difficulties of interpreting and identifying the buildings of the Campus Martius, one of which is the lengthy history of occupation of the area. The Republican Campus Martius lies beneath many layers of post-classical, medieval and modern development all of which significantly reduce the chances of viewing and examining Republican construction elements.[4] The sheer quantity of material presents problems with how to organise, interpret and present the vast array of physical remains and literary sources. Also, the continued restorations and reconstructions of the buildings of the Campus Martius throughout antiquity and the modern era leads to problems regarding the initial identification of buildings and the recognition of levels of stratigraphy and extant elements from the Roman period.[5] Coupled with these difficulties is the often challenging nature of the ancient literary sources which commonly post-date the events and dedications that they record by several hundred years.[6] As a result of these

---

[1] Rehak, 2006, 10.
[2] *LTUR* I, 222, (Wiseman); See also: Wiseman, 1974, 5-17; Coarelli, 1997, 363-503; Rehak, 2006, 12-4.
[3] For the Mausoleum of Augustus see: *LTUR* III, 234-7 (von Hesberg); *LTUR* III, 237-9 (Macciocca); Davies, 2000, 8; See also: Claridge, 1998, 181-4; Coarelli, 2007, 302-4; Hope, 2007, 142-3.
[4] Heiken, Funiciello & De Rita, 2005, 7; Aldrete, 2007, 178.
[5] Coulston and Dodge, 2000, 3; Heiken, Funiciello & De Rita, 2005, 90; Aldrete, 2007, 41, 178.
[6] Forsythe, 2005, 59.

obstacles an appropriate methodology must be established before an in-depth investigation into the development of the Campus Martius can be undertaken.

1.1.1. The Utilisation of Phases

The developmental history of the Campus Martius from the foundation of Rome until the end of the Republic can be divided into a series of phases. While it may be imprudent to subscribe to phases of development with immovable concrete dates, the investigation of the Campus Martius within general phases with semi-permeable barriers or cut-off points gives enough separation and space to allow the various phases that the Campus Martius witnessed to reveal themselves. The following sections examine the manner in which phases can be applied to historical and archaeological investigations and the way phases of development can be witnessed on the Campus Martius.

To contain architectural, social, cultural and political developments together within a series of thematic and chronological phases aids in the creation and promotion of a new interpretation of the Campus Martius. Yet in order to recognise the phases of development of the Campus Martius it should first be made clear what is meant by the term 'phase' within historical and archaeological studies. A particularly apt and succinct definition is provided by Kidder who defines an historical or archaeological phase as:

> *"a cultural complex possessing traits sufficiently characteristic to distinguish it....from earlier and later manifestations of the cultural development of which it formed a part".* [7]

Such a definition can be applied to a study of the Campus Martius and can aid in evaluating the influences exerted upon the area and expressed within it. This approach leads to the recognition of four phases of development on the Campus Martius for the time period under consideration, each with its own unique qualities. Yet the phases of development present in the Campus Martius can only truly be understood against the wider backdrop of the physical, social, cultural and political development of the whole of Rome. However, to define phases of development for the entire city of Rome is far beyond the scope and remit of this study. Furthermore, the particular external influences

[7] As quoted by Rouse 1955, 713.

at work on the extra-pomerial area of the Campus Martius were oftentimes very different to those influences which impacted on the city of Rome in a more general sense. Hence, the phases that are outlined below apply very specifically to the Campus Martius alone.

There is the danger that the recognition and emphasis of the phases of development of Campus Martius, if incorrectly applied, could lead to the isolation of the Campus Martius, rendering it an area unaffected by the development of the rest of the city of Rome. This is not the aim of the phases and consequently, where possible, reference is made to contemporary developments within the wider city of Rome. The isolation of the Campus Martius and its buildings from the rest of the city of Rome is something that has occurred in the past. For the past one hundred years or so it has been the tendency of many scholars to investigate the construction of single buildings on the Campus Martius (for example the Pantheon, the Mausoleum of Augustus, the Ara Pacis) without taking into account the nature, function and environment of the surrounding Campus Martius.[8] Ultimately, this practice led to a disassociation of the building from its relevant physical and historical context, rendering its interpretation weaker and isolated from its physical environment. By applying phases of development to the wider Campus Martius and using, where possible, comparisons to the development of the city of Rome, and including the more general political and social backdrop, this disassociation can be avoided.

1.1.2. Application of Phases to the Campus Martius

The phases applied to the development of the Campus Martius should not be seen as impermeable, restrictive, brackets of time and motif, but rather as more general and natural divisions which allow for a new methodological approach in which the various motifs and themes are contained within permeable boundaries. As such the phases reflect the natural development and evolution of the Campus Martius and are not contrived simply to bracket an elongated time period. This permeability emphasises that the phases of the Campus Martius are divisions of the natural development and evolution of the Campus Martius.

---

[8] For example, De Fine Licht, 1966; Conlin, 1992; MacDonald, 2002.

The division of the Campus Martius into a number of chronological and thematic phases also allows for a topographically specific interpretation. The context of a building, its physicality, and the reason behind its construction, can only truly be understood if the buildings that were constructed around it, and also those buildings that were constructed at the same time, are investigated and understood. This contextualisation helps to anchor the building, physically and historically within the wider Campus Martius. Further important contextual elements for the interpretation of the buildings of the Campus Martius are the social, cultural and political developments that relate to the era in which the buildings were constructed. For these reasons, the phases outlined below are all chronological and mindful of time-specific events within the wider Roman world, for example warfare (such as the Punic Wars) and social and political developments. An in-depth knowledge of the contemporary cultural and political trends of the time can aid greatly in a modern interpretation of the reasons behind construction on the Campus Martius and the reasons why the buildings under investigation facilitated particular functions within specific architectural formats.

The four phases of development take into account architectural, cultural, social and political trends, traditions and innovations and highlight such diverse cultural influences and developments as art, literature, religion and language. Oftentimes cultural, political and social themes are not conducive to rigidly defined phases as it was often the case that they developed over a much longer period of time (for example the acceptance of foreign religion and language). However, the cultural influences, as outlined below, contain distinct features that serve to distinguish them from previous and subsequent phases. For example, new and innovative architectural techniques of Phase Two (early 3rd century BC to mid 2nd century BC) were fundamentally concerned with temple architecture, while Phase Three (from the mid 2nd century to the early 1st century BC) witnessed a rapid and important development of the architectural format of the portico. These architectural developments, and the reasons behind the evolutions, function to define the phase thematically as well as chronologically.

One of the fundamental factors which helps to define the phases applied to the Campus Martius is the manner in which Rome interacted with, and manipulated, cultures with which it came into contact. The relationship between Rome's native culture, wider Italian

culture and elements of Greek culture altered and developed over time.[9] This evolving relationship is witnessed through the physical development of the Campus Martius and the manner in which the Campus Martius was utilised. The advancement of Roman territory and the effect that this had on Rome, Roman culture and Roman citizens manifested itself through the four phases of the Campus Martius, both in the building types constructed, the building materials used, the dedications of buildings and the physical urban growth of the Campus Martius from south to north.

The phases applied to the development of the Campus Martius are set out in tabular format below:

Phase One:

- From the foundation of Rome to the early 3rd century BC.
  - The earliest uses of the Campus Martius.
  - Few permanent buildings constructed in this phase.
  - Area characterised by military use and religious practice.
  - Area becomes defined as a usable space on the periphery of the city of Rome but remained a largely open space, free for military drills and leisure activities.

Phase Two:

- From the early 3rd century BC to the mid 2nd century BC.
  - Characterised by the construction of victory temples on the Campus Martius, particularly in the southern sector, around the Circus Flaminius.
  - Temples were constructed as victory monuments for military advancement in Italy, Greece, North Africa and Spain.
  - Area became strongly associated with the rite of triumph and the language of victory.
  - The expansion of Roman territory in Italy and further afield is reflected in the continued growth and development of the area, and particularly in the continued growth in the density of construction from the southern Campus Martius towards the central Campus Martius, for example, in the *area sacra* of Largo Argentina.

[9] Cornell, 1995, 397; Wallace-Hadrill, 2008, 14-16.

Phase Three:

- From the mid 2nd century BC to the early 1st century BC.
  - Many porticoes are constructed in the Campus Martius.
  - The monuments constructed represent Roman victory and are also used as statements of personal success and achievement.
  - The growth of Roman territory is again witnessed by the increased density in building in the area and increased building activity in the south-central Campus Martius.
  - Greek marble and statues are displayed as representations of Roman hegemony over foreign, and in particular Greek, construction materials.

Phase Four:

- From the early 1st century BC to the late 1st century BC.
  - Many large complexes are constructed, commonly associated with entertainment and public leisure.
  - Buildings are constructed by Roman military leaders in order to advertise their personal victory with the ultimate aim of achieving public recognition and political power.
  - Construction on the Campus Martius becomes reflective of the foundation of Imperial power in Rome as buildings are constructed by wealthy politicians such as Pompey the Great and Augustus for the benefit of the people.

A number of running themes are visible throughout these phases. The location of the Campus Martius and the freedom it granted, along with the association with the Roman military influenced the initial development and subsequent longevity of many of these themes. The Campus Martius was an excellent location for self promotion and commemoration following military victory through the rite of triumph, an issue which, by Phase Four, led to the construction of vast entertainment complexes in order to please the masses. Representations of Greek culture were frequently found on the Campus Martius, be it in the form of construction materials such as Pentelic marble, statues used for decoration or architectural formats and techniques. The expression of Greek culture on the Campus Martius was a physical representation of Rome's interaction with the eastern Mediterranean and the Greek world and more generally with the rest of the Mediterranean. The way in which the Romans interacted with, reacted to and accepted Greek culture is representative of the manner in which Rome interacted with, reacted to

and accepted aspects of other foreign cultures. While Greek culture was not the only foreign cultural influence on Rome, in relation to the Campus Martius it was influential and in many respects remains the best preserved in the literary and archaeological record.

1.2. Roman Political and Cultural Interaction

There are a number of important terms commonly used for the discussion of the development of Rome and the Campus Martius which are either open to interpretation or controversial in their use. For example, geographical regions can be referred to in a number of ways but must always remain mindful to reflect, where possible, the political and social backdrop of the relevant era. An example of this is the name 'Greece' which cannot necessarily be used without explanation and definition as it may easily be taken to reflect a modern country which was non-existent in the Roman period. The concept of nationhood and country are modern notions inherent in modern theories of interpretation which denote boundaries and concepts of nationality that were not present in Regal and Republican Rome.[10] In relation to a study of the development of the Campus Martius terms such as 'Italy' and 'Greece' must be examined as these were the areas that Rome had most contact with and whose culture most impacted upon the development of the Campus Martius. Related terms such as 'Hellenisation' and 'Hellenism' must also be examined as they form part of the vocabulary used to define the way in which Rome came into contact with, and was influenced by, Greek culture. Once these terms are defined the nature of Roman cultural interaction with other states can be examined in more detail and 'foreign' influence on the development of the Campus Martius can be better understood.

1.2.1 Geographical Terms

While modern geographical descriptions are often not reflective of the Roman world view, some form of referencing is required in order to discuss Rome's interaction with 'foreign' states and regions.[11] Where appropriate the name used by the relevant literary sources such as Livy and Dio, to describe a region is used, as these terms best reflect Rome's definition of foreign states, be they based on geographical boundaries, cultural

---

[10] Laurence, 1998, 95-6.
[11] Williams, 1997, 71 (who addresses some of the issues in relation to the Celts); Lomas, 1997, 3-4; See also: Darby, 1953, 3-4; Clarke, 1999, 14-5.

commonalities or other perceived features. In this work the names Illyria, Macedonia and Greece refer to the regions as they stood and as they were recognised by the Romans during the Republic and as they were recorded in the sources. Such references do not reflect modern state boundaries.

The terms used to describe foreign trade and cultural interactions are often very much vaguer than the terms/names used by the sources to describe foreign states. Hence, Cato the Elder and Plutarch (*Cat. Mai.* 22.3) often refer to 'Greek culture', a term which may in fact represent common cultural traits of the broader regions of the eastern Mediterranean and southern Italy. Other vague terms for areas that shared common cultural characteristics are 'the Greek world' and 'the eastern Mediterranean'. These terms may appear overly vague, but by taking into account Rome's and Roman historians' Rome-centric interpretation of foreign exchange and interaction, they are rather apt. These terms allow the modern observer to study and investigate cultural interaction and exchange on a much wider scale, without getting overly caught up with linguistic arguments and hermeneutical interpretations.

Having defined the manner in which geographical areas are referred to within this work, and the benefits of both precise and broad referencing, attention can be turned to the terms used to define the cultural interaction and exchange between Greek and Roman society. This is of particular importance as it was frequently the case that aspects of foreign, and particularly Greek, culture were employed and exploited on the Campus Martius. Consequently the definition of terms such as Hellenism and Hellenisation aid greatly in clarifying the more elusive aspects of Roman intercultural activities.

1.2.2. Cultural Terms

'Hellenisation' is a commonly used term to define the movement of Greek culture within the Mediterranean. While the term Hellenisation is frequently used, and has been by historians and archaeologists alike for at least a century, it should be re-assessed and replaced by a more appropriate term as it fails to take into account the varied and complicated path of cultural transmission between Greece, Rome, and other parts of the

Mediterranean.[12] The term 'Hellenisation' suggests that the active participant in the process of cultural transmission and absorption were the inhabitants of the eastern Mediterranean. The term does not take into account the actions of the second party (be they Rome or any other society) and instead suggests that aspects of Greek culture were forcibly projected onto another, most likely weaker, cultural tradition. As a result this term is representative of the theory of exogenous change which suggests that all cultural change and innovation is initiated by a stronger external force, in this case Greek.[13] This is a relatively dated theory that does not allow for the ingenuity and tradition of the receptive society and assumes that the receiving society is culturally weaker and as such is not a theory that this work subscribes to. When applied to Rome, as is often the case for the development of Roman religion, the theory of exogenous change privileges Hellenisation as the dominant external influence, prior to which Roman religion was simplistic and underdeveloped.[14] The theory of exogenous change is not an accurate reflection of the development of Roman religion and relies on a misinterpretation of the literary sources and archaeological evidence. It is an example that shows the pitfalls of the theory of exogenous change and subscribes to diffusionism and core-periphery models.[15]

'Hellenisation' does not accurately reflect the political relationships and influencing factors behind the transmission of Greek culture to Rome. Rather the term 'Hellenism' is more appropriate as it does not imply a cultural dominance in the same way that Hellenisation does. Nor does it imply a cultural imperialism, but rather it allows for endogenous change, which is to say, independent, natural, cultural development and progression within a state. This is a much more acceptable theory regarding cultural transmission in the Mediterranean for this work as it is far more inclusive and allows for a society's individual strengths and traditions. In order for an investigation into the way in which different cultural traits were transferred throughout the Mediterranean to proceed it is important to first explore the methodology and theories regarding cultural transmission. By doing so theories of cultural imperialism and diffusionism can be put to one side and the development and evolution of Roman culture in Rome, and particularly on the Campus Martius, can be re-assessed and understood in a new light.

---

[12] Lomas, 1993, 6; Wallace-Hadrill, 2008, 18-19.
[13] Renfrew, 1986, 5-6; Wallace-Hadrill, 2008, 18-19.
[14] Cornell, 1995, 160-1.
[15] Cornell, 1995, 160-1.

1.2.3. Peer Polity, Koine and Diffusionism.

A number of theories can be applied to the cultural interaction between Rome, Etruria, Greece, North Africa and other societies of the ancient Mediterranean. In current modern thought the most useful theory for this type of study is that of 'peer-polity interaction'.[16] The theory of peer-polity interaction allows for contact between various societies which in turn leads to common cultural elements developing within different, though geographically relatively close, communities. The theory of peer-polity interaction allows for the influence of other, external, societies (in this case including Etruscan and Greek) on the community in question (Rome), while also allowing for the independent internal cultural development of the state.

A number of schools of thought have at times chosen to focus on the external forces that influenced the development of a state, known as 'Exogenous Change' or else on the internal, independent, development of the state, known as 'Endogenous Change'.[17] Both of these theories can be used to great effect when applied to appropriate topics. However, should either one be used inappropriately, and without any allowance for other types of societal change, then the results of the study may be overtly biased and unreflective of the actual social practices at work in the state or society. During the course of archaeological and historical investigation into the development of the Campus Martius, and Rome in general, both exogenous and endogenous theories have been used. The exogenous theories have utilised 'models of dominance' and have promoted the belief that change within a society comes about as a result of contact with a larger, more powerful and advanced socio-political group, for example Greece or Etruria.[18] It is frequently the case that the term 'Hellenisation' is used in relation to this theory, and as has been stated, has resulted in particular schools of thought regarding the development of Roman religion. Another example of the model of exogenous change is the theory of diffusionism, so often applied to the early development of Rome.[19] When applied to Rome, diffusionism suggests that the Greeks or the Etruscans were the more developed, militarily powerful and culturally advanced socio-political group of the Mediterranean and as a result exerted huge cultural, military and political influence over the smaller, weaker, under-developed

---

[16] Renfrew, 1986, 1-18; Cornell, 1995, 164; Smith, 1996, 85; Smith, 2000, 24; Forsythe, 2005, 117-8.
[17] Renfrew, 1986, 5-6; Cornell, 1995, 164.
[18] Cornell, 1995, 151-72.
[19] Renfrew, 1986, 5-6.

city of Rome. Much of the reasoning for the application of this theory comes from the general belief that Greek culture was superior and pre-dated evidence for Roman culture. The same diffusionism theory can be applied to Etruscan influences over Rome.[20] So popular was, and often is, the theory of diffusionism that for many decades there has been no challenge to the theory that the Etruscans ruled over Rome in the Regal period and were responsible for Roman temple design and the theory that Roman religion developed as a result of contact with the eastern Mediterranean.[21]

There are a number of reasons to challenge the application of diffusionism to the relationship between Rome and other cultures/societies, primarily Greece and Etruria. Firstly, the theory of diffusionism can only be properly utilised when it can be proven, beyond doubt, that the relationship that existed between two polities was clearly one of an advanced and dominant society over a weaker, underdeveloped, receptive culture.[22] This is something that has never been proved within Italy or the Mediterranean. A number of archaeological artefacts, particularly those that include Etruscan inscriptions, have been used in an attempt to prove the theory that Etruria dominated Rome. Many of these Etruscan inscriptions were found on the Forum Boarium, a large trading area of ancient Rome.[23] However, the lack of solid material evidence seems to suggest that Etruria did not invade Rome and there is certainly not enough evidence to suggest that Etruria dominated Rome culturally and politically. Also, in relation to Rome's relationship with Greece, the example often cited is that Rome had little or no artistic skill prior to Hellenic interaction and that consequently the vast majority of learned artistic skill resulted from contact with Greece.[24] When diffusionism is applied in this way it fails to allow for independent, internal Roman cultural development, skill and innovation. It also fails to allow for the influence that contact with regional, independent neighbours within Italy had on the development of Rome and the influence of what may be classed as a common cultural *koine*.[25]

A far more profitable, and arguably more exact, means of interpreting cultural interaction is that of peer-polity interaction. Within this theory a polity is understood as a socio-

---

[20] Cornell, 1995, 89.
[21] Beard, North, Price, 1989a, 61-3; Cornell, 1995, 162.
[22] Renfrew, 1986, 6.
[23] Cornell, 1995, 157; Forsythe, 2005, 117.
[24] Wallace-Hadrill, 2008, 18.
[25] Cornell, 1995, 164.

political unit which is autonomous, and while it is not necessarily defined territorially, it is often surrounded by analogous units.[26] Peer-polity interaction allows for change to come from a regional level with the vast majority of socio-political contact and influence coming from regional, local, independent communities.[27] Such contact, on a local level, allows the societies of a region to develop 'specific structural homologies',[28] such as, in the case of Italy, temple form and architectural and artistic similarities such as colonnades. Rome may have initially come into contact with temple form and monumentalisation on a regional level within central Italy as a result of economic migration between regions within central Italy. The benefit and balance of subscribing to the theory of peer-polity interaction is that it not only takes into account the importance of regional contact, but it also allows for exogenous and endogenous change, while recognising that socio-political change does not come solely from either internal or external sources. Of course the simple coining of a term does not lead to the instant clarification of historical and archaeological data. Nor does it lead to instant clarification of the complexities involved in the movement of peoples and material culture within Italy and the wider Mediterranean. However, the clarification of the relationships between states and cultures that the theory of peer-polity interaction provides, if applied cautiously, can lead to a newer, clearer and arguably more accurate interpretation of the cultural exchange at work in Italy, and importantly, between Rome and Greece.

[26] Renfrew, 1986, 3-4.
[27] Renfrew, 1986, 7.
[28] Renfrew, 1986, 5.

1.3 Sources of Evidence

Some issues regarding the nature and dating of the sources require clarification before an in-depth study of the development of the Campus Martius can be embarked upon. The many sources of evidence relating to the development of the Campus Martius from the Regal period to the end of the Republic are often of a late date and not contemporaneous with the events that they describe.[29] This is certainly the case for the literary sources of Rome, most of which range in date from the 1st century AD to the 5th century AD. In addition, due to the topography of the area and the continued habitation of the Campus Martius since the Republican period, archaeological excavation has proven hard to undertake and the results difficult to interpret.[30] As a result it is with utmost care that the sources for the development of the Campus Martius should be approached.

1.3.1 Literary and Epigraphic Sources

A significant source of information for the development of the Campus Martius comes from the literary and epigraphic tradition, these range from the *fasti* to the annalistic tradition. Of the literary sources available, few of the *fasti* date anywhere near to the events which they describe.[31] These lists and calendars are an important tool for the decipherment of a chronology for the Republican period, of particular note are the *fasti consulares* and the *fasti triumphales.*[32] The former is a list of the consuls of Rome who gave their names to the year in which they held office and can be used to create a type of dating system. Much of the *fasti consulares* are reconstructed from a number of literary sources which present only slightly differing versions, with the majority of discrepancies dating to the period before 300 BC.[33] The *Fasti Capitolini* provides the fullest and longest version of the list of consuls, covering the period from 509 BC onwards (Fig. 3).[34] The *fasti triumphales* provides an important resource as it records the date of many Roman victories, the name of the person who celebrated the victory, and the name of the people

[29] Forsythe, 2005, 59.
[30] Taylor, 2000, 240; Heiken, Funiciello & De Rita, 2005, 8.
[31] Cornell, 1995, 13.
[32] Cornell, 1995, 399-401; Forsythe, 2005, 71; Beard, 2007, 61-7.
[33] Cornell, 1995, 218.
[34] Cornell, 1995, 218.

who were conquered. This is of particular help when trying to decipher who was responsible for the construction of the victory temples of the southern Campus Martius and what victory the temples commemorated.[35] While the information provided by the consular lists and other *fasti* are of great importance for developing a chronology of Rome's political institutions, they do not necessarily relate directly to the development of the Campus Martius. However, they are an important tool as they aid, if indirectly, in the dating of events and monument construction on the Campus Martius. More specific information regarding the evolution of the Campus Martius is preserved in the ancient literary sources.

Since the late 19th century the Roman annalistic tradition has come in for serious criticism regarding its accuracy and reliability with claims of falsification, anachronisms and embellishments.[36] While it is true that sources such as Livy, Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Fabius Pictor are often anachronistic, repetitive and subject to mistakes, the information provided should not be dismissed out of hand as to do so is hypercritical and results in the loss of important information often based on reliable information and sources. The authors of the late Republic, such as Cato the Elder and Livy, would have found it impossible to invent military encounters, political characters or specific events in the late Republic as familiarity with the consular and triumphal lists, and with other *fasti*, would have resulted in the inhabitant of Rome being aware of events from the early Republic.[37] Verbal tradition would also have played a significant part in forming a recognisable historic tradition. Not all information regarding Rome's traditional history was reliant on verbal tradition and calendars. Cicero records that there was a physical, literary account of Rome's history that was used by Roman historians (*De Or.* 2.52-3). According to Cicero the early historians of Rome modelled their style on official records that were called the '*Annales Maximi*'.[38] This reference by Cicero is important evidence of the fact that Roman historians based their works on annals and other surviving documents from an earlier time that are no longer preserved. Virgil (*Ad Aen.* 1.373) suggests that these annals may have been chronicles kept by the *pontifex maximus*, and Cicero notes that they recorded events that dated as far back as the origins of Roman history through until the 120's BC.[39] While these annals are mentioned by name, nothing

[35] Cornell, 1995, 399-401.
[36] Cornell, 2005, 54; Forsythe, 2005, 59.
[37] Smith, 2000, 18; Cornell, 2005, 49.
[38] Cornell, 1995, 13; Forsythe, 2005, 69.
[39] Cornell, 1995, 14.

else is known about them and it is uncertain what other literary sources authors such as Livy and Varro relied on in order to commit their history of Rome to paper.[40] It is possible that there were other types of annals and archives recorded and held in Rome which were used as sources of information by Livy and other later writers. Such documents may have been kept by temple priests, for example in locations such as the temple of Saturn or the temple of Ceres.[41]

Livy's chronicle of Roman history is of the utmost importance for a reconstruction of the events of the Roman Republic and the associated development of the Campus Martius. Titus Livy (59 BC –AD 17) wrote his book '*From the Foundation of the City of Rome*' from the 20's BC onwards and at the time of Livy's death the work consisted of 142 books, of which only 35 survive.[42] Fortunately, given the nature of the sources for the earliest period of Rome's history, the first 10 books do survive, covering the period from the foundation of Rome to 293 BC, while books 21 – 45, which cover the period from 218-167 BC, also survive.[43] The information contained within Livy's work is of particular importance for dating, locating and identifying the temples constructed on the Campus Martius in Phase Two. The various *fasti* provide further confirmation of the information provided by Livy. It is therefore regrettable that the important period of 293-218 BC is not preserved as it would have provided information regarding the First Punic War and the foundation of a number of victory temples, including those of Juturna and Fons (Appendix: 3.2.2; 3.2.3)

Dionysius of Halicarnassus is also an important source for the reconstruction of the history of the Republican period, though like Livy, this account was written in the 1st century AD. Dionysius of Halicarnassus' '*Roman Antiquities*' covered a similar period to that of the first 10 books of Livy, from the foundation of Rome to 264 BC.[44] Of the 20 original books, only 11 survive, covering the period from the foundation of Rome to 443 BC, though segments of the later books were preserved by Byzantine writers.[45] Dionysius of Halicarnassus wrote his account of Roman history in Greek, either with the intent of

[40] Smith, 2000, 17.
[41] Cornell, 1995, 15; Forsythe, 2005, 66, 70.
[42] Forsythe, 2005, 66.
[43] Forsythe, 2005, 66.
[44] Forsythe, 2005, 67.
[45] Cornell, 1995, 2; Forsythe, 2005, 67.

providing the information for the inhabitants of the eastern Mediterranean or, perhaps more likely, the Greek speaking inhabitants of Italy.[46]

Cassius Dio (referred to throughout this work simply as Dio) is another writer whose work contributes significantly to an examination of the Campus Martius, though he wrote later than Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Dio was a Greek author, though served as a Roman consul and senator, who wrote his work '*Roman History*' in the early 3rd century AD.[47] His work covers the period from Rome's foundation up to the Punic Wars and as such provides a substantial amount of information regarding the foundation of victory monuments in Rome. His *Roman History*, which was set out in 10 books, does not survive in its original version, but rather is preserved in fragments in a 12th century summary written by the Byzantine monk Zonaras.[48] Again, the sources used by Dio are uncertain, and while it is possible that he was aware of and used parts of Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, he also includes information and facts that originate from another, as yet unknown, source.[49]

Another important source, if only for specific books that concern the city of Rome and the Campus Martius in particular, is Strabo. His book '*Geography*', written in the late 1st century BC – early 1st century AD, is not a historical account in the traditional sense, but functioned as a geographical guide to areas of Rome, Italy and Greece.[50] As such he provides a magnificent account of the view over the Campus Martius in the early 1st century AD and mentions explicitly a number of buildings that were present in the area. One passage in particular (5.3.8) provides a beautiful description of the Campus Martius and how it would have been viewed by the inhabitants of Rome at the beginning of the 1st century AD.

> "*In a word, the early Romans made but little account of the beauty of Rome, because they were occupied with other, greater and more necessary, matters; whereas the later Romans, and particularly those of today and in my time, have not fallen short in this respect either — indeed, they have filled the city with many beautiful structures. In fact, Pompey, the Deified Caesar, Augustus, his sons and friends, and wife and sister, have outdone all others in their zeal for buildings and in the expense incurred. The Campus Martius contains most of these, and thus, in addition to its natural beauty, it has received still further*

[46] Beard, North & Price, 1998a, 169-70; Forsythe, 2005, 67-8.
[47] Cornell, 1995, 3.
[48] Cornell, 1995, 3.
[49] Cornell, 1995, 3.
[50] Cornell, 1995, 3; Clarke, 1999 193-4.

> *adornment as the result of foresight. Indeed, the size of the Campus is remarkable, since it affords space at the same time and without interference, not only for the chariot-races and every other equestrian exercise, but also for all that multitude of people who exercise themselves by ball-playing, hoop-trundling, and wrestling; and the works of art situated around the Campus Martius, and the ground, which is covered with grass throughout the year, and the crowns of those hills that are above the river and extend as far as its bed, which present to the eye the appearance of a stage-painting — all this, I say, affords a spectacle that one can hardly draw away from".*

This is an amazing account of the Campus Martius that provides a substantial amount of information regarding the manner in which the area was used at the beginning of the 1st century AD. The fact that Strabo chooses to use the Campus Martius as an example of the location of Rome's most beautiful structures highlights the fact that the area had grown into an important location for construction by the Imperial period and one which had evolved over time to become the location for statements of personal power, victory and promotion for the new Imperial rulers of Rome.

The Greek biographer Plutarch provides substantial amounts of information regarding specific politicians and rulers of Rome in his book chronicling the lives of famous Romans. Written towards the end of the 1st century AD the accounts rely heavily on Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and also draw on other sources which are as yet unknown.[51] His accounts of the founders of Rome such as Romulus and Numa are important for the reconstruction of Rome's earliest period, while his accounts of the lives of the politicians of the late 1st century BC aid greatly in the reconstruction of the social and political backdrop of the fall of the Republic. Additional authors also prove useful for the reconstruction of the social and political context of Rome from its foundation until the end of the Republic and on occasion provide information regarding specific events and monuments on the Campus Martius. Tacitus and Suetonius, while primarily concerned with the events of the Imperial period, often hint at Republican events and monuments and aid in the clarification of positions of monuments and their subsequent reconstructions.

Of course not all the information provided by historians regarding Roman history prior to the 1st century AD should be trusted implicitly and techniques should be employed to assess the reliability of the information provided by the authors. For example, through

---

[51] Ogilvie & Drummond, 1989, 4.

comparison it can be found that Cicero, Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Livy all generally agree on a number of very important points, suggesting that they were aware of the common historic tradition and did not deviate from it too severely.[52] So too, the literary accounts can be compared to what is known from the numerous *fasti* in order to determine if the chronology of the sources is accurate. Of course, where possible, the literary sources can be compared against the archaeological record in order to determine the accuracy of the literary accounts.[53] While this is not always possible, due in part to the vagueness of the sources and the lack of archaeological certainty regarding the buildings of the Republican period, there are times when the literary and archaeological sources marry, creating a comprehensive picture of the development of the Campus Martius, of particular buildings, and the nature of their foundation and development.

1.3.2. Archaeological Evidence

The site of Rome has been continually inhabited since the earliest hilltop settlements were established on the Palatine hill in the 10th century BC.[54] Following the sacking of the city by the Visigoths in the fifth century AD the remaining inhabitants of the city fled to the Campus Martius and inhabited the area, building tenements and turning the Republican and Imperial buildings of the area into habitable spaces, often taking the Roman building materials from the original sites and reusing them for new purposes elsewhere.[55] The Campus Martius continued to be used as an area for housing and public building throughout the middle ages, through the Renaissance, and into the modern era. After nearly 2,500 years of continual construction, reconstruction and habitation, the identification of temples, tombs and buildings in the Campus Martius relies on the interpretation of information from the literary sources, chance finds during modern demolition for buildings and roads, and comparison with later sources and maps such as the Forma Urbis Romae and the Regionary Catalogues.

---

[52] Cornell, 2005, 52.
[53] Cornell, 2005, 54-5.
[54] Cornell, 1995, 54-7; Forsythe, 2005, 80-3. See also: Conlin, 1997, 45; Coarelli, 1997, 11; Rehak, 2006, 9-11.
[55] Richardson, 1992, 67; Coulston and Dodge, 2000, 6.

The difficulties associated with this continually inhabited site are exaggerated by the manner in which the ground level in the area of the Campus Martius has continued to rise. The frequent flooding of the river Tiber and the associated deposition of river silt has caused the ground level of the Campus Martius to rise substantially.[56] Coupled with the continual erosion of earth and sediment from the surrounding hills to the east of the Campus Martius, the ground level of the area is far higher than it would have been in the Republican and early Imperial periods.[57] Evidence of this can be clearly seen today at the *area sacra* of Largo Argentina where the Republican victory temples of the 3rd to 1st centuries BC lay metres below the modern street plan (Fig. 4).[58] Excavations have shown that at the end of the Republican period the Campus Martius lay 10 'metres above sea level' (masl).[59] The current ground level in modern Rome in the area of the Campus Martius is 18-20 masl.[60] Consequently it is with great difficulty that Republican and early Imperial buildings constructed on the Campus Martius are found, identified and excavated.

The continued habitation of this area following the fall of Rome was not the only reason for the destruction of the monuments of the Campus Martius.[61] Many of the buildings constructed in the area, especially those dating from the Republican period, were demolished during the late Republican and early Imperial eras. For example, the temples of Pietas and Fons (Appendix: 3.3.3; 3.2.3), constructed in 231 BC and 192 BC respectively, were demolished by Caesar in order to facilitate the construction of the theatre of Marcellus (Appendix: 5.4.3) (Dio, 43.49.2-3).[62] The original Pantheon (Appendix: 5.3.7), constructed by Agrippa in 25 BC was demolished and reconstructed by Hadrian in AD 118-125, leaving little trace of the form and function of the original building.[63] All of these issues render the archaeological record difficult to decipher as the alterations to the buildings in antiquity, the depths at which the remains lay and the continual construction and habitation of the area render it almost impossible to excavate. As a result what little archaeological information that can be gleaned from excavations carried out haphazardly around the Campus Martius must be substantiated with

---

[56] Coulston and Dodge, 2000, 3; Heiken, Funiciello & De Rita, 2005, 90; Aldrete, 2007, 178.
[57] Heiken, Funiciello & De Rita, 2005, 7; Aldrete, 2007, 178.
[58] Aldrete, 2007, 178.
[59] Aldrete, 2007, 41.
[60] Aldrete, 2007, 41.
[61] Platner & Ashby, 1926, 94; Heiken, Funiciello & De Rita, 2005,8.
[62] *LTUR* II, 14 (Viscogliosi).
[63] *LTUR* IV, 54 (Ziolkowski). See also: Shipley, 1933, 57; Favro, 2005, 242.

information from the literary sources, *fasti,* and by comparison with later sources such as the Forma Urbis Romae and the Regionary Catalogues.

1.3.3. The *Forma Urbis Romae*

The Forma Urbis Romae (FUR), also known as the Roman Marble Plan or Severan Marble Plan, is a map of Rome inscribed on Proconnesian marble slabs and dates to the reign of Septimius Severus, from between AD 203-211.[64] The map shows a planimetric representation of the city with the northern quarter of the city at the bottom of the map and the southern quarter of the city at the top of the map. The FUR was likely based on a Flavian map of the city, which in turn was based on an Augustan relief of the city.[65] Originally the FUR was displayed on the north east facing wall of the Temple of Peace and constituted eleven rows of marble slabs, with 151 slabs in total.[66] The marble plan measured 18.10m in height and 13m in width, covering a total space of 235m^2.[67] The scale of the map was 1:246.[68] The map was subsequently broken into many pieces and has since required substantial investigation and interpretation in order to reassemble sections of it.

The map was first found in 1562 and many pieces were subsequently lost, though some of these lost fragments are preserved on Renaissance drawings which are now held in the Vatican archives.[69] Only 1,163 pieces have been found, accounting for only 10% of the original map and there are many hundreds of fragments which have still to be identified (Fig. 5).[70] Along with the fragments of the map, the sections preserved during the Renaissance account for a further 10%, preserving, at best, 20% of the original plan. Fortunately of the 20% of the map that survives many of the fragments and later drawings relate to the Campus Martius. The names of the buildings are frequently inscribed alongside the plan of the buildings (for example next to the Diribitorium and Serapeum on fragments 35, aa, bb and 35lpqr of slab IV-5 of the FUR) aiding significantly in the

[64] Coulston and Dodge, 2000, 355. See also: Claridge, 1998, 153;Coarelli, 2007, 128.
[65] Coulston and Dodge, 2000, 356. See also: Coarelli, 2007, 128.
[66] Coulston and Dodge, 2000, 355. See also: Claridge, 1998, 153;Coarelli, 2007, 128.
[67] Coulston and Dodge, 2000, 355; Coarelli, 2007, 128.
[68] Coulston and Dodge, 2000, 356; Coarelli, 2007, 128.
[69] Harley & Woodward, 1987, 226-7.
[70] Coulston and Dodge, 2000, 355; Coarelli, 2007, 128

identification of buildings and the reconstruction of the map (Fig. 6; Fig. 7). A degree of caution must be applied to the interpretation of the FUR in relation to Republican and early Imperial buildings due to the late date when the map was inscribed. As a result, while the map may aid in allocating a position for particular buildings, the actual form of the buildings and the internal divisions do not necessarily reflect the Republican form of the edifice. An example of this is the Baths of Agrippa which, while initially constructed by Agrippa in 25 BC (Appendix: 5.3.3), underwent extensive reconstruction under Hadrian. As a consequence the FUR preserves the later, more elaborate Imperial plan of the baths and not the Republican format.[71]

In the past fifty years the map has been the subject of a great many interpretations and reconstructions, prime amongst which was the work carried out by Cozza and Gatti.[72] It was as a result of the work of these two eminent Roman archaeologists that the fragments of the FUR were reinterpreted in light of excavations carried out in the early-mid 20th century and a number of buildings on the FUR were reinterpreted. In more recent years the Stanford Digital Forma Urbis Romae Project has made the fragments of the Marble Plan available to the digital community, facilitating new interpretations and reconstitutions.[73] This project also includes the Renaissance drawings along with modern references and bibliography to bring together an invaluable tool for Roman topographical interpretation.

1.3.4. The Regionary Catalogues

The Regionary Catalogues consist of two catalogues, the *Notitia* and the *Curiosum*, both of which were written in the 4th century AD (AD 354 and AD 375 respectively) and which list the buildings contained in the 14 regions created by Augustus in AD 7.[74] Features such as houses, apartment blocks, theatres, aqueducts, bridges and statues are listed and counted in the catalogues, though often the total numbers given do not correspond to the information provided in the catalogues. The Regionary Catalogues appear not to have been used for administration purposes, but rather, may have been used

[71] Yegül, 1992, 133.
[72] Carrettoni, Colini & Cozza et.al., 1960.
[73] http://formaurbis.stanford.edu/index.html.
[74] Nordh, 1949, 86-8; Coarelli, 1997, 13-4; See also: Claridge, 1998, 32; Coulston and Dodge, 2000, 354.

as an early type of guide book to the city of Rome, an earlier version perhaps of the Einsiedeln Itinerary.[75] In the 19th century it had been thought by Jordan that the buildings listed were used as markers to define the limits of the 14 regions, a suggestion that was accepted to some extent by Lanciani.[76] This theory was rightly rejected by Nordh who noted that a number of the buildings listed were contained within the boundaries of each region and that the description of each region began with the term *continent* (*contains*).[77] Nordh has convincingly argued that the original function of the Regionary Catalogues was to list the districts contained within each region, and that at a subsequent date later authors added information about buildings and monuments.[78]

The information provided by the *Notitia* and *Curiosum* is complicated and often contradictory. One of the more important aspects that these sources preserve is the number of seats or places in each of the public buildings such as theatres and stadiums. Garnering information regarding the relative positions of buildings based on the Regionary Catalogues is rather difficult as the listed buildings are not noted in a very clear linear fashion. At the end of the catalogue entry for the Circus Flaminius/Campus Martius, the area is summarised in both the *Notitia* and *Curiosum* as follows:

Streets	35
	35 shrines
	48 *vicomagisters*
	2 curators
	2,777 blocks of flats
	140 houses
	25 grain warehouses
	63 bath houses
	120 cisterns
	20 bakeries/mills
Circumference	32,500 paces

[75] Coulston and Dodge, 2000, 354.
[76] Olinder, 1974, 15; Richardson, 1992, xx.
[77] Richardson, 1992, xx.
[78] Nordh, 1949, 58-67.

While the information provided by the Regionary Catalogues is not directly applicable to the development of the Campus Martius during the Republican period, it does provide a definite reference as to the continued existence of Republican buildings in the 4th century AD. Together with the FUR, the information gathered from archaeological excavation and the information provided by the literary sources it is possible to reconstruct the topographical and thematic development of the Campus Martius from the foundation of Rome until the end of the Republic.

1.4. Introduction to the Building Appendix

The sites and buildings examined in the main body of the thesis are presented in tabular form in an appendix in volume two of this thesis. The appendix has been added as a useful reference tool designed to be used prior to, during and after consultation with the main body of the text and can act as an aid for the cross-referencing of buildings and sites. The buildings within the appendix are listed in the same order as they are presented in the many body of the text and as a result retain the chronological and thematic framework that is applied to the thesis as a whole. Each entry has been assigned a number (for example 1.2.3) which reflects the chapter number in which the building is referenced in volume one of this thesis. When reference is made to an appendix entry within the main body of the text it appears in the form (Appendix: 1.2.3).

The information pertaining to each building entry within the thesis is limited to essential information in the appendix and presented in tabular format for ease of use as a reference guide. Such limitations apply, in particular, to the lists of ancient references, epigraphic and numismatic references, construction materials and extant elements. This appendix is not meant as an exhaustive list of available sources of evidence and readers should direct any further queries and questions towards the relevant section of the main body of the text. Modern references have been limited to entries in the *Lexicon Topigraphicum Urbis Romae* as this is the most up-to-date, accessible and reliable source of information for the buildings of the Campus Martius. One image has been placed within each entry in the appendix in order to locate it visually within the wider context of ancient and modern Rome.

The placing of the buildings and sites examined in this thesis into a tabular appendix provides the opportunity to appraise and investigate the location, function, nature and form of the sites of the Campus Martius in a different way than the text of the thesis allows. This format facilitates the direct comparison of data from a number of different sites and allows a number of sites to be investigated concurrently. While this appendix can be used as a simple adjunct for the main body of the thesis, it also provides the opportunity for future research projects. To date no complete catalogue has been created which lists the buildings and sites of the Campus Martius in association with relevant literary sources. This is due in part to the number of different types of sites and the

complicated intermingled phases of development and re-development. By focusing on the sites of the Campus Martius in chronological order and in a tabular format, the opportunity arises for multiple entries for single buildings, allowing for the comparison of not just one building to another, but of independent phases of development to other phases of development. By building up a catalogue in this way and providing information for several phases of each building, the opportunity will arise to create a comprehensive database of material which can be used for the comparison of various buildings on the Campus Martius to each other. In addition, the creation of such a catalogue or database will allow for direct comparison between the phases of development of the buildings of the Campus Martius with other areas of Rome such as the Forum Romanum.

While such a project is beyond the remit and limitations of this doctoral thesis, the appendix as it stands is a useful tool for an examination of the physical and literary evidence of the development of the Campus Martius and on occasion shows how Rome's cultural interaction with Italy and the wider Mediterranean was visible in the area's physical development. The information has been displayed as clearly and precisely as possible. On occasions when a particular category is inapplicable or where evidence is not available the symbol --- has been used. It should be noted, in particular, that the sections pertaining to the Forma Urbis Romae and the Regionary Catalogues often remain blank. This is in part due to the late date of these sources of information and reflects how frequently the buildings of the Republic had either been demolished or were no longer openly visible in the Campus Martius by the 2nd century AD and 4th century AD respectively. As this appendix does not claim, or attempt to be, an exhaustive account of the physical and literary evidence available for the Campus Martius some sections have remained unfilled as the level of research that was permitted for this doctoral thesis does not always permit the extensive, in-depth analysis of any singular building that a catalogue or database can provide. Nonetheless it remains an important tool for quick references to the information provided about each building and allows for a greater level of cross-referencing.

Conclusion

Due to the complicated nature of the sources of information and the convoluted intercultural contact that existed in the Republican period it is of the utmost importance to define the terms of reference and the language used for an investigation into the topographical and thematic development of the Campus Martius, and Rome in general. By addressing these issues at this early stage the subsequent interpretation and discussion of the evolution of the Campus Martius will not be hindered by drawn out terminological exegeses and definition. Rather, themes such as military training, political competition, leisure activities, religious worship and triumph can all be investigated within well understood and defined phases of time.

The four chapters that follow are divided according to the phases set out in this chapter and are sub-divided by theme and by building. Where at all possible the buildings and topographical development of the Campus Martius are set out chronologically. Over the course of the four phases a complete chronological and thematic developmental history of the ethos and buildings of the Campus Martius is explored. The first phase (Phase One) encompasses the earliest phase of development of the Campus Martius, from Rome's foundation to the beginning of the third century BC. While this period is frequently dismissed as an era in which there were few physical developments within the area, and as a period for which there is little in the way of archaeological or literary evidence, it shall become apparent that the Campus Martius enjoyed significant development in this period, both in terms of military use, cultic activities, political activities and recreational uses. Phase One sets out and explores many trends that continue to develop throughout the subsequent phases and which continued to influence and impact upon the way the Campus Martius was used and viewed in subsequent phases.

Chapter 2: Early Sites of the Campus Martius (Phase One)

Introduction

Phase One of the development on the Campus Martius covers the period from the 8th century BC, when the site of Rome was a cluster of hill top communities, to the beginning of the 3rd century BC. This is a particularly long phase which witnessed Rome's transformation from a small community into a Republican power who held sway over much of central Italy. The area of the Campus Martius endured change on a similarly large scale in Phase One as the open floodplain evolved from an area primarily used for chthonic religions, agriculture and military drills, to an area that provided space for political gatherings, religious worship and the census of the Roman population. As such it evolved into a functional space, shaped to reflect and meet the needs of the evolving city of Rome and its inhabitants.

Phase One of the Campus Martius, from the foundation of Rome to the early 3rd century BC, is a difficult period of time to investigate as the ancient literary sources are far removed from the period of time under consideration and the archaeological record for the phase is often uncertain and difficult to interpret.[1] Similarly, the FUR and the Regionary Catalogues aid little in reconstructing the topography of the Campus Martius in this early period. The best literary references for the development of the Campus Martius in Phase One come from the first ten books of Livy (written in the last two decades of the 1st century BC) and the first eleven books of Dionysus of Halicarnassus (written in the 1st century AD).[2] These books, together with epigraphic and numismatic evidence, provide more information about the Campus Martius in this early period than may initially be assumed. Be this as it may the interpretation of the form and function of buildings must be undertaken cautiously due to the nature and date of the sources. Nevertheless, it is possible to determine a number of facts regarding the nature and function of the Campus Martius in Phase One and determine the influencing factors behind its development as well as the way it was used and viewed by the inhabitants of the city of Rome.

---

[1] Rehak, 2006, 9; Coarelli, 2007, 264.
[2] Cornell, 1995, 2-3; Forsythe, 2005, 66-7.

2.1 Defining the Campus Martius

In order to investigate those influences which had the greatest impact on the development of the Campus Martius, the area that constituted the Campus Martius must first be defined and described. The boundaries of the Campus Martius altered through Phase One to Phase Four but consisted generally of both natural geographical features, such as the river Tiber to the west and the Pincian and Quirinal hills to the north-east and south-east respectively, as well as purposefully constructed man-made boundaries, such as the Via Flaminia, constructed in 220 BC by C. Flaminius (Livy, *Epit.* 20; Strabo, 5.217) (Fig. 8).[3] Even in antiquity the precise limits of the Campus Martius and the way in which it was referred to in the literary sources were somewhat vague.[4] The name 'Campus Martius' was never officially conferred on the area. Common literary references to the area include: the area '*between the city and the Tiber*' (Livy, 2.5.2; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 5.12.2), and the '*Ager of Tarquinius*' (Livy, 2.5).[5] Ovid describes the Campus Martius as the '*grassy Campus whose side is pressed by the waters of Tiber*' (Ovid, *Fast.* 3.519-20) while on many occasions it was simply known by the name 'Campus' (Livy, 40.52.4; Cicero, *Cat.* 2.1.1; Valerius Maximus, 4.6.4).[6] In 7 BC Augustus divided the city of Rome into fourteen administrative regions, with Region IX consisting of the Campus Martius and the Circus Flaminius (Suetonius, *Aug.* 30.1; Dio, 55.8).[7] Even at this point the area was not officially known by the name 'Campus Martius'.[8] Certainly by the time Suetonius was writing (in the late 1st - early 2nd century AD) the area was known as the Campus Martius though evidence suggests that this was simply a colloquial name, as it does not appear in any official writings or documents (Suetonius, *Caes.* 39*; Nero.* 12).[9] By the 4th century AD the Regionary Catalogues listed the Campus Martius as part of *Regio IX Circus Flaminius,* suggesting that the toponym Circus Flaminius was applied more generally to the entire area of the Tiber floodplain, and not just to the specific area in the south-western corner of the Campus Martius.[10]

---

[3] *LTUR* V, 135 (Patterson).
[4] *LTUR* I, 222-2 (Wiseman); Coarelli, 1997, 5. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 92; Rehak, 2006, 10; Coarelli, 2007, 261.
[5] *LTUR* I, 220 (Wiseman); Coarelli, 1997, 5. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 92.
[6] Coarelli, 1997, 6-7.
[7] *LTUR* IV, 197 (Fraschetti). See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 444; Favro, 1996, 136-7.
[8] *LTUR* I, 220 (Wiseman). See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 445.
[9] Platner & Ashby, 1926, 445; Richardson, 1992, 65-6.
[10] Nordh, 1949, 86-8; Coarelli, 1997, 13-4.

For the purpose of this study the area of the Campus Martius consisted of the area north of the Forum Boarium and Capitoline Hill, south of modern Piazza del Popolo and was defined on its western side by the Tiber. In Phase One the eastern boundary of the Campus Martius was marked by the Pincian and Quirinal hills, but by Phase Two the construction of the Via Flaminia created a man-made eastern border, defining the third side of the triangular shaped floodplain in the bend of the river Tiber that was the Campus Martius. (Fig. 9; Fig. 10)

The literary sources can be used as the basis for a strict topographical definition of the boundaries of the Campus Martius.[11] Wiseman has chosen this method to define the Campus Martius and in doing so places a northern limit on the Campus Martius in the area of Via Tomacelli (Fig. 11).[12] Such a strict interpretation of the Campus Martius is not without its drawbacks. For example, because Suetonius notes that the Mausoleum of Augustus was located '*inter Flaminiam viam ripamque*' (Suetonius, *Aug.* 100.3-4), Wiseman chooses to locate the area of the Mausoleum of Augustus beyond the boundary of the Campus Martius.[13] While this is a very precise and accurate interpretation of the literary sources, it fails to take into account the perspective of the 1st century AD inhabitant of the city. It seems unlikely that such a clear and defined view of the area would have been prescribed to at ground level. Given the scale of the mausoleum and its dominance of the northern skyline it seems more than likely that the population of the city would have associated the tomb with the Campus Martius and with the other Augustan construction projects of the Campus Martius.[14] Given the vast period of time under consideration in this work, the differing reliability of the literary sources and the variances in the perspective of the individual in Rome, it is, in my opinion, wiser to accept a much broader definition of the Campus Martius. For the purposes of this study the northern limit of the Campus Martius may be considered to have been placed in the area to the north of the Mausoleum of Augustus, in the area of modern Piazza De Popolo where the river Tiber bends westward towards the foot of the Pincian Hill, narrowing the floodplain considerably (Fig. 11).[15] This definition of the northern limit of the Campus Martius means that in total the Campus Martius measured 2km from north to south and

[11] *LTUR* I, 220-1 (Wiseman).
[12] *LTUR* I, 220 (Wiseman).
[13] *LTUR* I, 221 (Wiseman).
[14] Davies, 2004, 50; Rehak, 2006, 36-7; Hope, 2007, 142.
[15] Rehak, 2006, 36-7. See also: Richardson, 1992, 65.

almost 2km from east to west at its widest part, covering an area of approximately 600 acres in a roughly triangular shaped area.[16]

2.1.1. Natural Boundaries

In Phase One the eastern and western boundaries of the Campus Martius were defined by easily visible geographical features. The river Tiber marked the western boundary of the area while the Pincian and Quirinal hills created a natural eastern border.[17] The Campus Martius was a natural floodplain for the Tiber and as a result suffered frequent flooding (Livy, 2.5.2, 38.28.4; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 5.13.2).[18] These destructive floods were hugely influential in determining not only the physical nature of the Campus Martius but the events and functions that it would facilitate over future centuries. The frequent flooding of the river created a naturally level area which would provide open land for recreational pastimes as well as promote the construction of large scale entertainment complexes such as the theatre and portico of Pompey (Appendix: 5.2.2; 5.2.3). The proximity to the Tiber should be interpreted equally as a hindrance and an advantage for the area as it was as a result of the frequent flooding that a large tract of land available for recreational and political activities came into being within walking distance of the centre of Rome. The frequent flooding also deterred the construction of residential construction programmes, leaving the area to develop a more monumental profile and provide building opportunities away from the high density urban areas of central Rome. The river did not only influence the geography and topography of the area but also social and religious associations. The close proximity to the Tiber encouraged the development of a number of cults dedicated to water deities who were worshipped in the *area sacra* of Largo Argentina from Phase Two onwards (early 3rd century BC to mid 2nd century BC).[19]

To the east and southeast of the floodplain the slopes of the Capitoline, Quirinal and Pincian hills bordered the Campus Martius. Due to the ongoing process of erosion these

---

[16] Rehak, 2006, 10.
[17] *LTUR* I 220 (Wiseman); Coarelli, 1997, 3-4. See also: Claridge, 1998, 177; Rehak, 2006, 10; Coarelli, 2007, 261.
[18] Coarelli, 1997, 3; Heiken, Funiciello & De Rita, 2005, 63; Rehak, 2006, 10; Aldrete, 2007, 33-4.
[19] *LTUR* IV, 81 (Coarelli); *LTUR* IV, 347 (Burgers); Coarelli, 1997, 10; Heiken, Funiciello & De Rita, 2005, 85.

hills were partially responsible, along with the alluvial deposits from the Tiber floodwaters, for the gradual and sustained increase in the ground level of the Campus Martius.[20] This increase can be seen in the depth at which a great number of buildings on the Campus Martius lie, including the temples of Largo Argentina and the Pantheon and is particularly visible in the areas of Piazza Venezia, Piazza Pilota and Piazza di Spagna (Fig. 4).[21] Between the third century BC and the first century AD the ground level of the Campus Martius rose by 4m and seventeen major floods are recorded in the sources (though it may be assumed that many more, possibly smaller, floods went unrecorded).[22] The river continued to flood on a regular basis throughout antiquity and the modern age until the river was canalised in the early 19th century.[23] Between them the Tiber boundary to the west and the Pincian and Quirinal hills to the east aided in physically defining the area in Phase One and permanently impacted upon the functions facilitated by the Campus Martius.

2.1.2. Artificial Boundaries

While from an early date the Campus Martius was defined by its natural borders, it was the artificially imposed boundaries that most obviously determined the way in which Romans interacted with the Campus Martius and used the available space. The *pomerium,* a symbolic boundary line that marked the Campus Martius as external to the city of Rome, defined the southern limit of the Campus Martius from early in the Regal period right through to the Imperial period.

A *pomerium* was a line marked in the earth that defined the space in which a city could be founded and auspices could be taken. As such it was applied to other sites, as well as to Rome and was frequently required for the foundation of a colony (Servius, *ad. Aen.* 1.422; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 2.50; Festus, 1.444).[24] The line was created by a plough, pulled by a bull, and the resultant furrow represented the trench of the symbolic

---

[20] Heiken, Funiciello & De Rita, 2005, 7; Aldrete, 2007, 178.
[21] Heiken, Funiciello & De Rita, 2005, 90; Aldrete, 2007, 41, 178. See also: Coulston and Dodge, 2000, 3.
[22] Claridge, 1998, 179; Aldrete, 2007, 96.
[23] Taylor, 2000, 81; Heiken, Funiciello & De Rita, 2005, 78; Aldrete, 2006, 225. See also: Coulston and Dodge, 2000, 2; Rehak, 2006, 36.
[24] *LTUR* IV, 97 (Andreussi); Beard, North & Price, 1989a, 177, 179; Patterson, 2000a, 90. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 392; Cornell, 1995, 203.

fortifications of the city while the earth represented the earthworks.[25] As the *pomerium* was a particularly symbolic boundary it is possible that it also represented a purification rite which cleansed all those who crossed over it. The religious association with the auspices and the possible association with purification rendered the *pomerium* a religious limit and not a defensive boundary.[26] According to Plutarch (*Rom.* 11.1-4) Romulus was the first person to undertake the ritual to create a *pomerium* for Rome. Tacitus (*Ann.* 12.24) recalls the route of the *pomerium* as it was believed to have been set out by Romulus, stating that the *pomerium* ran from the Ara Maxima, around the base of the Palatine Hill to the altar of Consus, the *Curiae Veteres* and the Sacellum Larum and the Forum Romanum.[27] This route seems rather unlikely as it does not correspond to the route as described by Varro (*L.L.* 5.143) but rather closely resembles the route of the *Lupercal*.[28].

As the *pomerium* was symbolic and liable to alteration it was marked by a series of marker stones called *cippi*, a number of which have been found in the Campus Martius. The exact line that the *pomerium* followed in Phases One to Four to the south of the Campus Martius is still open to debate.[29] As the *pomerium* was not aligned with urbanism, nor with urban sprawl, it did not move in line with the growth of the city of Rome.[30] For example, when the Servian wall was constructed around Rome in the 6th century BC the *pomerium* was not extended in order to correspond with it, but instead remained around the Palatine Hill.[31] It was not until 80 BC that the *pomerium* was extended, on this occasion by Sulla (Tacitus, *Ann.* 12.23; Gellius, 13.14.3).[32] The extent to which it was extended at this date is unknown, as are the recorded enlargements by Julius Caesar (Dio, 43.50) and Augustus (Tacitus, *Ann.* 13.23; Dio, 5.6).[33] The only definitive and traceable enlargements of the *pomerium* are attributable to Claudius (Tacitus, *Ann.* 12.24), Vespasian (*CIL* VI 31538a) and Hadrian (*CIL* VI 1233a).[34] These extensions were marked by the placing of *cippi* throughout the Campus Martius, a

---

[25] *LTUR* IV, 96-7 (Andreussi); Beard, North & Price, 1989a, 157. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 392; Richardson, 1992, 293.
[26] *LTUR* IV, 98 (Andreussi); Beard, North & Price, 1989b, 179; Patterson, 2000a, 90.
[27] *LTUR* IV, 98 (Andreussi); Richardson, 1992, 293.
[28] *LTUR* IV, 98 (Andreussi). See also: Platner & Ashby, 1923, 393; Richardson, 1992, 293.
[29] Poe, 1984, 57-8; Beard, North & Price, 1989a, 177; Patterson, 2000a, 89.
[30] Beard, North & Price, 1989b, 176-7; Cornell, 1995, 199.
[31] Patterson, 2000a, 88. See also: Stambaugh, 1988, 190.
[32] Cornell, 1995, 203; Patterson, 2000a, 86. See also: Richardson, 1992, 294.
[33] Beard, North & Price, 1989a, 177; Patterson, 2000a, 86. See also: Richardson, 1992, 294.
[34] Poe, 1984, 59-74; Beard, North & Price, 1989a, 177. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 395-6; Richardson, 1992, 294-5.

number of which have been found, though the route that they marked is highly debatable.[35]

The *pomerium* marked not only the area in which the official auspices could be taken, but also the area from which a number of activities were excluded. In particular this included activities and rites associated with the military, again emphasising the symbolism of purity embodied by the *pomerium*. For example, it was not permissible for the army to cross the *pomerium* while bearing arms, nor was a magistrate's *imperium* fully applicable within the *pomerium* (Dio, 53.12.3-4; 39.39.6-7).[36] A magistrate with pro-consular power was thereby forced to hand over power once he crossed the line of the *pomerium* during the triumphal procession.[37] As the *comitia centuriata* were a representation of the army they were not allowed to meet within the *pomerium,* and as a result met and voted on the Campus Martius (Cicero, *De Re Pub.* 2.22.39-40; Livy, 1.43).[38] Religious concerns were also associated with the ritual boundary and particular deities were not allowed to be worshipped within the *pomerium,* for example Bellona, the goddess of war and frenzy in battle, whose temple was located in the southern reaches of the Circus Flaminius.[39] In addition, cults that were thought too foreign to be allowed onto the auspicious ground of the *pomerium* were forced to remain in extra-pomerial locations such as the Campus Martius, these included the Egyptian goddess Isis (Dio, 53.2.4) and chthonic deities such as Dis Pater and Proserpina (Festus, 478L), all of whom were worshiped on the Campus Martius.[40] Acts and practices that were deemed unsuitable for pomerial Rome included the burial of the dead, and as a consequence a number of tombs were constructed on the roads that led out of the centre of Rome, including on the Via Flaminia (Cicero, *De. Leg.* 2.58).[41] Theatres with permanent seating were also not allowed to be constructed within the *pomerium* possibly due to a fear by the leaders of Rome of mass congregation and resultant political insubordination (see section: 5.2) (Valerius Maximus, 2.4.2).[42]

---

[35] Poe, 1984, 55; Beard, North & Price, 1989a, 177; Beard, North & Price, 1989b, 95; Patterson, 2000a, 89; Cornell, 1995, 203. See also: Richardson, 1992, 294-5.
[36] *LTUR* IV, 99 (Andreussi); Versnel, 1970, 191; Künzl, 1988, 30; Beard, North & Price, 1989a, 179.
[37] Versnel, 1970, 191; Künzl, 1988, 32-4; Patterson, 2000a, 91; Rehak, 2006, 4.
[38] Patterson, 1992, 194; Patterson, 2000a, 91; Bead, North & Price, 1989a, 179; Ross Taylor, 1990, 47; Cornell, 1995, 195; Mouritsen, 2001, 27; Millar, 2002, 16; Rehak, 2006, 4.
[39] *LTUR* I, 191 (Viscogliosi); Coarelli, 1997, 392. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 82; Richardson, 1992, 58.
[40] *LTUR* IV, 100 (Andreussi); Poe, 1984, 76; Beard, North & Price, 1989a, 180; Patterson, 2000a, 91-2; Contra Ziolkowski, 1992, 278 who argues that exclusions were more likely associated with a lack of space within pomerial Rome.
[41] Beard, North & Price, 1989a, 180; Patterson, 2000a, 92.
[42] *LTUR* IV, 99 (Andreussi); Gruen, 1992, 205; Coleman, 2000, 220; Sear, 2006, 54-5.

The Campus Martius facilitated and housed religious, military, political and other aspects of daily Roman life that were deemed unsuitable for commemoration or promotion within the sacred boundary of the *pomerium*.[43] This is not to say that those elements housed by the Campus Martius were deemed any less important for the Romans on a daily basis. In fact it seem likely that the popularity of the buildings and activities facilitated by the Campus Martius allowed the symbolic and invisible border that was the *pomerium* to be overlooked by the inhabitants of the city, who would not have interacted with the *pomerium* in the same way as the Servian wall. The invisibility of the *pomerium* does not detract from its importance and an examination of those elements housed within the *pomerium* and those elements housed in the Campus Martius can shed light upon the religious and socio-political morals of Rome during the early Republic. It can also aid in an interpretation of how the later ideas of Roman Republican *gravitas* and morality came to be formed.

In comparison to the *pomerium*, the Via Flaminia was a highly visible, purposefully and physically constructed, boundary of the Campus Martius. Constructed in 221 BC (in Phase Two) it covered the route that is now preserved by the Via del Corso (Livy, *Per.* 20; Strabo, 5.2.10) (Fig. 11).[44] Constructed by C. Flaminius, it facilitated movement of people from the Capitoline Hill in the south to Rimini in the north.[45] The location of the road meant that the eastern-most area of the Campus Martius, at the foot of the Pincian and Quirinal hills became physically separated from the rest of the Campus Martius.[46] The separation was one that was recognised two centuries later by Augustus when the emperor re-organised the city into fourteen regions, with the area to the west of Via Flaminia designated as Region IX and the area to the east of Via Flaminia designated as Region VII.[47] By the time of the Regionary Catalogues (in the 4th century AD) Region VII was known as '*Via Lata*'.[48] As the Via Flaminia was not present in Phase One the Pincian and Quirinal represented the eastern boundary. Together the natural boundaries of the hills and river, in conjunction with the symbolic border of the *pomerium* combined to exert an influence over the Campus Martius and define its borders.

---

[43] Beard, North & Price, 1989a, 178-9; Rehak, 2006, 9.
[44] *LTUR* V, 135-7 (Patterson); Richardson, 1992, 415; Palmer, 1990, 58-9; Laurence, 1999, 22. See also: Rehak, 2006, 10.
[45] Wiseman, 1993, 220; Laurence, 1999, 22.
[46] Aldrete, 2004, 13.
[47] *LTUR* IV, 200-1 (Palombi); Favro, 1996 136-7. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 446-7.
[48] *LTUR* IV, 200-1 (Palombi). See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 446-7.

2.1.3. Flooding

Construction was ongoing on the Campus Martius from 435 BC onwards (when the Villa Publica was constructed), and the rising floodwaters of the Tiber continued to inundate the area and cause havoc on a frequent basis. Even though these floods had a detrimental impact on the city no attempt was ever made in antiquity to prevent flooding, though Julius Caesar did attempt to re-route the river as it passed around the Campus Martius (Cicero, *Att.* 13.33).[49] Embankments were not constructed to halt the devastating floods until the 19th century.[50] While it is important to consider the Tiber as a border of the Campus Martius, it is also important to investigate the effects of frequent flooding to evaluate the impact it had on the physical development of the Campus Martius.

Floods are often mentioned in surviving literary sources, though these sources date from the Augustan period and later and do not always accurately reflect the frequency and severity of floods in Rome in the Republican period, nor the manner in which they affected the Campus Martius directly. The references to floods provided by Livy (38.28), Dio (39.61.1-2), Pliny the Elder (*Epist.* 8.17) and Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.76) are not all inclusive and by no means incorporate the innumerable floods that occurred in Rome and affected the Campus Martius throughout the Republic and Empire.[51] A recent attempt to calculate the frequency of flooding in ancient Rome suggests that there was one 'exceptional' flood roughly every twenty years, i.e. a flood of great severity that did not subside for a week, and that for every 'exceptional' flood there were between four and five 'significant' floods, i.e. floods of a lesser severity where water did not subside for a few days.[52] Taking the average life span of a Roman inhabitant in the late Republic or early Empire at thirty years, an average Roman citizen would have experienced one exceptional and six or seven significant floods in their lifetime.[53] Flooding was so common and unremarkable that the literary sources fail to make reference to every one. Rather, authors such as Livy and Dio tend only to make a note of a flood if it was exceptionally powerful or, more

---

[49] Robinson, 1992, 17; Richardson, 1992, 405; Dodge, 2000, 169. See also: Stambaugh, 1988, 43.
[50] Coulston and Dodge, 2000, 2; Taylor, 2000, 81; 2; Heiken, Funiciello & De Rita, 2005, 7; Rehak, 2006, 36; Aldrete, 2007, 225.
[51] Heiken, Funiciello & De Rita, 2005, 63; Aldrete, 2007, 33, n.17.
[52] Aldrete, 2007, 62, 81.
[53] For the average Roman life span see: Harlow & Laurence, 2002, 8.

commonly, if it affected a particular rite or ritual that was itself worthy of note.[54] For example Ovid (*Fast.* 519-520) recorded that it was customary to move the *Equirria* from the Campus Martius to the Caelian Hill when the Campus Martius flooded, while in AD 12 the *ludi Martialies* were held in the Forum of Augustus instead of the Circus Maximus, due to the inundation of the circus (Dio, 56.27.4).[55] As the Campus Martius lay only 5 'metres above sea level' (or 5 masl) in the Republican period and was bordered by the Tiber, it would have been one of the first areas of Rome to flood when the waters of the Tiber rose. Hills, such as the Capitoline and the Palatine, would have been spared the damages of the flood water.

There are a total of nine references in the ancient literary sources to the Tiber flooding a 'flat' or 'level' area, though this is not to say that all nine of these references refer to the Campus Martius.[56] Floods are recorded on flat/level land in the years 241 BC (Orosius 4.11.6; Aug. *De Civ. Dei* 3.18), 189 BC (Livy, 38.28), 54 BC (Dio, 39.61.1-2), 27 BC (Dio, 53.20.1), AD 15 (Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.76), during Trajan's Reign, (Pliny, *Epist.* 8.17), and in AD 371.[57] The Forum Boarium and the Forum Romanum, as well as the area around the base of the Palatine Hill, were also flat and liable to flooding and were equally worthy of note in the sources when they flooded (Fig. 12). However, given the very low lying level of the Campus Martius it is highly likely that should any of the aforementioned flat areas flood, then the Campus Martius would also have been submerged. Consequently all nine passages refer, either directly or indirectly, to a flooding of the Campus Martius.

Medieval accounts of flooding of the Campus Martius, for example Bede (*Mai. Chron.* 589) along with other medieval sources such as 13th century stone flood markers, record not only the severity of the flood but also how long they lasted, how high the water reached and where they affected (Fig. 16).[58] They also focus on the fact that the flooding started to the north of the floodplain and worked southwards, following the natural direction of the river flow.[59] This was a natural direction for the inundation of the area to begin because as part of the river's natural course the water was forced around the bend

[54] Aldrete, 2007, 25.
[55] Aldrete, 2007, 79.
[56] Aldrete, 2007, 33 n.17.
[57] Aldrete, 2007, 63.
[58] Heiken, Funiciello & De Rita, 2005, 61-3; Aldrete, 2007, 63-4. See also: Taylor, 2000, 151 n.59.
[59] Aldrete, 2007, 39. See also: Taylor, 2000, 133.

that formed the western and northern boundary of the Campus Martius (Fig. 12). Should the water levels have risen, the first point at which the water would have breached its banks and flowed onto the Campus Martius was the point at which it was under greatest pressure, namely at the start of the bend in the river. An important point to bear in mind is that the date of these sources of information is medieval, and it is likely that the urban environment of the medieval Campus Martius influenced the manner in which the area flooded. However, given the nature of the floodplain and the course of the river, flooding in the area would have been initiated in much the same way as floods in the Roman period.

During the Roman period it did not take a particularly substantial rise in water levels for the Tiber to burst its banks and for the Campus Martius to flood. At present, the Tiber flows through modern Rome at a level of between 5-7 masl, while the average height of the Campus Martius is 18-20 masl, necessitating an 11m rise in water levels for flooding to begin. During the Roman period the Tiber flowed at 6 to 6.5 masl, while the ground level of the Republican Campus Martius was 10 masl.[60] As a result a rise in water levels of as little as 3.5m would have flooded the Campus Martius.[61] A recent study has calculated the scale of flooding in Rome in the Augustan period and led to the following conclusion: A 'minor' flood occurred when the Tiber reached a level of just 10 masl, just 4m above the regular level of the river (Fig. 13). When the Tiber waters reached 15 masl then Rome would have witnessed a 'major' flood, while on the rare occasion that the Tiber reached a staggering 20 masl then Rome would have been ravaged by an 'exceptional' flood (Fig. 14).[62]

The severity of flooding in Rome influenced the impact that the floodwaters had on the city and on the Campus Martius in particular. The direction of river flow meant that a minor flood started to make inroads onto land in the northern Campus Martius and made its way southwards, likely rejoining the river Tiber in the area around Tiber Island.[63] This 'minor' flood resulted in the flooding of 70% of the Campus Martius with slightly higher areas, for example around Monte dei Cenci, escaping most of the water.[64] Given that the ground level in the Augustan era was several feet higher than had been the case in the

[60] Aldrete, 2007, 41, 61.
[61] Aldrete, 2007, 41.
[62] Aldrete, 2007, 45-50.
[63] Aldrete, 2007, 46.
[64] Wiseman, 1974, 10.

early to mid Republic, it is likely that during the early and mid-Republic an increase in water levels to 10 masl resulted in a near 100% inundation of the Campus Martius. Thus, as a natural floodplain the Campus Martius was naturally the most flood prone region of Rome. This is of no great surprise, and neither was it surprising for the inhabitants of Rome who would have witnessed some level of flooding of the Campus Martius on an annual basis. Yet the Campus Martius continued to evolve into an area that was utilised for the construction of temples, porticoes, bath houses and theatres. The question remains then as to why the Romans chose to build on such a site, and whether or not the floods influenced the nature of the buildings constructed on the Campus Martius?

First and foremost, throughout the Republic the ongoing urbanisation of central Rome led to a scarcity of space for significantly visible construction projects within the *pomerium.* Consequently a number of triumphant generals chose to construct victory monuments on the Campus Martius, not only because their temples could be placed close to the triumphal route, but because the open space that surrounded their temples aided in the monumentalisation of the building.[65] Also, the customs that restricted personal expression and self-promotion within the *pomerium* were not as severe on the Campus Martius. The risks associated with flooding were therefore far outweighed by the many advantages of building a personal monument close to the route of triumph and in a conspicuous and symbolic area associated with the military.

An examination of a map of Rome in the Imperial period makes it quite clear that the vast majority of entertainment buildings located within the city were constructed on the Campus Martius and similar areas that were prone to frequent flooding such as the Circus Flaminius (3.1.3).[66] The earliest entertainment venues of Rome, for example the horse racing arenas of the Trigarium (Appendix: 2.3.2) and the Circus Maximus, were both located on very low lying areas, the former in the north-western corner of the Campus Martius.[67] It is likely that during the early Republic these arenas did not require permanent construction elements like seats and stands. It was only later that the Circus Maximus constructed stands, first in wood (*fori publici*) and later, by the 1st century AD in stone.[68] There is no indication these facilities were relocated at any point in order to

---

[65] Trigger, 1990, 122.
[66] Heiken, Funiciello & De Rita, 2005, 63.
[67] *LTUR* 1, 272-3 (Ciancio Rossetto); *LTUR* V, 89 (Coarelli); See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 541; Palmer, 1990, 28-33.
[68] *LTUR* I, 272-3 (Ciancio Rossetto); Coarelli, 2007, 323. See also: Claridge, 1998, 264.

avoid floods. During the late Republic the Campus Martius also witnessed the construction of three permanent stone theatres, all of which were located within the reach of floodwaters. The inauguration of the Theatre of Balbus (Appendix: 5.4.2) in 13 BC was itself affected by a flood, as recorded by Dio (54.25.4), who reported that the theatre had to be reached by boat on the evening of the inauguration (Suetonius, *Aug.* 29).[69] Obviously the flooding did not deter the construction of large scale entertainment complexes, nor victory temples, on the Campus Martius.

Large scale entertainment venues were particularly capable of withstanding flooding if certain precautions were taken. Firstly, the scale of the buildings rendered them less likely to be damaged by floods. Buildings such as the Theatre of Balbus (Appendix: 5.4.2) and the Theatre of Pompey (Appendix: 5.2.1) were unlikely to be severely damaged by floodwaters and were unlikely to suffer the problems of weakened foundations and substructures that smaller buildings were likely to incur during a flood.[70] Secondly, the utilisation of durable building material like tufa, marble and travertine meant that these buildings were stronger than the concrete buildings located in other, drier, parts of Rome. The use of marble and travertine as a building material itself is significant and can be interpreted in light of the competitive nature of late Republican politics. The use of these materials was not only practical but also served to promote and advertise the altruism of Rome's patrons who paid for these expensive and luxurious materials.

The Campus Martius witnessed the construction of permanent buildings, in the form of temples and entertainment complexes from as early as the third century BC, all of which were constructed in an area renowned for flooding. However, the symbolic association of the area with religious cults, military triumph and political self promotion, along with the relative freedoms granted by the area in comparison to areas such as the Forum Romanum, Palatine and Capitoline far outweighed the dangers presented by the waters of the Tiber. The power of the Tiber could be rebuffed with the use of strong building materials, ensuring that the visible, physical statements of political and religious Roman power survived the elemental forces of the river. The Tiber was then, in part, responsible for the monumentalisation of the Campus Martius, for had it not been for the fact that the area remained for the large part unsuitable for residential housing, then the area would

[69] Beacham, 1999, 120; Aldrete, 2007, 24-5. See also: Claridge, 1998, 220; Sear, 2006, 65.
[70] Heiken, Funiciello & De Rita, 2005, 63.

have developed in a far different way, and arguably would have been far less monumental.[71]

[71] For lack of residential housing see: Evans, 1982, 409; Evans, 1994, 107-9; Taylor, 2000, 43-7; Heiken, Funiciello & De Rita, 2005, 63.

2.2. The Early Functions of the Campus Martius

From Phase One onwards the Campus Martius was used for cultic activities, military drills, political voting, leisure activities and agriculture. As such it was as a multi-functional area from an early date. Due to the nature of these various activities it is most frequently the case that the functions of the Campus Martius are recorded in the literary sources alone as they leave little or no trace in the archaeological record, nor on the FUR or in the Regionary Catalogues. Be this as it may, what is known about the early Campus Martius indicates that the early functions of the area influenced not only the manner in which the area was used in later phases, but even the name by which the area became known.

2.2.1. Mars and Agriculture

The name 'Campus Martius' derives from the earliest association of the floodplain with Mars, the god of war and agriculture.[72] It is known from the ancient literary sources (including Livy, 1.16.1; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 2.56.2) that the Roman troops who honoured and worshipped Mars gathered on the floodplain in order to muster and practice manoeuvres in Phase One. The open level field close to the centre of Rome but symbolically separated from it by the *pomerium* was a perfect spot for military drills, manoeuvres and congregations. Therefore, the troops could gather while still bearing arms before crossing the sacred boundary in order to celebrate a triumph.[73] From the beginning of the Republic onwards the *comitia centuriata,* which was itself a committee founded in a military capacity, gathered on the Campus Martius in order to vote (Cicero, *De Re Pub.* 2.22.39-40; Livy, 1.43), cementing from early on in Phase One the relationship between the Campus Martius and political activity, a theme that would continue to grow in importance throughout the Roman Republic.[74] While the association between Mars and warfare is commonly recognised, there were many other aspects of the deity's character that made him a fitting god to be honoured on the Campus Martius. In

---

[72] *LTUR* I, 222 (Wiseman); Rehak, 2006, 11.
[73] *LTUR* IV, 99 (Andreussi); Versnel, 1970, 191; Beard, North & Price, 1989a, 179.
[74] Bead, North & Price, 1989a, 179; Ross Taylor, 1990, 47; Patterson, 1992, 194; Cornell, 1995, 195; Patterson, 2000a, 91; Mouritsen, 2001, 27; Rehak, 2006, 4.

many respects he can be considered to be a multi-functional god, and a reflection of the multi-functional nature of the Campus Martius from as early as Phase One.

The early rural and agricultural environment of the Campus Martius in Phase One is preserved by a number of authors, including Dionysius of Halicarnassus (5.13) who noted that horses were kept in the area, and the Scholia Juvenal (6.528) which suggested that the area was used for the keeping of sheep.[75] The growing of grain on the Campus Martius is preserved in the story of Tarquinius Superbus who, according to the version of the myth recorded by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (5.13.2) and Servius (*ad Aen.* 9.272), was granted ownership of the Campus Martius by public decree and grew his own crops on it.[76] Of course such a reference must be interpreted with great caution, not only due to the fact that the surviving versions date to the Imperial period, but also because the sources are relating a traditional, perhaps even a mythical, event. Nonetheless, the Campus Martius would certainly have been capable of providing land for agricultural uses, and was likely quite fertile due to the frequent flooding of the area and the ongoing deposits of alluvial material though it must be assumed that animals were moved to higher ground when the area was likely to flood and that crops were often lost to floods.

Upon the expulsion of the Tarquins from Rome, the grain was burnt and the land of the Campus Martius was re-taken by the people of Rome (Livy, 2.5.3-4).[77] The traditional date by which the Campus Martius came into public ownership is thus preserved in the sources as 509 BC, when the 'Etruscan' kings were expelled from Rome.[78] Another tradition, preserved by Pliny the Elder (*H.N.* 34.25), suggests that the land was given into public ownership as a gift by a Vestal Virgin named Gaia Taracia or by Acca Larentia.[79] Even allowing for this tradition, by the beginning of the Republic the Campus Martius was clearly an area owned by the Roman people as a whole. It was not until the time of Sulla that private ownership of land was allowed on the flood plain (Orosius, 5.18.27; Livy, 4.22.7).[80]

---

[75] Rehak, 2007, 11.
[76] Wiseman, 1993, 222. See also: Rehak, 2006, 11; Coarelli, 2007, 263.
[77] *LTUR* I, 222 (Wiseman); See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 92; Richardson, 1992, 210; Coarelli, 1997, 136.
[78] *LTUR* I, 222 (Wiseman); Coarelli, 1997, 136-48.
[79] *LTUR* I, 222 (Wiseman); Coarelli, 1997, 143-8. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 92.
[80] Purcell, 1996, 185. See also: Richardson, 1992, 66.

From as early as the 7th century BC the developing hill-top communities of Rome would have required land on which to grow crops for the community and to provide pasture for their animals.[81] Such land was often held as *ager publicus*, or public land, and was held by the public for the grazing of animals and the cultivation of crops.[82] It is possible that at the beginning of Phase One the Campus Martius was considered *ager publicus*. The Campus Martius would have suited such a role perfectly due to the fact that it was a level area with plenty of soil which was close to the Palatine and close to an ample supply of fresh water. While the frequent flooding of the area must have certainly hindered the growing crops at particular times of the year, it would have been possible to keep animals on the land. The natural topography of the Campus Martius and the indications in the literary sources leaves little doubt that in its earliest phase the Campus Martius was used for cultivation and animal husbandry.

The importance of the god Mars for the Campus Martius is reflected in the name given to the area and the many altars and shrines dedicated to him in the area (Livy, 1.44.1-2).[83] Like his Greek counterpart Ares, Mars is most commonly associated with war, conflict and upheaval, and is not seen primarily as a god associated with fertility and agriculture.[84] Consequently, the toponym 'Campus Martius' can easily be interpreted as a purely militaristic name defining an area in which the god of war was worshipped in a location associated with military exercise and voting. However, further investigation into the sources indicates that Mars was often associated with war and agriculture at the same time.[85] Evidence for this comes from Cato the Elder's *Book on Agriculture* (*Agr.* 141-2) in which a prayer is addressed to Mars to watch over and protect the crops and animals of a farmer.[86] The origin of the association between Mars, the god of war and Mars the god of agricultural protection is rather uncertain. It is possible that the association developed as a result of Mars protecting lands while his worshippers were away at war, or simply that he was a god who looked after those whose main pursuits were war and agriculture.[87] Either way, the origin of the early connection remains uncertain. One clear association between Mars and agriculture during the Republic is preserved in the Roman calendar. The month of March, named in honour of the god Mars was the first month in the Roman

[81] Cornell, 1995, 81; Smith, 2000, 23-4. See also: Stambaugh, 1988, 143-4; Forsythe, 2005, 80-3.
[82] Cornell, 1995, 269; Smith, 1996, 116-7. See also: Richardson, 1992, 66-7; Rehak, 2006, 11.
[83] Ross Taylor, 1990, 48. See also: Richardson, 1992, 245.
[84] Beard, North & Price, 1989a, 15-6, 43.
[85] Scullard, 1981, 84-5; Beard, North & Price, 1989a, 15-6, 43; Fowler, 1969, 126.
[86] Scullard, 1981, 84-5; Beard, North & Price, 1989a, 15-6, 43.
[87] Scullard, 1981, 84.

Republican year, and as a result was associated with the dawning of a new spring and the new fecundity of the earth following the winter. Also, from as early s the 5th century BC it was the month in which the new war season was celebrated.[88] These correlations indicate that from an early date the god of war was associated with fertility, re-birth and agriculture and substantiates the theory that from its earliest phase of development the Campus Martius was used both as a location for practice by the military as well as a location for agriculture and animal husbandry.

Militaristic deities and agricultural deities are frequently seen as mutually exclusive, an exclusivity which creates problems for the interpretation of a number of cults and festivals that took place on the Campus Martius, a particular example of this being the festival of the *Equus October* in Phase One. This festival, which involved the sacrifice of a horse to Mars, was likely a rite of fertility in which the participants asked the god Mars to provide an abundant crop, as is noted by Festus who wrote that '*the sacrifice was performed on account of a successful crop of grain*' (Festus, 246L).[89] Yet the rite was not devoid of military overtones and as part of the rite a horse race was held after which the horse on the right hand side of the winning chariot was sacrificed to Mars (Plutarch, *Ques. Rom*, 97; Festus, 178; *Fast.Phil.*).[90] This was followed by a fight between the inhabitants of the Subura for the head of the horse which likely symbolised the fertility of the land.[91] On this occasion an agricultural rite of fertility was accompanied by a display of violence and fighting. A further example of a rite that was associated both with the military and agriculture is the *Equirria* which took place on the Campus Martius in March to mark the New Year.[92] One facet of this rite concerned the army being purified of the blood guilt of warfare while the beginning of the New Year and the military season were marked in a ritual that possibly had overtones of fertility.

It was not necessarily the case that the Romans saw such a clear distinction between agriculture and military activity, particularly as the soldiers of the Roman army worked on their farms while not on campaign.[93] As a result, the association between the Campus Martius, warfare, agriculture and fertility suggests that from a very early date in Phase

---

[88] Beard, North, Price, 1998a, 43.
[89] Scott, 1929, 227; Pascal, 1981, 261; Palmer, 1990, 16; Smith, 2000, 33; Coarelli, 2007, 263.
[90] Scott, 1929, 227; Degrassi, 1963, 256; Johnson, 1960, 113; Pascal, 1981, 275.
[91] Pascal, 1981, 266-8.
[92] Pascal, 1981, 204; Fowler, 1969, 330-1.
[93] Beard, North, Price, 1998a, 48.

One the area was multi-functional and facilitated different, though not mutually exclusive, functions. An interpretation of the Campus Martius in its earliest phase of development as a solely military area is inexact and does not allow for the other religious and agricultural aspects of the area. However, the function of the Campus Martius in Phase One did not remain static. With the ongoing evolution of the early city of Rome and the ever increasing requirement for a strong Roman military force, references within the sources to agriculture and animal husbandry on the Campus Martius disappear and the influence of the army becomes ever more present. This on going militarisation of the Campus Martius is further witnessed in the utilisation of the term *campus* rather than *ager* to describe the floodplain of Mars.

Many literary sources use the term *campus* as a military term, using it to define the actual battlefield as opposed to the actual field in which military practice took place.[94] Tacitus (*Hist.* 3.24), Ennius, (*Ann.* 280) and Vegetius (1.11) all use the word *campus* in the sense of an actual battlefield, underscoring the very strong militaristic nature of the word at least by the Imperial period. It can be argued then that the only element referring to the original agricultural function of the area was retained by the name of the deity, whose name was specifically retained as it inferred an association with the Roman army.

From early in Phase One the Campus Martius was a multi-functional area shaped by the evolving requirements of the inhabitants of the early city. Consequently the manner in which the area was used evolved over time as Roman power in central Italy grew and the requirements of the inhabitants altered. It was the natural evolution and growth of the city of Rome which influenced the changes that occurred on the Campus Martius and initiated the change of use from an agricultural space to a location for military manoeuvres and political concerns. While it is not possible to trace these functions in the archaeological record, there are a number of other developments and uses that find some degree of preservation in the archaeological record and which, due to their continued use and recognition throughout the Republic and early Empire, warrant far greater comment in the literary sources. For example, the cults of the Campus Martius which continued to be celebrated throughout the Republic and those areas of the Campus Martius that continued to be used for public voting and the census (the Ovile and the Villa Publica. Appendix: 2.4.2; 2.4.3).

---

[94] Irby-Massie, 1996, 297.

2.3. Cult and the Early Campus

Many early important cult sites were present on the Campus Martius during Phase One. More often than not there was no physical structure to house these cults, instead, sacred groves and open areas such as the *Apollinar*, which was used for the cult of Apollo and which later became site of the temple of Apollo Medicus, were used as areas of worship.[95] Dis Pater and Proserpina were worshiped in an open area of the north-west Campus Martius and their cult would develop to become one of the most important cults of the Campus Martius, due in part to its association with the *ludi saeculares* (Fig. 17).[96] The Secular games, or *ludi saeculares,* influenced not only the cult of Dis Pater and Proserpina but also encouraged the use of the Campus Martius for other cultic festivities, leading ultimately to the use of the Campus Martius for horse-racing and other entertainments. The following sections explore the nature of the cults of the Campus Martius in Phase One and the manner in which they influenced the way the area was used and exploited during the later Republic and Empire.

2.3.1. Dis Pater, Proserpina and the Tarentum

The Tarentum, sometimes erroneously referred to in the ancient sources as the Terentum (Festus, 350; Servius, *ad Aen.* 8.65), was located in the most westerly area of the Campus Martius in the bend of the River Tiber (Valerius Maximus, 2.4.5; Zosimus, 2.1-7; Festus, 440L, 441L).[97] There is no archaeological evidence available to determine for certain a location for the Tarentum, consequently despite their late date for Phase One the literary sources must be relied upon. An indication of the location of the Tarentum within the Campus Martius comes from Festus (329) who suggests that it was located *'in extremo Campo Martio'*.[98] A similar geographical description is given by Varro (*Rust.* 3.2.5) when he locates the Villa Publica (Appendix: 2.4.3) as *'in Campo Martio Extremo'*.[99] These

---

[95] *LTUR* I, 49 (Viscogliosi). See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 15; Coarelli, 2007, 270.
[96] *LTUR* V, 21 (Coarelli); Pascal, 1981, 286; Poe, 1984, 59; Beard, North & Price, 1998a, 71-2. See also: Rehak, 2006, 10.
[97] *LTUR* V, 21 (Coarelli); Beard, North & Price, 1989a, 202; Coarelli, 1997, 74-8. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 508; Rehak, 2006, 27; Coarelli, 2007, 263.
[98] Olinder, 1974, 74, n.205; Poe, 1984, 72; Richardson, 1992, 111.
[99] *LTUR* V, 21 (Coarelli); Poe, 1984, 76.

descriptions cause a degree of confusion, as neither the Tarentum nor the Villa Publica can truly be described as located at the extreme limits of the Campus Martius as we understand it. These topographical descriptions can only be deemed correct and accurate if the traditional north-south orientation used to view the map of Rome is altered to reflect the orientation of the FUR (Fig. 18).[100] On the FUR the top of the map is centred on the south-eastern area of the city of Rome, placing the Tarentum in the lowest area of the map, at the bottom. Such an orientation renders the literary references of Festus and Varro valid as topographical markers, as both the Villa Publica and the Tarentum would have been located towards the extreme southern edge of the FUR.

The Tarentum was intimately associated with the gods Dis Pater and Proserpina.[101] These two gods represent the Roman versions of the Greek gods Hades and Persephone and along with the goddess Ceres make up a trinity of gods who represented the underworld.[102] Dis Pater and Proserpina were worshipped on the site of the Tarentum due to their associations with death and the underworld and the fact that at least part of the Tarentum was on top of a volcanic fissure that emitted gases.[103] A subterranean altar for the cult was founded here by a Sabine from Eretum called Valesius (according to Valerius Maximus (2.4.5), Zosimus (2.1-7; 3.1-3) and Festus (329; 350)), who after consulting an oracle wished to prevent the death of his children from a plague.[104] The *gens* Valeria were responsible for the original upkeep of the cult, while Zosimus (2.1-7; 3.1-3) records that a later dedication by P. Valerius Publicola on the occasion of the *ludi saeculares* could be read on the altar.[105] Following the children's recovery from the plague, games were held in honour of the gods which were known as the *ludi saeculares,* though at an early date they may have been known as the *ludi Tarenti* (Livy, *Per.* 49; Valerius Maximus, 2.4.5).[106]

The association between the Tarentum, Dis Pater and Proserpina and the *ludi saeculares* is the most common reason why the Tarentum is mentioned in the literary sources. The name of the games themselves is derived from the Latin word *saeculum,* which is

---

[100] *LTUR* V, 21 (Coarelli).
[101] *LTUR* III, 19 (Coarelli); Poe, 1984, 59; Coarelli, 1997, 74; See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926 508; Rehak, 2006, 10; Coarelli, 2007, 263.
[102] Poe, 1984, 62.
[103] Rehak, 2006, 10. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 508.
[104] *LTUR* I, 220 (Wiseman); *LTUR* II, 19 (Coarelli); *LTUR* V, 20 (Coarelli); Poe, 1984, 63. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1922, 152.
[105] *LTUR* II, 19 (Coarelli); *R.E.* VIIIa (Valerius), 302; Poe, 1984, 60.
[106] *LTUR* II, 19 (Coarelli).

translated as meaning 'century' and likely represented the longest possible life span of a Roman, though on occasion it was taken as one hundred and ten years.[107] While the name of the games would suggest that they were held at regular one hundred year intervals throughout the Republic and Empire, there is certain evidence only for the Republican games that were held in 249 BC (Varro, *In Censorinus,* 17.8) and also in 146 BC.[108] Subsequent games are known from the Imperial period, but these were often initiated by decree of the emperor. For example the *ludi saeculares* were held during the reigns of Augustus (17 BC/*Acta,* 90-100), Claudius (47 AD; Suetonius, *Claud.* 21), Domitian (88 AD; Suetonius, *Dom.* 4) and Antoninius Pius (147 AD; *Acta* 90-9).[109] As these particular emperors desired to hold games during their reign, they had fictitious historic games noted in the calendar in order to justify the fact that enough time had passed since the last time the games were held. Consequently, it is often difficult to determine which games noted in the sources were actually held according to the one hundred or one hundred and ten year rule, and which games were simple literary devices retrojected to justify the imperial evocation of the games.[110] The games continued to be celebrated into the mid 3rd century AD and in AD 248 Philip the Arab used the games to celebrate Rome's one thousandth birthday (*Historia Augusta, Gordian III,* 33.1; Zosimus, 1.19-22; Sonarus, 12.19; Aurelius Victor, 28.1).[111]

One of the primary sources of information for the *ludi saeculares* is the inscribed *acta* of the *ludi* which describe Augustus' games of 17 BC.[112] Similar *acta* are known from the reigns of Claudius and Severus, though it is the *acta* of Augustus which provides the most insightful and detailed information.[113] The games generally consisted of theatrical performances, in Greek and Latin, as well as chariot races which were held in the nearby Trigarium (2.3.2).[114] During the Imperial period the scenic performances took place in the three permanent theatres of the Campus Martius (for example, *Acta,* 155-8), however during the Republic the theatrical performances were held in temporary theatres (*Acta,* line 108), as was common practice in that era, or on simple temporary stages with no

[107] Beard, North, Price, 1998a, 71.
[108] Beard, North, Price, 1998a, 71, 205.
[109] Coarelli, 2007, 263; Beard, North & Price, 1989a, 205-6.
[110] Beard, North, Price, 1998a, 71.
[111] *LTUR* V, 20 (Coarelli); Bowersock, 1983, 124.
[112] *LTUR* V, 21 (Coarelli); Poe, 1984, 60, n. 29; Palmer, 1990, 26; Beard, North, Price, 1998b, 139-44.
[113] Beard, North, Price, 1998b, 139-44.
[114] *LTUR* V, 89-90 (Coarelli); *LTUR* V, 21 (Coarelli); Palmer, 1990, 61.

seating provided.[115] As with all Roman festivals, sacrifice was particularly important and the *ludi saeculares* were no exception. The sacrifices of the games were held in a number of areas by the time of Augustus, ranging from the Palatine to the Aventine and the Capitoline indicating that not all elements of the festival were held in the Campus Martius.[116] However, the most important rites and rituals of the *ludi saeculares* remained in the Tarentum and were focused around the altar to Dis Pater and Proserpina.

According to the traditional foundation story of the games, the altar of Dis Pater and Proserpina was originally found beneath the ground and was disinterred only on the occasion of the Saecular Games (Festus, 440L; Valerius Maximus, 2.4.5), emphasising the subterranean, chthonic, nature of the deities.[117] In order to honour the gods during the *ludi saeculares* three separate sacrifices were held at the altar on three consecutive nights. The sacrifices held on the first night were in honour of the Moirae (*CIL* VI 32323/*ILS* 5050, lines 90-100), on the second night they were in honour of Illytheria (*CIL* VI 32323/*ILS* 5050, lines 115-18) and on the third night in honour of Tellus (*CIL* VI 32323/*ILS* 5050, lines 134-7) (Livy, *Epit.* 49; Sevius, *ad Aen.* 8.65; Martial, 1.69.2; 4.1.8; 10.63.3; Statius, *Silv.* 1.4.18; 4.1.38).

The *acta* of the *ludi saeculares* of 17 BC, in conjunction with the literary sources, gives some suggestion of a rough location for the Tarentum and the altar. According to the *acta* the Tarentum was located between the Euripus (Appendix: 5.3.5) and the Pons Neronianus, the bridge located just to the south of the modern Ponte Vittorio Emanuele and which connected the Campus Martius with the Vatican fields (Fig. 20).[118] Of course the Pons Neronianus was constructed centuries after the area was first used for the worship of Dis Pater and Proserpina and more than fifty years after the *ludi saeculares* of 17 BC. However, a line in Ovid's *Fasti* (1.501) highlights that there was an association between the Tarentum and the Tiber at the point where the bridge would later be constructed. Ovid mentions the *vada tarenti* which can be translated as '*the ford of the Tarentum*'.[119] This was the location where a ferry ran between the Tarentum and the Vatican area prior to the construction of the bridge, hence supplying an approximate location for the Tarentum during the Republic. These sources indicate a location for the

[115] Palmer, 1990 27; Beard, North & Price, 1989b, 140-3.
[116] *LTUR* V, 21 (Coarelli); Poe, 1984, 64.
[117] *LTUR* II, 19 (Coarelli). See also: Coarelli, 2007, 263.
[118] Platner & Ashby, 1926, 401.
[119] *LTUR* V, 21 (Coarelli).

Tarentum around the end of the modern Corso Vittorio Emanuele and Piazza Pasquale Paoli.[120]

A recent numismatic study has challenged the commonly accepted idea that the Tarentum was devoid of permanent buildings.[121] A Domitianic coin of AD 88 (*RIC* II 202.N.321) (Fig. 21) illustrates a sacrifice to the Moirae with a hexastyle temple in the background which, arguably, was dedicated to Proserpina. Another coin (*RIC* II 202.N383) (Fig. 22) shows a sacrifice to Illytheria, while in the background a temporary *scaena* is recognisable within the area of the Tarentum.[122] These two Domitianic coins show two temples which may, according to an interpretation by Coarelli, be recognised as those of Dis Pater and Proserpina.[123] An arch shown on one side of the coin is argued by Coarelli to be a Severan addition to the Tarentum.[124] This is an audacious interpretation given that none of the extant sources mention any permanent temple building in the area of the Tarentum at any stage of its history. This is not to say that they did not exist, simply that they were never explicitly noted. In fact the paucity of references to the Tarentum likely accounts for the lack of references to the theorised temples of the Tarentum. Coarelli goes even further by arguing that fragments 672abcd of the FUR represent the two temples of the Tarentum, basing his theory on the fact that their plans are characteristically Republican (Fig. 23).[125] Coarelli's reconstruction and interpretation is persuasive, but ultimately lacking in reliable evidence. Given the large number of temples constructed in the Campus Martius during the second half of the 2nd century BC it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that two temples were constructed in the Tarentum in honour of Dis Pater and Proserpina, though it must be noted that they would have been by far the most northerly temples of the Campus Martius and for that reason would likely have warranted comment even from authors of the 1st century AD. Given the relative silence of the sources and the fact that the reconstruction of fragments 672abcd of the FUR can not be proven correct, in my belief it is wiser to hold back from any specific statements regarding the dating and location of these two temples.

---

[120] Coarelli, 2007, 263.
[121] *LTUR* V, 21-2 (Coarelli).
[122] *LTUR* V, 22 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 1997, 88-94.
[123] *LTUR* V, 22 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 1997, 88-94.
[124] *LTUR* V, 22 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 1997, 91.
[125] *LTUR* V, 22 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 1997, 92-3.

2.3.2. Trigarium

Unfortunately the literary sources are rather vague when it comes to defining the location and function of the Trigarium (Pliny, *H.N.* 28.238, 29.9, 37.202) (Fig. 24). An etymological examination of the name of the area suggests that it was used for horse racing and that the original exercises and races held on this site consisted of teams of three horses (*triga*) (Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 7.73.2).[126] Most commonly the word Trigarium is used, or defined, in a more general sense in later bilingual glossaries which provide no specific information for the Trigarium of the Campus Martius, for example the *Glossary of Philocalus* in the *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* (2.201).[127] Only Zosimus, writing around AD 500, mentions the Trigarium of the Campus Martius, but on this occasion only as part of a dream (Zosimus, 21-27).[128] These sources provide no direct evidence for the racing of horses or chariots, though this is the most commonly accepted function of the area in scholarly investigation.[129] The assumption that the Trigarium was used for racing inevitably deems it a simple open area, the result being that it cannot be traced within the archaeological record.

A pomerial cippus from the Claudian era carries the inscription '*a trigario ad pontem Agrippae*' '*the trigarium next to the bridge of Agrippa*' (*CIL* VI 31545), and aids in narrowing the likely position of the Trigarium.[130] The Pons Agrippae was located *c.*160m north of the modern Ponte Sisto, though the relative position of the Trigarium to the Pons Agrippae is difficult to ascertain.[131] One possibility is that the Trigarium was located upstream from the Tarentum in the northern most reaches of the Campus Martius.[132] A second interpretation argues convincingly that the Trigarium was located to the south of the Tarentum.[133] The latter hypothesis is far more convincing given the discovery of an inscription found close to Palazzo della Cancelleria which gives details of the victory of a group of charioteers in the hypothesised area of the southern Trigarium (*CIL* VI 10044).[134] The inscription reads: *May Victory/of the Blues/forever/ remain unchanged!/*

---

[126] *LTUR* V, 89 (Coarelli); Palmer, 1990, 28-33. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 541.
[127] La Rocca, 1984, 58; Palmer, 1990, 29.
[128] *LTUR* V, 89 (Coarelli); La Rocca, 1984, 58; Palmer, 1990, 29.
[129] La Rocca 1984, 58-9; Palmer, 1990, 29; Coarelli, 1997, 81-4.
[130] *LTUR* V, 89 (Coarelli); Frothingham, 1887, 478-9; Palmer, 1990, 30. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 581.
[131] *LTUR* IV, 107 (Coarelli). See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 398.
[132] Palmer, 1990, 29-31; Contra *LTUR* V, 89 (Coarelli).
[133] *LTUR* V, 89 (Coarelli).
[134] *LTUR* V, 90 (Coarelli); Sherk, 1988, 216. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 495.

Good Luck!.[135] Based on these inscriptions the Trigarium most likely lay between the modern Via dei Giubbonari, Via dei Cappellari and Via del Pellegrino.[136]

Further evidence for the association of this area in the north-west Campus Martius with horses and the equine industry comes from the location of the Stabula IIII Factionum which was located south of the Trigarium between Palazzo della Cancelleria and Palazzo Farnese (Fig. 25; Fig. 26).[137] The Stabula IIII Factionum were the stables used by the four racing factions of Rome known as *albata, russea, prosina* and *venola.*[138] The four stables were separate buildings but all placed within close proximity to each other creating a type of professional equestrian area for Rome.[139] In all likelihood the stables were purposefully set up close to the already established Trigarium, providing a pre-defined and usable training ground in close proximity to the stables and highlighting a continuity of equestrian use in the area well into the Imperial period.

The discovery of an inscription (*CIL* VI 8461) dating from the Imperial period, possibly from the late 2nd century AD, suggests that a lead processing plant was constructed in the Trigarium some time later.[140] Such a plant could not have been accommodated when the Trigarium was still in use for chariot racing and consequently provides a *terminus ante quem* for horse racing in the area. The inscription does indicate that by the 2nd century AD the title 'Trigarium' was used as a toponym for the area in general and no longer referred to the location of the horse racing area itself.[141] Further information is provided by the Regionary Catalogue which records the relative location of the Trigarium in relation to the Ciconias Nixas (*Reg.* IX). However, due to the nature of the Regionary Catalogues it does not specify if by the 4th century AD it still functioned as a course for chariot racing, or if the name had simply become a toponym for the general area, though it was most likely the latter, given the information provided by the inscription.

The location of the Trigarium and its association with the racing and training of horses has led to the conclusion that it was the location for the *Equus October* (Festus, 190L) and for the races of the *ludi saeculares*. Between them the Trigarium and the Tarentum

---

[135] Sherk, 1988, 216.
[136] La Rocca, 1984, 59; Coarelli, 1997, 83. See also: Coarelli, 2007, 263.
[137] *LTUR* V, 90 (Coarelli); Richardson, 1992, 366.
[138] Richardson, 1992, 366. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 495.
[139] Richardson, 1992, 366. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 495.
[140] La Rocca, 1984, 58; Palmer, 1990, 31; Coarelli, 1997, 81.
[141] La Rocca, 1984, 58; Palmer, 1990, 31; Coarelli, 1997, 81-4.

occupied large sections of the north-west Campus Martius and were partially responsible for the area remaining devoid of large scale building activities until the Imperial period. Thus there is no direct reference in the sources to the Trigarium prior to the reign of Claudius. While the Trigarium and the Tarentum are two of the most challenging areas of the Campus Martius to reconstruct due to this lack of information, they preserve a small amount of information about early religious worship and recreation on the Campus Martius.

2.3.3. Caprae Palus

The Caprae Palus was a swamp or pool in the central Campus Martius and was noted in antiquity as the traditional site of Romulus' ascension to the heavens (Livy, 1.16.1; Ovid, *Fast.* 2.491; Plutarch, *Rom.* 27; *Num.* 2).[142] The name Caprae Palus translates as the 'Goat swamp or marsh' and suggests the physical nature of the area, the lowest area of the Campus Martius.[143] The traditional account of Romulus' ascension states that it occurred during a meeting connected with the census of the army (Livy, 1.16.1), hence the location for the ascension was near the Ovile (Appendix: 2.4.2) and the Villa Publica (Appendix: 2.4.3) where the census took place.[144] Consequently the Caprae Palus was located in an area to the south-east of the Tarentum, in an area later associated with the Pantheon (Appendix: 5.3.7.) and the building project of Agrippa in the mid 1st century BC (Phase Four) (Fig. 27).

The Caprae Palus is noted as a location of worship for Juno Caprotina and the Poplifugia (Varro, *L.L.* 6.18; Plutarch, *Rom.* 29; *Cam.* 33-36; Macrobius, *Sat.* 1.11.36).[145] The sources of evidence for the worship of Juno Caprotina are rather contradictory, leading to difficulties in the reconstruction of the festival, which was celebrated on the 7th of July on the Nones of Caprotina (Livy, 1.16.1; Varro, *L.L.* 107; Plutarch, *Rom.* 29, *Cam.* 33).[146] Varro (*L.L.* 6.18) notes that the Poplifugia and the Nonae Caprotinae were separate festivals yet associates both of them with the day on which Romulus ascended into the

---

[142] *LTUR* I, 234 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 1997, 17-9. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 98; Richardson, 1992, 70; Rehak, 2006, 11.
[143] Johnson, 1963, 28; Palmer, 1974, 8; Rehak, 2006, 10.
[144] *LTUR* I, 234 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 1997, 18.
[145] *LTUR* III, 120-1 (Coarelli); Johnson, 1960, 113; Johnson, 1963, 28; Palmer, 1974, 8.
[146] *LTUR* III, 121 (Coarelli); Degrassi, 1963, 518; Johnson, 1963, 28-35; Palmer, 1974, 7-17.

heavens at the Caprae Palus.[147] According to Plutarch (*Rom.* 29, *Cam.* 33) the Nones Caprotina were particularly celebrated by women, most notably by female slaves, in recognition of the role women had played in the defeat of one of Rome's enemy Latin tribes.[148] Plutarch describes how freeborn Roman ladies would lend their finest clothes to their female slaves and let them partake of feasts beneath the branches of the goat-fig trees on this feast day (See also: Macrobius, *Sat.* 1.11.36-40; Varo, *L.L.* 6.18).[149] All of these sources highlight the Caprae Palus as a very important site for early religious worship in Rome.

The festival of Juno Caprotina may not have been the first festival of the Campus Martius that was primarily aimed at women.[150] Throughout Rome, and indeed throughout Greece, it was quite common that the worship of Proserpina (Persephone) and Ceres (Demeter) was most specifically associated with women. The types of cults to be most intimately associated with women were those associated with childbirth and with the role of women in the family and the state.[151] Proserpina and Ceres represented the relationship between mother and daughter, as well as the fertility of the land, and therefore they were most likely to be associated with female only worship on the Campus Martius.[152] Ilytheria too was honoured on the Campus Martius as part of the *ludi saeculares* and by the 1st century BC Isis too found a home on the central Campus Martius (Dio, 47.15.4).[153] The presence of these female deities indicates that the northern and north-central Campus Martius was particularly associated with fertility deities and their celebration and, given the nature of the rites involved in the worship of Juno Caprotina, was associated on occasion with female-only celebration and worship.

The 4th century AD Regionary Catalogue of Regio IX lists the Pantheon, which later sat on the site of the Caprae Palus of Phase One, in close proximity to the Ciconiae Nixae (*Cur.* 124 V2; *Not.* 176 V2).[154] The nature of the Regionary Catalogue prevents a more accurate allotment of location and only gives relative locations (Fig. 27). The Ciconiae Nixae itself was an open area or square between the 1st century AD Mausoleum of

---

[147] Johnson, 1960, 113; Palmer, 1974, 13.
[148] Johnson, 1960, 111; Palmer, 1974, 8-9.
[149] Johnson, 1960, 111; Palmer, 1974, 9.
[150] *LTUR* III, 121 (Coarelli); Beard, North, Price, 1998a, 70.
[151] Beard, North, Price, 1998a, 71.
[152] Poe, 1984, 62-3.
[153] Palmer, 1990, 60 who suggests that this link can be traced as far as the Madonna del Parto in the church of St. Augustine.
[154] *LTUR* I, 268 (Lega); La Rocca, 1984, 60-1; Palmer, 1990, 52-3; Coarelli, 1997, 13-4, 29.

Augustus and the Tiber, and was associated with the landing of wine in Rome from the adjacent docks.[155] This area is also known from an inscription (*CIL* VI 1785) which dates to the reign of Aurelian.[156] This late date means it was not necessarily associated with the early Republican Caprae Palus which had already been built over.[157] The Calendar of Philocalus indicates that the north-western area of the Campus Martius retained many of the early original Republican functions and associations, particularly religious associations, well into the Empire.[158] On the 15th of October the *Equus October* is listed, indicating a continuity in the way the area was used and the longevity of the feast of Mars.

2.3.4. Temple of Apollo Medicus

The Temple of Apollo Medicus is one of the oldest permanent buildings of the Campus Martius and the longest surviving, albeit in various reconstructions, from the fifth century BC into the Imperial period. This temple, located to the south of the Circus Flaminius and close to the Servian Wall, was the first temple built to Apollo in Rome (Fig. 28).[159] The temple was vowed to Apollo Medicus in 433 BC as a result of a plague in Rome (Livy, 4.25.3; 40.51.6). It was constructed in an extra-pomerial area on a site called the *Apollinar* which was known for the worship of Apollo (Livy, 3.63.7; Varro, *L.L.* 5.52).[160] The association between the temple and the earlier site of the *Apollinar* shows that there was a continuity of the cult in the area. The first permanent temple building was dedicated two years after the initial vow was made, in 431 BC, by the consul Cn. Julius (Livy, 4.29.7).[161]

Because of the continuing worship of Apollo on the site, from 431 BC onwards the temple underwent a number of reconstructions. Two of the most important and substantial re-buildings of the temple came in 353 BC, following damage sustained to the temple during the Gallic invasion (Livy 7.20.9), and in 179 BC when the censor M. Aemilius

---

[155] Platner & Ashby, 1926, 111.
[156] *LTUR* I, 267 (Lega); Palmer, 1990, 52-3. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 111.
[157] *LTUR* I, 234 (Coarelli).
[158] *LTUR* I, 267 (Lega); Degrassi, 1963, 257, 521; Palmer, 1990, 52.
[159] Coarelli, 2007, 15.
[160] *LTUR* I, 49 (Viscogliosi); *LTUR* I, 48 (Coarelli); Orlin, 2002, 22; See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 15; Coarelli, 2007, 270.
[161] *LTUR* I, 49 (Viscogliosi); Coarelli, 2007, 270.

Lepidus was responsible for the work (Livy, 40.51.3). Another important rebuilding came in 34 BC when C. Sosius completely rebuilt the temple and named it in honour of his family (Dio, 50.1.1).[162] As a result in both Imperial and modern sources the temple is often called the 'Temple of Apollo Sosianus'. The ancient literary sources refer to the temple's location in a number of different ways. Livy refers to the temple as '*in Pratis Flaminiis*' (*in the Flaminian field*) (Livy, 3.63.7), linking the temple to the Circus Flaminius which was inaugurated by C. Flaminius in 221 BC (Phase Two). Pliny the Elder refers to it as '*ad Octaviae Porticum*' (*next to the Porticus Octaviae*) (Pliny, *H.N.* 36.34) aligning the temple to the portico constructed by Augustus in 27 BC. In the *fasti* the temple is referred to as '*ad theatrum Marcellum*' (*next to the theatre of Marcellus*) (*Fast. Fr. Arval*, 23rd September), associating it with the adjacent theatre of Marcellus which was inaugurated by Augustus in 13/11 BC.[163] These references all confirm the location of the temple, which is known and visible today, in the southern most corner of the Campus Martius, to the east of the visible remains of Theatre of Marcellus (Appendix: 5.4.3).

The temple of Apollo underwent significant reconstruction and alterations throughout the Republic and Empire yet always retained its association with Apollo. The continuity of worship in the area is representative of Rome's growing awareness and interest in their historical and religious history, and shows a desire by successive generations of Roman politicians to associate themselves with a visible reminder of Rome's past. The parts of the temple of Apollo, which can still be seen today from Via del Teatro Marcello, date from the later re-buildings of the temple and do not reflect the earliest form of the temple (Fig. 29).[164] The 5th century BC version of the temple was located several metres back, to the north of these visible remains.[165] Due to the very early date of the first version of the temple and the continued utilisation of the site, it is nearly impossible to identify the original form of the temple. Archaeological excavation has revealed that the late Republican version of the temple dating from 34 BC incorporated a number of elements from the 179 BC refurbishment, including a mosaic inscription which was displayed on the podium (Fig. 30; Fig. 31).[166] The podium from 179 BC measured 5.5m high, 21.32m

[162] *LTUR* I, 50-1 (Viscogliosi); Favro, 1996, 91.
[163] *LTUR* I, 49 (Viscogliosi); Degrassi, 1963, 35.
[164] Van Buren, 1954, 324.
[165] *LTUR* I, 51-2 (Viscogliosi).
[166] Colini, 1938, 259-60; Shipley, 1931 28; Coarelli, 2007, 270.

wide and 40m long and was decorated with travertine.[167] Given the 5th century BC date of construction the earliest version of the temple must have had a rather smaller and more humble podium, representing its original evolution from the *Apollinar*. The later, grander, constructions highlight not only the growing importance of the site in later phases, but also the ever increasing realisation of the age of the site and its importance from the very earliest phase of Rome's development. Consequently the Temple of Apollo can be interpreted as one of a small number of buildings on the Campus Martius that were recognised as being representative of Rome's earliest period of development. As such it is one of the first examples of Rome's awareness and interest in their history, foundation and tradition, a theme that would continue to influence the construction of buildings on the Campus Martius for centuries to come.

The site of the temple of Apollo functioned in a number of different ways. It was used as a place of religious worship and from as early as 449 BC, prior to the construction of the first temple on the site, it was also used to house meetings of the Senate (Livy, 3.63.7).[168] This same function was also facilitated by the adjacent temple of Bellona (3.3.2) (Livy, 34.43.2; 39.4.2; 41.17.4; Cicero, *Att.* 15.3.1).[169] Most commonly the temple was used by the Roman Senate when they met to discuss the bestowal of a triumph.[170] Due to their positions outside of the *pomerium* in the Republican period the Temple of Apollo and the Temple of Bellona (Appendix: 3.3.2) suited such meetings perfectly. This extra-pomerial location allowed those members of the Senate whose duty it was to bestow the triumph to meet with the victorious general who still held his pro-consular powers.[171] It was fitting that the temple of Apollo was associated with senatorial meetings concerned with triumph due to the fact that it was close to the temple of Bellona where the 'Just War' had first been proclaimed (Servius, *ad Aen.* 9.52). Thus, both temples were responsible for the symbolic proclamation of war and its subsequent conclusion and celebration.

The temple of Apollo indicates the longevity that was possible for a site in Rome, and in particular on the Campus Martius. It represents not only one of the oldest cult sites on the Campus Martius, but in the whole of Rome. The lack of available archaeological and literary information for the earliest period of the site does not detract from the importance

---

[167] Coarelli, 2007, 270.
[168] Orlin, 2002, 22.
[169] *LTUR* I, 190 (Viscogliosi); Richardson, 1992, 58; Stamper, 2007, 55.
[170] Favro, 1994, 152. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 15.
[171] *LTUR* IV, 99 (Andreussi); Versnel, 1970, 191; Beard, North & Price, 1989a, 179.

of the temple. All of the religious sites of the Campus Martius in Phase One lack conclusive archaeological information, while the literary sources are substantially removed from the time period under consideration. Be this as it may, what scant information there is provides enough material to form a picture of the Campus Martius from the foundation of Rome to the early 3rd century BC as a place whose extra-pomerial status had a profound influence on the religion practiced there and whose association with the military resulted in an early association of cult and army which culminated in the holding of military meetings in temples on the Campus Martius. This association between the army and the Campus Martius would continue right through to the end of the Republic, resulting in the construction of altars to Mars and the construction of temples as monuments to commemorate victory.

2.4. The Army and the Campus

While there are few literary sources which specifically mention the army in connection with the Campus Martius (including Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 5.13; Horace, *Carm*, 3.7.25; Vegetius, *De Re Mit.* 1-10) the influence of the military is clearly reflected in the naming of the area. Evidence for military activity is also witnessed in a number of other ways, namely the construction of an altar to Mars, and the construction of buildings such as the Ovile (Appendix: 2.4.2) and Saepta Julia (Appendix: 5.3.9) which facilitated meetings of the Roman magistrates and the inauguration of those with Roman military power (Servius, *ad Ecl.* 1.33; Cicero, *Att.* 4.16.8; Livy, 26.22.11). The buildings constructed on the Campus Martius in Phase One highlight the area's association with military training as well as with the congregation and the formal bestowal of military power. While the sources of evidence are rather more reliable for this, the later period of Phase One, they often remain difficult to interpret.

2.4.1. The Altar of Mars

In the 1st century AD Vitruvius wrote that the cult of Mars was normally located outside of the *pomerium* (*De Arch.* 1.71). Such was the case for the first altar of Mars constructed on the Campus Martius.[172] Festus (204L) and the *lex Regia* record that the altar existed as early 433 BC, the same year recorded for the first Roman censorship. The nearby Villa Publica (Appendix: 2.4.3), where the census was undertaken, was constructed two years previously in 435 BC (Livy, 5.22.7).[173]

Two passages by Livy (40.45.8 and 35.10.12) aid in defining the position of the altar, through indirect reference to the buildings that it was located close to, as well as to the more general functions of the altar. According to Livy (40.45.8) when the new censors were elected they placed their *curule* chairs next to the altar of Mars. Once the census had taken place one censor was chosen by lot and it became his duty to make a sacrifice to

---

[172] *LTUR* III, 223-4 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 1997, 182-3. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 328-9; Richardson, 1992, 245; Rehak, 2006, 11-2.
[173] *LTUR* III, 224 (Coarelli); *LTUR* V, 202 (Agache); Coarelli, 1997, 184. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 581; Richardson, 1992, 245, 430; Rehak, 2006, 11.

Mars in order to purify the assembled crowd (Livy, 1.44.1-2).[174] Consequently a close relationship, both symbolic and physical, can be seen to have existed between the altar of Mars and the Villa Publica. From these two references it becomes clear that the altar of Mars was located close to the Porta Fontinales, and therefore the Servian wall, and also close to the areas that facilitated censorial functions, namely the Villa Publica and the Ovile (later known as the Saepta Julia) where the *comitia centuriata* met.[175]

It is debatable as to the relationship that existed between the altar of Mars and the Temple of Mars, which was constructed in 138 BC by D. Junius Brutus Callaicus to the north of the Circus Flaminius.[176] As the location of the temple of Mars has been ascertained with some degree of certainty to the north of the Circus Flaminius (Valerius Maximus, 8.14.2; Pliny, *H.N.* 36.26), it is possible to identify a more specific location for the altar. Resultantly a position in the south-central Campus Martius can be attributed to the altar, between the later Divorum and Iseum to the west, the Via Flaminia to the east, the temple of Hadrian to the north and the Vicus Pallacinae to the south (Fig. 33; Fig. 34).[177] Within this quadrant archaeological remnants dating to the Imperial period were uncovered on Via del Plebiscito in 1925 (Fig. 32; Fig. 33). Measuring 60m in length the remains lay atop older, smaller, remains likely from the Republican period.[178] These remains have best been interpreted as a large embankment of a square plan which was supported by a perimeter wall containing niches, possibly for statues.[179] Such a construction may represent the form of the altar of Mars, especially when the remains are compared to an artistic representation of the altar of Mars on a relief excavated from Palazzo Santa Croce and now housed in the Louvre (Fig. 35).[180]

2.4.2. The Ovile

The Ovile was the earliest building devoted to politics on the Campus Martius and was an early version of the Saepta Julia constructed by Caesar and inaugurated by Agrippa in 26

---

[174] Richardson, 1992, 245; Ross Taylor, 1990, 48.
[175] *LTUR* III, 224 (Coarelli); Ross Taylor, 1990, 47-8; Richardson, 1992, 245.
[176] *LTUR* I, 222 (Wiseman). See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 328; Richardson, 1992, 245.
[177] *LTUR* III, 224 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 1997, 190.
[178] *LTUR* III, 224 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 1997, 190-1.
[179] *LTUR* III, 224 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 1997, 191.
[180] Coarelli, 1997, 195.

BC (Varro, *Rust.* 3.2; Cicero, *Att.* 1.33; Livy, 26.22.1).[181] According to Servius (*ad Ecl.* 1.33) there were various barriers which were used to section off the aisles within the building in order that the *curiae, tribus* or *centuriae* could assemble and pass through the aisles and vote in an orderly manner.[182] The Ovile was divided into thirty lanes for the *comitia curiata*, thirty-five for the *comitia tribute* and eighty or eighty-two lanes for the *comitia centuriata.*[183] The only representation of the Ovile survives on a denarius from 113/112 BC (*RIC* 292/1) which depicts the triumph of P. Licinius Nerva.[184] The name Ovile (literally translated as '*sheep pen*') reflected this division of the building. Though the Ovile became known as the Saepta Julia upon re-dedication in 26 BC, the name Ovile continued to be used on occasion to describe the building in the later Republic and Empire (Livy, 26.22.11; Lucan, 2.197). The re-dedication of the building did not result in the name of the building loosing its meaning. The word *saepta* retained some of the inferences related in the word *ovile*; *saepta* translating from the Latin as 'enclosure'.

The location of the Ovile in Phase One corresponded to the location for the Saepta Julia, which stood to the west of the Via Flaminia in the 1st century BC (Fig. 2).[185] In the early 20th century the Ovile was thought to have extended further to the west than the later Saepta Julia, an interpretation that is no longer valid, and it was thought to be square in shape with sides measuring around one thousand Roman feet.[186] Until 1934 the location of the Saepta Julia was itself mistakenly placed further to the east, towards the Via Flaminia, based upon the misinterpretation of the letters inscribed on two fragments of the FUR (fr. 23 and 24). [187] As a result the Saepta Julia was associated with the visible remains beneath Palazzo Doria and Palazzo Bonaparte and those beneath the church of S. Maria in Via Lata. This is now known to be incorrect and G. Gatti has since located the Saepta further to the west and closer to the Pantheon.[188] Gatti's location for the Saepta is based on an interpretation of fragments 35p, aa, bb and 36 or the FUR and the analysis of the remnants of a brick wall to the east of the modern Pantheon (Fig. 36).[189] The wall originally belonged to the western portico of the Saepta Julia, known as the Porticus

---

[181] *LTUR* IV, 228 (Gatti); Ross Taylor, 1990, 47.
[182] Shipley, 1933, 38; Ross Taylor, 1990, 47; Coarelli, 1997, 161; Mouritsen, 2001, 26. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 373.
[183] *LTUR* IV, 228 (Gatti). See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 373.
[184] *LTUR* IV, 228 (Gatti); Ross Taylor, 1990, 48.
[185] *LTUR* IV, 228 (Gatti); Ross Taylor, 1990, 48.
[186] Platner & Ashby, 1926, 373.
[187] *LTUR* IV, 228 (Gatti).
[188] *LTUR* IV, 228 (Gatti); Ross Taylor, 1990, 48.
[189] ; *LTUR* IV, 228 (Gatti); Ross Taylor, 1990, 48; Mouritsen, 2001, 27.

Argonautarum (Fig. 37). It is now possible to ascertain with some degree of certainty the southern and eastern limits of the Saepta Julia. Recent archaeological investigation has noted that the remains of a building beneath Palazzo S. Marcuto and the church SS. Stimmate di S.Franceso likely mark the eastern and southern boundaries of the Saepta Julia respectively (Fig. 38).[190] All of these elements can be attributed to the later Agrippan reconstruction of the building in 26 BC and not to the original Ovile, which leaves no discernable trace.

The function of the Ovile, and the later Saepta Julia, serves to underscore the importance of the military and politics on the Campus Martius in Phase One. It was in the Ovile that the *comitia centuriata*, and later, from *c.*145 BC the *comitia tributa,* met and voted.[191] The *comitia centuriata* was presided over by a consul or a praetor and was organised into 193 centuries according to wealth, with the wealthiest century voting first.[192] Its form may have represented, and originated from, that of the Roman army and its division. Another possible interpretation is that the *comitia centuriata* was ultimately a power that still resembled elements of the governing system of the Regal period and that it physically represented the typical structure that the Roman *res publica* took in the first century BC.[193] As a result of these overtly militaristic influences it was only fitting that such a group should meet in the Campus Martius, outside of the *pomerium* in an area that facilitated the congregation of armed forces (Gellius, 15.27.5).[194] The *comitia centuriata* was originally responsible for the election of the consul and the censor, thereby according the Campus Martius an important role in the execution of the business of government as early as Phase One. However, by 218 BC the *comitia centuriata* was no longer the main legislative body of Rome and was used, instead, for the declaration of war and the declaration of peace.[195] It was likely the case that the *comitia centuriata's* main role prior to this date was for the election of generals rather than the consuls, underscoring the *comitia centuriata's* role as a military body which was required to be situated outside of the sacred city boundary (Cicero, *Mur.*17.38).[196]

---

[190] *LTUR* IV, 229 (Gatti).
[191] Ross Taylor, 1990, 47; Patterson, 1992, 194; Mouritsen, 2001, 27.
[192] Mouritsen, 2001, 26; Miller, 2002, 16.
[193] Miller, 2002, 18.
[194] *LTUR* IV, 99 (Andreussi); Bead, North & Price, 1989a, 179; Ross Taylor, 1990, 47; Patterson, 1992, 194; Cornell, 1995, 195; Patterson, 2000a, 91; Mouritsen, 2001, 27; Forsythe, 2005, 111. See also: Rehak, 2006, 4.
[195] Miller, 2002, 16-17.
[196] Miller, 2002, 19.

The Ovile, in its earliest form, is then the only building of early Republican Rome which visibly reflected the socio-political interactions of early Rome and Latium and the early active implementation of politics. It was here, in the central Campus Martius, that magistrates were elected, war and peace were declared and the people of Rome had an input into the governmental and legislative process. Another building which was influential for the development of the Campus Martius from Phase One until the end of the Republican period in Phase Four was the Villa Publica (see section: 2.4.3). This building, and the grounds that surrounded it, were responsible for censorial activities, yet also facilitated recreational activities in its grounds. It is an excellent example of the multi-functional nature of the Campus Martius and a reflection of the evolving and changing needs of the inhabitants of Rome from the first to fourth phase.

2.4.3. Villa Publica

The Villa Publica was constructed in 435 BC (Livy, 4.22.7) and later restored in 194 BC (Livy, 34.44.5).[197] Livy is not the only ancient source to establish the antiquity of the building and Dio also wrote that it was amongst the oldest buildings of Rome (Dio, *Fr.* 109.5) Given that the primary use of the building was the taking of the census (Varro, *Rust.* 3.2; Apuleius, *Apol.* 1), it is likely that the it was constructed by the first censors of Rome in order to meet their physical and administrative census needs, confirming a date of construction of 435 BC, two years prior to the election of the first censors of Rome.[198]

As the Villa Publica was originally designed for the taking of the census its function was reflected in its form. It consisted not just of a single building, but also of open parklands which surrounded the building to accommodate the inhabitants of the city of Rome as they descended upon the Campus Martius in order to be counted.[199] Livy notes that it was also used as a type of guest-house for visiting ambassadors and emissaries (Livy 30.21.12; 33.24.3). Varro (*Rust.* 3.2) noted that it was decorated internally with many paintings and statues. Meanwhile, there is one reference to pre-triumphal generals staying in the Villa Publica prior to celebrating their triumph. This reference (Josephus, *A.J.*

---

[197] *LTUR* III, 224 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 1997, 164. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 581.
[198] *LTUR* III, 224 (Coarelli); *LTUR* V, 202 (Agache); Coarelli, 1997, 164-5. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 581.
[199] Poe, 1984, 71-2; Coarelli, 1997, 168. See also: Richardson, 1992, 430.

7.5.4) refers to the triumph of Vespasian and Titus and is the only indication that the Villa Publica was used in such a way.[200] Given the late date for this reference it does not confirm if the Villa Publica of Phase One was used by pre-triumphal generals in the same way.

The location of the Villa Publica has been a topic of some considerable debate. In the early 20th century it was incorrectly located just north of Piazza del Gesú, close to the Saepta Julia.[201] This location was based on two literary references, one by Cicero (*Att.* 4.16.14) the other by Varro (*Rust.*3.2). More recently, however, the Villa Publica has been located, along with the altar of Mars (see section: 2.4.1) and the later Saepta Julia (see section: 5.3.9), in the area between modern Piazza Venezia, Via del Corso and Piazza del Collegio Romano (Fig. 39).[202] With this scheme in mind the Villa Publica lay in a triangular area between the Circus Flaminius to the south, the Saepta to the north, and the altar of Mars on the third side.[203] Given the nature of the buildings in the surrounding vicinity this would seem an appropriate position for it. Originally in the 5th century BC the Villa Publica would have been surrounded by a vast amount of open space, as the southern area of the Campus Martius had yet to be urbanised, and temples, porticoes and theatres had yet to encroach upon the central Campus Martius. However, throughout Phases Two to Four a significant amount of development occurred which diminished the amount of open space available to the Villa Publica.

While physical remains pertinent to the building and its grounds may be ellusive, there are a number of figurative representations that aid in forming an image of the Villa Publica in Phase One. One of the best representations of the form of the building survives on the reverse of a coin (*RRC* 429/2) (Fig. 40). The coin also carries the inscription T.DIDI/IMP/VILPUB.[204] The inscription confirms that it was minted to commemorate the two triumphs of T. Didius in 100-99 BC and 93 BC.[205] Given the date of the coin and the representation of the building the coin most likely shows the appearance of the Villa Publica in the 1st century BC.[206] While this post-dates the original form of the Villa Publica in Phase One by some three hundred years, it remains the only clue as to what the

[200] *LTUR* V, 202 (Agache); Beard, 2007, 93-6.
[201] Coarelli, 1997, 170-1.
[202] Coarelli, 2007, 263.
[203] Coarelli, 1997, 170-1; Coarelli, 2007, 263.
[204] *LTUR* V, 203 (Agache); Coarelli, 1997, 173; Crawford, 1974, 453.
[205] *LTUR* V, 202 (Agache); Coarelli, 1997, 173; Contra Crawford, 1974, 453.
[206] Coarelli, 1997, 173-4.

central building may have looked like. On the coin the Villa Publica is depicted as a two story building surrounded by a walled enclosure. The lower level of the building is shown to have consisted of a portico with rows of arches clearly displayed.[207] Some of these archways appear to have doors or gates attached to them. On top of this ground floor portico level a second level is depicted which shows that the wall has engaged half columns. These are depicted with column bases and capitals. The next storey has another portico, this one with smaller columns than the ones depicted on the ground floor. On top of this storey lies a sloped roof.[208] This architecturally elaborate design was likely far more advanced than the 5th century BC version of Phase One, which was probably a single storey building, though it may have used colonnades along its sides.

The Villa Publica was an important building for Rome, even if it was used on an infrequent basis. The reason for its initial construction on the Campus Martius was its association with the military and politics, as well as the requirement for open space. The altar of Mars, the Ovile and the Villa Publica are all either totally untraceable in the archaeological record or else leave little trace of their existence. Yet what can be determined from the literary record emphasises the strong symbolic association between the military, politics and the Campus Martius. This association was facilitated, and likely even initiated, by the area's extra-pomerial location. All of the symbolic associations went on to impact greatly upon the way the Campus Martius was perceived and used in Phases Two, Three, Four and beyond.

[207] *LTUR* V, 203 (Agache). See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 581.
[208] *LTUR* V, 203 (Agache).

Conclusion

Any study of the development of the earliest phase of the Campus Martius is hindered by the fact that there is little in the way of literary or archaeological sources that can aid in the formation of modern interpretations and reconstructions of the area. What little that does survive must be used with the utmost care, as more often than not the evidence regarding Phase One of the Campus Martius dates from the later Republic and the Imperial period. Be this as it may, with careful examination of sources and materials a great deal of the information regarding the original form and function of the area comes to light.

During Phase One the Campus Martius evolved from an area associated with agriculture and early Roman warfare to a multi-functional area that encompassed many different aspects of religious worship, military training and political representation. While some of these functions were represented by the physical construction of buildings such as the Ovile and the Villa Publica, many more, such as the Trigarium, the Tarentum and the Caprae Palus did not require physical structures and left no trace on the archaeological record. The Campus Martius was not only preoccupied with the military, politics and cult, the open landscape, located within the natural floodplain of the Tiber, meant that the area could also accommodate recreation and relaxation. From its first phase of development the Campus Martius was a multi-functional area, and the functions were tied very closely together. And it was here, more so than anywhere else, that the requirements of the people were met and where one might witness the influence that Roman people themselves had on the development of a portion of the city of Rome.

Phase One saw the scene set for the subsequent development of the Campus Martius. The next phase of development saw prominent Roman military leaders take a major role in the physical evolution of the area. It was during Phase Two (from the beginning of the 3rd century BC to the middle of the 2nd century BC) that the southern Campus Martius started to become far more monumental and urban in nature and the area of the Circus Flaminius began to develop as one of Rome's most important areas for politics, military triumph and victory commemoration. A great number of temples were constructed in the southern Campus Martius during Phase Two, and it was the location of the *pomerium,* the rite of

triumph and the association with early military exercise and training that influenced these constructions, along with the early religious associations of the area.

Phase Two also saw competition among individuals manifest itself on the Campus Martius and have a massive influence and effect on the area from the early 3rd century BC until the end of the Republic. Whereas Phase One saw construction on the Campus Martius by the Roman state, Phase Two saw the commemoration of victory by individual prominent military leaders who, while keenly aware of their duty to the Roman state, also wished to commemorate their own personal success. It was this commemoration which in turn led to the monumentalisation of the Campus Martius and the construction of lavish and extraordinary buildings from the 3rd century BC onwards.

Chapter 3: The Temples of the Campus Martius (Phase Two)

Introduction

Phase Two, from the beginning of the 3rd century BC to the mid 2nd century BC, represents a period of time in which a large number of temples were constructed on the Campus Martius to a variety of deities and for a wide array of reasons. First and foremost these temples were victory monuments, built with the aim of promoting and commemorating Roman success in Italy and further afield. The temples also, importantly, commemorated the role of the Roman military generals responsible for the victories. As such the temples constructed in Phase Two represent not only the expansion of Roman power and territory throughout Italy and the wider Mediterranean, but the increasing power of Roman political leaders who revelled in victory and public recognition.

As a result of Rome's role in the Punic wars and Rome's continuing expansion through the Mediterranean there was an explosion in the number of triumphs celebrated and temples constructed on the Campus Martius in Phase Two. The increase in triumphs led, from 221 BC onwards, to a great number of buildings being constructed in the southern quarter of the Campus Martius, in an area known as the Circus Flaminius (Fig. 41; Fig. 43). As this area was also important for the arrangement of troops as part of the triumphal procession it became synonymous with statements of victory, a relationship that continued well into the Imperial period.

The influencing factors behind the development of the Campus Martius in Phase One continue throughout Phase Two. The open nature of the Campus Martius was an added advantage for those wishing to construct a victory monument in Rome. The level area of the Campus Martius, unhindered by the centuries of development that were present in the Forum Romanum, meant that the temples constructed here in Phase Two were conspicuous and visible in the landscape, adding monumentality and creating further recognition, and ultimately support, for the provider of the temple.[1] The location of the

[1] Trigger, 1990, 119-21.

pomerium was also of particular importance as it meant that the Campus Martius could be used for the construction of innovative temples using new construction mediums and dedicated to deities who were not necessarily embraced within the *pomerium* (for example Lares Permarini and Hercules Musarum).[2] These unique and unusual temples by their very nature appealed to a very wide audience and consequently focused much attention on the military generals responsible for their construction. Temples constructed in Phase Two were also visibly associated with the buildings and activities of Phase One on the Campus Martius. By placing a temple in an area that would be visible to all those attending meetings in the Ovile and Villa Publica, the provider of the temple was again drawing attention to his victories on behalf of the Roman state, while at the same time promoting his personal successes and advertising his political career.

One of the most significant factors that influenced a provider to construct a temple in the southern Campus Martius was a desire to visibly and symbolically associate his building with the triumphal route. This route, which snaked through the southern Campus Martius before finishing on the Capitoline, was thronged with the inhabitants of Rome on days when a triumphal parade was in progress.[3] The steps of temples, particularly those in the vicinity of the Circus Flaminius, were used as viewing platforms for these magnificent spectacles (Plutarch, *Aem. Paul.* 33).[4] By placing his victory temple close to the route of the triumph, the provider ensured that his temple would be associated with the future glories and celebrations of Rome. The desire for public recognition in Phase Two also stimulated the importation of Greek art which was displayed in the triumphal displays and in the buildings of the Campus Martius. These works of art were used as tools to amass public recognition and became a language of personal and state victory abroad.

The growth in military commemoration lead to a rise in competition amongst Roman military leaders throughout this, and later, phases of development. This competition can be traced through literary sources and through the archaeological record of the Campus Martius as grander and more ostentatious victory monuments were constructed as Phases Two (from the beginning of the 3rd century BC to the mid 2nd century BC) and Three (from the mid 2nd century BC to the beginning of the 1st century BC) progressed. Temple construction, the frequency of triumphal displays and the quantity of Greek artwork

[2] For Lares Permarini: *LTUR* III, 174 (Coarelli); Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 92-3; Coarelli, 1997, 259-9. For Hercules Musarum: *LTUR* II, 19 (Viscogliosi); Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 101-2; Coarelli, 1997, 452-485.
[3] Favro, 1994, 151-3.
[4] Favro, 1994, 157.

imported as booty bear witness to the intensity of competition among military generals in this period. This competition, and the failing of the Republican government to curb the increasing personal political power among military leaders during the expansion of Roman power in the Mediterranean, led to the evolution of the charismatic leader in Rome, culminating in the building projects of Pompey the Great and Julius Caesar in the Campus Martius in Phase Four.

The route of the triumph and the growing competition amongst politicians for public recognition proved to be the major influencing factors for the development of the Campus Martius in Phase Two, a fact witnessed by the construction of victory monuments. The victory temples investigated as part of Phase Two are arranged, as far as possible, both chronologically and according to location of construction, leading to a division between those temples located in the south central Campus Martius in the *area sacra* of Largo Argentina, and those temples located in the southern corner of the Campus Martius, in the area around the Circus Flaminius (Fig. 4).

3.1 Triumph, the Circus Flaminius and Victory Temples

In Phase Two, from the early 3rd century BC to the mid 2nd century BC, the Campus Martius began to be used on a more frequent basis for the ritual of military triumph. Roman triumph, which saw the procession of victorious military generals, their troops, booty and captured slaves through the streets of Rome, from the Campus Martius to the Capitoline Hill, is of particular significance for any study of the Campus Martius (Fig. 42).[5] The route the triumph took through the Campus Martius influenced the topography of the area, the nature of the buildings constructed and the general associations of the area, leading to the construction of a number of victory temples in the southern area of the Campus Martius.[6] Victory monuments were constructed in this area by victorious Roman generals not only with the aim of physically associating personal military victory with past and future Roman triumphs, but to add historical weight and the possibility of long-lasting recognition to the temples and their providers.

The area of the Circus Flaminius became the focus of triumphal activity as the procession arranged itself and set off from the Campus Martius from the late 3rd century BC (Fig. 43). The Circus Flaminius, founded by C. Flaminius in 221 BC (Livy, *Epit.* 20; Festus, 89L), began its life as an open area without stands or seating and was used as an extra-pomerial congregational space.[7] The increasingly popular trend for the erection of victory monuments around the triumphal route led to the construction of a great number of temples and porticoes around the fringes of the Circus Flaminius, resulting in the gradual diminishment of the open space of the Circus Flaminius.[8] By focusing on the evolution of the triumph in Rome and the route of the procession it is possible to see how the rite influenced the topographical development of the Campus Martius and the reasons behind the construction of victory monuments around the Circus Flaminius.

---

[5] Favro, 1994, 152-4; Rehak, 2006, 13; Beard, 2007, 92-6.
[6] Versnel, 1970, 110-1; Favro, 1994, 152-4; Cornell, 2000, 48. See also: Holleran, 2003, 54; Flower, 2004, 329
[7] *LTUR* I, 269-70 (Viscogliosi); Wiseman, 1974, 4; Richardson, 1992, 83; Favro, 1994, 153; Coleman, 2000, 217; Rehak, 2006, 13.
[8] Wiseman, 1974, 8.

3.1.1. Origin and Development of Triumph

Plutarch records the triumph of Romulus as the first triumph held in Rome (*Rom.* 16), though the actual origins of the triumph are still rather unclear.[9] Modern investigations into the origin of the rite often emphasise a number of disparate and conflicting arguments, frequently with the emphasis placed on the influence of the Etruscans on the development of the Roman triumph.[10] The origin of the rite is of less concern to this study than the impact of the route on the topographical, thematic and architectural development of the Campus Martius. In relation to this study only a few questions regarding the origin and variations in triumphal displays need to be explored and clarified.

There were three types of triumphal celebration that could be held in Rome during the Republic; a triumph proper, which took place in the city of Rome and culminated on the Capitoline; a triumph held on the Alban Mount, 27km outside of Rome (Livy, 42.21.7), and finally an *ovatio* which was similar to the triumph proper but lacked the pomp and ceremony as the celebrator went up to the Capitoline without the aid of a chariot.[11] Both the triumph on the Alban Mount and the *ovatio* were held only up until the mid 2nd century BC (end of Phase Two), after which time the triumph proper was the most common type of triumph held in Rome.[12] The decision as to which type of triumph was celebrated by a victorious general lay with the Senate. From the first recorded *ovatio* in 503 BC (Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 5.47.2), until the rite of triumph ceased to celebrated by anyone outside of the Imperial family in 19 BC (Balbus' triumph over the Garamantes: Pliny, *H.N.* 5.36-7; Strabo, 3.5.3; Dio, 54.18.2), 288 victory celebrations were held in Rome, of which, 248 were triumphs proper, 24 were *ovationes,* 11 were classified as naval triumphs and 5 were triumphs held on the Alban Mount.[13]

One of the most famous triumphs held on the Alban Mount was celebrated by M. Claudius Marcellus in 211 BC following his infamous defeat and sack of Syracuse, as a result of which he imported vast quantities of Greek art into the city of Rome (Livy,

---

[9] Bonfante-Warren, 1970, 49; Favro, 1994, 152; Beard, 2007, 61.
[10] Versnel, 1970, 255-303; Bonfante Warren, 1970, 49-66.
[11] Bonfante-Warren, 1970, 50-1; Versnel, 1970, 165-6; Künzl, 1988, 30-1; Beard, 2007, 62.
[12] Sumi, 2005, 33.
[13] Sumi, 2005, 30-1.

26.21.1; Plutarch, *Marc.* 22.1). The Senate had only granted him permission to celebrate an *ovatio* and as a consequence he used his own money to pay for a triumph on the Alban Mount which allowed for more pomp and ceremony than an *ovatio*.[14] Papirius Maso also enacted the rite of *ovatio* following his semi-successful campaign in Corsica in 231 BC.[15] While the *ovatio* was not associated directly with the Campus Martius, it is still worth noting that many elements of it closely resembled elements of the triumphal procession a fact that has prompted Bonfante-Warren to write that the *ovatio* pre-dated the triumph and went on to include elements of Etruscan ritual, later evolving into the triumph proper.[16] This would suggest that the rite of triumph developed naturally and included Roman and Etruscan elements in line with peer-polity interaction theory which allows for the incorporation of many aspects of Italian culture.[17] For example, Warren argues that the introduction of a chariot, for the general to parade into the city in, was an Etruscan addition to the triumph and distinguished the triumph from the *ovatio*.[18] While the chariot may be accepted as a distinguishing feature, its introduction by the Etruscans is rather less certain.[19]

The majority of information about triumph in Rome is preserved in the literary sources. Due to the temporary nature of the rite it is near impossible to find any corroborating information for the ritual in the archaeological record. Very few original artworks which were displayed during the triumph ever survived to the modern age, while the location and identification of the victory temples and associated monuments remains a difficult task.[20] The literary sources do provide information regarding the nature and ritual of the triumphal procession (Livy, 45.39.10, 30.15.12; Tacitus, *Ann.* 4.58.6; Valerius Maximus, 2.8.) as well as more detailed accounts of specific triumphs, for example the triumph of Aemilius Paullus in 167 BC following the victory over Perseus at the battle of Pydna (Plutarch, *Aem. Paul.* 33-4). In brief, during the procession the general was carried on a chariot, dressed in ritual purple and gold garments, his face painted red, while his family, troops, booty and the captured enemy all followed as part of the parade.[21] Plutarch (*Aem.*

---

[14] Rawson, 1989, 432; Gruen, 1992, 94; Edwards, 2003, 58 Miles, 2008, 61-2.
[15] *LTUR* II, 256 (Arenon); Versnel, 1970, 165-6; Bonfante-Warren, 1970, 50; Miles, 2008, 62.
[16] Bonfante-Warren, 1970, 50-1.
[17] Renfrew, 1986, 1-7.
[18] Bonfante-Warren, 1970, 51.
[19] Bonfante-Warren, 1970, 51; Cornell, 1995, 82; Beard, 2007, 222-3.
[20] Wiseman, 1974, 5-8; Pollitt, 1978, 155-7; Beard, 2007, 10-11.
[21] Versnel, 1970, 56-7; Bonfante-Warren, 1970, 54; Favro, 1994, 155-6; Beard, 2007, 84.

Paul. 33-4) supplies one of the best descriptions of a triumphal procession. Importantly Plutarch records that:

> *"The people erected scaffoldings in the theatres for equestrian contests, which they call circuses, and round the forum, occupied the other parts of the city which afforded a view of the procession."*

This suggests that the temples of the Campus Martius and Circus Flaminius were used for viewing the spectacle. Not only is this description an indispensable account of the triumph that occurred in 167 BC, but it also elegantly conveys the excitement and joy experienced by those witnessing the event. Plutarch also describes the great riches that were displayed on the third day of the procession:

> *"The first barely sufficed for the exhibition of the captured statues, paintings, and colossal figures, which were carried on two hundred and fifty chariots. On the second, the finest and richest of the Macedonian arms were borne along in many wagons. The arms themselves glittered with freshly polished bronze and steel, and were carefully and artfully arranged to look exactly as though they had been piled together in heaps and at random....On the third day, as soon as it was morning, trumpeters led the way, sounding out no marching or processional strain, but such a one as the Romans use to rouse themselves to battle. After these there were led along a hundred and twenty stall-fed oxen with gilded horns, bedecked with fillets and garlands. ....Next, after these, came the carriers of the coined gold, which, like the silver, was portioned out into vessels containing three talents....Next, mounted on a chariot of magnificent adornment came Aemilius himself, a man worthy to be looked upon even without such marks of power, wearing a purple robe interwoven with gold, and holding forth in his right hand a spray of laurel"* (Plutarch, *Aem. Paul.* 33-34).

This description is likely exaggerated to some extent by Plutarch but nonetheless provides a colourful depiction of the procession. It also indicates the vast quantities of booty that was paraded through the city. These items were often subsequently displayed in private residences as well as in the temples and porticoes of the Campus Martius. In Phases Two and Three the triumphal displays contained enormous amounts of Greek artworks as it was frequently the case that the vanquished foe was from Greece or a Hellenised region of the Mediterranean. This led later Roman writers such as Cato the Elder to criticise the generals of Phase Two, such as Paullus and Metellus, for un-Roman behaviour. Nonetheless, triumphal displays were often the first time that the inhabitants of Rome had the opportunity to see works of Greek art.

Valerius Maximus' work '*Facta et Dicta Memorabilia*' (*Memorable Deeds and Facts*), written in the first century AD during and just after the reign of Tiberius, confirms the strict procedures by which a triumph was granted (Valerius Maximus, 2.8).[22] During the Republic, in order to qualify for a triumph, a magistrate had to hold *imperium* while the war in which he fought must have been a just and original war (Valerius Maximus, 2.8.5). The Roman military leader was not allowed to claim a triumph for the defeat of a slave rebellion or for re-capturing territory that had previously been annexed by Rome. For such victories an *ovatio* or a triumph on the Alban Mount was granted.[23] The number of enemies defeated had to have numbered a minimum of five thousand and the war had to be fully concluded (Valerius Maximus, 2.8.1). A number of these rules evolved and fluctuated over time and towards the end of the Republic the required number of enemies killed altered and it was permitted that the war need not be fully concluded before the triumph was bestowed.

The rite to bestow a triumph was reserved by the Senate, though during Phase Three the number of triumphs greatly increased. This increase may reflect the struggle of the Senate to retain its authority, but more likely it was due to the increased number of battles that the Romans were involved in and the increase in victories as a result of the Punic Wars.[24] The increase in military activity and the subsequent bestowal of triumphal honours meant that those holding *imperium pro consule,* as well as the tradition *imperium,* were allowed to celebrate a triumph. This was then extended to some praetors and men of lesser status.[25]

One of the most famous examples of the relaxing of rules of qualification for the celebration of triumph is that of Pompey the Great who was allowed to celebrate a triumph in 71 BC while still under the minimum age limit and without having held the position of consul.[26] In fact, by the 1st century BC a number of elements of the triumph had changed, likely due to Rome's interaction with the eastern Mediterranean and the Hellenistic monarchs. For example, in the 3rd century BC the traditional dress of the triumphant general of the purple '*toga purpurea*' was replaced with the more elaborate

---

[22] Versnel, 1970, 164; Beard, 2007, 209-11.
[23] As is recalled by Valerius Maximus who notes that Q. Fulvius and L. Opimius petitioned for a triumph following their battles in Capua in 211 BC and Fregellae in 125 BC respectively (Valerius Maximus, 2.8.4).
[24] Richardson, 1975, 50-63.
[25] Richardson, 1975, 60-2.
[26] Pollitt, 1983, 61; Palmer, 1990, 1; Seager, 2002, 28-9; Beard, 2007, 15.

'*toga picta*' and '*tunica palmate*' (Festus, 228L).[27] Also, by the early 1st century BC the celebrants of the triumph became the most celebrated part of the procession and overtook in importance the themes of purification and religious devotion. Such changes can be seen in the later Republican triumphs of Pompey the Great and Sulla. It seems likely that by the 1st century BC the increased awareness of Greek, and specifically Hellenistic, culture in Rome led to the celebrating general being seen fit for personal glorification for his military success in much the same way as a Hellenistic monarch.[28]

As Rome's familiarity with Greek culture increased throughout Phase Two (from the beginning of the 3rd century BC to the mid 2nd century BC) so too the generals who celebrated victories and constructed victory temples came in for personal public recognition, admiration and celebration, ultimately leading to an increase in the influence they had on Republican politics. While Greek culture cannot be pinpointed as the only influencing factor in the growth of personal political power in Rome, in the mid-Republic it seems that it had a specific, and even overt, influence on the way in which Roman politicians chose to advertise their successes. Given Rome's close interaction with Hellenistic monarchs such as King Pyrrhus and King Attalus in Phase Two, it appears that some generals' interaction with Hellenistic power instigated the importation of Greek art to Rome in Phase Two along with the use of Greek building materials such as marble, and ultimately the desire for personal recognition and adulation in the face of traditional Roman values and morals. This theme of evolving personal political power is one that originates in Phase Two and grows throughout Phases Three and Four, leading ultimately to the rise of charismatic leaders such as Julius Caesar and Pompey the Great.

While the military rank and political popularity of the individual celebrating the triumph is important for an interpretation of the buildings that they constructed, the frequency and route of the triumphal parade warrants further investigation as it was these factors that influenced the topographical development of the Campus Martius. Favro believes, based on a passage of Josephus (*Bel. Jud.* 4.4) describing an Imperial triumph, that the triumphal procession can be viewed as a rite containing three clearly defined intentions, each based in a separate area of the city of Rome, progressing in turn from (1) the Campus Martius to (2) the Forum and (3) the Capitoline (Fig. 42; Fig. 43).[29] These stages

---

[27] Bonfante Warren, 1970, 64; Favro, 1994, 162, n.20; Beard, 2007, 84.
[28] Hanson, 1959, 54; Bonfante Warren, 1970, 65; Holleran, 2003, 54.
[29] Favro, 1994, 154; Beard, 2007, 92-105.

include (1) the ceremonial conclusion of the military campaign, which was held in the south-central Campus Martius, (2) the justification to the Senate and people of Rome of the general's campaign, as witnessed in the centre of the city, and (3) the appeasement and honouring of the gods, in particular Jupiter on the Capitoline.[30] This thematic structure is a useful tool for a modern interpretation of the triumph, but may not represent the general view held by the Roman population at the time. However, recognising that the rite was organised in, and proceeded from, the Campus Martius is essential as in doing so the area can be interpreted as of equal importance as the Capitoline and Forum Romanum within Rome when it came to the commemoration of Roman victory. The requirement for the troops to gather and set out from the Campus Martius influenced the physical development of the Circus Flaminius and the central Campus Martius in different ways. While the Circus Flaminius became synonymous with victory monuments due to the procession's route to the Capitoline Hill, through the Porta Triumphalis, it seems likely that, for the Republican period at least, some open space was always reserved in the Campus Martius in order to facilitate the preparation of the triumph. The allocation of a possible route for the triumph emphasises the important role triumph played in the development of the Campus Martius and the Circus Flaminius (Fig. 5).

3.1.2. The Route

As the triumph was, in its origin and practice, an essentially military honour and celebration, a general wishing to celebrate a triumph in Rome was required to remain outside the *pomerium* with his troops until formally declared triumphant by the Senate as the armed Roman troops were prohibited from entering the sacred area of the city until cleansed of the blood guilt of war.[31] The location of the *pomerium* during Phases One to Four meant that the area of the south-western Campus Martius was a suitable distance from the city for the general and his troops to remain camped until permission was granted for them to begin the official rite. It is likely that the triumph served in some manner as a rite of purification in which the soldiers and the city were cleansed of the blood guilt of war by passing through the triumphal gate and offering sacrifices.[32]

---

[30] Favro, 1994, 153-6.
[31] Bonfante Warren, 1970, 49; Versnel, 1970, 191; Beard, North, Price, 1989a, 179-8.
[32] Bonfante Warren, 1970, 49, 54; Versnel, 1970, 3-4; Favro, 1994, 161, n.11.

The south-central area of the Campus Martius was used both for the organisation of the triumphal procession and as the starting point of the spectacle of triumph. The main location for this organisation was the area around the Villa Publica and, from 221 BC onwards, the area around the Circus Flaminius (Fig. 43).[33] The general and his troops remained in the open area around the Villa Publica while they awaited confirmation from the Senate that a triumph was to be formally bestowed (Josephus, *Bel. Jud.* 4.4).[34] Evidence for the association of the triumph and the Villa Publica comes from Josephus who records the Imperial triumph of Titus and Vespasian: [35]

> "*While it was still night, the whole army in centuries and cohorts advanced with their officers and waited about the gates, not of the palaces on the Palatine, but (of a villa) near the Temple of Isis: for there the generals were spending the night.*" (Josephus, *Bel. Jud.* 4.4).

While this line relates to an Imperial triumphal procession and not a Republican procession, there is no reason to believe that the starting point would have differed radically from the route in the 3rd century BC. The triumph was seen as such a traditional rite that it is likely that the route and its starting point would have remained largely unchanged throughout the Republic and early to mid-Republic. The rationale for organising a triumphal procession on the Campus Martius appears to be fairly simple and self-explanatory. First and foremost, it was an area close enough to the Capitoline and Forum Romanum so as to allow for easy and convenient access. Secondly, the Campus Martius had always been associated with the military and with the god Mars (Livy, 1.16.1; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 2.56.2). It was fitting that the early mustering ground for the Roman army and the area in which the army congregated before setting off for war (Varro, *Rust.* 3.2.4) be used as the origin point for the triumph.[36] Also, as the rite was very much associated with the official conclusion and celebration of military campaign, the congregation of the troops in the area sacred to Mars, an area with an altar and a temple dedicated to him, would have been particularly appropriate.[37]

---

[33] For Villa Publica: *LTUR* V, 202-5 (Agache). For Circus Flaminius, *LTUR* I, 269-70 (Wiseman).
[34] Makin, 1921, 26-30; Favro, 1994, 153.
[35] Makin, 1921, 26-30; Beard, North & Price, 1989a, 179; Beard, 2007, 93-6.
[36] *LTUR* I, 222 (Wiseman); Patterson, 2000a, 91; Rehak, 2006, 11.
[37] For altar of Mars: *LTUR* III, 223-6 (Coarelli).

As it was common practice for the army to worship Mars with an offering in the camp on the night before battle commenced (Livy, 8.9.1-10), it is possible that once the triumph was formally granted by the Senate the troops celebrated on the Campus Martius and made offerings up to the gods, and particularly to Mars.[38] On the occasion of the triumph the entire Campus Martius, and the south-central Campus Martius in particular, were transformed into a primarily military area as political, religious and recreational activities were displaced in favour of the celebration of all things military. Hence, while the Campus Martius may be interpreted as a location utilised by the general Roman populace on a daily basis to fulfil their religious, social and political needs, on the significant occasion of the triumph the Campus Martius became very much an area that facilitated the military requirements of the Roman state and army.

The route that the triumph took is the subject of discussion by many authors, most notably in recent years by Favro and Beard.[39] Such studies have attempted to locate a triumphal route through Rome based on literary and archaeological sources. Such attempts have often proved inconclusive due to the scarcity of specific information relating to the route. There is little evidence that can prove with certainty the actual route that the triumph took, and nor can it be ascertained if the route remained the same throughout antiquity or if it varied from triumph to triumph.[40] While the stability of the entire route remains uncertain in general, by focusing primarily on how the triumph affected the Campus Martius during the Republic, significant parameters can be set that enable a degree of certainty regarding the route of the triumph as it proceeded through the Campus Martius.

Josephus is the only literary source to provide any substantial information regarding the route that the triumph took, particularly in the Campus Martius (Josephus. *Bel. Jud.* 7.123-31). In relation to the triumph of Vespasian and Titus in AD 71 he wrote:

> *'All the soldiery marched out, while it was still night, in proper order and rank under their commanders, and they were stationed on guard not at the upper palace but near the Temple of Isis. For it was there that the emperor and prince were resting that night. At break of day Vespasian and Titus emerged, garlanded with laurel and dressed in traditional purple costume, and went over to the Porticus Octaviae. For it was here that the Senate, the leading magistrates and those of equestrian rank were awaiting their arrival.....After the prayers,*

[38] Beard, North & Price, 1989b, 157; Favro, 1994, 155.
[39] Favro, 1994, 154-7; Beard, 2007, 92-106.
[40] Beard, 2007, 93.

> *Vespasian briefly addressed the assembled company all together and then sent the soldiers off to the traditional breakfast provided by the emperors. He himself meanwhile went back to the gate which took its name from the fact that triumphs always passed through it.*' (Josephus, *Bel. Jud.* 7.123-31)

This quotation contains references to a number of locations that were important for triumph on the Campus Martius. While the passage refers to a triumph held during the Imperial period and references Imperial buildings such at the Porticus Octaviae, it can be argued that the very fact that Josephus uses phrases such as 'traditional breakfast' indicates that some features of the triumph date back to the Republican period and were contained within triumphal parades right through to the mid 1st century BC. On the other hand, Beard argues that the information supplied by Josephus can only relate to the ritual held on the occasion of Vespasian's and Titus' triumph and should not necessarily be seen to represent a 'traditional' triumph.[41] A middle ground between these two arguments can be reached in relation to the topographic markers of the Campus Martius provided by Josephus. It seems very unlikely that Josephus would have arbitrarily noted monuments such as the Villa Publica, Porticus Octaviae and the Porta Triumphalis without regard for the topography of the area in the first century AD. While these areas may not have been relevant for all triumphs that passed through the Campus Martius, the topography of the area and requirement to accommodate a large military crowd suggests that the Villa Publica, Porta Triumphalis and Porticus Octaviae were associated with a great many triumphs due to their proximity to the Circus Flaminius, the open areas to the north of the Villa Publica, the triumphal gate and the *pomerium* (Fig. 41).

As discussed in some detail in section 2.4.3 the location of the Villa Publica is significant in relation to the triumphal route, as is the Porta Triumphalis, as the latter helps to clarify the likely route that the triumph took through the Campus Martius.[42] Unfortunately a lack of information regarding the Porta Triumphalis precludes any certainty regarding its form and location. The Porta Triumphalis is mentioned only five times in the literary sources, all after 55 BC. It is mentioned by Cicero (*In. Pis.* 23.55), Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.8), Suetonius (*Aug.* 100) and Josephus (*Bel. Jud.* 7.5.4).[43] Martial (8.65.1-12) states that it was the entrance way to the city, while Josephus (*Bel. Jud.* 7.5.4) states that it was important for the triumph itself, perhaps the point at which a ritual cleansing of the blood guilt

[41] Beard, 2007, 100-1.
[42] *LTUR* III, 334-5 (Coarelli); *LTUR* V, 202-5 (Agache); Künzl, 1988, 31-4; Richardson, 1992, 301.
[43] *LTUR* III, 334 (Coarelli); Versnel, 1970, 132-63; Beard, 2007, 98.

associated with war occurred.[44] Given that the term *porta* can refer to a gate in a wall rather than a freestanding arch, it is possible that the Porta Triumphalis was associated with, or identical to, the Porta Carmentalis which was a gate located in the Servian Walls close to the theatre of Marcellus.[45] Coarelli goes so far as to suggest that the original gate was located in the Servian wall and was later rebuilt as a freestanding arch, though there is no mention of this in the sources and no reason to believe that it had to be a freestanding arch at any point of its history.[46]

With regard to the route itself the reference by Josephus (*Bel. Jud.* 7.123-31) that Vespasian went 'back' to the Porta Triumphalis from the Porticus Octaviae is particularly perplexing.[47] 'Back' may be interpreted as returning toward the start of the triumph, north towards the central Campus Martius (Fig. 42). This would mean that the gate was placed north of the Circus Flaminius in the south-central Campus Martius.[48] No archaeological evidence has ever been found that would support the theory that the Porta Triumphalis was located in this area, nor the theory that the Porta Triumphalis was located close to the Villa Publica, as proposed by Makin.[49] An alternative explanation is that Josephus is giving directions in relation to the centre of pomerial Rome. This would not have been a particularly unusual literary technique, as the Capitoline Hill and Forum Romanum were the most recognisable topographical locations and markers on the Roman urban landscape and more recognisable markers for his audience. By stating that Vespasian went back to the gate, he simply means towards the city. Hence, the gate should be located at the most southerly edge of the Circus Flaminius, likely in the area of the Servian Wall.[50]

Following the marshalling and arrangement of the various elements of the triumph on the Campus Martius, the parade moved in a southerly direction, around the Forum Boarium, at which point it circled in a counter-clockwise direction around the Palatine Hill via the Circus Maximus, then finally up to the Capitoline Hill and the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus (Propertius, *Elegies,* 3.4.15-8; Josephus, *Bel. Jud.* 7.140; Pliny, *H.N.* 34.33)

---

[44] Bonfante Warren, 1970, 49, 53; Versnel, 1970, 145.
[45] *LTUR* III, 334 (Coarelli); Künzl, 1988, 33-4; Richardson, 1992, 301; Coarelli, 1997, 126-7; Beard, 2007, 97. Contra Wiseman, 1974, 12; Contra Makin, 1921, 30.
[46] *LTUR* III, 335 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 1997, 130.
[47] Makin, 1921, 29-30; Beard, 2007, 99.
[48] Beard, 2007, 99.
[49] Makin, 1921, 29-30.
[50] *LTUR* III, 324-5 (Coarelli); *LTUR* III, 334 (Coarelli).

(Fig. 42).[51] The move from the open spaces of the Campus Martius into the more densely urbanised area of the city with defined urban spaces and streets forced the triumph to evolve from a throng of people to a more controlled and organised line.[52] This represented a move from an extra-pomerial area, where the participants and spectators were freer and consequently more expressive, into a crowded urban space where participants were controlled and activities and military powers were restricted. This is a hugely significant transition in relation to an interpretation of the Campus Martius as it exemplifies the way in which the Campus Martius facilitated public expression and recreation in comparison to the area inside the *pomerium* where personal expression was restricted and the inhabitants of Rome and the military leaders were obliged to conform with Roman political, social and military formalities and constraints.

The buildings that were constructed along the triumphal route in the area of the Campus Martius were not subjected to such strict regulation as those on the Palatine or Capitoline hills, thus allowing for a more progressive, and perhaps more natural, development of the architecture, topography and cultural remit of the Campus Martius. Temples constructed on the Campus Martius also benefitted from the open nature of the area as it rendered buildings and their associated victory statements far more visible, making them excellent tools for self-promotion as well as adding monumentality (for example the Temple of Hercules Musarum. Appendix: 3.3.4). All of these factors were relevant in later phases and influenced the construction of porticoes and theatres along the triumphal route in Phases Three and Four.[53]

The extra-pomerial location of the Campus Martius allowed for the inclusion of elements of self-expression within the victory temples located there. Deities were often chosen because of their associations with family members (as was the case with Juno Regina and Diana, see section 3.3.5) or were constructed on a particularly large scale in order to draw attention to the political power of one's relative (for example the scale of the temple of Lares Permarini, see section 3.2.4).[54] Building materials such as Pentelic marble as well as vast quantities of Greek statues were incorporated into the construction and decoration of the temples. These materials would not have been tolerated within pomerial Rome due

---

[51] Bonfante-Warren, 1970, 54-5; Favro, 1994, 154.
[52] Favro, 1994, 153-4.
[53] Trigger, 1990, 119-21.
[54] For Juno Regina and Diana: *LTUR* II, 14 (Viscogliosi); *LTUR* III, 126-8 (Viscogliosi); Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 106. For Lares Permarini: *LTUR* III, 174-5 (Coarelli); Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 94.

to their inherently Greek nature. The Campus Martius may have accommodated the army and as such can be seen to have promoted traditional Roman military and political power, but more fundamentally it allowed for a type of personal expression not normally permitted by the confines of the *pomerium* and Roman gravitas.

3.1.3. The Circus Flaminius

It is vital that the location of the Circus Flaminius is positively identified in the southern Campus Martius as it had a huge impact on the topographical development of the area and was influenced by its proximity to the triumphal route.[55] Livy, Dio and Pliny the Elder, among others, all record the location of numerous temples, porticoes and shrines in relation to the Circus Flaminius, making it even more important that the location of the Circus Flaminius be pinpointed so that the best use may be made of their references.[56] Unfortunately the vast majority of temples have left no discernable trace in the archaeological record and consequently if one is to ascribe any possible location for these temples one must first be able to ascertain, with some degree of certainty, the general area in which the Circus Flaminius lay. Other informative sources regarding the location of the Circus Flaminius are the 4th century AD Regionary Catalogue and many *fasti* dating to the Republican and Imperial periods. The remains of the buildings associated with the Circus Flaminius which are still identifiable within the archaeological record also aid in this difficult task.

In order to locate the Circus Flaminius, the form and nature of this 'building' must first be questioned. A basic interpretation of the title of the 'Circus Flaminius' indicates that it was a horse racing arena named in honour of the family who constructed it in 221 BC and/or who owned the land on which it was constructed (Plutarch, *Rom.* 66).[57] The term *circus* suggests a Roman chariot racing stadium that consisted of two long sides, one rounded end and one open ended. A circus would frequently contain some type of permanent seating along the sides and therefore would, with luck, be visible to some

[55] For a detailed account of the scholarly tradition surrounding the Circus Flaminius see Olinder, 1974, 7-16.
[56] *LTUR* I, 272 (Viscogliosi); Wiseman, 1974, 5-8; Olinder, 1974, 17-82.
[57] *LTUR* I, 269 (Viscogliosi); Ross-Taylor, 1966, 31; Olinder, 1974, 7-16. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 111-2; Claridge, 1998, 221; Coarelli, 2007, 261-1, 266-7.

extent within the archaeological record. Thus, it had in previous generations, particularly in the 19th and early 20th centuries, always been assumed that somewhere within the southern Campus Martius lay a stadium for chariot racing that would resemble, though perhaps on a much smaller scale, that of the Circus Maximus. Given the commonly applied title of this building there was no reason to challenge the mental imagery conjured by the title 'Circus Flaminius', rather, all that had to be ascertained was the locality in which it had been constructed. It is only in recent years that this preconception has been challenged. [58]

It is now commonly accepted that the Circus Flaminius was not a circus in the traditional sense and that it was not used for chariot racing and did not have a solid horse-shoe shape with seating provided for spectators.[59] Rather, it was an open area used for a number of different types of events, many of which would not have been held within a traditional circus building. Wiseman suggests that the area was called a 'circus' due to the fact that it was roughly circular or oval in shape, the Latin noun *circus* or *circulus* meaning 'circle'.[60] Indications that the Circus Flaminius did not commonly accommodate chariot racing survives in the literary sources. Cicero (*Att.* 1.14.1) and Martial (12.74.2) both note that there were markets held in the Circus Flaminius while Livy (27.21.1) and Plutarch (*Marc.* 27) both refer to the fact that *contiones* were held here. Meanwhile, Dio (55.2.2) mentions that funeral orations were held in the circus and Vitruvius (*De Arch.* 9.8.1) notes that a sundial was placed in the circus. All of these sources describe an area that was used for functions more commonly associated with a Roman forum or market than with a traditional circus building.[61] Some informal or smaller scale games were also held in the Circus Flaminius, for example, the *Ludi Tauri* (Varro, *L.L.* 5.154) and the *Ludi Plebii* (Valerius Maximus, 1.7.4).[62] As both of these games were held at great intervals, it seems unlikely that any permanent seating was erected for their celebration and temporary, most likely wooden, seats were probably erected.[63]

Many attempts have been made to associate information from the archaeological and literary records with a solid circus building in the southern Campus Martius; however in

---

[58] Wiseman, 1974; 4; Coarelli, 2007, 267.
[59] *LTUR* I, 271 (Viscogliosi); Wiseman, 1974, 3-4; Coleman; 2000, 217. See also: Claridge, 1998, 221; Coarelli, 2007, 266-9.
[60] Wiseman, 1974, 3-4.
[61] Wiseman, 1974, 4; Coleman, 2000, 217.
[62] *LTUR* I, 270 (Viscogliosi); Coleman, 2000, 217.
[63] *LTUR* I, 271 (Viscogliosi); Wiseman, 1974, 4; Coarelli, 1997, 365; Sear, 2006, 54.

an attempt to do so exceptions were made in order to justify the lack of available archaeological material. For example, Ross Taylor, in her treatise on Roman assembly, tried to account for the fact that *contiones* of the tribunes, a meeting where the participants were required to remain standing, were held within the circus.[64] Such a meeting was held in 209 BC to discuss the tribune position of M. Claudius Marcellus (Livy, 27.21.1; Plutarch, *Marc.* 27). Due to the fact that the circus was assumed to have been a fully formed traditional circus building with permanent seating, Ross Taylor assumed that the Circus Flaminius was the only site in Rome in which the gathered congregation were permitted to sit for the *contiones*.[65] As the open nature of the Circus Flaminius has now be ascertained, this theory can be challenged and the Circus Flaminius can be accepted as a location in which those attending the *contiones* followed tradition and were required to stand for the meeting as normal.[66]

In light of the fact that the Circus Flaminius was an open, multi-functional space used for religious and secular events, the information provided by a number of ancient literary sources regarding the function and name of the site can be reconsidered. For example, where previously it was thought that the Circus Flaminius represented a traditional circus building, the fact that the site was referred to four times in the literary sources as the *prata Flaminia* or *Campus Flaminius* or 'Field of Flaminius' was always particularly problematic (e.g. Livy, 3.54.15; Varro, *L.L.* 5.154). Attempts were made to explain away the term by suggesting that the names referred to the site prior to the physical construction of the circus proper.[67] Knowing, as we now do, that in actual fact the circus was an open area, the terms *prata* and *campus* can be more easily applied as descriptive references to the open, forum-like area of the Circus Flaminius, particularly before it witnessed increased building activity and monumentalisation.

From as early as the 15th century AD the area around Via della Botteghe Oscure was identified as a likely location for the Circus Flaminius based on the archaeological remains that were found in the area.[68] However, the discovery of the Forma Urbis Romae in 1562 (FUR) and Gatti's subsequent reconstruction of this area, led to the area around Palazzi Mattei and Via della Botteghe being correctly identified as the theatre and Crypta

[64] Ross-Taylor, 1966, 31-2.
[65] Ross-Taylor, 1966, 32.
[66] Ross-Taylor, 1966, 29-31; Wiseman, 1974, 4.
[67] Olinder, 1974, 20; Wiseman, 1974, 3-4.
[68] Olinder, 1974, 8.

Balbi.[69] As a result a location for the Circus Flaminius had to be sought elsewhere, and evidence for a new position came from the FUR. Fragments 31ii and 31u of slab V-12 clearly indicate, based on Gatti's reconstruction, that the Circus Flaminius was located in front of the Porticus Octaviae, in the area along the modern road Via del Portico d'Ottavia (Fig. 47; Fig. 48; Fig. 50).[70]

Another method of confirming a location for the Circus Flaminius is by ascribing it a location relative to the buildings which are described in the ancient sources as being positioned in, or close to, the Circus Flaminius. Consequently based on literary sources and the FUR it has been ascertained that the Circus Flaminius was located in close proximity to the temples of Apollo, Jupiter Stator, Juno Regina, Hercules Musarum, and as a result, the quadroporticoes of Octaviae (Metelli) and Philippi (Fig. 46; Fig. 47; Fig. 48; Fig. 49).[71] As a number of these temples and quadroporticoes have been positively identified within the archaeological record and/or on the FUR, a location can, with some degree of certainty, be defined for the Circus Flaminius. This location places the Circus Flaminius, by the mid-Republic, in the area of Rome now occupied by the Jewish ghetto, between Via Arenula to the north-west and the theatre of Marcellus to the south-east, and with the Porticus Octaviae to the north and the Great Synagogue of Rome (Tempio Maggiore di Roma) to the south (Fig. 43). This open area likely covered a slightly wider area in the 3rd century BC prior to the construction of numerous victory monuments in Phases Two and Three.[72] This effectively means that the Circus Flaminius covered an area of around 500m in length.[73]

The rite of triumph had a drastic impact on the way in which the Campus Martius was perceived and used and how its topography developed. It was not only the route that the triumph took through the southern Campus Martius that impacted upon the area, but the subsequent construction of victory monuments which permanently commemorated the transient triumphant procession. It was the extra-pomerial location of the Campus Martius which allowed the triumph to have such a marked effect on the area as statements of victory, personal advertisement and cultural diversity were accommodated in an area that

---

[69] *LTUR* I 271 (Viscogliosi); *LTUR* V, 31 (Manacorda); Olinder, 1974, 8; Wiseman, 1974, 10-11; Sear, 2006, 66.
[70] *LTUR* I, 271 (Viscogliosi); Carrettoni, Colini & Cozza et.al., 1960, 91-3; Gatti, 1961, 17-20.
[71] *LTUR* I, 272 (Viscogliosi); Wiseman, 1974, 5-8; Coarelli, 2007, 267.
[72] Olinder, 1974, 8; Humphrey, 1986, 544.
[73] *LTUR* I, 271-2 (Viscogliosi); Coarelli, 2007, 266-7.

facilitated military activity. While Phase Two witnessed Roman political and military expansion and its commemoration, traditional religious association continued to find space on the Campus Martius and continued the association between the Campus Martius, the Tiber and fertility deities. While the Circus Flaminius facilitated military advancement and innovation, the *area sacra* of Largo Argentina retained and promoted aspects of Rome's traditional religious backdrop while incorporating victory commemoration, again highlighting the multi-functional nature of the Campus Martius.

3.2. The Early Temples of the Campus Martius

It is not surprising that the first deities to be honoured with the avowal and construction of temples on the Campus Martius were ones that were clearly associated with the physical environment of the floodplain of the Campus Martius and with its association with the military. For example, the temple of Bellona was constructed in the southern Campus Martius due to the area's strong association with war while temples were also dedicated to deities such as Juturna (Appendix: 3.2.2) and Lares Permarini (Appendix: 3.2.4) who were associated with water.[74] Given the proximity of the Campus Martius to the Tiber, and the numerous springs present in the area, such as the Sallustian spring and *amnis petronia* (Festus, 296L, 39L), the construction of temples to honour deities associated with water occurred at an early stage of Phase Two, at the beginning of the third century BC.[75] A number of temples associated with water and the physical nature of the Campus Martius were located in the central Campus Martius and in the *area sacra* of Largo Argentina (Fig. 51; Fig. 52). This location was more closely associated with the open, recreational area of the Campus Martius and was less densely packed with monuments. While the temples of the Circus Flaminius highlight an association with military triumph and victory, the temples of the central Campus Martius and the *area sacra* of Largo Argentina show that there was recognition on the part of their dedicators of the early nature of the Campus Martius and a desire to be associated with it. This association was created by the choice of deity honoured and the construction of the temple in an area removed from the urbanised regions of Rome.

3.2.1. L'Area Sacra

Four Republican victory temples and ancillary buildings are visible today in central Rome in the area commonly referred to as L'area Sacra of Largo Argentina (Fig. 51; Fig. 53).[76] Today the site covers the area between the modern Via Flordia, Via di Torre Argentina,

---

[74] *LTUR* I, 190 (Viscogliosi); *LTUR* III, 175 (Coarelli); *LTUR* IV, 347 (Burgers); Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 48, 93; Coarelli, 1997, 260-1.
[75] *LTUR* IV, 81 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 1997, 10; Heiken, Funiciello & De Rita, 2005, 85.
[76] Coarelli, 1981; Coarelli, 1997, 179-267. See also: Claridge, 1998, 215-9; Rehak, 2006, 14-5.

Via di San Nicola in Cesarini and Largo Argentina.[77] Two temples (Temples A and B) were already known on the site prior to 1926-7 when demolition work was undertaken to widen the modern road at which point a further two temples were discovered (Temples C and D).[78] In the Imperial period the site was bordered to the north by Thermae Agrippa (Appendix: 5.3.3) and the Hecatostylum (see section: 5.2.3) to the south by the Circus Flaminius, to the east by the Porticus Minucia Frumenteria (see section: 4.3.3) and to the west by the portico that was part of Pompey's theatre and garden complex (Appendix: 5.2.3) (Fig. 54; Fig. 55).[79] However, in its earliest developmental period in the third and second centuries BC the *area sacra* of Largo Argentina would have been the most northerly temple complex of the Campus Martius and would have been seen as being rather remote from the centre of Rome. At the end of the 3rd century BC this area was quite rural in nature in comparison to the location of the Circus Flaminius and its numerous victory temples, and it may have been for this reason that the deities commemorated in Largo Argentina were more visibly associated with the archaic, traditional environment and nature of the Campus Martius. The deities honoured in this area were associated with water and with more earthly elements, in a manner akin to the buildings of Phase One of the Campus Martius (from the foundation of Rome to the early 3rd century BC).

The date of the construction of the temples of Largo Argentina and the gods to whom they were dedicated has been the subject of much debate since their discovery in the early 20th century.[80] As a result the temples have been designated A, B, C, and D, reflecting the fact that the identification of their dedications has always been ambiguous. In light of recent interpretation and excavation it now seems clear that the dedication of temples A, B and D has been largely ascertained, while the dedication of Temple C (possibly Feronia) remains a topic open to debate. The task of identifying the temples has been somewhat hindered by the stratigraphy of the area, with numerous layers of development and re-development and many levels of paving from many different refurbishments in both the Republican and Imperial periods.[81]

---

[77] Coarelli, 2007, 275.
[78] Coarelli, 1981, 11; Claridge, 1998, 215; Coarelli, 2007, 275.
[79] Coarelli, 1981, 12.
[80] Coarelli,1981, 11; Cornell, 2000, 49-50; Coarelli, 2007, 275.
[81] Coarelli, 1981, 13-14; Coulston & Dodge, 2000, 3.

A century of archaeological investigation has discovered that the *area sacra* was not reserved for the construction of temples alone. For example the area housed the Statio Aquarum, the offices of the Roman water department, constructed beside the temple of Juturna by Agrippa around 33 BC (Phase Four), before being moved to an area beside the lacus Juturnae in the Forum Romanum in the 4th century AD.[82] While this building is of a later date and is not a victory temple, it indicates the continuing importance of the theme of water in the area.[83] Meanwhile, evidence from the perimeter of the *area sacra* has brought to light the remains of the Porticus Minucia Vetus (Appendix: 4.3.3), which was a four-sided portico that surrounded the victory temples, creating a self-contained enclave of Republican victory commemoration.[84] This quadroportico was added in 102 BC by M. Minucius Rufus (Phase Three) and indicates that the temples were still worthy of note some one hundred and fifty years following the construction of temple A (Juturna). So significant were these temples in 102 BC that M. Minucius Rufus desired to physically and symbolically associate himself with them. Archaeological investigation into the development of the *area sacra* indicates that in its entirety it was not a pre-conceived monument, but rather developed as a result of plans by at least five politicians to associate themselves to this area of the Campus Martius and to each other's victories. The resultant effect was that the area later contained within the Porticus Minucia Vetus embodied architectural and cultural aspects that were both contradictory and complimentary to each other.

By constructing a temple in the semi-rural area of the central Campus Martius, the provider created a monument that made an impact visually upon the visitor to the area. While lacking direct contact with the Circus Flaminius it seems highly likely that the temples of Largo Argentina would have been easily associated with the triumphal procession as it assembled in the Villa Publica prior to the beginning of the actual parade.[85] Consequently the temples of Largo Argentina, like those of the Circus Flaminius, would have had a connection to the triumphs of subsequent years, suggesting that those responsible for their construction had a strong desire to become associated with the past, present and future military triumphs of Rome but were aware of the popularity

---

[82] *LTUR* IV, 347-8 (Burgers); Coarelli, 1997, 246, 249. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 311-2.
[83] *LTUR* IV, 347 (Burgers); Ziolkowski, 1986, 623-41.
[84] Not to be confused with the Porticus Minucia Frumentaria which was constructed to the east of Largo Argentina in the Imperial period. See: *LTUR* IV, 347 (Burgers); *LTUR* IV, 137 (Coarelli).
[85] Favro, 1994, 153.

that could be amassed by constructing a temple in a more remote, though symbolically relevant, area.[86]

3.2.2. Temple of Juturna.

The temple of Juturna was vowed by C. Lutatius Catulus in 242 BC (Servius, *Ad Aen.* 12.139). The occasion for the vowing of the temple was the victorious Roman battle at Drepana, near Eryx, where Catulus was wounded (Polybius, 1.49-52; Eutropius, 2.27.2).[87] This temple was subsequently constructed in the Campus Martius, and while its exact location and year of dedication were not noted in any ancient literary source, the *dies natalis* was recorded as the 11th of January (*Fasti Antiates;* Cicero, *Pro. Clu.* 101).[88]

The form and location of the temple of Juturna has been determined, with some degree of certainty, in the archaeological record as a result of excavation and the aid of some important literary references. Based on the datable elements of the four temples of Largo Argentina, Temple A is most likely that of Juturna (Fig. 53; Fig. 56; Fig. 58).[89] First and foremost it coincides with the reference of Ovid (*Fast.* 1.463-4), who in the 1st century AD placed the temple near the end of the Aqua Virgo, which is known to have terminated its course above ground level in the vicinity of the Pantheon/Caprae Palus (Appendix: 2.3.3; 5.3.7) (Frontinus, *Aq.* 1.10, 1.22).[90] The extant archaeological remains of Temple A date it to the third century BC, indicating that it was constructed by C. Lutatius Catulus and not the later Q. Lutatius Catulus, the consul for 102 BC, as was recorded by Servius (*Ad Aen.* 12.139).[91] The latter, Q. Lutatius Catulus, was however responsible for the construction of the temple of Fortuna Huiusce Diei within the complex of Largo Argentina, which can be identified as Temple B of Largo Argentina, constructed *c.*101 BC (see section: 5.1.2) (Fig. 55).[92] Therefore, Temple A and Temple B represent two

---

[86] Makin, 1921, 25-36; Cornell, 2000, 48; Rehak, 2006, 13.
[87] *LTUR* III, 162-3 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 1981, 45; Coarelli, 1997, 243-4. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 308; Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 44-5.
[88] Degrassi, 1963, 395.
[89] *LTUR* III, 162-3 (Coarelli); Coarelli 1981, 45-6; Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 47; Claridge, 1998, 218; Stamper, 2007, 44-6; Contra Ziolkowski who believes that Temple C is the Temple of Juturna. Ziolkowski, 1986, 623-9.
[90] *LTUR* I, 73 (Le Pera); Lloyd, 1979, 195.
[91] Coarelli, 1997, 243-50; Coarelli, 1981, 46; Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 47-8; Coarelli, 2007, 277-9.
[92] *LTUR* II, 269-70 (Gros); Coarelli, 1981, 38; Coarelli, 1997, 275-92; Stamper, 2007, 45.

temples in very close proximity to each other that were constructed by two members of the same extended family, suggesting a familial association with the *area sacra,* as well as a desire by Q. Lutatius Catulus to associate himself with his forefather. A small building stands between Temple A and Temple B and this has been identified by Coarelli as the headquarters of the Statio Aquarum constructed here c. 33 BC.[93] Both Temple A and Temple B are recorded on fragment 37a of slab IV-6 of the FUR (Fig. 60).[94]

In its earliest form the temple of Juturna was a *prostyle* temple which stood on a high podium of 4m (Fig. 56; Fig. 61).[95] The footprint of the temple originally measured only 9.5m x 16m, the same size as the later *cella* of the temple, and had four columns across the front of the portico and was approached by a set of eighteen steps.[96] The temple stood on the clay ground, the ground level at the time being 3m lower than the later levels of the area.[97] The main building material of the temple was Grotta Oscura tufa, while it was decorated with terracotta antefixes.[98] A redevelopment of this temple occurred in the middle of the second century BC, when a raised platform measuring 12.5m wide x 14m long was placed in front of the temple, covering the original altar and the foot of the staircase of the original version.[99] In its form the platform is quite similar to the one which stood in front of Temple C of Largo Argentina (Fig. 54). This platform functioned to raise the altar by 1.5m, presumably in order to protect it from the floods which frequently inundated the area.[100] The altar was made accessible by a set of four steps during this reconstruction. A second redevelopment correlates with a second paving of Largo Argentina, which occurred at the end of the 2nd century BC.[101] While some changes were made at this time, the temple itself retained the same features and characteristics as previous versions. It was likely during the Augustan age that the temple was amalgamated into a large complex which consisted of a peripteral hexastyle building measuring 15m x 27.5m.[102] The temple was again altered after the fire of AD 80 and the white travertine

[93] *LTUR* III, 163 (Coarelli); *LTUR* IV, 347-8 (Burgers); Coarelli, 1997, 246.
[94] Carrettoni, Colini & Cozza et.al., 1960, 103-4.
[95] *LTUR* III, 163 (Coarelli); Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 47.
[96] *LTUR* III, 163 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 1981, 16.
[97] Coarelli, 1981, 16. See also: Claridge, 1998, 215.
[98] *LTUR* III, 163 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 1981, 16; Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 47.
[99] *LTUR* III, 163 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 1981, 16.
[100] Claridge, 1998, 215; Aldrete, 2006, 33-5.
[101] Coarelli, 1981, 13-14.
[102] *LTUR* III, 163 (Coarelli).

paving that can be seen today in front of the remains of the temple date to this repaving (Fig. 59).[103]

Both the form of the temple and the god to whom it was dedicated are important for an analysis of the southern Campus Martius during Phase Two. Juturna's association with water and healing is very important for the interpretation of the *area sacra* in general. The goddess Juturna was originally a nymph of a spring in Lavinium and was transported to Rome through cultural exchange with the Latin centres.[104] It is likely that the area in general had a particular association with water gods due the fact that it was close to the Tiber, the Navalia and to natural springs in the area such as the Sallustina and *amnis petronia* and also perhaps because the area was renowned for its frequent flooding (Festus, 296L; 39L).[105] The location of the *area sacra* and the foundation of the temple of Juturna, went on to influence the foundation of the victory temples of Lares Permarini (Appendix: 3.2.4) in 190 BC and Feronia Nymphae in 101 BC (possibly Temple C of Largo Argentina), both of which were associated with water gods. The association between water based deities and activities and the construction of victory monuments in the central Campus Martius is exemplified by the foundation of the Statio Aquarum in Largo Argentina around 33 BC and the later development of the Baths and Stagnum of Agrippa in 25 BC (Appendix: 5.3.3; 5.3.4).

3.2.3. Temple of Fons.

The temple of Fons was vowed by C. Papirius Maso following his defeat of the Corsican tribes and the resultant peace treaty in 231 BC (Cicero, *Nat. De.* 3.51-2).[106] The battle had been particularly hard and he lost many of his men to dehydration as he had been forced to chase the tribes through myrtle fields (Zonaras, 8.18.4).[107] Following the discovery of a spring, a number of his men were saved and as a consequence he vowed a temple to be

---

[103] Coarelli, 1981, 14; Claridge, 1998, 215.
[104] Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 46.
[105] *LTUR* IV, 81 (Coarelli); *LTUR* IV, 347 (Burgers); Coarelli, 1997, 10; Heiken, Funiciello & De Rita, 2005, 85.
[106] *LTUR* II, 256 (Arenon); Coarelli, 1997, 250-58. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 210; Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 51-2.
[107] Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 52.

constructed in Rome. The connection between a temple of the southern Campus Martius and deities associated with water and healing is again apparent. Unlike Catulus, Maso was not granted a triumph in Rome as he was not particularly favoured by the Senate and a number of men under his command had died while on campaign. Instead he was granted permission to celebrate a triumph on the Alban Mount, which he paid for himself, and for which he wore a crown of myrtle instead of the traditional laurel crown to commemorate events in Corsica.[108] He was so proud of this myrtle crown that he even wore it to the first Plebeian Games held in the Circus Flaminius in 220 BC some ten years later (Pliny, *H.N.* 15.126).

Little is known about the form and location of the temple of Fons, though the *dies natalis* is recorded as the 13th of October, while it is also noted in the *fasti* that the temple was located '*extra portam Fonti(nalem)*' (*Fast.Viae.Ardeat*).[109] The reference suggests only a very vague location for the temple, as the exact location of the Porta Fontinalis itself is uncertain.[110] Only two ancient passages (Festus, 85; Livy, 35.10.12) record the existence of the Porta Fontinalis, while it is only referenced in three inscriptions (*CIL* VI 9514; *CIL* VI 9921; *CIL* VI 33914).[111] While Livy (35.10.12) does mention that the temple was '*ad Martis aram*' ('next to the altar of Mars') this does not really aid in the allocation of a position as the altar of Mars itself is still a topic of great debate (2.4.1).[112] If one is to accept the recent suggestion that the Porta Fontinalis stood in the vicinity of modern Piazza Venezia, then it may reasonably be assumed that the temple of Fons stood somewhere in the south-east corner of the Campus Martius, close to the southern end of the Via Flaminia (the modern Via del Corso) (Fig. 57).[113] A location in this region would have ensured that the temple of Fons was located close to the triumphal route as well as to the *amnis patronia*. While Maso was denied the right to parade with his troops along the triumphal route proper, he ensured that his name, and his success in Corsica, was permanently associated with the triumphal route so that his triumph would be visually associated with later Roman victories.

---

[108] *LTUR* II, 256 (Arenon); Versnel, 1970, 165-6; Bonfante-Warren, 1970, 50; Miles, 2008, 62.
[109] *LTUR* II, 256 (Arenon); Degrassi, 1963, 54, 503; Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 53; Coarelli, 1997, 253-4.
[110] *LTUR* III, 328-9 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 1997, 254. See also: Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 54.
[111] *LTUR* III, 328; Platner & Ashby, 1926, 408.
[112] For the location of the altar of Mars see section 2.4.1
[113] *LTUR* II, 256 (Arenon); Platner & Ashby, 1926, 408; Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 53-4; Coarelli, 1997, 254-5.

The *dies natalis* of the temple of Fons was the 13th of October, which was a significant date as it was on this day that the Fontinalia was celebrated throughout Rome (Varro, *L.L.* 6.22).[114] On this day each year the god Fontus was honoured by the strewing of garlands and flowers into the public fountains of Rome.[115] While it is tempting to associate the temple of Fons and the feast of the Fontanalia based on the *dies natalis*, one must question the suggestion that there was a very strong relationship between the feast and the temple, as a great number of public fountains and water related deities were involved with the celebration of the Fontanalia.[116] Nonetheless, the location of the temple and the fact that it was vowed following a battle in which many Roman men died from dehydration does indicate, at least at some level, an association with water.

3.2.4. Temple of Lares Permarini.

The temple of Lares Permarini was vowed by L. Aemilius Regillus, the naval praetor of 190 BC during Rome's conflict in Aegean and Asian waters against Antiochus III of Syria (Livy, 37.7.8-16.).[117] Working in association with Rhodes and Pergamum, the climax of the encounter took place in Myonnesus in the autumn of 190 BC.[118] In honour of his victory, Regillus was granted a naval triumph in 189 BC, which was described in some detail by Livy (37.58.4). In his parade he displayed a great amount of booty, suggesting perhaps that Rome had received a greater proportion of moveable wealth than the Rhodian fleet.[119] His victory was commemorated in a *tabula triumphalis* which does not itself survive, but which was subsequently recorded by Livy (40.52.5-7) and which is very boastful of Regillus' victory.[120] As was normal practice when a general returned to Rome with great quantities of booty, the victory temple which he vowed was constructed from his own *manubiae*.[121]

---

[114] *LTUR* II, 257 (Arenon); Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 53.
[115] *LTUR* II, 256 (Arenon).
[116] *LTUR* II, 257 (Arenon); Coarelli, 1997, 254.
[117] *LTUR* III, 174 (Coarelli); Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 92-3; Richardson, 1992, 233; Coarelli, 1997, 258-9. See also: Claridge, 1998, 217-8.
[118] *LTUR* III, 174 (Coarelli); Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 92.
[119] Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 92.
[120] Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 92.
[121] Beard, North, Price, 1998a, 34-5; Orlin, 1997, 121-36; Miles, 2008, 54-8.

Around 190 BC, the year that the Temple of Lares Permarini was vowed, a number of other temples were also vowed for construction on the Campus Martius. This was due in part to the great number of battles and campaigns being carried out as part of the Punic Wars. From 192-182 BC six temples were vowed for construction on the Campus Martius, all of them constructed in the area around the Circus Flaminius, suggesting that the ongoing monumentalisation of the Campus Martius and Circus Flaminius had quickened in the first decades of the second century BC. In comparison to the other temples constructed in this ten year period on the Campus Martius, the temple of Lares Permarini was by far the most northerly temple as it was built in the *area sacra* of Largo Argentina and not in the Circus Flaminius (Fig. 4).

Both Livy (40.52.4) and Macrobius (*Sat.* 1.10.10) locate the temple of Lares Permarini in the Campus Martius. The *Fasti Antiates* records the *dies natalis* of the 23rd of December while the *Fasti Praenestini* gives further information for the temple, stating that its *dies natalis* was the 22nd of December and that it was located *in port[icu Mi]nucia.*[122] Given the avowal date of 190 BC and the date of the *Fasti Praenestini* (beginning of the 1st century AD), this must be a reference to the Republican Porticus Minucia Vetus, constructed *c.*110 BC (Fig. 54).[123] Consequently, the location of the temple depends a great deal upon the location one accepts for the Porticus Minucia Vetus (4.3.3). It is most plausible that the Porticus Minucia Vetus was constructed around the temples of the *area sacra* (modern Largo Argentina), enclosing the temple of Lares Permarini and the temple of Juturna by 102 BC (Fig. 4).[124] This is a particularly persuasive argument and one that has become ever more popular. However, it has also been argued that the temple of Lares Permarini coincides with the archaeological remains found on Via delle Botteghe Oscure.[125] This seems unlikely as an interpretation of these remains suggests that this was the site for the temple of the nymphs.[126]

Based on the datable evidence, Temple D of Largo Argentina, the largest and most southerly of the four temples enclosed by the Porticus Minucia Vetus, is that of Lares Permarini (Fig. 55). Based on the fact that concrete was used for the construction of the

---

[122] *LTUR* II, 175 (Coarelli); Degrassi, 1963, 138-9, 543; Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 94; Coarelli, 1997, 258.
[123] *LTUR* III, 137-8 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 1997, 296-345.
[124] *LTUR* II, 175 (Coarelli); *LTUR* III, 137-8 (Coarelli); *LTUR* IV, 347 (Burgers); Coarelli, 1981, 38; Coarelli, 2007, 279.
[125] As argued by: Ziolkowski, 1992, 120-2; Rehak, 2006, 15.
[126] *LTUR* III, 175 (Coarelli); *LTUR* III, 350-1 (Manacorda); Coarelli, 1997, 303.

podium, Temple D can be dated to no earlier than the beginning of the second century BC, fitting with the avowal of Lares Permarini in 190 BC.[127] Little remains of the original temple, though a great deal more remains of the refurbishment and redevelopment of the temple which coincided with the second paving of the area at the end of the second century BC. The podium in this later reconstruction was of a great size, measuring 23.5m x 37m and with a height of 2.58m (Fig. 61; Fig. 62).[128] The podium had a travertine base and was by far the largest podium in Largo Argentina.[129] Other than the podium, little information regarding the form of the temple in the 2nd century BC remains, though it would seem that at least following the reconstruction after the Domitianic fire the temple was prostyle and pseudo-peripteral, with 6 columns in the portico to the front.[130] The *cella* walls from this Domitianic rebuilding survive in part, and appear to take up the full width of the podium.[131] Further excavation of this temple is required but exploration is hindered by the fact that a great deal of the temple lies beneath Via Florida (Fig. 63; Fig. 64).

While the form of the original temple remains uncertain, the size of the podium implies that Regillus was making an ostentatious statement regarding his triumph. Another possible interpretation is that the temple was constructed on such a large scale in order to commemorate his family, and in particular his father, who had been denied the consulship when Fabius Maximus cancelled the consular elections in 214 BC (Livy, 24.7.11).[132] The sheer scale of the temple of Lares Permarini would have made a very visible political statement and it is reasonable to assume that Regillus was not only celebrating his own military triumph, but was also promoting the political achievements of his father. As the temple took eleven years to construct, the dedication did not take place within Regillus' own lifetime. Consequently in 179 BC the honour of the dedication fell to M. Aemilius Lepidus, a relative of Regillus', who coincidentally was the censor for the year and who was responsible for a number of building dedications in that year including the temples of Diana and Juno Regina (Livy, 40.52.4).[133] In fact, the temple of Lares Permarini was one of four temples dedicated in the Campus Martius in 179 BC suggesting a very important,

---

[127] *LTUR* III, 175 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 1981, 38.
[128] *LTUR* IV, 138 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 1981, 19; Claridge, 1998, 217.
[129] *LTUR* IV, 138 (Coarelli); Shoe, 1965, 180-1, 185; Coarelli, 1981, 18; Coarelli, 2007, 277.
[130] Richardson, 1992, 233.
[131] *LTUR* III, 175 (Coarelli); Claridge, 1998, 217-8.
[132] Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 94.
[133] Coarelli, 1997, 259; Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 93.

and arguably co-ordinated, monumentalisation of the southern Campus Martius and Circus Flaminius.

While the household gods known as the Lares were commonly worshipped by the Romans, this temple marks the first time that the Lares Permarini, or household gods of the mariners, were worshipped by the Romans.[134] It has been postulated that during his naval campaign, while on the island of Samothrace, Regillus came into contact with a god who protected seafarers. These gods of the island were called the Cabiri and originated in Thrace and incorporated mystical elements in their worship.[135] Apart from the fact that the Cabiri may have appealed to Regillus because they protected seafarers, the association with the Roman Lares may also be important. The traditional Roman *Lares Familiaries* were particularly associated with the sacrifice of a ram following the death of a family member. As Regillus' brother had died on the same campaign, on the island of Samothrace, it is possible that the Lares were incorporated into this grouping in order to pay honour to his brother, hence merging two deities in honour of both Regillus' family and his naval exploits.

The fact that this deity had never before been witnessed in Rome, and the fact that the victory was a naval one, likely influenced the decision to build this victory temple in the *area sacra.* By constructing his temple in this area Regillus was afforded the opportunity to associate his monument with other aquatic deities and future military triumphs. It was also a location spacious enough to build a grand and ostentatious temple. This is a good example of a growing desire among prominent politicians to place their temples in a thematically relevant location, both in the *area sacra* and in the Circus Flaminius.

[134] Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 93.
[135] *LTUR* III, 175 (Coarelli); Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 93; Coarelli, 1997, 260-1.

3.3. Temples, Triumph and Politics

The benefits of constructing a victory temple in the Circus Flaminius, in close proximity to the route of the triumph, have been explored at some length thus far. The individual who constructed a temple in this manner not only benefited himself politically during his lifetime but also ensured that by association his descendants could also garner political recognition and support. Such was the case for the son of M. Acilius Glabrio following his construction of the temple to Pietas in 190 BC (see section: 3.3.3) (Livy, 40.34.4-6; Polybius, 20.10.10).[136] The association between politics, triumph and the Circus Flaminius greatly influenced not just the location of the temple, but the deity to whom it was dedicated, the axis on which it sat and the materials that were used to construct and decorate it. However, due to the available literary and archaeological sources for Phase Two it remains difficult to identify with total accuracy the exact location of all of the temples located close to the Circus Flaminius.

3.3.1. 'In Circo' and 'Ad Circum'

There are a number of literary sources which are of particular use for the identification of victory temples and other buildings in the vicinity of the Circus Flaminius. The regular literary sources, such as Pliny (*H.N.*), Livy, Cassius Dio and Vitruvius (*De Arch.*), written from the late 1st century BC to the 3rd century AD and covering a period from the foundation of Rome to the early Empire provide, on occasion, information pertinent to the Circus Flaminius in Phase Two. Sources such as these, while often written some two hundred years after the construction of the relevant temples and buildings, often mention in passing that Republican buildings, and temples in particular, were located in, or close to, the Circus Flaminius. Another very important type of source, particularly in relation to temples, are the *fasti.* These Roman calendars record the *dies natalis* of a temple and occasionally imply the location in which it was constructed. The *fasti* vary in date from the Republican period to the Imperial period and often preserve contradictory

[136] *LTUR* IV, 86 (Ciancio Rossetto).

information.[137] These contradictions often hint at the fact that the temple has been reconstructed or refurbished at a later date.

In light of the fact that the Circus Flaminius is now recognised to have been an open area between modern Via Arenula and the remains of the theatre of Marcellus, a great deal more information can be garnered from the use of the terms *in circo, ad circo* and *in campo* which are so frequently used to describe the victory temples of the southern Campus Martius (Fig. 43; Fig. 46).[138] The location of a temple is often confused in modern treatise because in one source the temple is referred to as located in the circus (*in circo*), while in other sources it is located as near the circus (*ad circo*) or next to the circus (*apud circo*). By 221 BC, the date of the foundation of the Circus Flaminius, six temples were described as *in circo*. These temples were Vulcan, Apollo, Bellona, Neptune, Hercules Custos and perhaps also the temple of Castor (Fig. 46).[139] At the time when these temples were constructed, in the early to mid Republic, the area that would become known as the Circus Flaminius encompassed quite a wide area and was unhindered by many permanent structures, particularly to the north. As a result, a temple could easily be placed within this area and allotted a geographical reference by the literary sources or *fasti* within the actual field of the Circus Flaminius; hence temples were referred to as *in circo*. However, the construction of later temples and porticoes, especially along the north-eastern side of the circus area, forced the open area of the Circus Flaminius to shrink. With the narrowing of the open area newer buildings could no longer be constructed within the open circus area and many buildings were instead described as *ad* or *apud* the small open area of the circus.[140]

This argument is best exemplified by taking a closer look at the date and nature of the sources themselves. The use of the term *ad/apud* is far more common in the *fasti* than it is within the literary sources.[141] The reason for this is that the *fasti* were written, by and large, from the early Imperial period onwards, by which time the Circus Flaminius was no longer a large open space and could no longer accommodate buildings within it. Consequently, buildings were perceived to be further away from the open area than had previously been the case. As a result the perspective of Republican authors such as Livy

[137] Degrassi, 1963; Olinder, 1974, 26-36; Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 19; Cornell, 1995, 13, 218.
[138] Olinder, 1974, 17-82.
[139] Wiseman, 1974, 5.
[140] Wiseman, 1974, 8.
[141] Olinder, 1974, Tables, 1, 2, & 3.

was considerably different from the Imperial compilers of the *fasti* who described the positions of the Republican temples to the open space of the Circus Flaminius as they saw it.[142]

An understanding of these sources and the relative description of location means that another problematic issue can be resolved. Two temples, Vulcan and Juno Regina, are referred to in the sources as being both *in campo* and *in circo Flaminio*.[143] For many years these descriptions led to the duplication of the cult and uncertainty regarding the location of the circus.[144] Given what is now known about the nature and development of the Circus Flaminius this problem can be remedied. Originally these two temples were considered as *in circo* due to their position in relation to the open area of the Circus Flaminius (Fig. 46). Confusion arose for authors in the late Republic when the open area of the original circus got smaller and the northern Circus Flaminius was replaced instead by an urban streetscape.[145] As a result, those temples originally on the northern edge of the Circus Flaminius would have been seen as removed from the visible open circus area by quite some distance. Consequently, the temples of Juno Regina and Vulcan were thought to be closer to the south-central Campus Martius than to the Circus Flaminius and consequently the temples were given a new designation, *in campo,* and became associated with the Campus Martius which was now visibly closer.[146] These two references led to the assumption that there were two temples of both Juno Regina and Neptune; one *in circo* and one *in campo.*

The reason why the Circus Flaminius was so frequently referred to in the sources, and the reason why so many temples and porticoes were constructed in the vicinity, was as a result of its strong association with the rite of military triumph. The open nature of this area was used to facilitate statements of victory and military advancement. While the theme of triumph was of great importance for the initial and subsequent development of the area, the growing number of victory monuments also led to a growth in competition between generals. The Circus Flaminius, throughout Phase Two, grew into an area in which victorious military generals could advertise their success and commemorate their victories. As the number of triumphs increased, due to Roman military advancement and

---

[142] *LTUR* I, 270 (Viscogliosi); Wiseman, 1974, 8.
[143] Wiseman, 1974, 5.
[144] *LTUR* I, 272 (Viscogliosi).
[145] Wiseman, 1974, 7-8.
[146] *LTUR* II, 126-8 (Viscogliosi); Wiseman, 1974, 5-8.

success in the Punic Wars, Roman generals could use the Circus Flaminius as a space to construct lavish monuments with the aim of attracting public recognition and support. As soon as the Circus Flaminius was recognised as a space for victory monuments it became associated with competition between generals vying for political and personal support in order to further their own careers. While this theme may have originated and started to evolve in Phase Two, in Phases Three and Fourth, with the expansion of Roman imperial power and the associated fall of Republican rule, physical reminders of political competition in the Circus Flaminius and wider Campus Martius became ever greater and on a grander scale. Aspects of this can be seen in the temples constructed around the Circus Flaminius in Phase Two.

3.3.2. Temple of Bellona

The temple of Bellona was located at the south-eastern corner of the Circus Flaminius close to the temple of Apollo Medicus and the later theatre of Marcellus (Fig. 65; Fig. 66).[147] It now seems likely that the temple can be associated with the remains found beneath Piazza Montanara upon its demolition in 1932-3 (Fig. 66).[148] Dedicated to a goddess concerned with warfare it was appropriately located outside of the *pomerium* and close to the Porta Triumphales and the triumphal procession as it passed from the Campus Martius to the Forum Boarium.[149] Pliny the Elder (*H.N.* 35.12) records that the temple was originally vowed by Appius Claudius, the consul for 495 BC with Servilius. This is most likely an error by Pliny the Elder as it places the temple at a very early date.[150] Given what is known about the temple's association with triumph and the declaration of war, a 3rd century BC date seems far more appropriate.[151] More likely the Appius Claudius in question was Appius Claudius Caecus who dedicated a temple in 296 BC following a victory over the Etruscans (Livy, 10.19.17; Ovid, *Fast.* 6.201).[152] The location of the temple associated it with the *gens Claudia* as the tomb of the family lay on the slopes of the Campidoglio, not far from the location of the temple of Bellona.[153] The

[147] *LTUR* I, 191 (Viscogliosi); Coarelli, 1997, 392.
[148] *LTUR* I, 192 (Viscogliosi); Ashby, 1933, 3; Lugli, 1946, 2.
[149] *LTUR* I 191 (Viscogliosi).
[150] *LTUR* I, 191 (Viscogliosi).
[151] *LTUR* I, 190 (Viscogliosi); Coarelli, 2007, 271.
[152] *LTUR* I, 191 (Viscogliosi); Wiseman, 1974, 14; Ziolkowski, 1992, 18-19; Coarelli, 1997, 391.
[153] *LTUR* I, 191-2.

connection with the *gens Claudia* was further emphasised in the early Imperial era when Appius Claudius Pulcher restored the temple.[154] It is of particular note that this temple, so associated with the Claudian family, should sit beside the temple of Apollo Medicus, dedicated in honour of the Julian family.[155]

Bellona was a native Italian deity who was also known as Duelon or Duellona, from the old Latin word for war '*Duellum*' (Horace, *Odes*, 3.5.38; Cicero, *De Or.* 153).[156] She was a goddess associated with war and represented an aspect of the god Mars, most likely the frenzy associated with battle.[157] The *dies natalis* of the temple of Bellona was recorded as the 3rd of June (Ovid, *Fast.* 6.199; *Fast.Ven*).[158] The temple was used for a number of functions concerning the administration of war, its declaration and celebration and was used by the Senate when they met to discuss the bestowal of triumph.[159] Many such meetings are preserved by Livy, who reports on the discussions that were held in the temple prior to the triumph of Marcellus in 211 BC (Livy, 26.21.1), those of P. Cornelius Scipio in 206 BC and 191 BC (Livy, 28.38.2 and 36.39.5), and Ti. Sempronius Gracchus and L. Postumus Albinus in 178 BC (Livy, 41.6.4).[160]

In addition to the declaration and celebration of military combat, the Senate met in the temple in order to discuss the election of governors, pro-praetors and pro-consuls before they were sent to their provinces, and again to greet them upon their return (Cicero, *Verr.* 2.5.41; Plutarch, *Sull.* 7.6; Dio, 50.4.5).[161] Also, foreign ambassadors, such as those from Carthage and Macedonia (in 202 BC and 171 BC respectively) were received here as they were very rarely allowed to cross the *pomerium* into the city proper (Livy, 30.21.40; 33.24.5; 42.36). In addition to the actual temple building, other architectural elements were associated with the wider temple complex. According to Festus (33L) the *Columna Bellica* stood in front of the temple, while he also records that a *Senaculum*, an open space for senators to meet, was located nearby (Festus, 347).[162] Unfortunately Festus is the only source to record the existence of the *Senaculum* in front of the temple of Bellona

---

[154] *RE* III, *Claudius,* 296-8.
[155] For more on the association between the two families and the two temples see *LTUR* I, 191 (Viscogliosi).
[156] *LTUR* I, 190 (Viscogliosi); Taylor & Scott, 1969, 570; Clausen, 1971, 71.
[157] *LTUR* I, 191 (Viscogliosi); Platner & Ashby, 1926, 82; Richardson, 1992, 58; Coarelli, 1997, 392.
[158] Degrassi, 1963, 465.
[159] *LTUR* I, 191 (Viscogliosi); Taylor & Scott, 1969, 570; Richardson, 1992, 58.
[160] For a more detailed list of the triumphs noted by Livy see *LTUR* I, 191 (Viscogliosi).
[161] *LTUR* I, 190 (Viscogliosi); Richardson, 1992, 58.
[162] *LTUR* I, 300-1 (La Rocca); Richardson, 1992, 58; Taylor & Scott, 1969, 571.

and an exact location for it is impossible to determine based on archaeological evidence and current sources.[163]

There are a small number of literary references which aid in the search for an exact location for the temple of Bellona in the south-eastern area of the Circus Flaminius. Plutarch (*Sull.* 32) wrote that the temple was located at the *agora*, perhaps referring to the Forum Holitorium with its market places and traders.[164] Plutarch (*Sull.* 30) also mentions that in 82 BC the cries of Marius' supporters and the Samnite prisoners of war captured at the battle of Porta Collina and held in the Villa Publica could be heard by the senators in the temple of Bellona (Seneca, *Clem.* 1.12.1; Dio, *fr.* 109.5-7). This indicates that the temple was located within earshot of the Villa Publica (Fig. 57). Plutarch (*Sull.* 30) goes on to state that it was located next to the temple of Apollo and its *perirrhanterion* (ritual marble water basin).[165] Ovid (*Fast.* 6.205) noted that the temple was placed *ad circo*, indicating that by the Imperial period it was at least partially removed from the open area of the Circus Flaminius but in close proximity to it. Presently, based on the interpretation of the literary sources, the most convincing argument for the location of the temple of Bellona comes from Coarelli, who has argued for a location to the east of the temple of Apollo Medicus/Sosianus.[166] There are a few scant archaeological remains in this area, most of which date from the Imperial period, which came to light during the excavations of 1932-3 (when Piazza Montanara was demolished), and also during excavations held from 1938-9, though unfortunately no substantial part of the temple has survived.[167]

What has remained is a podium with a concrete core constructed in *opus quadratum*. An examination of what remains of the temple, in association with fragments 31d and 31e of slab V-12 of the Marble Plan (Fig. 67), suggests that, at least in the Imperial period, the temple of Bellona was peripteral and hexastyle with 9 columns along the sides and that it stood on a podium, and was approached by a frontal staircase.[168] An analysis of fragments of the architectural decoration dating from the 2nd half of the 1st century BC suggest that this temple was one of the first in Rome to use local Italian craftsmen to engrave the

---

[163] Platner & Ashby, 1926, 470; *LTUR* IV, 265 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 1997, 392; Richardson, 1992, 348.
[164] *LTUR* I, 190 (Viscogliosi).
[165] *LTUR* I, 190 (Viscogliosi); *LTUR* II, 299 (Coarelli).
[166] Coarelli, 1997, 392-5; Coarelli, 2007, 271.
[167] *LTUR* I, 192 (Viscogliosi); Lugli, 1946, 2; Richardson, 1992, 347-8.
[168] *LTUR* I, 192 (Viscogliosi); Carrettoni, Colini & Cozza et.al., 1960, 91-3; Richardson, 1992, 58; Stamper, 2007, 121.

marble used for the temple decoration.[169] This theory is based on the relatively poor quality of the work present in the entablature which indicates that it was undertaken by craftsmen inexperienced with the material.[170]

The temple of Bellona exemplifies in location, function and dedication the association of the Campus Martius with war, the military, triumph and politics. As such it is representative of the nature of the Campus Martius in Phases One and Two. While little can be ascertained about its architectural form, the quantity of references to it in the literary sources imply just how important this temple was in Rome, both at times when Rome was engaged in military battles, and in times of peace. The temple, *columna* and *Senaculum* created a compound in which the military nature of both the Campus Martius, and the city of Rome itself, was advertised, honoured and commemorated.

3.3.3. Temple of Pietas.

The temple of Pietas was vowed by M. Acilius Glabrio following the battle of Thermopylae in 192 BC during which Glabrio successfully aided the Aetolians in their dispute with King Antiochus III of Syria (Polybius, 20.10.10; Plutarch, *Cat. Mai.* 12.1; Livy, 40.34.4-6).[171] Pietas may have been chosen as an appropriate deity to honour on this occasion as the god represented devotion and respect to parents, family and gods, as well as to the deceased and to the living. Pietas also represented respect to Rome itself.[172] Given the date of 192 BC for the avowal of the temple, these qualities would have had particular relevance for the inhabitants of Rome.

On his return to Rome in 190 BC Glabrio celebrated a full triumph (Livy, 37.46.2-6). While Glabrio could theoretically have been denied a triumphal parade (as technically the conflict with Antiochus III had not been fully resolved and he did not return to Rome with all of his troops) the Senate declared that he might celebrate the rite in the traditional manner, indicating that he had considerable support within the Senate. The triumph is

---

[169] *LTUR* I, 192 (Viscogliosi); Strong, 1963, 80; Stamper, 2007, 121.
[170] *LTUR* I, 192 (Viscogliosi); Stamper, 2007, 121.
[171] *LTUR* IV, 86 (Ciancio Rossetto); Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 85-6; Richardson, 1992, 291; Coarelli, 1997, 447-8.
[172] *LTUR* IV, 86 (Ciancio Rossetto); Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 87.

described in some detail by Livy (37.46.3-4), while Caesius Bassus (GL. 6.265 (Keil)) preserves a *tabula triumphalis* which was written in Saturnine verse.[173] Glabrio's popularity amongst the senators was somewhat short-lived however as he commemorated his victory by bestowing lavish gifts upon members of the public, a move which was viewed by the senators of the time as 'buying' support (Livy, 37.57.11). He distributed gifts such as bread, money and oil and it may have been the sheer quantity of material distributed, and not the act itself, which led to criticisms from his peers.[174] Legal action was taken against him and he was burdened with a hefty fine, which was later withdrawn when he stood down from the censorial elections (Livy, 37.58.1). He was not seen in political life again.[175] These acts exemplify the increasing level of competition in Republican Rome for public recognition and support, though on this occasion the Senate wielded enough power to rein in the general.

The temple of Pietas was not fully completed until 181 BC, at which time it was likely Glabrio's son who carried out the dedication (Livy, 40.34.4-6; Valerius Maximus, 2.5.1).[176] Due to the amount of booty that was retrieved during the initial campaign against Antiochus III, it seems unlikely that the reasons for the ten year delay between vow and dedication was financial. It is therefore possible that a degree of senatorial pressure had been exerted which resulted in the delay in the construction of the temple.[177] Natural events may also have contributed to the lengthy construction period involved on this occasion. Livy (35.21.5-6; 35.40.8) recorded that the area in which the temple was constructed required extensive repairs after the floods of 193 BC and 192 BC and the fire of 192 BC, all of which would have hindered construction. A number of literary sources subscribe a general location for the temple of Pietas, however they are quite contradictory. Livy (40.34.4; Valerius Maximus, 2.5.1) recorded that the temple was located *in foro holitorio* while Julius Obsequens (54) noted that the temple was located *in circo Flaminio*.[178] These two observations suggest that the temple was located in the extreme south of the Campus Martius, in the area around the southeast corner of the Circus Flaminius (Fig. 55). Such a position placed the temple in close proximity to the triumphal route. Pliny the Elder (*H.N.* 7.121) went further and noted that the temple was

[173] Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 86.
[174] Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 87.
[175] Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 88; Coarelli, 1997, 450.
[176] *LTUR* IV, 86 (Ciancio Rossetto); Richardson, 1992, 290; Coarelli, 1997, 449.
[177] Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 88.
[178] *LTUR* IV, 86 (Ciancio Rossetto); Richardson, 1992, 290; Coarelli, 1997, 449.

originally constructed '*now where the theatre of Marcellus is*'. In light of this last statement it may be taken that the temple of Pietas was one of the two temples that Julius Caesar demolished in order to make way for the theatre that was inaugurated in 13/11 BC and named in honour of Marcellus (Fig. 71). Cassius Dio (43.49.2-3) confirms this theory as he also records that the temple was demolished by Caesar.

Nothing of the original temple survives, but given that it was constructed only a few years before Temple D of Largo Argentina it likely took a similar form to the temple of Lares Permarini, with a high podium and tufa as the primary construction medium.[179] Nothing of the decoration of the actual temple is known, however Valerius Maximus (2.5.1) noted that the gilded equestrian statue displayed to the front of the temple and dedicated by Glabrio's son was the first of its kind in Italy.[180] This type of statue was particularly fitting as a memorial to Glabrio as it was unique and ostentatious, as well as undoubtedly expensive.

The fact that two different *dies natalis* are recorded for the temple of Pietas suggests that following the original temple's destruction in the late 1st century BC a shrine or temple to the god was erected on a different site. The date of the 13th of November is recorded in a fragment of the *Fasti Antiates*.[181] Meanwhile the *Fasti Amiternini* records the date as the 1st of December.[182] Therefore both the original temple of 181 BC and the late Republican version had different *dies natalis*.[183] This theory is dependant upon the interpretation of the fragment [*tati*] in the *Fasti Antiaties* as *Pietati*, rather than *Felicitati.* It has been suggested that one of the two small buildings at the back of the theatre of Marcellus, as marked on FUR 31qrs of slab V-12, is likely to be that of a temple of Pietas (Fig. 68).[184] This suggestion is particularly persuasive as the site of the original temple would have remained sacred and would have warranted the construction of even a small shrine. This hypothesis is not universally accepted. For example Castagnoli suggested that the temple should be reconstructed beside the temple of Apollo Medicus, on the site which has since been identified as the temple of Bellona (Appendix: 3.3.2).[185] Richardson meanwhile, believes the temple should be placed near the church of S. Nicola in Carcere, south of the

---

[179] *LTUR* III, 175 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 1981, 38.
[180] *LTUR* IV, 86 (Ciancio Rossetto); Gruen, 1992, 119; Richardson, 1992, 290; Coarelli, 1997, 449.
[181] *LTUR* IV, 86 (Ciancio Rossetto); Degrassi, 1963, 23, 530; Coarelli, 1997, 448.
[182] *LTUR* IV, 86 (Ciancio Rossetto); Degrassi, 1963, 533; Coarelli, 1997, 448.
[183] Pietilä-Castrén, 1987; 89.
[184] *LTUR* IV, 86 (Ciancio Rossetto); Carrettoni, Colini & Cozza et.al., 1960, 91-3; Coarelli, 1997, 448, 451.
[185] *LTUR* IV, 86 (Ciancio Rossetto); Castagnoli, 1986, 331.

theatre of Marcellus.[186] The most convincing argument remains the theory that the small shrine of Pietas was placed at the back of the theatre of Marcellus, in one of the eastern rooms of the building.[187] This would place the temple parallel to the church of S. Nicola in Carcere.

3.3.4. Temple of Hercules Musarum

The temple of Hercules Musarum was vowed by M. Fulvius Nobilior during the siege of Ambracia in 189 BC (Livy, 38.3.1-9.12; Polybius, 21.26-28). As there was no single definitive battle during this siege it is not known exactly at what point the temple was dedicated. It is possible that it was vowed at the same time as the games to Jupiter were also promised (Livy 39.5.7). These games were not held until 186 BC, a year after Nobilior's triumph for his victory over Ambracia took place.

The location of the temple is well attested by the Forma Urbis Romae (FUR) on fragments 31bb of slab V-12 (Fig. 69), as well as the now lost fragments of 31ee, ff, gg (Cod.Vat.Lat. 3439- Fo 22r) (Fig. 70).[188] As a result the temple is recognisable on the north-easterly side of the Circus Flaminius (Fig. 71; Fig. 74). This temple was one of the first to monumentalise the northern side of the Circus Flaminius and would have been visibly associated with the triumphal route. The temple, at least in the form it took during the Severan period when the FUR was created, was of a *tholos* type with a rectangular *pronaos* and was approached by a flight of five steps (Fig. 72; Fig. 73).[189] Around the rectangular *pronaos* were a series of niches which may have been used to display the statues of the Muses. Gros believes that this plan, as reflected in the FUR, was retained from the original Republican temple, however Richardson disagrees with this and suggests that this form came about during the reconstruction by Philippus in 29 BC (Suetonius, *Aug.* 29.5).[190] Unfortunately thus far archaeological investigation has been unable to resolve this debate. The unusual design of the building can be interpreted as representing the two cults; Hercules and the Muses. Hercules was frequently worshipped

---

[186] Richardson, 1992, 290.
[187] *LTUR* IV, 86 (Ciancio Rossetto); Sear, 2006, 62.
[188] Carrettoni, Colini & Cozza et.al., 1960, 91-3.
[189] *LTUR* III, 19 (Viscogliosi); Richardson, 1992, 187; Coarelli, 1997, 475-6.
[190] Richardson, 1977, 355-61; Richardson, 1992, 187; Coarelli, 1997, 457.

within a *tholos* shaped temple, for example the temple of Hercules Victor on the Forum Boarium (Fig. 75; Fig. 76), and consequently it was likely that the *tholos* element of the temple represented the cult of Hercules, while the rectangular section of the temple represented the Muses, with the niches used for the display of statues of the Muses.[191] Further evidence for the association of Nobilior and the Muses comes from the inscription *CIL* VI 1307 found near the temple.[192] The inscription reads:

M. Folvios M.f./
Ser.n. Nobilior cos Ambracia/
Cepit.

The inscription was found on a plinth which originally belonged to a statue of one of the Muses, likely taken as booty from Ambracia and subsequently displayed in the temple (Pliny, *H.N.* 35.66).[193] A coin struck in 66 BC by Q. Pomponius Musa, represents another statue of a Muse, believed to have been located within Nobilior's sanctuary (Fig. 77).[194] Hence it is quite clear that both aspects of the cult, the Muses and Hercules, were physically represented within this unusual temple complex.

Two contradictory *dies natalis* are recorded for the temple, June 13th (*Fast.Phil*) and June 30th (Ovid, *Fast.* 6.797), one of these dates almost certainly being the original date of dedication, the other representing the date of dedication following the rebuilding by Philippus in 29 BC (Suetonius, *Aug.* 29.5).[195] The exact year for the original dedication of the temple remains elusive and only a rough date can be generally ascertained by comparing the date of the vow for the construction of the temple (189 BC) and the date of Nobilior's triumph (187 BC). The temple cannot have been dedicated as early as 189 BC as Nobilior was still in Ambracia, but a date of 187 BC, the same year as he celebrated his triumph, is possible though suggests an unusually quick construction in comparison to other temples constructed on the Campus Martius in this era. 179 BC, when Nobilior was censor, is a likely date based in part on a passage in Eumenius (*Panegyrici,* 9.7.3), which states that the temple was constructed *'ex pecunia censoria'* (*from censorial money*). This reference to censorial funding is almost certainly incorrect as the temple of Hercules

[191] Richardson, 1977, 361; Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 100; Richardson, 1992, 187.
[192] *LTUR* III, 17-18 (Viscogliosi); Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 101-2.
[193] Richardson, 1977, 361; Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 101-2; Richardson, 1992, 187; Miles, 2008, 69.
[194] Crawford, 1974, 437-9; Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 102; Richardson, 1977, 358; Richardson, 1992, 187; *LTUR* III, 19 (Viscogliosi).
[195] *LTUR* III, 18 (Viscogliosi); Degrassi, 1963, 471.

Musarum was not listed by Livy (40.51) with the other buildings that were constructed by Lepidus and Nobilior in their censorial building activities of 179 BC.[196] The mistake on the part of Eumenius in attributing the funding does not render the dedication date of 179 BC incorrect. The fact that Nobilior became a target for the conservative oration of M. Cato in 179 BC (Cicero, *Tusc.* 1.3) suggests that something occurred in that year to draw attention to the consul's actions.[197] The dedication of a temple containing many works of Greek art taken from Ambracia would certainly have focused enough attention on him to warrant criticism.[198]

It was the objects and functions contained within the temple, rather than the temple form itself, which led to numerous comments from Republican writers. One of the reasons that Nobilior was picked out for particular criticism from Rome's more conservative critics such as Cato the Elder was because of the quantity of Greek artwork that he imported into Rome. A number of people from Ambracia had complained to Rome about the quantity of materials plundered from the city while Nobilior was proconsul of Greece in 187 BC (Livy, 38.43.1-5). Livy (38.9.13) notes that the booty brought to Rome was of a very high quality, perhaps due to the fact that King Pyrrhus had himself been resident in Ambracia before the siege and resultant sacking by the Romans had taken place (Polybius, 21.30.9). Nobilior had been careful not to take any works made in terracotta, but instead took only the works of art of the finest materials (Pliny, *H.N.* 35.66).[199] Pliny the Elder also mentions that they were statues, not paintings, and that they were likely made from bronze (*H.N.* 35.66). Livy, meanwhile, records that Nobilior brought 785 bronze statues and 230 marbles statues into Rome as part of his triumph (Livy, 39.5.13-16) and that he left behind the terracotta statues (Pliny, *H.N.* 35.66).[200] Nobilior's choice of bronze and marble indicates an awareness on his part of at least an aesthetic contrast between Greek and Roman art and the potential benefit to him personally of displaying high quality works of art in Rome. His interaction with Ambracia and King Pyrrhus may have initiated or developed his interest in Greek art and may have been the spark that helped him recognise the benefits of a Hellenistic type of personal power.[201]

---

[196] Gruen, 1992, 206.
[197] *LTUR* III, 18 (Viscogliosi); Sciarrino, 2002, 48; Harrison, 2005, 24.
[198] *LTUR* III, 17 (Viscogliosi).
[199] Gruen, 1992, 107-10; Miles, 2008, 69-70.
[200] Pollitt, 1978, 156; Gruen, 1992, 108.
[201] Miles, 2008, 69-70.

Nobilior also worked hard to associate his temple with the traditional history of Rome, thus rendering it more acceptable to the Roman populace as it was not solely associated with a new religious cult and innovative foreign artworks. Therefore, according to Servius (*ad Aen.* 1.8), Nobilior built into his new temple the *aedicula* of the *camenae* which dated to the reign of King Numa Pompilius and which had been stored in the temple of Honos and Virtus.[202] The association with King Numa went further, as Macrobius (*Sat.* 1.12.16) notes that a calendar, perhaps a version of the *Fasti Praenestini,* was also displayed in the temple, creating another association with Numa, the Roman king known as the reformer of the Roman calendar (Livy, 1.18.2; Ovid, *Fast.* 1.27-42).[203] Nobilior's attempts to associate himself with Numa may have stemmed from a desire to found his new and innovative cult within the wider context of the traditional and historical elements of Rome's past. The social background of this era should also be kept in mind. In 181 BC the Romans believed that they had discovered the original tomb of Numa, which contained the books on agriculture.[204]

The manner in which the temple functioned is referred to in a number of the ancient sources.[205] Livy (39.22.2), for example, highlights the fact that Nobilior actually brought Greek artists into the city of Rome and in particular suggests that poets were known to frequent and utilise the temple of Hercules Musarum (Pliny, *H.N.* 34.19). The temple may also have been used as a type of auditorium by these poets, a practice that was quite common in the Hellenistic courts and may reflect Nobilior's experiences in the eastern Mediterranean (Valerius Maximus, 3.7.11).[206] The temple of Hercules Nobilior embodied a number of new ideals and principles on the Campus Martius. A new and innovative form of merged deities was worshipped within a temple of uncommon design. The complex itself was openly associated with art and poetry, both Roman and imported from Greece, yet within the temple associations were also made with the traditional history of Rome and solid connections were emphasised between the temple and Numa Pompilius. The temple therefore looked back at the history of Rome's foundation and the Regal period, and forward towards the new contacts that were being made in the eastern Mediterranean. The temple of Hercules Musarum, the triumph celebrated by Nobilior and

---

[202] *LTUR* III, 18 (Viscogliosi); Platner & Ashby, 1926, 89; Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 102; Rawson, 1989, 442; Gruen, 1992, 109; Coarelli, 1997, 461-2; Sciarrino, 2002, 45.
[203] Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 102; Gruen, 1992, 109; Rehak, 2006, 77.
[204] For more on this and the association with Pythagoras see section 6.1.2.
[205] Coarelli, 1997, 464-73; Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 102.
[206] Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 102; Coarelli, 1997, 464-6.

the works of art put on public display by him, all indicate that this Roman general had become aware of the positive benefits that the careful use, display and promotion of Hellenic culture could have. Nobilior used Greek culture to garner and amass public support through the display of the best works of Greek art that he could find. By displaying these new, innovative and beautiful works he drew attention to his role in Rome's victory. As such he was one of the earliest Roman leaders to use Greek culture as a physical language of military success. This may have stemmed, in the first place, from his contact and interaction with Hellenistic monarch and kingdoms.

3.3.5. Temples of Diana and Juno Regina

A huge increase in the pace of development of the southern Campus Martius, and the Circus Flaminius in particular, took place in 179 BC and two further temples were constructed here. The temples of Diana and Juno Regina were both vowed by the consul M. Aemilius Lepidus in 187 BC during the course of the Ligurian War (Livy, 39.2.11) and both were dedicated in 179 BC during his censorship (Livy, 40.52). Both temples, in their original forms, shared a *dies natalis* of the 23rd of December (*Fast.Ant.Mai*).[207] While Livy records that Lepidus financed the temples himself, he also notes that he asked the Senate for money for the dedication games (Livy, 40.52.3). As the temples were not noted in the list of censorial buildings constructed by him and Nobilior while they were censors, it may be concluded that he financed the project himself from his own *manubiae*. The temples were dedicated by Lepidus on the 23rd December 179 BC, the day after he had dedicated the temple to Lares Permarini (Appendix: 3.2.4) on behalf of his relative L. Aemilius Regillus (Livy, 40.52.4; Macrobius, *Sat.* 1.10.10).[208] M. Aemilius Lepidus' victories in Liguria were rather small compared to some of the great battles of the Punic Wars, and neither he nor his co-consul, C. Flaminius, celebrated a triumph for their victory in Liguria. This provides an indication that not all buildings constructed close to the route of the triumphal procession and the Circus Flaminius were associated with the personal triumph of their provider. Livy (38.42.9-10) wrote that Lepidus was unhappy that pro-consular power was continually renewed in Asia Minor and Greece, while new

---

[207] *LTUR* II, 14 (Viscogliosi); *LTUR* III, 126 (Viscogliosi); Degrassi, 1963, 25, 544-5; Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 104; Coarelli, 1997, 485.
[208] Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 105-6; Coarelli, 1997, 485.

consuls were always sent to Liguria where there was little chance of major military encounters or opportunities for the accumulation of booty. Therefore Lepidus likely vowed and constructed these temples in order to make a statement about the poor mission on which he had been sent.[209] This event can be seen as an example of the competition between Roman military generals in Phase Two (from the beginning of the 3rd century BC to the mid 2nd century BC), and the desire for military conflict and the ensuing public recognition.

Both Juno Regina and Diana had temples constructed in their honour on the Aventine Hill in Rome prior to 179 BC.[210] Juno Regina's temple on the Aventine was constructed in 392 BC following a defeat of Veii (Livy, 5.21.3; 5.22.6-7).[211] In the area of Veii, Juno was worshipped as a female protector of the city and a patron of women, especially those who were to bear male soldiers, and it is likely that at least some of this element of the deity was introduced into the city along with the cult.[212] Diana, meanwhile, was also associated with women and with hunting, and Servius Tullius was traditionally recognised as the provider of the temple to Diana on the Aventine (Varro, *L.L.* 5.43; Livy, 1.45.2-6).[213] In Rome Diana was also associated with the protection of soldiers. As a result Juno Regina and Diana overlapped in their powers and responsibilities and this may have been the very reason that Lepidus chose to honour them both with temples vowed at the same time. That Lepidus chose two deities to honour is an indication of the personal reasons for the dedication of these two temples.[214] The religious remit of the deities suggests that a child related to Lepidus may have been born into his family, necessitating the dedication of temple to a sympathetic deity.[215]

As the two temples were vowed at the same time, by the same person and shared a *dies natalis* of the 23rd of December (*Fast.Ant.Mai.* 23rd December; Obsequens, 16), they may also have been constructed in close proximity to each other.[216] Unfortunately, the temple of Diana is far less conspicuous in the archaeological record of Rome than the temple of Juno Regina. Possibly one of the small buildings located behind the Theatre of Marcellus

---

[209] See also Gruen, 1984a, 218-9; Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 104; Coarelli, 1997, 487.
[210] Platner & Ashby, 1926, 290, 149-50; Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 106.
[211] Platner & Ashby, 1926, 290; Richardson, 1992, 215.
[212] Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 106.
[213] Platner & Ashby, 1926, 149-50; Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 106; Richardson, 1992, 108.
[214] Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 106.
[215] Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 106.
[216] Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 104; Coarelli, 1997, 485.

on fragment 31s of slab V-12 of the FUR is the temple of Diana (Fig. 78; Fig. 79), the other building representing the temple of Pietas (see section: 3.3.3).[217] This interpretation relies on the fact that following its original dedication the temple of Diana was not mentioned in any of the extant Roman calendars. This indicates that the temple ceased to exist and may have been demolished by Caesar in order to make way for the theatre of Marcellus and then replaced by Augustus with a smaller shrine behind the theatres.[218] The exact original location of the temple of Diana therefore remains uncertain. Coarelli further substantiates the theory that the second version of the temple was dedicated behind the theatre of Marcellus by associating the temple with the remains of the 'Friezes of S. Lorenzo' which show elements of a naval battle along with antefixes of a similar subject.[219] These were found in the area in between the Porticus Octaviae and the River Tiber.[220] However, while the antefixes can be dated to the Augustan era, the friezes date from a later period of time and are not necessarily associated with the temple of Diana.[221] One particular flaw in this theory is that if the temple of Diana was rededicated in the same manner as the temple of Pietas, then a second *dies natalis* should also be associated with the newly founded temple. However, there is no other recorded *dies natalis* other than the 23rd of December. This is possibly because two further temples had been dedicated to Diana by the time Augustus reconstructed the temple and consequently there was no need for a third one (Suetonius, *Aug.* 29.5; 29.1). Pietas, meanwhile, had only one temple in Rome which had to be properly and fully rededicated and given a new *dies natalis*.[222]

The argument for the construction of a shrine to Diana behind the Theatre of Marcellus is compelling, however the evidence does not put the argument beyond doubt, so for now at least it can only remain a strong possibility. Wiseman, for example, agrees that the original temple was demolished, however he suggests that it was removed in order to make way for the porticoes of Octaviae and Philippi, and not the theatre of Marcellus, hence placing the original temple on a more north-easterly site (Fig. 55).[223] This theory is conjectural and finds no supporting evidence in the extant archaeological record, though

---

[217] *LTUR* II, 14 (Viscogliosi); Carrettoni, Colini & Cozza et.al., 1960, 91-3, pl. 29; Coarelli, 1997, 485-6; Sear, 2006, 62, n.177.
[218] *LTUR* II, 14 (Viscogliosi).
[219] *LTUR* II, 14 (Viscogliosi).
[220] *LTUR* II, 14 (Viscogliosi).
[221] *LTUR* II, 14 (Viscogliosi).
[222] Degrassi, 1963, 533; Coarelli, 1997, 48; *LTUR* IV, 86 (Ciancio Rossetto).
[223] Wiseman, 1974, 14; Coarelli, 1997, 486.

the theory would allow for the location of the original temple of Diana in close proximity to the temple of Juno Regina. Until evidence for the original location of the temple in this area comes to light, the proposition remains hypothetical. An alternative proposition, as expounded by La Rocca, suggests that the cult of Diana was housed within the temple of Apollo, where there were known to be statues to Diana, Apollo, Leto and a group of Niobids on display (Pliny, *H.N.* 36.28, 36.34).[224] Of all three possible suggestions of location the last remains the least convincing. The location of a statue no more implies the location of a temple than an unnamed representation on a Marble Plan indicates its location behind the Theatre of Marcellus. For now at least the location of the temple of Diana can only be assumed to be in the Circus Flaminius and somehow associated with the temple of Juno Regina.

Meanwhile, the temple of Juno Regina is known to have been located in the south-eastern area of the Circus Flaminius and its location is confirmed by fragments 31bb, 31vaa of slab V-12 of the FUR and by fragments 31ggz which no longer exist but which are preserved in the Vatican Manuscripts (*Cod.Vat.Lat.* 3439, Fo.23r) (Fig. 80).[225] The temple of Juno Regina was located beside the temple of Jupiter Stator, within the later Porticus Metelli of 110 BC (Appendix: 4.3.2). It stood to the north of the temple of Jupiter Stator which was also constructed by Metellus at the same time as the quadroportico in 110 BC (Fig. 81).[226] Obsequens (75.25) suggests that the original temple of Juno Regina was damaged in 158 BC/156 BC, and this may have been one of the reasons why Metellus chose to reconstruct it during the course of the construction of his quadroportico in 110 BC.[227] Archaeological excavation has discovered that the form of the original temple of Juno Regina was somewhat altered by Metellus' rebuilding.[228] The FUR identifies the temple of Juno Regina, in its later phase, as a prostyle temple with six frontal columns.[229] It is not beyond the bounds of possibility that the original temple of Juno Regina was later rebuilt in its entirety.

The temple of Juno Regina, in association with the temple of Jupiter Stator, underwent a third reconstruction under the reign of Augustus, at which point the *dies natalis* of both

---

[224] *LTUR* II, 14 (Viscogliosi).
[225] *LTUR* III, 127 (Viscogliosi); Coarelli, 1997, 487.
[226] *LTUR* IV, 130-2 (Viscogliosi); Coarelli, 1997, 487.
[227] For more on the reasons why Metellus chose to construct a quadroportico around the extant temple of Juno Regina, see below 4.3.2; Coarelli, 1997, 487.
[228] Coarelli, 1997, 487.
[229] *LTUR* III, 127 (Viscogliosi).

temples was moved to the 23rd of September (*Fast.Pal.Urb*).[230] The temple was later damaged in the fire of AD 80 and both temples were totally reconstructed in the Severan age, and it is this stage of the temple which can, to some extent, be traced in the archaeological record, predominantly in the cellar of No.5 on Via di S. Angelo in Pescheria and in the courtyard of No.12 of the same road, as well as in the cellar of No.12 Via Tribuna di Campitelli (Fig. 74).[231]

The temples of Diana and Juno Regina emphasise the fact that a victory temple need not be constructed in association with the triumph of its provider in order to become associated with the rite of triumph. The location, scale, decoration and games associated with the temple were of equal importance to the actual triumphal march through the city of Rome, as the temple created a permanent reminder of a Roman victory in the face of the transient triumphal procession. The fact that nearly fifty years later, in 146 BC, Metellus chose to construct his victory temple and portico around Lepidus' temple of Juno Regina shows how recognisable and popular the temple had become and how intimately associated with Roman victory celebration it had become.

3.3.6. Temple of Fortuna Equestris

Q. Fulvius Flaccus was a renowned and popular Roman statesman who vowed the construction of a temple of Fortuna Equestris in 182 BC following his victory as praetor in Hispania Citerior (Livy, 40.18.6; 40.39.1). Flaccus had been ambushed while leading some of his men, but the skilful deployment of his cavalry led to a Roman victory (Livy, 40.39.2-40.15).[232] Flaccus was the first Roman leader to attain a substantial victory in Hispania Citerior and as a result he vowed a temple to Fortuna Equestris and games to Jupiter (Livy 40.10.10).[233] This was the first time that an epithet was used for the goddess Fortuna in Rome, though it was a practice that would become increasingly popular.[234] The decision to choose the epithet Equestris was self-explanatory as the victory stemmed from an impressive manoeuvre by the cavalry. However, the decision to choose Fortuna as the

---

[230] *LTUR* III, 126-7 (Viscogliosi); Degrassi, 1963, 512; Coarelli, 1997, 485.
[231] *LTUR* III, 127 (Viscogliosi).
[232] Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 111; Coarelli, 1997, 268.
[233] Orlin, 1997, 138.
[234] Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 112.

primary deity for the dedication of the temple may have been more personal, perhaps resulting from family interests and practices rather than as a reflection of the conflict in which Flaccus was victorious. It was Flaccus' grandfather who, following a victory over the Volsinii in 264 BC, constructed a temple to Fortuna and Mater Matuta in the Forum Holitorium in the area of modern S. Omobono.[235] It was likely this dedication that influenced the decision of Fulvius Flaccus to dedicate a temple in honour of Fortuna, indicating a familial association with the goddess.

Flaccus was granted permission to celebrate a triumph as a result of this victory in Hispania Citerior and was granted permission to return to Rome with a representative section of his army (Livy, 40.35.3-4). Livy (40.43.6-7) describes the lavish triumph that ensued. During the course of the celebration Flaccus ensured that his troops were paid very well, granting them double their salary for the campaign (Livy, 40.43.6-7).[236] While this was an ostentatious, and obviously generous, act it was not the first time that such a reward had been granted to the troops as Cn. Manlius Vulso had also seen fit to grant a wage increase in 187 BC as had Maso in 187 BC (Livy, 39.7.2).[237] The vast amount of money that Flaccus paid out to his troops is indicative of the amount of booty that he had taken from Spain. Livy (40.44.9-10) records that Flaccus engaged in some forward planning prior to leaving Spain and that he had arranged to start collecting money from the area prior to his departure from the province. This enabled him to generate healthy cash flow in order to finance the temple that he had vowed and perhaps, in part, to finance the games promised to Jupiter.[238]

The degree to which Flaccus was actually involved in the construction of the temple of Fortuna Equestris is debatable. Livy (40.44.10) states that Flaccus saw to it that magistrates took over the contracts for the temple and it is possible that he did not actually choose the location for the temple himself.[239] In fact he may not even have been in Rome when the games to Jupiter were held, as he was swiftly posted to Liguria following his triumphal return to Rome.[240] Flaccus was a very popular Roman general and held a second triumph for his victory over the Ligurians on the first anniversary of his

---

[235] *LTUR* II, 281-5 (Pisani Sartorio); Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 271; Coarelli, 1997, 271.
[236] Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 112.
[237] *LTUR* II, 256-7 (Arenon); Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 112.
[238] Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 113.
[239] Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 113-4.
[240] Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 113-4.

Spanish triumph. However, in 174 BC, while holding the position of censor, Flaccus' fortunes took a turn for the worse and his popularity in Rome plummeted as a result of his perceived pillaging of a Greek temple at Croton.[241] Livy (42.3.1) wrote that Flaccus took '*half of the marble tiles from the temple of Hera Lacinia at Croton*' in order to use them for the roof of his own victory temple in Rome. This move was very unpopular as Flaccus was perceived by many as having used his censorial powers to desecrate a sacred building (Livy, 42.3). Flaccus' act differed from the large scale importation of looted works of art from areas of military conflict as such works were seen as *manubiae* and were recognised as the spoils of war. The looting of architectural elements from a sacred temple in an area not involved in the particular military conflict was judged as entirely different. The Senate ordered Flaccus to return the tiles immediately, though according to the sources they were simply left on the ground within the precinct of the temple of Hera, as no one in the Croton area had the skills to reattach them to the roof of the temple (Livy, 42.3.4; Valerius Maximus, 1.1.20).

The temple of Fortuna Equestris was finally dedicated in 173 BC, with a *dies natalis* of the 13th of August (Livy, 42.10.5).[242] While plays and circus performances were held on the day of the temple's dedication, Flaccus never again attained the level of popularity which he had previously enjoyed and he committed suicide in 172 BC (Livy, 42.28.10-12). The location of the temple is unknown and no trace of it has ever been found in the archaeological record, though Vitruvius provides a brief description of the form of the temple and a suggestion of its location. Vitruvius (*De. Arch.* 3.3.2) describes the temple as '*ad theatrum lapideum*' ('next to the marble theatre'), which could suggest a location close to either the theatre of Marcellus or the theatre of Pompey, both of which used marble in their construction, though the latter is more likely, especially considering its designation in the *Fasti Amiternini* as the *theatrum marmoreum*.[243] While the *dies natalis* is recorded in the *Fasti Antiates* it does not appear in any Augustan *fasti*, suggesting that by this time the temple was no longer in existence.[244] A line in Tacitus (*Ann.* 3.71) confirms that in Rome in AD 22 no temple of Fortuna Equestris existed, indicating that the temple must have been demolished some time between 30 BC (when Vitruvius wrote) and AD 22 (as noted in Tacitus).[245] The discovery of a late Republican inscription further

---

[241] *LTUR* II, 269 (Coarelli); Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 114-6; Richardson, 1992, 155; Orlin, 1997, 138-9.
[242] *LTUR* II, 268 (Coarelli); Degrassi, 1963, 495; Richardson, 1992, 155; Coarelli, 1997, 269.
[243] Olinder, 1974, 41-2; Coarelli, 1997, 268.
[244] Degrassi, 1963; 494-5; Coarelli, 1997, 268.
[245] *LTUR* II, 268 (Coarelli); Richardson, 1992, 155; Coarelli, 1997, 270.

supports the theory that the marble theatre recorded by Vitruvius was that of Pompey.[246] This temple would then have been one of the most northerly temples of the Campus Martius region in Phase Two, though it would not have been too far removed from the Republican victory temples of Largo Argentina. Given the timeframe for the demolition of the temple and the vague area attributed to its location, it seems likely that the temple would have been removed as a result of the building projects of Agrippa and Augustus in the central Campus Martius, or perhaps by the fire of AD 21 that also destroyed the stage of the theatre of Pompey (Tacitus, *Ann.* 3.72.4).[247]

Vitruvius describes the temple as *systylos* with an inter-columnation of two diameters (*De. Arch.* 3.3.2). Such an arrangement was often used when the columns and architrave were required to support a great weight.[248] The *systylos* format therefore adds weight to Livy's account of the plan to use the marble roof tiles from Croton on the temple of Fortuna Equestris. The use of such a heavy material for the roof would have required a reduction in diameter between the columns compared to the intercolumnations of other temples constructed in Phase Two. This is the first example of a temple in Rome using marble roof tiles, though as the Campus Martius was being used as an area for innovative architectural designs and the use of many different building materials, it comes as no surprise that Flaccus' temple was constructed in this area. The use of these tiles, and the fact that Flaccus went to such lengths to retrieve them, provides an indication of the competitive nature of construction on the Campus Martius in Phase Two. Though ultimately Flaccus failed in his plan to garner public support for his political career, the extremes he went to in pursuit of his plans provides a clear example of the competitive nature of construction on the Campus Martius in Phase Two. The fact that he chose Greek marble roof tiles from Croton to commemorate a victory won in Hispania Citerior is also indicative of how physical representations of Greek culture had become inextricably linked to the physical display and commemoration of Roman victory by the end of Phase Two.

---

[246] *LTUR* II, 268 (Coarelli); Panciera, 1986, 35-44; Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 116; Richardson, 1992, 155.
[247] *LTUR* II, 268 (Coarelli); Olinder, 1974, 41; Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 116; Richardson, 1992, 156-7; Coarelli, 1997, 274.
[248] Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 116; Richardson, 1992, 155; Coarelli, 1997, 269.

Conclusion

The analysis of Phase Two has emphasised the fact that from the beginning of the 3rd century BC to the middle of the 2nd century BC Rome, and the Campus Martius in particular, underwent some fundamental changes. Throughout Phase One the Campus Martius evolved from a primarily agricultural and military area to an area that facilitated the ever increasing needs of the growing Roman population. Phase Two's development saw a growth in the impact that the military had on the Campus Martius as the number of triumphal parades increased and as victorious Roman generals chose the Campus Martius to construct their victory monuments. Throughout Phase Two the Campus Martius became a trophy cabinet for Rome's conquests in the Mediterranean and as a result of the Punic Wars. The open, extra-pomerial nature of the Campus Martius rendered it an ideal location for statements of victory and for the advertisement on behalf of the Roman general of personal success. The Campus Martius had become an area in which Roman military generals could advertise their activities, amass public support, and advance their political careers.

The increasing number of triumphs held in Rome throughout Phase Two coupled with a heightened degree of political astuteness among Roman generals led to competition among the generals for public recognition and support. This desire for support prompted the successful generals to construct more lavish and ostentatious monuments (as can be witnessed in the size, construction materials, construction techniques and decoration used for a number of temples on the Campus Martius). These statements of victory should be viewed in the context of the inadequacies of Republican government, which failed to curb the power of such men and allowed them to celebrate their power symbolically, through triumphal processions, and physically, through construction and the display of works of art, often imported from Greek areas of the Mediterranean.

The competitive nature of the political elite of Rome grew through Phases Two, Three and Four, culminating in the battle for support amongst the charismatic leaders of Phase Four, namely Sulla, Pompey the Great and Julius Caesar. It was as a result of the actions of the generals of Phase Two, such as L. Aemilius Regillus, M. Fulvius Nobilior and M. Aemilius Lepidus, that Pompey, Julius Caesar and Octavian were able to construct lavish victory monuments on the Campus Martius. The leaders of Phase Two had sown the

seeds and transformed the Campus Martius into a landscape suitable for victory commemoration and political competition. The political leaders of Phase Three (from the mid 2nd century BC to the beginning of the 1st century BC) continued the themes of victory and political competition on the Campus Martius, but made the statements of victory far more personal than had been witnessed in Phase Two, and raised the level of competition by constructing larger physical commemorations of victory in the form of porticoes and decorating them with vast quantities of Greek art. These porticoes, constructed as victory monuments, were named in honour of their providers and represent an important transitional period between the victory temples of Phase Two and the prolific entertainment complexes constructed by the charismatic leaders of Phase Four.

Triumphal processions and the construction of victory temples dramatically impacted upon the Campus Marius. The nature of these celebrations meant that physical representations of Greek culture were first witnessed in Rome on the Campus Martius. The complicated and contradictory nature of the developing relationship between Hellenism and Rome was physically represented in this area. For example, temples were constructed in the *area sacra* of Largo Argentina which referenced the area's connection with native religions, while at the same time temples were constructed to new deities and to gods who represented Greek and other new and unusual religious associations. The Campus Martius had therefore continued to develop as a multi-functional and culturally embracing area of the city of Rome.

A number of individual Roman military leaders of Phase Two such as M. Fulvius Nobilior and M. Aemilius Lepidus played an important role in the inter-cultural contacts between Greece and Rome. These men acted as a type of middleman between Rome and the eastern Mediterranean and between Roman morals and Hellenic culture. This role saw them working ostensibly for the benefit of the Roman Republic, albeit occasionally expressing their own personal acceptance of Hellenic culture. Phase Three continues to follow the development of this relationship and examines the increasing level of personal acceptance of Greek culture by these Roman politicians and military leaders. Phase Three also shows how, from the mid 2nd century to the early 1st century BC, the Campus Martius continued to develop as a multi-functional area that was tolerant of the introduction of new architectural formats, particularly the portico and quadroportico.

Chapter 4: The Porticoes of the Southern Campus Martius (Phase Three)

Introduction

Phase Three, from the mid second century BC to the early 1st century BC, represents a rather short span of time characterised by the construction of victory monuments in the form of porticoes. While the temples of Phase Two were useful tools for the promotion of Roman victory abroad and the advertisement of the role of the military generals, porticoes provided an even more valuable tool of self-promotion and advertisement. The portico was a malleable and versatile architectural format that could be used for the display of art, the definition of private space, the creation of a sacred space, or simply as a covered walkway that could be used by the public as a place for shelter.[1] The basic architectural form of a portico consists of a back wall with a row of columns to the front (the colonnade) and a spanning roof which covers the intermediate space (Fig. 83). This architectural feature was common in Egyptian, Greek and Italian architecture, though the construction materials and manner in which they were used in these areas differed based on the availability of materials and the purpose for which the portico was required.[2] On the Campus Martius two types of portico prevailed; the single sided portico, which consisted of just one wall and colonnade, and the four sided variant where four porticoes were constructed in a square to enclose a central space (Fig. 84).

Phase Three witnessed the continued growth in power and influence of the Roman military leaders and a resultant increase in competition for public support and recognition. The military leaders of Phase Three (from the mid 2nd century BC to the early 1st century BC) chose the portico form for their victory monuments because it provided a more versatile format for self-promotion and advertisement. Porticoes offered a distinct advantage over victory temples as they were secular buildings and could be named in honour of the provider, for example the Porticus Octavia constructed by Cn. Octavius in

[1] Coulton, 1976, 1-2.
[2] Ellis, 2000, 531; Lancaster, 2005, 12-21.

168 BC (see section: 4.3.1).[3] A portico could be used for the permanent public display of artistic treasures brought to Rome as *manubiae* from the Mediterranean and further afield, a function that was not so easily accommodated by temples. The architectural format of the quadroportico meant that it could be constructed around pre-existent temples, utilising space that would otherwise have been unsuitable for the construction of a victory monument, for example the Porticus Metelli, constructed by Q. Caecilius Metellus in 146 BC (see section: 4.3.2) around Aemilius Lepidus' temple to Juno Regina (Appendix: 3.3.5; 4.3.2). By constructing a quadroportico around a pre-existent temple the provider of the quadroportico ensured that his name would be forever associated with the name of the provider of the temple, thus bolstering his own credentials and popularity. All of these factors rendered the portico format a popular form of victory commemoration in the late 2nd century BC.

The way in which porticoes and quadroporticoes were designed, constructed and utilised is representative of the way in which Greek culture was present and used in Rome during this period. Phase Three saw Rome's first marble temple; it was constructed on the Campus Martius and was designed by the Greek architect Hermodorus of Salamis and made from Greek Pentelic marble (Velleius Paterculus, 1.11.5) (Appendix: 4.3.2). At the same time Greek statuary and other works of art continued to be imported into Rome and displayed in the porticoes and quadroporticoes of the Campus Marius.[4] These displays were a manifestation of Rome's contact and interaction with Greek culture and were employed as conspicuous tools of personal and political promotion in Phase Three. Phase Two saw Greek culture used primarily as a subtle means of self-promotion, a notable exception being Marcellus who was overt in its use for personal gain (Livy, 26.21.1; Plutarch, *Marc.* 22.1). In Phase Three a middle ground was found and physical representations of Greek culture became more visible, more common, and ultimately a more useful language for Roman cultural interaction and victory abroad. This proliferation of Greek materials and decoration likely stemmed from a growing familiarity with aspects of Hellenic culture.

---

[3] For the Porticus Metelli: *LTUR* IV, 130-1 (Viscogliosi); Coarelli, 1997, 529. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 424; Richardson, 1992, 315; Coarelli, 2007, 271-2. For the Porticus Octavia: *LTUR* IV, 139-41 (Viscogliosi); Olinder, 1974. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 426; Boyd, 1955, 152-9; Richardson, 1992, 317; Coarelli, 1997, 515-28.

[4] Miles, 2008, 234.

The porticoes of this phase are arranged chronologically and represent a mixture of both single sided porticoes and four sided quadroporticoes. It should be noted that not all of the porticoes constructed on the Campus Martius in Phase Three were constructed directly as a result of Roman victory and triumphal celebration, but they all represent, on some level, a desire on the part of the provider to promote his own name and success and increase his power and political standing in Rome. As such, they are physical representations of the evolution of the charismatic leader in late Republican Rome and highlight the effect of a growing Roman empire on Republican politics. As the geographical area over which Rome held sway increased through the mid-late Republic, so too the power and influence of the senate decreased in the face of growing power and independence of the Roman military leaders responsible for that growth. The development of the Campus Martius in Phase Three therefore represents a transitional period in the role of the individual military leader in late Republican politics.

4.1. The Portico Format

The simple architectural form of the portico meant that it was a common feature in Egypt, Greece and Rome. The manner in which porticoes were used in these areas varied according to location and available construction materials and they were used in a variety of secular and religious contexts. Its commonality resulted from its very simple design and the fact that it could be manipulated for innumerable terrains, environments and situations. The portico remains a feature of modern architecture and is visible attached to a number of neo-classical buildings including banks, market buildings, universities and churches (Fig. 85). Office blocks, shopping precincts and other modern buildings also utilise the portico form, attesting to its malleability and convenience. While the portico may not be a uniquely Roman architectural feature, the way in which it was used as a freestanding building to advertise personal military victory, display foreign spoils of war and promote a political career are particular to Rome, and more specifically to the Campus Martius, in Phase Three.

A number of porticoes constructed on the Campus Martius took the form of a four sided quadroportico. The four sided portico in Rome varied considerably in form and function from their single sided counterparts. Built as a single, cohesive, building, and unlike the porticoes of the Greek agora, it was not made up of four separate buildings surrounding an open space. Rather, it was constructed as a single, four-sided building with each side represented by one portico and attached to the next at a 90 degree angle to form a square (Fig. 84). The four sided portico was capable of facilitating a far greater array of activities and events than the single sided portico. For example, four sided porticoes often enclosed spaces that were used for religious, recreational, political and artistic activities and were the ultimate multi-functional building of the Campus Martius. Modern studies fail to use a consistent term when referring to these four sided porticoes. In order to distinguish a single sided portico from a four sided portico within this work 'quadroportico/quadroporticoes' will be used where appropriate as it obviously distinguishes the four sided portico from the single sided portico. The necessity to differentiate between a single sided and four sided portico was recognised by Strabo (14.1.37) in the early 1st century AD when he described the four sided *stoa* of Smyrna as a 'quadrangular stoa'.

4.1.1. Form and Terminology

A portico is simply a back wall with a row of columns to the front supporting a roof, creating a covered walkway open on one side. Porticoes were often used in Egypt within internal spaces but were also placed outside a building in order to add monumentality to its façade, for example around royal tombs and rising terraces.[5] Examples of external monumental porticoes in Egypt include the 11th and 18th Dynasty monuments of Deir el-Bahri.[6] Egyptian porticoes date from as early as the 11th dynasty in the Middle Kingdom (c.2134-1991 BC) and have also been recorded in the New Kingdom (c.1550-1292 BC).[7] The 11th dynasty example comes from Deir el-Bahri where porticoes were used to define the first level terrace of the mortuary temple of Queen Hatshepsut (Fig. 86).[8] On this occasion the portico was constructed from limestone, a common construction material of Egypt.[9]

In Greece, porticoes were known as stoas and were more commonly associated with public spaces such as the agora where they were associated with politics and democracy and were used to define space, bring cohesion to buildings constructed in the agora, and on occasion, to emphasise or monumentalise a central building.[10] At the most basic level stoas were commonly constructed around the Greek agora to provide a location for politicians and local officials to meet in a shaded area to discuss matters of business and politics. For example, at the stoa of Attalos in the Athenian Agora and the Stoa of Philip at Megalopolis (Fig. 87; Fig. 88).[11] Examples of Greek stoas date to as early as the 7th century BC (for example the stoa of the Samian Heraion) but became a common element of the Greek agora by the 5th century BC.[12] Stoas often contained two rows of columns and could use a mixture of orders; when two rows were present the most common arrangement used the Ionic order for the interior columns and the Doric order for the

[5] Bryan, 2003, 232; McKenzie, Roger & Moorey, 2006, 154-60; Thomas, 2007, 115-6.
[6] Coulton, 1976, 19; Bard, 1999, 236-7; Winlock, 2001, 19; Gates, 2003, 106.
[7] Shaw, 2003, 9-10.
[8] Bard, 1999, 234-7; Bryan, 2003, 232-3; Gates, 2003, 105-6.
[9] Nicholson & Shaw, 2000, 5-6. See also: Bard, 1999, 234; Bryan, 2003, 232.
[10] Thompson & Wycherley, 1972, 82; Coulton, 1976, 20.
[11] Coulton, 1976, 255; Thompson & Frantz, 1992, 2-3; Winter, 2006, 10.
[12] Thompson & Wycherley, 1972, 82; Winter, 2000, 51-2.

external columns.[13] The most common construction material for Greek stoas was marble, often Pentelic, which was relatively accessible throughout Greece.[14] The Greek stoa can be traced to an earlier date than the Roman portico in the archaeological record, but to attribute the origin of the Roman portico to Greece is too simplistic an interpretation and relies heavily on the concept of diffusionism and consequently accepts that architectural progression and development in Rome resulted from a stimulus from a dominant Greek culture. Rather, it may be contended that the porticoes of Egypt, the stoas of Greece and the simple portico of Rome evolved as a result of independent architectural development, using locally available materials to construct a rather plain, but eminently useable, space that could facilitate a number of functions.

The simple format of the stoa or portico did not preclude it from use in more complex architectural projects. Throughout Greece in the Hellenistic period it became ever more common to construct a number of stoas around the open agora in order to add a visible boundary to the area. This can be seen in the agoras of Thasos and Miletos (Fig. 89; Fig. 90).[15] While functioning as an area for trade, commerce, politics and shade, the construction of four, or occasionally three, stoas around the open area of the agora helped to visually define its boundaries and rendered the central space more enclosed. A series of surrounding porticoes also functioned to monumentalise the central buildings, as was the case for the Athenian agora which was defined on all sides by the Stoa Poikile, the Stoa of Zeus, South Stoa I, the Stoa Basileios and the Stoa of the Herms (Fig. 91).[16] One reason for using stoas to enclose an open space in Greece during this period was that public buildings ceased to be viewed as separate un-integrated buildings and began to be seen as linked components which acted together as part of a wider thematic and architectural scheme.[17] Within a religious context stoas were often added around a temple or sacred precinct to add monumentality and create an emphasis on one central temple.[18] In Egypt the porticoes of Deir el-Bahri were used to define the terrace of the tomb of Hatshepsut and functioned to create a boundary between the external secular space and the internal religious space.

---

[13] Thompson & Wycherley, 1972, 82. See also: Laurence, 1996, 193; Winter, 2006,58, 65-70; Stamper, 2007,88.
[14] Winter, 2006, 65; Stamper, 2007, 88.
[15] Thompson & Wycherley, 1972, 82; Coulton, 1976, 174.
[16] Coulton, 1976, 170; Shipley, 2000, 87-8; Winter, 2000, 53.
[17] Coulton, 1976, 170-3.
[18] Coulton, 1976, 170; Winter, 2000, 53.

Similar uses for the portico can be seen on the Campus Martius. For example porticoes were constructed along the triumphal route in order to define the north-eastern side of the Circus Flaminius and rendered it a more enclosed, visually defined, space. Meanwhile two single sided porticoes were constructed along the banks of the Tiber to emphasise the course of the river and the western boundary of the Campus Martius. Porticoes were also used in association with religious buildings on the Campus Martius as quadroporticoes were constructed around pre-existent temples to monumentalise the original temple and add historical gravity to the new victory monument (Fig. 92). For example, when Metellus constructed his quadroporticoes around the existent temple of Juno Regina, he was physically and symbolically associating himself with the victory of M. Aemilius Lepidus, an action which promoted and bolstered his personal success and achievements and added historical weight to a contemporary victory (see section: 4.3.2). These quadroporticoes functioned to create a sacred *temenos* of Greek style, similar to the stoas placed around the temple of Artemis at Brauron in the fifth century BC (Fig. 93).[19] As shall become apparent the porticoes of Phase Three physically monumentalised the Campus Martius, while at the same time symbolically monumentalising the role and power of the victorious Roman military leader of the 2nd century BC.

4.1.2. Porticoes of the Campus Martius

There were a number of reasons why the Campus Martius was a suitable location for the construction of porticoes as victory monuments in Rome. As porticoes did not require embankments or other supporting architecture, the level floodplain could be used to emphasise the scale and monumentality of the monument. The fact that these monuments were commonly surrounded by open tracts of land was also of particular importance as it meant that these great monuments could be seen from a suitable distance and as a consequence people were able to view, consider and interpret the architectural decoration of the building and any messages or themes that may have been promoted by its façade. Such a view was not always possible in the heavily urbanised areas of central Rome and the Forum Romanum, where the sheer density of buildings often did not allow the façade of the buildings to be viewed in a wider perspective.[20] The potential of the portico and the

[19] Coulton, 1977, 169; Winter, 2000, 20, 42.
[20] Stamper, 2005, 168.

quadroportico for use as a victory monument and statement of personal success was emphasised by the open space that the Campus Martius provided.

The vast majority of porticoes constructed on the Campus Martius were constructed in the southern half of the area, in close proximity to the Circus Flaminius, creating a civic space that was frequently used by a large number of people.[21] By Phase Three the Circus Flaminius was an area where a great number of temples had been constructed and had evolved into an area synonymous with triumph and the commemoration of victory.[22] By constructing porticoes in the area victorious military generals were continuing the trend to use the Circus Flaminius as an area for the commemoration of Roman military success, not only because of its topographical associations but also due to the ever increasing historical importance of the area. The porticoes of Phase Three not only monumentalised Roman military achievement but also functioned to define solid boundaries of the previous open and relatively unhindered area of the Circus Flaminius. The four sided quadroporticoes of Phase Three were constructed for the most part along the north-eastern side of the Circus Flaminius, on the same axis as the temples of Juno Regina and Hercules Musarum, defining the north-eastern boundary (Fig. 92). The fact that the Tiber created a natural border to the south-western side of the Campus Martius meant that this area did not require any prominent man-made markers. The degree to which the porticoes along the north-eastern side of the Circus Flaminius functioned to define that side of the Circus Flaminius is preserved by the 4th century AD Regionary Catalogues which considered the Circus Flaminius a separate area from the Campus Martius (*Reg.* IX).[23]

The names ascribed to the porticoes of the Campus Martius, and by which they are known in the literary sources, are particularly interesting. Prior to Phase Three, no building on the Campus Martius was known solely by the name of its provider. Only the Circus Flaminius, which was an open area as opposed to a physical building, carried the name of the person responsible for its origins (Plutarch, *Rom.* 66). Yet from Phase Three onwards the naming of buildings in honour of oneself and one's family became an ever more popular undertaking. All of the quadroporticoes constructed on the Campus Martius in Phase Three preserve the name of the provider of the building in its official title. The

---

[21] *LTUR* I, 269-72 (Viscogliosi); Wiseman, 1974, 3-4; Coarelli, 1997, 363-74. See also: Coarelli, 2007, 266-7.
[22] *LTUR* I, 270 (Viscogliosi); Wiseman, 1974, 5; Olinder, 1974, 9-18; Favro, 1996, 153. See also: Coarelli, 1997, 375-6; Beard, 2006, 94.
[23] Nordh, 1949, 86-8; Olinder, 1974, 17-20; Coarelli, 1997, 13-4.

ability to commemorate one's own name in the title of a physical and permanent building explains why secular porticoes became a particularly popular type of building in Phase Three, and why temples were no longer the preferred type of building for victory statements on the Campus Martius. The decline in the authority of the Republican government in the face of Roman territorial and political expansion allowed individual military action to be commemorated in the personal naming of buildings. Roman expansionism also facilitated the ascension to power of the charismatic leaders who recognised the opportunity for personal political advancement if adequate personal support could be guaranteed.

4.2. Single-Sided Porticoes

The Portico Post Spei and Porticus Post Navalia were the first porticoes constructed on the Campus Martius. These porticoes were not constructed as victory monuments but were built by the censors of 179 BC as part of a project to clear and clean the banks of the Tiber River (Livy, 40.51.2-9). Their functional status was reflected in their architectural format; they were single-sided porticoes situated away from the Circus Flaminius and the triumphal route. The fact that they were not victory monuments did not detract from the fact that they could be used as monuments to gain public attention and garner support. Given the historical backdrop of Phase Three and the growing political instability of the time, even those who had been elected to public office still had to ensure that they maintained a public profile and preserved civic support. Election to the position of censor and the careful and astute use of the associated powers could help those in public office gain support and popularity in the same way that the celebration of a triumph might.

4.2.1 M. Aemilius Lepidus and M. Fulvius Nobilior

The censors for the year 179 BC, M. Aemilius Lepidus and M. Fulvius Nobilior, were responsible for a variety of construction projects on the Campus Martius.[24] A number of temples, porticoes and other building projects were either vowed and contracted out by the censors, or formally inaugurated by them during their term of office (Livy, 40.51.2-9). The censors were responsible for the construction of two single sided, freestanding porticoes, namely the Porticus Post Spei (Appendix: 4.2.2) and the Porticus Post Navalia (Appendix: 4.2.3).[25] This was not the first time that either Lepidus or Nobilior had initiated building projects on the Campus Martius, the former having vowed the temples of Diana and Juno Regina in 187 BC (Appendix: 3.3.5) and dedicating them in the year 179 BC and the latter having vowed the temple of Hercules Musarum in 189 BC

[24] *LTUR* IV, 139 (Coarelli); Pollitt, 1983, 49-51; Coarelli, 1997, 487. See also: Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 105; Ryan, 1998, 243.
[25] For Porticus Post Spei: *LTUR* IV, 150-1 (Coarelli). See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 426; Richardson, 1992, 319. For Porticus Post Navalia: *LTUR* IV, 139 (Coarelli). See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 426.

(Appendix: 3.3.4) and dedicating it in 179 BC.[26] As a result by 179 BC, if not before, Lepidus and Nobilior were very aware of the potential benefits of construction on the Campus Martius.

Livy (40.45.6-46.16) notes that Lepidus and Nobilior had been political rivals when they were elected to share the censorship of 179 BC, though this does not seem to have hindered their productive term in office.[27] The two censors were influential with regards to the development of the Campus Martius, and the physical evolution of Rome itself. Besides the two porticoes already mentioned and the temples that were dedicated by Lepidus and Nobilior in the same year, the censors were also responsible for the construction of a vast array of buildings throughout Rome.[28] According to Livy (40.51) Lepidus was responsible for the construction of a theatre, for works carried out on the temple of Jupiter on the Capitoline and for the construction of a causeway at Tarracina. Nobilior, meanwhile, was responsible for the construction of a harbour on the Tiber, for the construction of bridge pillars in the river, for the construction of a fish market, and for the forum and colonnade outside of the Porta Trigemina (Livy, 40.51). Livy attributes the construction of the Porticus Post Spei and the Porticus Post Navalia to Nobilior (Livy, 40.51).[29] Livy also wrote that Nobilior was responsible for the contracting out of the construction of the Basilica Aemilia, a hugely important building in Rome which made use of internal colonnades and porticoes.[30] Joint credit is given to the censors by Livy for the restoration of shrines and public spaces and for the re-opening of such spaces to the public, as well as for plans to create a new aqueduct (though this plan was never fulfilled).[31] Livy also states that the two censors were jointly responsible for the introduction of harbour dues and taxes.

While Livy's passage is an informative account of the building projects of 179 BC, the allocation of credit for the individual construction projects is not necessarily accurate. It now seems certain that the construction of the Basilica Aemilia, which is credited by Livy to Nobilior alone, was initiated by both Lepidus and Nobilior as joint censors of 179 BC. Support for this comes from Varro (*L.L.* 6.4) who notes that C. Scipio Nasica installed a

---

[26] *LTUR* III, 17-9 (Viscogliosi); *LTUR* III, 126-8 (Viscogliosi); Coarelli, 1997, 485-8, 452-84; See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 290, 255; Olinder, 1974, 59-61.
[27] Gruen, 1993, 206; Ryan, 1998, 243; Klar, 2005, 177.
[28] *LTUR* I, 167 (Steinby). See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 72-5; Richardson, 1992, 55.
[29] Ziolkowski, 1988, 328-9.
[30] Richardson, 1992, 55; Ward-Perkins, 1994, 34; Winter, 2006, 202.
[31] Heiken, Funiciello & De Rita, 2005, 144-5.

water clock in the *basilica Aemilia et Fulvia*.[32] The basilica was later known simply as the Basilica Aemilia, due in part to the later association of the *gens Aemilia* with the building.[33] The construction of a theatre is also only attributed to Lepidus.[34] While there is nothing in the sources to imply that this building was a joint venture, the sheer scale of the project suggests that it was in a censorial capacity that the theatre was vowed.[35] Livy (40.51) notes that the theatre was to be constructed next to the temple of Apollo in the southernmost Campus Martius, locating it outside of the *pomerium.* This was the first attempt by a Roman statesman to construct a permanent theatre on the Campus Martius, prior to this all theatres had been constructed from wood and had been temporary buildings (see section 5.2).[36] Yet this attempt, like the attempts by Q. Fulvius Flaccus and A. Postumiuis Albinus in 174 BC and C. Cassius Longinus and M. Valerius Messalla in 154 BC was condemned to failure by the Roman Senate who held the view that permanent theatres would damage Roman morals (Livy, *Per*, 48; Valerius Maximus, 2.4.2).[37] It is unknown if work on the theatre of Lepidus and Nobilior ever begun, or at what point plans for its construction were thwarted.

Two of the most influential buildings of the censorship, in terms of the development of the Campus Martius, were the freestanding single sided porticoes that were designated 'Post Spei' and 'Post Navalia.'[38] These buildings, which were constructed along the banks of the River Tiber were almost certainly associated with the introduction of new harbour dues and taxes (Livy, 40.51) and part of a general scheme to tidy the area. That such a vast quantity of important construction projects were undertaken by Lepidus and Nobilior in 179 BC emphasises the state of social and political affairs in Rome in the 2nd century BC. The increasing growth in Rome's power in the Mediterranean and Rome's associated rise in power of prominent politicians led to the censors being able to take on new and innovative construction projects such as the Basilica Aemilia and the permanent theatre next to the temple of Apollo. Livy (40.51) hints at the type of power held by the censors when he wrote that a number of the so called 'censorial' building activities benefited the censors personally. For example, Nobilior constructed a fish market and

---

[32] *LTUR* I, 167 (Steinby). See also: Platner & Ashby, 1927, 72; Richardson, 1992, 55.
[33] *LTUR* I, 167 (Steinby); Richardson, 1992, 55. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1927, 72.
[34] Gruen, 1992, 206; Klar, 2005, 163-4.
[35] Richardson, 1992, 240; HANSON, 1978, 18-24.
[36] Gruen, 1992, 205; Coarelli, 1997, 604; Beacham, 1999, 28-9; Coleman, 2000, 220; Sear, 2006, 54.
[37] Gruen, 1992, 206-7; Sear, 2006, 54-7.
[38] For Porticus Post Spei: *LTUR* IV, 336 (Coarelli). See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 493; Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 39, 41-3; Richardson, 1992, 365. For Porticus Post Navalia: *LTUR* IV 150-1 (Coarelli); Richardson, 1992, 13; Ziolkowski, 1992, 51-2; Coarelli, 1997, 460-1.

sold it as a personal enterprise while Lepidus personally charged the state for the construction of the causeway at Tarracina and for works carried out on his own adjoining land. It becomes obvious from these examples that Lepidus and Nobilior were fully aware of the potential personal benefits inherent in the position of censor in the 2nd century BC and the personal exposure that it granted them. Personal advertisement and the amassing of public support did not come solely from the celebration of military success aboard, but from the careful manipulation and orchestration of positions within the Roman governmental system. The Campus Martius was important for this type of self-promotion as it offered the censors the same benefits of personal advertisement as it did to victorious generals.

4.2.2. Porticus Post Spei

The existence of the Porticus Post Spei is recorded by Livy (40.51.6) who noted that it was one of the two porticoes constructed by the censors of 179 BC. While there is no trace of the portico in the archaeological record, the location of the portico can be pin-pointed in relation to the location of the temple of Spes. The temple of Spes was dedicated *c.*258-7 BC by A. Atilius Calatinus following a naval victory during the First Punic War (Cicero, *Leg.* 2.28; Tacitus, *Ann.* 2.49).[39] It was located in the northern Forum Holitorium, on the site of the later church of S. Nicola in Carcere (Fig. 94).[40] The location of the temple on this site is confirmed by two inscriptions, *CIL* VI 978 and *CIL* VI 979, which were found in front of the three temples beneath S. Nicola in Carcere, the former referring to a restoration undertaken by Hadrian, and the latter to a restoration by Antoninus Pius.[41] Based on the dates of the temples, as determined through an analysis of the archaeological remains, the southernmost temple of the complex was that of Spes.[42] The remains indicate that the temple of Spes was a Doric peripteral hexastyle temple with eleven columns down the side which would have originally been stuccoed.[43] The primary

[39] *LTUR* IV, 336 (Coarelli); Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 39. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 493; Richardson, 1992, 365; 41-3.
[40] *LTUR* IV, 336-7 (Coarelli); See also: Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 43; Claridge, 1998, 249; Coarelli, 2007, 314-5; All contra Richardson, 1992, 365 who attributes the remains central temple beneath S. Nicola in Carcere to the cult of Spes.
[41] *LTUR* IV, 337 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 2007, 315.
[42] *LTUR* IV, 337 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 2007, 314-5.
[43] *LTUR* IV, 337 (Coarelli) Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 41-3. See also: Claridge, 1998, 249; Coarelli, 2007, 314-5.

building material for the elevated structure was travertine, while the podium was likely constructed from tufa blocks. In total the building measured *c.*25m long by 11m wide (Fig. 95; Fig. 96).[44]

A further indication of the location of the Porticus Post Spei is provided by Livy, who notes that the portico was close to the Temple of Apollo Medicus (40.51.6). Consequently, while the southern and northern limits of the portico remain undetermined, it can be ascertained that at least some portion of the portico ran from behind the temple of Spes to the temple of Apollo Medicus, likely traversing the area that would later be taken up by the theatre of Marcellus. It is known that other buildings in this area were demolished to make way for the theatre of Marcellus, including the temple of Pietas (Appendix: 3.3.3), and possibly that of Diana (Appendix: 3.3.5), so it seems likely that the Porticus Post Spei was also demolished to make way for the theatre (Pliny, *H.N.* 7.121).[45] This would account for the lack of reference to the portico in the Imperial sources.

While the majority of the Porticus Post Spei lay outside of the true confines of the Campus Martius, and the actual name for the building was derived from a temple located on the Forum Holitorium and not on the Campus Martius, the portico was still an important building for the Campus Martius as it aided in the physical definition of the western boundary and likely introduced a greater footfall into the area from the Forum Boarium and the Forum Holitorium (Fig. 94). As the portico traversed the area from the Forum Boarium, through the Forum Holitorium, to the area of the southern Circus Flaminius, it possibly led people from the more urbanised and popularly used area of the Forum Holitorium towards the Campus Martius. By facilitating the movement of people it is possible that the Portico Post Spei also initiated the spread of trade, particularly the vegetable trade, in a northerly direction towards the Circus Flaminius from the Forum Holitorium. It could be argued that the routing of the vegetable trade via the Porticus Post Spei towards the Campus Martius was part of Lepidus' and Nobilior's new plan to regulate and improve the harbour and perhaps prevented over-crowding in the popular and important areas of the Forum Holitorium and Forum Boarium.

---

[44] Coarelli, 2007, 315.
[45] *LTUR* IV, 86 (Ciancio Rossetto); Coarelli, 1997, 451; Coarelli, 2007, 314.

Unfortunately nothing is known of the form of the Porticus Post Spei from either the archaeological record or the FUR. Taking into account the rough location of the Porticus Post Spei and the fact that it was associated with the rejuvenation of the harbour, it is likely that it was a single sided freestanding portico that stood with the colonnaded side facing the river and its back to the Campus Martius and Forum Holitorium. This arrangement would have meant that boats pulling up to the quayside could have unloaded their goods directly into the portico. Also, any unsightly untidiness arising from quayside activity would have been shielded from the eyes of those frequenting the Campus Martius, Circus Flaminius and Forum Holitorium. As the Porticus Post Spei was associated with trade and commerce and was not a victory monument, it is unlikely to have been used for the large scale display of art and booty. The fact that the portico is not mentioned in any literary source in association with triumph, art or booty substantiates the theory that the Portico Post Spei was utilitarian in nature and that its primary function was to keep clean and maintain the quayside, though this does not render it less significant for the development of the southern Campus Martius. The portico defined the line of the Tiber as it passed through Rome alongside the Campus Martius and Forum Holitorium and by doing so added monumentality to the area. Those who approached the Campus Martius for the first time via the River Tiber would have been met by the sight of a defined dockyard with a colonnaded front, which backed onto the southern Circus Flaminius and the Forum Holitorium. The Porticus Post Spei was one of a number of porticoes and utilitarian buildings that bordered the Tiber and facilitated the movement of goods into Rome. The construction of the portico in association with a censorial plan to clean the dockyards (Livy, 40.51) highlighted the way in which politicians carried out civically minded projects in order to gain popular support.

4.2.3. Porticus Post Navalia

The Porticus Post Navalia was also vowed by M. Aemilius Lepidus and M. Fulvius Nobilior in 179 BC as part of their censorial building project (Livy, 40.51). There are few literary sources for the Porticus Post Navalia and the information provided by Livy is

open to interpretation as the original Latin text has been corrupted.[46] Livy's reference can be reconstructed in either of two ways and relates the relative position of the Porticus Post Navalia to the Porticus Post Spei and the Porticus Extra Porta Trigimena. The two possible reconstructions are as follows:

> *M.Fulvius locavit forum et porticum extra portam Trigeminam, et aliam post Navalia ad fanum Herculis et post Spei ad Tiberim <ad> aedem Apollinis Medici.*[47] (Livy, 40.51.6)

OR

> *M.Fulvius locavit forum et porticum extra portam Trigeminam, et aliam post Navalia <et> ad fanum Herculis et post Spei a Tiberi <ad> aedem Apollinis Medici.*[48] (Livy, 40.51.6)

The first reconstruction of the text is the most straightforward and suggests that the Porticus Post Navalia was located behind the Navalia and beside the *fanum Hercules* (Fig. 98). It also allows for the association of the Porticus Post Spei to the temple of Apollo Medicus, which is a very likely relationship based on the topography of the area (Appendix: 2.3.4). This is by far the most plausible position for the Porticus Post Navalia based on what is already known about the location of the Navalia, the location of the Porticus Post Spei and the temple of Apollo. However, the second reconstruction has been used by Hülsen to substantiate his theory that the Porticus Post Navalia was located between the Porticus Extra Porta Trigemina and the Porticus Post Spei.[49] This seems far less likely as it disassociates the Porticus Post Spei from the temple of Apollo Medicus.

The question of the association between the Porticus Post Navalia and the *fanum Hercules* has brought to light some intricate difficulties regarding the topography of the extreme southwest of the Campus Martius. Due to the number of temples and shrines dedicated to Hercules in the area of the Circus Flaminius and Forum Boarium, it is uncertain to which temple or shrine of Hercules Livy is referring.[50] *Ad fanum Hercules* can be interpreted as a reference to the temple of Hercules Magnus Custos, the temple of Hercules Musarum,

---

[46] *LTUR* IV, 150-1 (Coarelli); See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 359.
[47] *LTUR* IV 150-1 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 1997, 460-1; See also: Richardson, 1992, 13; Ziolkowski, 1992, 51-2.
[48] Hülsen, 1896, 246; Olinder, 1974, 60; Ziolkowski, 1992, 51-2.
[49] Hülsen, 1896, 246-7; Platner & Ashby, 1926, 359; Coarelli, 1997, 351.
[50] Hülsen, 1896, 246-7; Platner & Ashby, 1926, 359; Coarelli, 1997, 351, 460.

or to the Ara Maxima in the Forum Holitorium where Hercules Invictus was worshipped.[51] The term *'fanum'* suggests that the cult site was an open area and not a temple and as a result *ad fanum Herculis* can be interpreted as a reference to the Ara Maxima in the Forum Holitorium (Livy, 1.7.10-11; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 1.40.6).[52] Alternatively it is possible that the reference to the cult of Hercules may refer to the temple of Hercules Custos which was either constructed, or restored, by Sulla in the 1st century BC and whose location is far from certain (5.1.2) (Ovid, *Fast.* 6.209-212).[53] A third possibility is that Livy was referring to the temple of Hercules Musarum, which had been constructed by M. Fulvius Nobilior following his triumph of 187 BC and which was located on the north-eastern side of the Circus Flaminius (3.3.4).[54] This is a tempting theory as it would have created a clear association between two buildings constructed by Nobilior, one as a triumphant military leader, another as a Roman censor. However, this interpretation is far from certain and there is no information in the sources to suggest that Nobilior was attempting to group his buildings together. Of these three possibilities the first is the most convincing as the term *fanum* is likely a reference to an open air altar and it is more than likely that had Livy been referring to a physical temple building, he would have used the term *templum* instead of *fanum.* Of course this theory cannot be solidly proven and as a result, at present, we must content ourselves with the fact that the Porticus Post Navalia lay along the eastern bank of the Tiber, close to the Porticus Post Spei, and perhaps that it ran as far south as the Ara Maxima (Fig. 98; Fig. 99).

There are no extant archaeological remains for the Porticus Post Navalia and Livy's reference is the only clear literary record of the portico. As such, it is uncertain if the portico took the form of a single sided portico or a quadroportico, or if it was single storey or double storey. Due to its position on the Campus Martius alongside the bank of the River Tiber, and due to the fact that it was associated with a rejuvenation of the harbour, it was likely a single sided freestanding portico constructed from locally available materials such as tufa and travertine. This format would have been particularly suitable for the storage and movement of goods from the docks after they were taken from the boats at the Navalia or further south in the Forum Boarium and Forum Holitorium. However, given the lack of archaeological information this can not be proven beyond a doubt. That the portico was a relatively plain building in comparison to some of the later

[51] *LTUR* IV, 139 (Coarelli); Olinder, 1976, 60-1; Coarelli, 1997, 351, 460.
[52] *LTUR* III, 115-17 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 1997, 351. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 253.
[53] *LTUR* III, 13 (Viscogliosi). See also: Whatmough, 1921, 65.
[54] Wiseman, 1974, 7, 12; Olinder, 1976, 60-3.

quadroporticoes of the southern Campus Martius may be inferred from the silence of the literary sources who would have recorded the existence of this building had it been of an unusual design or ornately decorated. These functional buildings, devoid of the decoration and pomp of the temples built to commemorate military victories, embodied a concept of Roman civic pride, rendering them equally useful as personal statements of achievement.

This location for the Porticus Post Navalia means that the eastern side of the River Tiber would have been defined by the Porticus Post Navalia and the Porticus Post Spei, from as far south as the Porta Trigemina, to as far north as the south central Campus Martius, thus creating a visible man-made limit to the south-western area of the Campus Martius. Already by 220 BC the Via Flaminia was in place creating a visible man-made eastern boundary.[55] Therefore, by the mid 2nd century BC the southern half of the Campus Martius would have been solidly defined by an eastern and western boundary and this definition would have been very visible to the inhabitants of the city of Rome. Coupled with the Capitoline Hill to the south, these physical boundaries, in association with the symbolic boundary of the *pomerium,* would, to some extent, have sectioned the Campus Martius off from the centre of Rome. These boundaries defined the Circus Flaminius and in doing so monumentalised the victory temples of the area, creating a defined space that was physically and symbolically associated with triumphal display, military victory and its commemoration.

[55] *LTUR* V, 135 (Patterson); Palmer, 1990, 58-9; Richardson, 1992, 415; Laurence, 1999, 22; Rehak, 2006, 10.

4.3. Four-Sided Quadroporticoes

The porticoes that were constructed on the Campus Martius after the construction of the Porticus Post Navalia and the Porticus Post Spei had a strong and obvious political statement behind their construction. The porticoes of Octavius, Metellus and Minucius were constructed as victory monuments that facilitated the victorious general in his quest for public recognition and political power. There were certainly two, and possibly three, quadroporticoes constructed on the Campus Martius in Phase Three, all of which were built as victory monuments. A four-sided portico had a number of additional benefits in terms of architectural format than that of the single sided portico. First and foremost it created an enclosed space that was suitable for many uses including the display of art. By displaying art acquired in military campaigns and placing it within one's own quadroportico, a victorious Roman general created an auspicious victory complex that attracted visitors and advertised personal success. The art could be installed in such a way as to create a themed political and cultural message; such was the case in the quadroportico of Pompey (see section: 5.2.3) in Phase Four (from the beginning of the 1st century BC to the end of the 1st century BC) where art taken from Greece and Asia was displayed alongside portraits of Roman writers in order to create a museum of Roman political and cultural advancement.[56] Unfortunately, as is often the case, the literary sources neglect to record in great detail the works of art put on display in the quadroporticoes of Phase Three and how they were received and perceived by the Roman public, but what is clear is that the architectural format of the quadroportico offered great opportunities for such displays.

4.3.1. Porticus Octavia

The Porticus Octavia was vowed by the naval praetor Cn. Octavius in 168 BC following his participation at the battle of Pydna and his defeat and sack of the city of Meliboea

[56] Gleason, 1994, 21; Kuttner, 1999, 346-7; Coleman, 2000, 222.

(Livy, 44.46.3).[57] No prisoners of war or spoils were exhibited in the course of his triumph, suggesting that they were displayed at a slightly earlier date as part of the triumph of Octavius' senior commander, L. Aemilius Paullus.[58] The dates of construction and dedication are uncertain, but must have occurred between 167 BC and 163 BC.[59] The Porticus Octavia should not be confused with the Porticus Octaviae, constructed by, or for, Augustus' sister Octavia in 27 BC and which replaced the earlier Porticus Metelli (Suetonius, *Aug.* 29; Dio, 49.43).[60]

Pliny (*H.N.* 34.13) records that the Porticus Octavia was constructed close to the Circus Flaminius while Festus (188L) records that it was close to the Theatre of Pompey. These references place the Porticus Octavia on the north-eastern side of the Circus Flaminius (Fig. 92).[61] Olinder and Gros have attempted to attribute the remains of the building at No.23 Via dei Calderari to the Porticus Octavia (Fig. 100).[62] These remains consist of two travertine pilasters with engaged columns and an entablature as well as some blocks of travertine paving, all of which have since been built into the front of a house. Platner and Ashby suggest that drawings from the sixteenth century show an upper story with a colonnade.[63] This location, on Via dei Calderari, would support Pliny's description of the portico as *'ad circum Flaminium'* while also correlating with Festus' reference to its proximity to the theatre complex of Pompey (Festus, 188L). While this is a somewhat appealing theory, the style of the visible remains date the building to the Imperial period and consequently No.23 Via dei Calderari cannot be the remains of the Porticus Octavia.[64]

It is possible that the front of the Porticus Octavia is recorded on fragment 31hh of slab V-12 of the FUR, to the north-east of the Porticus Philippi (Fig. 101).[65] This fragment shows a complete and uninterrupted series of buildings which continued along the north-eastern side of the Circus Flaminius, though unfortunately the fragment is not deep/wide enough to determine if the portico was single sided or four sided. The location that the

---

[57] *LTUR* IV, 139 (Viscogliosi); Olinder, 1974, 83-124; Coarelli, 1997, 515-28. See also: Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 118; Richardson, 1992, 317; Gruen, 1992, 115.
[58] Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 119; Gruen, 1992, 115; Coarelli, 1997, 518.
[59] *LTUR* IV, 139 (Viscogliosi); Olinder, 1974, 84-6; See also: Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 120; Coarelli, 1997, 518.
[60] Linder, 1974, 86; Favro, 1996, 106.
[61] *LTUR* IV, 140 (Viscogliosi); Olinder, 1974, 83-4; Wiseman, 1974, 13-4.
[62] Olinder, 1974, XXX; Gatti, 1979, 250-2; Se also: Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 123.
[63] Planter and Ashby, 1926, 425.
[64] *LTUR* IV, 141 (Viscogliosi); Claridge, 1998, 222.
[65] *LTUR* IV, 140 (Viscogliosi); Olinder, 1974, 110-13; Coarelli, 1997, 521.

FUR suggests is persuasive as it places the Porticus Octavia close to the victory temples of the Circus Flaminius and in an area that would become particularly popular for the construction of quadroporticoes in the next century (for example, both the Porticus Metelli and the Porticus Philippi were constructed along the north-eastern side).[66] However, there is no evidence other than a small fragment of the FUR to support this theory.

Traditionally the Porticus Octavia was considered to be a four-sided portico, an argument which was supported by Coarelli. He has since revised his original theory that the Porticus Octavia was a quadroportico that surrounded the temples of Vulcan and Mars.[67] However, the proposed location of the portico along the north-eastern Circus Flaminius and the proposed quadroportico format are not without their drawbacks and problems. For example, if one is to accept the location for the Porticus Octavia to the west of the later Porticus Philippi, there is no conceivable way in which the building could have been a four sided portico as the depth of the site was hindered by the location of the *amnis petronia,* which was located just 20m north-west of the Porticus Octavia at the time of the portico's construction.[68] As a consequence if one accepts this location for the Portico Octavia, the only logical possibility that remains is that the Porticus Octavia was originally a single sided portico in Phase Three. At the time of its reconstruction under Augustus in 33 BC (Augustus, *Res Ges.* 19) the Porticus Octavia may have been transformed into a quadroportico as the *amnis petronia* had been rerouted underground by that time.[69] The route of the *amnis petronia* dictated the form of this commemorative portico, the result being that it was the only freestanding single sided portico constructed on the Campus Martius in order to commemorate a Republican victory.

Pliny the Elder's description of the Porticus Octavia (*N.H.* 34.13) raises further issues regarding its architectural format, as he describes the Porticus Octavia as a '*porticum duplicem*' (*double portico*). This can be interpreted in a number of ways, leading modern scholars to suggest a number of conflicting forms for the building.[70] It seems unlikely given the date of the construction that *portium duplicum* refers to a two story building. If

---

[66] For Porticus Metelli: *LTUR* IV, 130-1 (Viscogliosi); Coarelli, 1997, 529; Coarelli, 2007, 271-2. For Porticus Philippi: *LTUR* IV, 146-8 (Viscogliosi); Richardson, 1992, 318.
[67] Olinder, 1974, 110-13; Coarelli, 1997, 520-1.
[68] Coarelli, 1997, 10; Wiseman, 1974, 13.
[69] *LTUR* IV, 81 (Coarelli); *LTUR* IV, 140-1 (Viscogliosi); Wiseman, 1974, 13; Olinder, 1974, 123.
[70] *LTUR* IV, 140 (Viscogliosi); Olinder, 1974, 91-2; Coarelli, 1997, 522-4. See also: Coulton, 1971, 183-4; Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 121-3.

this had been the case then the Porticus Octavia would have been mentioned by other Roman writers. Alternatively, the term can be taken to mean that the portico had two rows of columns, one to the front and one in the middle, an architectural format which is described in some detail by Vitruvius (*De Arch.* 5.9.2), who records that two rows of columns could be used in a single sided portico to divide the portico effectively into two rows or naves. Vitruvius (*De Arch.* 5.9.2) records the advantages of a portico with two rows of columns:

> "*Three of these porticoes will be laid out as single, and the fourth, which faces south, will be double, so that when there are windy storms, the rain cannot spatter into the interior part.*"

Unfortunately, this description, and the reference by Pliny the Elder, do not help to shed light on whether or not the Porticus Octavia was single sided or four sided.

Another important description of the building is provided by Pliny the Elder (*H.N.* 34.13) who records that the capitals on display in the portico were of the Corinthian order and were covered in bronze. This is the earliest reference to the use of the Corinthian order in Rome.[71] An alternate reading of the original text suggests that the capitals could have been of a more traditional order, but were described as *Corinthia* due to the fact that they were covered in bronze.[72] The Corinthian order, which merged new decorative techniques with aspects of the more common Ionic order, had been used in Greece since as early as the 7th century BC, for example at the temple of Bassae (Fig. 102) and the monument of Lysicrates in Athens, though was not itself prevalent in Greece.[73] The syntax of Pliny the Elder's statement makes the identification of the form of the capital difficult, but it seems reasonable, given the date of the construction of this building and the experiences of the provider in Greece and the eastern Mediterranean, that the capitals were both of the Corinthian order and were covered in bronze and that they were imported into Rome from the eastern Mediterranean by Octavius as a symbol of Roman power over both foreign building techniques and materials. The use of the order in the context of this victory monument suggests that Octavius had become aware of the order while in the eastern Mediterranean.[74]

---

[71] *LTUR* IV, 140 (Viscogliosi); Olinder, 1974, 88; Coarelli, 1997, 522. See also: Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 121; Gruen, 1992, 138.
[72] Olinder, 1974, 87-8.
[73] Strong, 1963, 73-4.
[74] Gruen, 1992, 138.

In Greece and the Hellenistic kingdoms the use of bronze architectural features was unusal and often a sign of great wealth. The use of this feature for the first time in Rome would have generated considerable interest and attracted visitors to the building.[75] On this occasion the bronze Corinthian capitals were displayed in a building constructed from traditional Roman building materials, such as tufa and travertine, with a primary use of the Iconic order, all architectural elements which would have functioned to emphasise the traditional Roman context and focused even more attention to the foreign nature of the capitals. By displaying these capitals Octavius was displaying his power over foreign culture and promoting Roman superiority aboard.

Velleius Patercullus (2.1.1-2) confirms that works of Greek art were displayed in the portico, the vast majority of which were probably taken as booty by Octavius while on campaign.[76] Further evidence for the display of booty and military gains comes from the Imperial period, following the building's reconstruction by Octavian in 33 BC. Dio (49.43) and Appian (*Illyr.* 28) both record that the Porticus Octavia was used for the display of the standards that the future emperor Augustus had taken from Dalmatia, thus indicating continued use of the Circus Flaminius for the commemoration of victory into the Imperial period.[77] The fact that the Porticus Octavia was used for the display of art does not necessarily lead to a definitive architectural format for the building as art may have been displayed just as easily within a single sided double portico as within a four sided quadroportico, though the fact that it had two naves means that art on display would have been spared the potentially damaging effects of the weather, as suggested by Vitruvius (*De Arch.* 5.11.2).

A fundamentally important aspect of this building was that it was the first building constructed on the Campus Martius to be named after the provider. With the exception of tombs, *columna rostrata* and posthumously named monuments, the Porticus Octavia was only the third building in the whole of Rome to be named in honour of its contemporary provider. The only other buildings in Rome at this time to be named in honour of a living person(s) was the Porticus Aemilia, constructed by M. Aemilius Lepidus and M. Aemilius

[75] Olinder, 1974, 88.
[76] *LTUR* IV, 140 (Viscogliosi).
[77] *LTUR* IV, 340-1 (Viscogliosi); Olinder, 1974, 123. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 426.

Paullus in 193 BC and the Basilica Aemilia et Fulvia of 179 BC (Fig. 103).[78] However, it should be noted that both the Basilica Aemilia et Fulvia and the Porticus Aemilia were less than conventional buildings, utilising new techniques in architectural form and construction materials and did not represent a Roman tradition in naming buildings. To name a more mainstream building associated with the triumphal route, and a monument commemorating Roman military victory, in honour of oneself was a bold and unusual move and set the trend for subsequent victorious generals to name their victory monuments in honour of themselves.

4.3.2. Porticus Metelli and the Temple of Jupiter Stator

The Porticus Metelli was an extraordinary building constructed in 146 BC by the praetor Q. Caecilius Metellus following his triumph over Macedonia and Andriscus (Velleius Paterculus, 1.11.3; Festus, 496L; Pliny, *H.N.* 36.40).[79] Importantly it is quite probably the first building constructed in Rome whose sole purpose was to display Greek art brought to Rome as *manubiae*.[80] Fortunately the location and form of the Porticus Metelli is known with certainty through archaeological remains, fragments of the FUR and a number of literary sources.

Pliny the Elder (*H.N.* 34.31) and Velleius Paterculus (1.11.3) both record that in 23 BC the Porticus Metelli was reconstructed by Augustus and renamed the Porticus Octaviae in honour of his sister Octavia.[81] As the Porticus Octaviae is easily identifiable on the FUR and visibly incorporated into the church of S. Angelo in Pescheria on Via del Portico Ottavia in modern Rome, the site for the earlier Porticus Metelli can be identified with relative ease (Fig. 104; Fig. 105).[82] Due to successive reconstructions throughout the Imperial and medieval periods little of the 2nd century BC quadroportico remains. Some remains have been found under Palazzo Clementi Patrizi in Piazza Campitelli indicating that the Porticus Metelli faced south-west, towards the Circus Flaminius and reflected the

---

[78] *LTUR* I, 167 (Steinby); *LTUR* IV, 116 (Coarelli). See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 72-6, 420.
[79] *LTUR* IV, 130-1 (Viscogliosi); Morgan, 1971, 480; Coarelli, 1997, 529; See also: Richardson, 1976, 61; Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 128-34; Richardson, 1992, 315; Gruen, 1992, 116; Coarelli, 2007, 271-2.
[80] Edwards, 2003, 51.
[81] *LTUR* IV, 131 (Viscogliosi); Coarelli, 1997, 529. See also: Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 130; Coarelli, 2007, 271.
[82] Richardson, 1976, 57-8.

same axis as the other buildings on the north-eastern side of the Circus Flaminius (Fig. 106; Fig. 107).[83] Blocks of tufa from Monteverde were also found on the site and may represent the bases of the columns of the quadroportico, while segments of *opus incertum* were found within the podium on which the quadroportico stood, likely representing the earliest phase of construction.[84] The quadroportico was built on a large scale and was large enough to accommodate two temples and a sacred *temenos* within its boundaries. The quadroportico was of a similar size as that of the Porticus Minucia Vetus which was located around the temples of the *area sacra* and measured *c.*105m x 92m.[85]

Metellus' quadroportico was constructed around two temples, one of which predated the Porticus Metelli, and one of which was constructed at the same time as the quadroportico (Fig. 105).[86] The temple of Juno Regina (Appendix: 3.3.5) had been located on this site for some thirty years, since 179 BC, when it was dedicated by M. Aemilius Lepidus (Livy, 40.52).[87] Metellus' new temple stood to the east of the temple of Juno Regina and was vowed to Jupiter Stator by the praetor in 146 BC and dedicated *c.*131 BC.[88] The lengthy period between vow and dedication reflects the scale and complexity of this building project. By constructing a quadroportico around two temples, Metellus was associating his victory in Macedonia with M. Aemilius Lepidus' victory of 179 BC in Liguria (Livy, 39.2.11). He was also, to all intents and purposes, creating a *temenos* in the Greek style.[89] Metellus probably chose this spot for his project because of its military associations and its location in relation to the triumphal procession and also because the temple of Juno Regina had been damaged by lightening in 156 BC and was in need of repair (Obsequens, 16). Metellus likely chose to refurbish this temple while the rest of his complex was being constructed.[90] The reconstruction of a temple was no less important than the construction of a new one, and it should not be assumed that the temple of Juno Regina held less importance in this complex because it was older. Lepidus was well known for great building activities which saw him responsible for at least three other buildings on the Campus Martius as censor, and a number of other buildings throughout

[83] *LTUR* IV, 131 (Viscogliosi).
[84] *LTUR* IV, 131 (Viscogliosi); Coarelli, 2007, 272.
[85] Coarelli, 1997, 536.
[86] Boyd, 1956, 152-3.
[87] *LTUR* III, 126-8 (Viscogliosi); Coarelli, 1997, 485-7. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 290; Coarelli, 2007, 271-2.
[88] Morgan, 1971, 503-4; Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 134.
[89] Richardson, 1976, 61; Gros, 1978, 37; Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 131.
[90] Morgan, 1971, 486-90; Richardson, 1976, 61; Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 131-2.

Rome. This was an association which Metellus was obviously eager to promote.[91] By rejuvenating the temple of Juno Regina, Metellus altered the way that people reacted to, and interacted with, the temple of Juno Regina. It can be argued that Metellus successfully 'rebranded' the temple, keeping the association with Lepidus, while quietly associating it with his own military victory in Macedonia.

According to the *Fasti Antiates Maiores* the temple of Jupiter Stator was a new dedication and celebrated its *dies natalis* on the 5th of September.[92] The temple was remarkable for a number of reasons. First, and perhaps most importantly, Velleius Paterculus (1.11.5) wrote that this temple was the first in Rome to be constructed in marble.[93] This can be interpreted in a number of ways and may simply imply that the temple was covered in a marble veneer.[94] Alternatively it may have been either partly constructed in marble, or constructed in marble throughout. As Metellus had recently won a great battle in Macedonia, and as he himself came from a wealthy family, it is likely that he would have constructed the temple completely in marble. The use of marble on such a large scale would also have served to convey an important statement regarding Roman control of building materials in the eastern Mediterranean. This statement, given the political backdrop to the construction of the temple, would have been interpreted as a sign of Roman superiority over Greece and Macedonia.[95] The fact that Metellus employed a Greek architect, Hermodorus of Salamis, to work on the project suggests that he required an architect who was familiar enough to work with a material which had not previously been used on such a scale in Rome (Vitruvius, *De Arch.* 3.2.5).[96] The form of the temple of Jupiter Stator is partially preserved on the Imperial FUR (fragment 31ggz of, slab V-12, preserved in Renaissance transcription), while Vitruvius (*De Arch.* 3.2.5) provides a brief description of its architectural form.

> *'The peripteros has six columns in the front and rear, and eleven on the flanks, counting in the two columns at the angels, and these eleven are so placed that their distance from the wall is equal to an intercolumnation, or space between the columns all round, and thus is formed a walk around the cella of the temple, such as may be seen in the portico of the theatre of Metellus and in that of Jupiter Stator, by Hermodorus.'* (Vitruvius, *De Arch.* 3.2.5)

---

[91] Those three buildings being the Temple of Diana, the Porticus Post Navalia and the Porticus Post Spei.
[92] Degrassi, 1963, 18, 508; Morgan, 1971, 487-7; Boyd, 1978, 156; Coarelli, 1997, 488-9.
[93] *LTUR* IV 131 (Viscogliosi); Morgan, 1971, 484; Gros, 1978, 71; Gruen, 1992, 116, 137; Coarelli, 1997, 488. See also: Coarelli, 2007, 271; Richardson, 1976, 61; Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 132-3.
[94] Pietilä-Castrén 1987, 132 n.37-39; Coarelli, 1997, 491.
[95] Coarelli, 1997, 491-2.
[96] Morgan, 1971, 486; Richardson, 1976, 61; Coarelli, 1997, 490-1.

Cicero (*Verr.* 4.126) recommended that the inhabitants of Rome go to the Porticus Metelli in order to see the works of Greek art on display there.[97] Of all of the porticoes and quadroporticoes of the Campus Martius, the Porticus Metelli is recorded most frequently for the art that was on display there. Some information has survived about the particular statues that were displayed in the Porticus Metelli. Pliny the Elder, for example, wrote that the cult statues of the temples of Juno Regina and Jupiter Stator were sculpted by Greek artists by the names of Dionysius and Polycles (Pliny, *H.N.* 36.35). This is one of the rare instances where names are given to the artists of particular works of Greek art and which can be associated with the location in which they were displayed. Another reference is preserved in Pliny the Elder (*H.N.* 34.14.31-2) who wrote that a statue of Cornelia, the mother of the Gracchi, was housed by the quadroportico.[98]

The most recognisable and important monument of the quadroportico was the Granikos Monument, a group of twenty-five bronze equestrian statues representing Alexander and his companions.[99] It had been commissioned by Alexander the Great following his victory at Granikos (Plutarch, *Alex.* 40.16; Arrian, *Ana,* 1.16) and was sculpted by the great Greek artist Lysippus and originally put on show in Dion in northern Greece before being taken by Metellus following his victory in Macedonia (Velleius Paterculus, 1.11.3-4; Pliny, *H.N.* 34.64). The dimensions of the quadroportico and the locations of the temples of Jupiter Stator and Juno Regina within the quadroportico suggests that the Granikos monument was possibly set up in the open area to the front of the temples of Juno Regina and Jupiter Stator.[100] This central location indicates that neither priority nor dominance was given to the temple of Jupiter Stator over and above the older temple to Juno Regina. It also shows that Metellus was keen to ensure that anyone who viewed the temples would see them in light of his symbolic association with Alexander the Great.

The representation of the Porticus Metelli on the FUR raises some questions as to its form, at least by the time of the FUR in the 2nd century AD. The quadroportico is preserved on fragments 31bb of slab V-12 of the FUR and the Renaissance preserved fragment 31ggz of slab V-12 (Fig. 108). Both the temples of Juno Regina and Jupiter

---

[97] *LTUR* IV, 131 (Viscogliosi); Morgan, 1971, 491-9; Richardson, 1976, 62; Coarelli, 1987, 490-1, 532-3; Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 133-4.
[98] Boyd, 1953, 158; Gruen, 1992, 120; Harlow & Laurence, 2002, 68.
[99] Pollitt, 1978, 158; Gruen, 1992, 143; Coarelli, 1997, 532; Edwards, 2003, 51.
[100] Coarelli, 1997, 532.

Stator are clearly shown and named on these fragments. The quadroportico itself is indicated by two parallel rows of columns that encompass the temples. However, there is no indication of a rear wall for the quadroportico. This is particularly unusual as the rear wall was indicated by a straight uninterrupted line for the Portico Philippi (31bb, cc of slab V-12). This suggests that, at least by the 2nd century AD, the Porticus Metelli did not have any rear wall and was simply a roofed double colonnade. While this was an unusual form for a portico to take there would have been a number of advantages to it. Firstly, it meant that both the temple of Juno Regina and the temple of Jupiter Stator remained visible from the Circus Flaminius. Secondly, the works of art on show within the portico and within the open area of the quadroportico, such as the Granikos monument, would have been visible to the visitors of the Circus Flaminius as well as to all those who took part in triumphal parades. The projecting central columns, indicated on the FUR by a series of two rows of six columns, all shown as dots in squares, likely represent a monumental entrance to the colonnade (Fig. 108).[101] If, as hypothesised, the Granikos monument was displayed in the centre of the complex it would have been visible through the monumental entrance, imbuing both the portico complex of Metellus and the monument itself with greater significance and importance.

Metellus' quadroportico was important on a number of levels. It was innovative and used marble on a scale never before witnessed in Rome. As such it was likely interpreted as culturally and politically significant by the late Republican inhabitants of Rome. To construct a temple in marble was a hugely extravagant act and was a statement of political and military victory over Greece as well as a statement of cultural dominance and superiority. Meanwhile, the sculptural decoration within the quadroportico would, to all intents and purposes, have created a Greek style monument on the edge of pomerial Rome. At the time of construction, Metellus' complex would have appeared foreign, diverse and perhaps would even have been disliked by more conservative sections of Roman society. What is beyond doubt is that it was innovative and quite different to anything before witnessed in Rome. The Porticus Metelli was, at the time, the grandest, most extravagant and boldest, building of Republican Rome and exemplified the importance of the Campus Martius as a location for personal advertisement and political self-promotion.

---

[101] Gleason, 1990, 10; Farrar, 1998, 181.

4.3.3. Porticus Minucia Vetus

The Porticus Minucia Vetus was constructed by M. Minucius Rufus following his triumph to celebrate his defeat of a Thracian tribe known as the Scordisci in 110 BC (Livy, *Epit.* 65; Velleius Paterculus, 2.8.3; Cicero, *Phil.* 2.84).[102] Construction took a number of years and the subsequent inauguration of the quadroportico did not take place until 102 BC.[103] There is a degree of uncertainty regarding the nature and location of the quadroportico as by the 4th century AD the Regionary Catalogues recorded two porticoes, both designated as 'Porticus Minucia', on the Campus Martius (*Reg.* IX).[104] In order to differentiate between the two, the older of the porticoes, constructed by M. Minucius Rufus in 110 BC was described as '*vetus*', while the later Imperial portico was described as the Porticus Minucia '*frumentaria*', referring to the regular use of the quadroportico for the distribution of grain.[105] Unfortunately literary references to the Porticus Minucia Vetus are few and far between.

The only literary sources that indicate the actual location of the Porticus Minucia Vetus are the *Curiosum* and *Notitia* of the Regionary Catalogue.[106] In both sources the entry for the Porticus Minucia Vetus is placed between the entries for the Porticus Philippi and the Crypt of Balbus in the description of Region IX.

Curiosum	**Notitia**
'Porticum Philippi Minucias veterum et frumentarium Cryptam Balbi'.	'Porticum Philippi Minucias duas veterum et frumentarium Cryptam Balbi'
'Portico Philippi Minucias Vetus and Frumentaria Crypta Balbi	Portico Philippi Two Minucias, Vetus and Frumentaria Crypta Balbi

[102] Coarelli, 1997, 296-7; Coarelli, 2007, 279.
[103] *LTUR* IV, 137 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 1997, 297.
[104] *LTUR* IV, 137 (Coarelli); Nordh, 1949, 86; Coarelli, 1997, 297.
[105] Coarelli, 2007, 279.
[106] *LTUR* IV, 137 (Coarelli); Nordh, 1949, 86; Coarelli, 1997, 297.

This suggests that both the Republican and Imperial porticoes were constructed close to each other, though the position ascribed to them is referenced only relative to the locations of the Porticus Philippi and the Crypta Balbi (Fig. 109). The allocation of a position for the Porticus Minucia Vetus and the Porticus Minucia Frumentaria must consequently rely on archaeological investigation, a task which is aided by the sound identification of the Crypta Balbi (Appendix: 5.4.2) and Porticus Philippi in the archaeological record.[107]

The remains of two quadroporticoes have been found in the area north of the Crypta Balbi and the Porticus Philippi. One portico was located around the victory temples of the *area sacra* in modern Largo Argentina, while another was placed to the east of the *area sacra*, around the remains of the early Republican temple found on Via della Botteghe Oscure (Fig. 110).[108] The datable evidence suggests that the remains of the quadroportico surrounding the *area sacra* of Largo Argentina are those of the Porticus Minucia Vetus and the remains of the portico surrounding the temple on Via delle Botteghe Oscure are those of the later Porticus Minucia Frumentaria.[109] This reconstruction is particularly apt as it allows the Republican quadroportico to be associated with the Republican victory temples while placing the Porticus Minucia Frumentaria in an area large enough to accommodate the distribution of grain. It also allows for the possibility that the Porticus Minucia Frumentaria was an imperial enlargement of the Porticus Minucia Vetus.[110]

Evidence to support the location of the Porticus Minucia Vetus around the *area sacra* comes from the early Imperial calendar the *Fasti Praenestini*.[111] This calendar records that the temple of Lares Permarini (see section: 3.2.4) was constructed on a site surrounded by a Porticus Minucia. As the temple of Lares Permarini has been positively identified as Temple D of Largo Argentina, the theory that the surrounding portico is the Porticus Minucia Vetus can be confirmed. An alternative theory is that the temple of Lares Permarini is located on Via delle Botteghe Obscure, where the remnants of a Republican temple have been found. If this were the case then the Porticus Minucia Vetus was located to the east of the *area sacra*. However, this theory seems unlikely given that

---

[107] For Porticus Philippi: *LTUR* IV, 146-8 (Viscogliosi); Richardson, 1977, 365-61. For Crypta Balbi: *LTUR* I, 326-7 (Manacorda); Sear, 2006, 66; Coarelli, 2007, 282.
[108] *LTUR* IV, 138 (Coarelli); Lugli, 1946, 7; Coarelli, 1981 12; Coarelli, 1997, 303.
[109] *LTUR* IV, 137-8 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 1997, 308-15. See also: Coarelli, 2007, 281.
[110] Coarelli, 1981 12; Coarelli, 1997, 303; Coarelli, 2007, 281.
[111] *LTUR* IV, 137 (Coarelli); Degrassi, 1963, 543; Coarelli, 1997, 297.

the date, format and nature of Temple D of Largo Argentina fits the ethos and background of L. Aemilius Regillus (Fig. 109; Fig. 110).[112] In my belief the temple of Lares Permarini can be identified as Temple D of Largo Argentina and the surrounding quadroportico can be identified as the Porticus Minucia Vetus.

Those who believe that the remains on Via delle Botteghe Oscure represent the temple of Lares Permarini, including Cozza and Richardson, consequently identify Temple D of Largo Argentina as the temple of the Nymphs.[113] This is based in part on Cozza's interpretation of fragment 35ff of slab IV-5 of the FUR (Fig. 113).[114] The remains on Via delle Botteghe Oscure indicate that the temple had eight columns along the front and a *cella* with two rows of six columns (Fig. 110).[115] The temple can be dated to the mid third century BC, though the majority of the visible remains date from the Domitianic reconstruction.[116] The temple was decorated with stucco and underwent three phases of construction.[117] Excavations in 1938 and 1941 found a number of stone water basins around the temple inside the limits of the surrounding quadroportico.[118] These water basins strongly suggest that these are the remains of the temple of the Nymphs and were most likely used as fountains for the cult.[119] With the positive identification of the remains of Via delle Botteghe Oscure as those of the temple of the Nymphs, the surrounding quadroportico can be identified as the Porticus Minucia Frumentaria, while Temple D of the *area sacra* can be confirmed at the Temple of Lares Permarini and the surrounding quadroportico confirmed as the Porticus Minucia Vetus. The scale of the quadroportico around the temple to the Nymphs indicates that it was an Imperial construction as it measured *c.*150m x 115m and was larger than any other portico or quadroportico on the Campus Martius.[120] As the function of the Imperial quadroportico was for the distribution of free grain rations to the Roman populace, the size of the quadroportico and the fact that it surrounded a lot of open space is particularly appropriate (Fig. 110; Fig. 112). It is impossible to agree with Cozza and Richardson's

---

[112] *LTUR* III, 174 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 1997, 258-9. See also: Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 92-3; Claridge, 1998, 217-8.
[113] Cozza, 1968, 9; Coarelli, 1997, 304. See also: Richardson, 1992, 316.
[114] Cozza, 1968 9.
[115] *LTUR* III, 350 (Manacorda); Colini, 1938, 259-60 (Where the site is identified as the Temple of Bellona).
[116] *LTUR* III, 350 (Manacorda); Coarelli, 1997, 305; Coarelli, 2007, 281.
[117] Arena & Delogu et.al, 2000, 14.
[118] Colini, 1938, 259-60.
[119] *LTUR* III, 350 (Manacorda); Lugli, 1946, 7 (where the site is identified as the temple of Bellona); Coarelli, 1997, 303-5.
[120] Coarelli, 2007, 281.

proposal that the Porticus Minucia Frumentaria surrounded the *area sacra* as it is impossible to see how grain rations could have been distributed in the small *area sacra,* crowded as it was with victory temples and statues.[121]

By placing his quadroportico around the victory temples of the *area sacra* in 110 BC, Minucius Rufus associated himself with generations of victorious Roman generals. The construction of the Porticus Minucia Vetus around the temples of Largo Argentina would have functioned to create a victory complex, with the victories of the third and second centuries BC becoming associated with Minucius' victory. Anyone who chose to visit the temples of the *area sacra* would first have to engage with Minucius' victory monument and would symbolically associate his victory with the victors of the 3rd and 2nd century BC, such as Catulus in 242 BC and Regillus over Antiochus III in 190 BC

While there is no actual physical or literary evidence for the association of grain distribution and the Porticus Minucia Vetus, some scholars, including Coarelli, have supported the theory that the Porticus Minucia Frumentaria was an imperial extension to the Porticus Minucia Vetus, and that the Republican quadroportico was always, at least at some level, used for the distribution of grain rations.[122] While the archaeological information for the Porticus Minucia Vetus fails on the whole to substantiate this theory, there are a number of indications that Minucia's family were associated with the distribution of grain. It has been established that the forefathers of M. Minucius Rufus were, from an early date, associated with the distribution of grain within the city of Rome (Livy, 4.13.7; Pliny, *H.N.* 34.21).[123] A column was set up to honour the work the family had done in relation to grain supply as early as 440-39 BC.[124] This was later commemorated on a coin of 135/4 BC (*RRC* 242/1) (Fig. 111).[125] That the family of the provider of the quadroportico was associated with the distribution of grain both before and after the foundation and utilisation of the Porticus Minucia Vetus can only suggest that the portico was used, in some way, for the distribution of grain in Republican Rome, though likely on a much smaller scale than the Porticus Minucia Frumentaria of the Imperial Period. The Porticus Minucia Vetus appears to have been a far more utilitarian portico than the Porticus Octavia or the Porticus Metelli. This suggestion may only stem

---

[121] Cozza, 1968, 9-11; Richardson, 1992, 316.
[122] Coarelli, 1997, 300-10.
[123] *LTUR* I, 305-6 (Torelli); *RE,* Minucius 40; Coarelli, 1997, 300.
[124] *LTUR* IV, 134-5 (Manacorda); Coarelli, 1997, 300.
[125] Coarelli, 1997, 300; Tameanko, 1999, 83. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 133; Boethius, 1978, 99.

from the poor literary sources for the building, most of which date to the Imperial period when the Porticus Minucia Vetus was attached to the Porticus Minucia Frumentaria and was associated with the distribution of grain.

Conclusion

The porticoes of Phase Three (from the mid 2nd century BC to the early 1st century BC) highlight an important era of development for the Campus Martius. In this phase porticoes became a new medium for statements of victory and offered victorious military generals greater opportunities to advertise their successes and garner political support from the public. The porticoes, and in particular the quadroporticoes, of Phase Three were a more malleable medium for victory statements. As secular buildings they could be named in honour of their provider and as a result charismatic political leaders were not forced to hide their achievements and successes behind a religious façade. These large open buildings also provided enough space to house and exhibit works of art taken from annexed countries and provinces and in so doing more visitors could be attracted to the building and they could be tempted to engage more with the victory monument than was necessarily possible with the temple buildings.

The porticoes and quadroporticoes of the Campus Martius were monumental for a number of reasons. Firstly, they could be used to define a space. This was certainly the case for the Porticus Post Spei and the Porticus Post Navalia which defined and monumentalised the south-eastern Campus Martius. Secondly, the quadroporticoes of Phase Three also helped to monumentalise the north-eastern side of the Circus Flaminius while also defining it. Thirdly, the quadroporticoes of the Campus Martius that were constructed around pre-existent temples redefined space and rebranded it. For example, the Porticus Metelli created an area associated with past and future triumphs of Roman generals and redefined the message behind M. Aemilius Lepidus' temple of Juno Regina. It would have been inappropriate for a victorious general of Phase Three to blindly obscure a victory temple from public view by constructing another victory monument in front of it. However, by constructing a quadroportico around a temple, the constructor would have been viewed as honouring, monumentalising and promoting the temple, and not desecrating or obscuring it.

By constructing four sided porticoes on the Campus Martius the generals of Phase Three were also enclosing what had previously been open, public, space. This was a trend that was to grow throughout the late Republic, and particularly in Phase Four. In Phase Three

the enclosing of public space was limited to the southern Campus Martius and the Circus Flaminius, leaving the central and northern Campus Martius free for recreation, military practice and horse racing. The quadroporticoes therefore began the transformation of the southern Campus Martius into an urban space which was visibly different to the open areas of the central and northern Campus Martius. It was not until Phase Four that vast tracts of public land were transformed into enclosed, private areas, for example the Horti Agrippae (Appendix: 5.3.6) and the theatre and portico of Pompey (Appendix: 5.2.3).

The victorious generals of Phase Three had the opportunity to promote their successes abroad in a way that had not been possible in Phase Two. The freedom they had is reflected in the personal names given to their porticoes and quadroporticoes and the fact that they enclosed public land. The generals of Phase Three, and their porticoes, represent a further step towards the power and influence that the charismatic leaders such as Pompey, Caesar and Agrippa held in Phase Four. While in Phase Three the buildings constructed still represented the victory of the Roman state and continued the trend of using the Campus Martius as a space for military and political commemoration, in Phase Four the Campus Martius developed into a space used for overt statements of personal political power and self-promotion. One reason for the transition was the history and association that the Campus Martius had with victory monuments, while the dwindling power of the Republic in the face of the growth of the Empire also facilitated the growth of personal political statements on the Campus Martius.

Chapter 5: The Late Republic (Phase Four)

Introduction

Phase Four of the development of the Campus Martius covers the turbulent period of the 1st century BC. This phase consequently reflects the influence late Republican politicians such as Pompey the Great and Julius Caesar had on the Campus Martius and traces the impact they had on the development of the topography of the area. Development on the Campus Martius in Phase Four was both respectful of the historical development that had preceded it while at the same time it facilitated innovative and progressive construction projects. As a result traditional style temples such as that of Fortuna Huiusce Diei were constructed alongside new types and styles of buildings such as the baths and Stagnum of Agrippa.

More so than any previous phase of development, the 1st century BC saw the power and influence of charismatic political leaders expressed not only through transient triumphal celebration, but through the construction of large scale permanent buildings.[1] Such displays and constructions reflect the competitive nature of politics in this phase and chart the subsequent rise to power of Roman generals with personal and political ambitions. This competition, ambition and revolution culminated in the foundation of Imperial power at the end of the 1st century BC. The ambitious desire for power was expressed on the Campus Martius by Pompey's theatre and portico project of 55 BC (Appendix: 5.2.1; 5.2.2; 5.2.3) and by Caesar's redevelopment of the Ovile prior to 25 BC (Appendix: 5.3.9).[2] Hand in hand with the desire for political power and public support went the promotion of political goals through the construction of large scale buildings and building complexes. Large scale buildings that were accessible to the general public were an excellent medium for self promotion and the Campus Martius provided the space, freedom and access that allowed such projects to attract the masses. Phase Four was not a phase in which subtle suggestions were made regarding political power and dominance.

---

[1] Favro, 1996, 86.
[2] For Pompey's Project: *LTUR* IV, 148-9 (Gros); *LTUR* V, 36-6 (Gros). For Caesar's Ovile: Shipley, 1933, 37; *LTUR* IV, 228 (Gatti).

Rather, the buildings of the Campus Martius were constructed as active tools of propaganda, used to garner public support by wooing the population of Rome.

Throughout the 1st century BC aspects of Greek culture were used as a means for communicating political ambition and drive, for example, through the construction of permanent theatres and the display of art. Greek culture had been used as a language of political statement in Rome since the 3rd century BC and Phase Four was no exception to this rule. Even more so in the 1st century BC Greek culture was used as a tool not only for statements of Roman victory, but as a tool to promote the role of the individual in the expansion of Roman power abroad. The social and political backdrop of Republican instability in the first century BC facilitated the advancement of the individual Roman politician in Phase Four and ultimately culminated in the rise to power of the first Roman emperor.

The following sections chart the continuing development of the Campus Martius and highlight the ongoing monumentalisation of the central Campus Martius. From the construction of a traditional victory temple to the erection of an Imperial theatre, the buildings that are investigated in this phase physically record the fall of the Roman Republic, the power of the individual Roman leader, and the manner in which architecture and physical representations of Greek culture were used to mark the transition from Roman Republic to Roman Empire.

5.1. Self promotion on the Campus Martius; Temples and Tombs

In Phase Four the central area of the Campus Martius witnessed comprehensively planned large scale development as well as small scale independent construction. The types of buildings constructed on the Campus Martius in Phase Four varied considerably. Compared to the 3rd and 2nd centuries BC (Phases Two and Three) fewer temples were constructed on the Campus Martius in the 1st century BC, though there was a marked increase in the number of tombs constructed by and for, prominent politicians. There was also an increase in the amount of planned and defined recreational spaces open to the public, for example the Horti Agrippa (Appendix: 5.3.6) and Porticus Pompeii (Appendix: 5.2.3). In addition, many more civic construction projects were initiated, such as baths, voting precincts and an aqueduct, a number of which were initiated by Julius Caesar, indicating a move towards Imperial rule and Imperial construction projects within the city of Rome.

As a result of the wider political instability in Rome in the 1st century BC, the opportunity for ambitious politicians to construct buildings that would attract public attention and popularity increased. These buildings were a form of visual self promotion that promoted a politician's ideals and quest for power to both a literate and illiterate audience.[3] Thereby many building types that had previously been an established part of Rome's architectural backdrop became tools capable of promoting an individual to the Roman public with the ultimate goal of public recognition and career advancement. Tombs and sepulchres were often used for this very purpose. For a number of reasons the Campus Martius, and particularly those areas that lined the Via Flaminia, had been used for burial since the early Republic.[4] Firstly, according to the laws of the Twelve Tables (as quoted by Cicero, *Leg.* 2.58), a fear of fire and pollution led to a blanket ban on burial within the *pomerium,* except for very exceptional occasions which required a dispensation from the Senate.[5] As a result areas such as the Esquiline, outside of the city walls, were commonly used for the burial of the dead.[6] Secondly, from the early Republic onwards it was common practice in Rome for aristocratic families to place their tombs along major roads leading in and out of

---

[3] Evans, 1992, 7.
[4] Coarelli, 1997, 591.
[5] Holloway, 1994, 170; Patterson, 2000a, 92; Hope, 2007, 130.
[6] Patterson, 2000a, 92; Patterson, 2000b, 264; Hope, 2007, 136.

the city so as to render the tomb visible to a large audience.[7] This was the case not only along the Via Flaminia, but most notably between the Via Appia and the Via Latina where the tombs of the Metelli, Servilli and Claudii Marcelli were located.[8] Despite the availability of space in the area these political tombs were often placed quite close to each other so as to represent the same familial and political rivalry in death as had existed in life.[9] As a consequence tombs on the Campus Martius, and in other areas of Rome, can be interpreted as monuments with specific and important political value. Unfortunately the nature of the Campus Martius and the fragmented state of the archaeological record means that there is little information surviving regarding the number of tombs that lined the Via Flaminia and the families who constructed them.

In the 1st century BC the most common type of tomb constructed in Rome was a *tumulus* style tomb, a round burial mound that was common to Rome as well as Etruria and the eastern Mediterranean.[10] In Greece *tumuli* were most commonly used for the burial of kings and the wealthy aristocracy and were constructed on a vast scale, for example the tomb of Clytemnestra at Mycenae, though in Rome by the 1st century BC *tumuli* were far smaller in scale and were used by families of lesser status.[11] By this time the Campus Martius offered an ideal location for the construction of a tomb as it afforded adequate space, in an extra-*pomerial* location, close to a central roadway into and out of the city. In the 1st century BC the Campus Martius was still strongly associated with the military and the congregation of troops prior to triumphal parades. As a result it provided an ideal burial spot for those who had, in life, been strongly associated with the military, the rite of triumph, and the expansion of Roman territory abroad. Consequently Sulla, Julius Caesar and the consuls of 43 BC, Pansa and Hirtius, were all buried in the central Campus Martius (Livy, *Epit.* 119; Velleius Paterculus, 2.62; Valerius Maximus, 5.2.10).[12] Their tombs, though for the most part no longer visible in the archaeological record, were reflective of the role they under took on behalf of the Roman state during their lifetimes and at the same time displayed an awareness on the part of the individual of the benefits of self promotion through the positioning, naming and the scale of their monuments.

---

[7] Patterson, 2000a, 92; Hope, 2007, 142.
[8] *LTUR* IV, 131-2 (Patterson); *LTUR* IV, 141 (Patterson); Patterson, 2000b, 264.
[9] Patterson, 2000b, 264.
[10] Favro, 1996, 118; McDonald, 2002, 45.
[11] McDonald, 2002, 45.
[12] *LTUR* IV, 286 (La Rocca); *LTUR* IV, 291 (Coarelli); *LTUR* IV, 209 (Coarelli). For tomb of Sulla: *LTUR* IV, 286 (La Rocca). For tomb of Caesar: *LTUR* IV, 278 (Coarelli); *LTUR* IV, 291 (Coarelli). For tomb of Pansa: *LTUR* IV, 302 (Macciocca). For tomb of Hirtius: *LTUR* IV, 290 (Coarelli).

These benefits continued even in death as family members could benefit from their relationship to their deceased relative and his enduring visual legacy on the Roman landscape.

By Phase Four the Campus Martius was developing a more urban profile and was physically more crowded in the area around the Circus Flaminius though the central and northern areas still remained largely devoid of permanent buildings. Consequently, tombs that were constructed in this area were very conspicuous. Visibility and public recognition were as important for funerary monuments as they were for victory temples. The tombs and temples of the Campus Martius during Phase Four were fundamentally concerned with personal statements of victory and public recognition, much in the same way as the temples and porticoes of Phases Two and Three had been. In the first half of the 1st century BC the construction of temples and tombs represent the increase in the number of visual advertisement and self promotion on the Campus Martius and at the same time exemplify a recognition on the part of Rome's political elite of Rome's and the Campus Martius' traditional heritage. These constructions are small scale compared to the vast complexes constructed in the second half of the 1st century BC, yet they serve to highlight the continued use of methods of self promotion and recall the continued rise to power of charismatic political leaders.

5.1.1. Temple of Fortuna Huiusce Diei

The temple of Fortuna Huiusce Diei was vowed by Q. Lutatius Catulus on the 30th of June 101 BC at the Battle of Vercellae over the Cimbri in northern Italy (Plutarch, *Mar.* 26.3). Following this victory he held a joint triumph with Marius in Rome and constructed a portico on the Palatine (Pliny, *H.N.* 34.54; Valerius Maximus, 6.3.1).[13] The temple of Fortuna Huiusce Diei was dedicated on the anniversary of the actual vow (*Fasti Allif.*), though how many years had passed since the initial vow was made is uncertain.[14] As Catulus dedicated the temple himself, it had to have been dedicated prior to his suicide in 87 BC.

---

[13] Coarelli, 1997, 276.
[14] *LTUR* II, 269 (Gros); Degrassi, 1963, 47, 488; Coarelli, 1981, 38; Coarelli, 1997, 275.

Varro (*Rust.* 3.5.12) noted that the temple, which he referred to as *Aedes Catuli*, was a circular temple located in the vicinity of the Villa Publica on the Campus Martius. The only temple in the area that fits this description is Temple B of Largo Argentina (Fig. 114).[15] The dating of the remains of Temple B within the *area sacra,* and particularly the level of the paving around the temple, confirms that this temple dates to the beginning of the 1st century BC and that its construction must have taken place at the beginning of the first century BC (Fig. 115).[16] Moreover, it is quite plainly a circular structure with associated finds in the area which confirm its association with Catulus and the deity of Fortuna Huiusce Diei (Fig. 116).

The extant remains of Temple B of Largo Argentina offer a glimpse of the developmental history of the temple. As was common for Roman temples, and particularly the temples of the *area sacra*, Temple B underwent many alterations and reconstructions.[17] At the beginning of the first century BC, the temple of Fortuna Huiusce Diei was a round, peripteral temple with a diameter of 19.2m (Fig. 117).[18] As it was the last temple constructed in the *area sacra* of Largo Argentina it was slotted into the available space between Temple A and Temple C and was constructed on a new level of tufa paving.[19] Consequently the earliest version of the temple sits at a higher level than the first versions of the other older temples of the area (Fig. 116).[20] The podium on which the temple stood was high, measuring 2.5m.[21] The staircase by which the temple was accessed was placed facing east, the top three steps of which survive and were constructed from travertine.[22] In its original form the temple had 18 Corinthian columns, constructed in traditional Roman materials, with the bases fashioned in tufa from Anio and the capitals in travertine.[23] All of these columns would originally have been stuccoed. The entablature that ran above the columns has been almost totally destroyed, with only one fragment of the frieze remaining. This small section of frieze was preserved on the back of a medieval inscription and indicates that the material used for the frieze was Greek Pentelic marble,

---

[15] *LTUR* II, 269 (Gros); Coarelli, 1981, 38; Coarelli, 1997, 278; Claridge, 1998, 216-7; Contra Platner & Ashby 1926, 216.
[16] *LTUR* II, 269 (Gros); Coarelli, 1981, 38; Coarelli, 1997, 284-5.
[17] Coarelli, 1981, 13, 19; Coarelli, 1997, 285.
[18] *LTUR* II, 270 (Gros); Coarelli, 1981, 19.
[19] Coarelli, 1981, 19; Coarelli, 1997, 285.
[20] Coarelli, 2007, 278-9.
[21] *LTUR* II, 270 (Gros). See also: Claridge, 1998, 215.
[22] *LTUR* II, 270 (Gros); Coarelli, 1981, 19; Coarelli, 1997, 285; Coarelli, 2007, 277.
[23] *LTUR* II, 270 (Gros); Coarelli, 1981, 19; Claridge, 1998, 215; Coarelli, 1997, 285; Coarelli, 2007, 278.

with a decoration of tendrils in the neo-Attic tradition.[24] This indicates that there was a mixture of traditional Roman building materials and newly accessible Greek marble. The original *cella*, which was destroyed by subsequent reconstructions, was constructed in *opus quasi-reticulatum* and was rather small, measuring just 9.3m in diameter.[25] Inside the *cella* the cult statue would have been placed on a base, likely on a central axis.

Fortunately the colossal cult statue of this temple has been found between Temple B and Temple C of Largo Argentina giving substance to the theory that Temple B was the temple of Fortuna Huiusce Diei (Fig. 118).[26] The statue was an acrolith and so the parts of the body that were clothed had been cast in metal while the extremities were carved from marble.[27] The only extant parts of this statue are the head, the right arm and a foot. The surviving head and neck measure 1.46m in height, suggesting that the statue stood approximately 8m high.[28] The statue is datable to *c.*100-95 BC and the material used and the fine execution of the statue suggests a very strong influence from the eastern Mediterranean.[29] There were few statues which displayed this quality of execution in 1st century BC Rome, a fact which has led Coarelli to the conclusion that this statue was the work of Scopas Minor, though no evidence of this fact has been witnessed either on the site or in the ancient literary sources.[30]

Two long bases that were placed either side of the staircase of the temple indicate that the colossal cult statue was not the only sculptural decoration of the temple.[31] These bases, measuring 6.66m x 2.10m were either contemporary with the original version of the temple or else placed slightly later in the 1st century BC. Pliny the Elder (*H.N.* 34.54) and Cicero (*Verr.* 4.4.126) confirm that these bases were used for the display of a group of statues with Pliny the Elder (*H.N.* 34.54) stating that there was a crowd of Greek statues in front of the temple. One statue depicted an old man and was attributed by Pliny to Pythagoras of Samos, while there were also seven bronze youths depicted nude. Meanwhile, Pliny the Elder records that there were three statues by Phidias displayed inside the temple. Prior to the identification of Temple B as that of the temple of Huiusce

---

[24] *LTUR* II, 270 (Gros); Coarelli, 1981, 20; Coarelli, 2007, 278.
[25] Coarelli, 1981, 19.
[26] *LTUR* II, 269-70 (Gros); Coarelli, 1997, 285, 292. See also: Claridge, 1998, 215-7; Coarelli, 2007, 278.
[27] Coarelli, 1981, 20; Coarelli, 2007, 278.
[28] *LTUR* II, 270 (Gros); Claridge, 1998, 217.
[29] *LTUR* II, 270 (Gros).
[30] *LTUR* II, 270 (Gros).
[31] *LTUR* II, 270 (Gros); Coarelli, 1981, 20. See also: Claridge, 1998, 217.

Diei it had been thought that these statues had been placed in a temple of the same name on the Palatine; this is now thought to be incorrect.[32]

The temple underwent significant alterations in the mid-first century BC. The original *cella* was demolished and enlarged to a diameter of 15.5m and the inter-columnations of the first version of the temple were walled up with blocks of tufa which were recessed between the columns. The result of this alteration was that the columns appeared to be engaged.[33] The redevelopment of the temple and the enlargement of the *cella* were accompanied by an enlargement of the podium which saw the top of the *stylobate* widened and peperino used to open the podium out to the sides, over the statue bases and over the original staircase.[34] The enlargement of the temple may indicate that the popularity of the cult had grown. At the same time the alterations indicate the complicated nature of development of the *area sacra*. Further alterations were carried out to the temple following the great fire of AD 80.[35] Temple B of Largo Argentina is represented on fragment 37a of slab IV-6 of the FUR, where it is shown as a *tholos*, a representation that does not take into account the later alterations of the temple (Fig. 119).

It can be seen quite clearly that this temple was constructed at a time where it had become more common to use Greek materials for the decoration of temples. The type of statues that were displayed here, both within and outside the temple, show a clear appreciation of Greek sculpture while the nature of the colossal cult statue indicates that either Catulus himself, or those responsible for the construction of the temple, had a fondness for physical representations of Greek culture. The ancient literary sources suggest that this fondness came from Catulus himself, as he was a well known devotee of Greek culture and a patron of the arts (Cicero, *De or*, 2.28).[36]

The temple of Fortuna Huiusce Diei shows the continued importance of the *area sacra* in the early 1st century BC. Catulus' decision to place his temple in very close physical proximity to the early Republican temples A and C (Juturna and Feronia) indicates that he wished to associate himself not only with contemporary and future triumphs that passed through the area, but also with the previous generation of victorious Republican leaders.

---

[32] For example, Platner & Ashby, 1926, 226; contra *LTUR* II, 270 (Gros); Coarelli, 1997, 276-7.
[33] *LTUR* II, 270 (Gros); Coarelli, 1981, 20. See also: Claridge, 1998, 217; Coarelli, 2007, 278.
[34] *LTUR* II, 270 (Gros); Coarelli, 1981, 20; Claridge, 1998, 217.
[35] *LTUR* II, 270 (Gros); Coarelli, 1981, 20; Claridge, 1998, 217.
[36] Gruen, 1984, 259.

Constructing a victory temple in this rapidly evolving area of the Campus Martius, and at the same time placing the temple within the *area sacra*, highlights the fact that the buildings of Phase Four were both progressive in form and function while simultaneously showing an awareness for the tradition and history of the area.

5.1.2. Temple of Hercules Custos

There is little information regarding the foundation of the temple of Hercules Custos and as yet it has not been identified within the archaeological record. The most informative source regarding the temple is Ovid (*Fast.* 6.209-212) who notes that the temple was located at the opposite end of the Circus Flaminius from the Temple of Bellona '*altera pars Circi*'. The remains of the temple have not been identified within the archaeological record, though the likely area in which it was located may be ascertained in relation to the known position of the Temple of Bellona and the Circus Flaminius.[37] Ovid mentions that the temple's inscription made reference to Sulla, but it is possible that Sulla may have been responsible only for a reconstruction of the temple and not for the initial construction itself which may have occurred as early as the third century BC.[38]

Unfortunately there is no reference to the foundation of the temple by Livy, possibly due to the loss of the books that covered the period from 293-218 BC.[39] However, Livy (21.62) does note for 218 BC that there was a temple to Hercules, whose epithet is unrecorded, and it is possible that the temple in question was that of Hercules Custos.[40] It is also known that a statue of Hercules was erected outside of a temple dedicated to him in 189 BC, and it is likely that the temple in question was that of Hercules Custos (Livy, 38.35.4). There are two *dies natalis* for the temple recorded in the *fasti*. One is the 4th of June (*Fasti Venusini*) the other the 12th of August (*Fasti Vallenses*).[41] However, it seems likely that the date of the 12th of August was due to confusion with the *dies natalis* of the

[37] *LTUR* III, 13 (Viscogliosi); Coarelli, 1997, 298. See also: Claridge, 1998, 221.
[38] *LTUR* III, 13 (Viscogliosi); Coarelli, 1997, 502; Orlin, 1997, 104; Coarelli, 2007, 267.
[39] *LTUR* III, 13 (Viscogliosi).
[40] Coarelli, 1997, 501-2.
[41] For *Fasti Venusini*: Degrassi, 1963, 465; Ziolkowski, 1992, 50-6. For *Fasti Vallenses*: Degrassi, 1963, 493-4.

temple of Hercules Invictus, rendering the 4th of June the most likely *dies natalis* for the temple of Hercules Custos.[42]

The vague topographical reference to the temple by Ovid is not the only clue to the location of the temple. The *Historia Augusta* (*Commodus*, 16.5) and the *Calendar of Philocalus* locate the temple within the Porticus Minucia Vetus during the *ludi in Minicia* of AD 354.[43] That the temple mentioned in the sources is that of Hercules Custos is substantiated by the recorded *dies natalis* of the 4th of June. While the Porticus Minucia Vetus encompassed the temples of the *area sacra* of Largo Argentina, the southern limit of the quadroportico has never been fully defined within the archaeological record (Appendix: 4.3.3). It is not beyond the bounds of possibility that the quadroportico itself extended as far south as the northern area of the Circus Flaminius, thereby encompassing the temple of Hercules Custos.[44] Thus, if one is to take the information provided by Ovid (*Fast.* 6.209-212) and by the *Calendar of Philocalus* it is possible to ascertain a very rough location for the temple south of the *area sacra,* north of the Circus Flaminius and west of the site of the later theatre of Balbus (Fig. 125).

One factor that does not correspond with this theory must be taken into account and that is that a number of inscriptions and statues that can be associated with a temple of Hercules that have been found relatively close to each other in what would have been the western side of the Circus Flaminius. In 1892, when work was done on Via Arenula between S. Bartolomeo dei Vaccinari, Ministero di Grazia e Giustizia and Piazza Cairoli, three dedicatory inscriptions to Hercules were found including *CIL* VI 30893, along with two statues (Fig. 120). These finds, in association with the various literary sources, has led Coarelli to place the temple on the site beneath S. Maria in Monticelli.[45] This is a more satisfying suggestion as there is no reason to believe that the Porticus Minucia Vetus ran as far south as the Circus Flaminius. In addition to this, the site of the S. Maria in Monticelli may be more accurately considered as the opposite end of the Circus Flaminius from the temple of Bellona.

Two other pieces of evidence may relate to the temple of Hercules Custos, though their association is rather more tenuous. A relief from the middle of the 3rd century BC was

[42] *LTUR* III, 13 (Viscogliosi); Coarelli, 1997, 498.
[43] *LTUR* III, 13 (Viscogliosi); Degrassi, 1963, 465; Coarelli, 1997, 500.
[44] *LTUR* III, 13 (Viscogliosi).
[45] Coarelli, 1997, 500.

found in an antique market in Ostia and shows a magistrate undertaking a sacrifice before two statues, one of Neptune, the other of Hercules.[46] As it is known that there was a temple of Neptune present in the area of the Circus Flaminius, it is possible that this relief depicts a sacrifice in the Circus Flaminius. Other finds include a colossal bronze statue of Hercules which was discovered in the cortile of Palazzo Pio Righetti in 1864 and which is known as the Hercules Mastai. A statue of Hercules and Telephus was discovered at the same location in 1507 (Fig. 121).[47] It is possible that this statue is the one depicted in the relief from Ostia, though there is as yet no way to corroborate this theory.

The temple of Hercules Custos remains somewhat difficult in all respects. It is uncertain as to who vowed the temple and when, as well as where it was located. This temple exemplifies the difficulties inherent in a reconstruction of the Campus Martius as a lack of systematic excavation and the complicated statrigraphic record render it very difficult to identify specific sites. Similar difficulties have been met with the identification of the temple of Neptune, the temple of Vulcan and temple of Castor, all of which were located in the area of the Circus Flaminius but have yet to be positively identified in the archaeological record.

5.1.3 Tomb of Sulla

While the temples of the Campus Martius were constructed to promote Roman military victory, the construction of tombs more visibly promoted the personal successes of a deceased Roman general.[48] The tombs of the political and social elite of the late Republic and the Imperial period would have made a substantial impact upon those entering and exiting the city via this major roadway due to their size and position.[49] The tombs that lined the Via Flaminia served to introduce first time visitors to the city of Rome to the history of the city and the importance the Romans placed on tradition, history and political and military advancement. The tomb of L. Cornelius Sulla is an example of one such tomb, though it is known only from the literary sources. The tomb was erected in the Campus Martius by decree of the Senate upon Sulla's death in 78 BC (Livy, *Epit.* 90;

---

[46] *LTUR* III, 14 (Viscogliosi); Now in the Musei Capitolini (INV.941/5).
[47] *LTUR* III, 14 (Viscogliosi); Sear, 2006, 60.
[48] Hope, 2007, 142.
[49] Hope, 2007, 142.

Plutarch, *Sull.* 38; Appian, *B. Civ.* 1.105-6; Lucan, *Pharsalia*, 2.222).[50] The dictator had himself expressed a wish to have his remains cremated (Cicero, *Leg.* 2.57), although this was contrary to the traditional funerary rites of his family, the *gens Cornelia,* who, like the Scipios, had practiced inhumation (Pliny, *H.N.* 7.187).

Lucan (*Pharsalia*, 2.222) noted that the tomb of Sulla was placed '*in medio campo*' thereby locating it in the central area of the Campus Martius, likely in the area between the Saepta Julia and the Caprae Palus.[51] In the early to mid Republic this area had become a place for the burial of prominent people, especially for those who had achieved great political success during the Republic.[52] The inhabitants of Rome who visited the central Campus Martius to vote in the Saepta Julia, visit the *area sacra* or exercise in the open northern area were able to see and appreciate the splendour of these tombs.[53] Given that the Caprae Palus was particularly associated with the bodily ascension of Romulus into the heavens (Livy, 1.16.1; Ovid, *Fast.* 2.491; Plutarch, *Rom.*27; *Num.*2), the location more than likely held particular relevance as a burial site for the elite among the population of Rome.

Dio (77.13) indicates that the tomb of Sulla disappeared from public sight in the late Republican period or early Empire as he records that the tomb was restored by Caracalla following its rediscovery. The architectural form of the tomb is also uncertain, though Lucan (*Pharsalia*, 2.222) calls it a *tumulus* suggesting that it would have been covered with earth, like the later *tumulus* of Caesar's daughter, Julia.[54] Given the area in which the tomb was located it was possibly moved, or removed in its entirety, for the construction of the Hadrianic Pantheon in AD 117-128.[55] Evidence that such removals took place to facilitate the construction of Hadrian's Pantheon survives from the *tumulus* of Julia (5.1.4), and while it must be assumed that the tomb of Sulla was to some extent smaller than that of the Julii, it seems that Sulla's tomb met with a similar fate.[56]

Sulla's life was therefore commemorated in an area of Rome which was closely associated with the military and which provided enough room to make the monument

---

[50] Coarelli, 1997, 592; Hope, 2007,136.
[51] *LTUR* IV, 286 (La Rocca).
[52] Coarelli, 1997, 592.
[53] *LTUR* IV, 286 (La Rocca).
[54] *LTUR* IV, 286 (La Rocca); *LTUR* IV, 291 (Coarelli); McDonald, 2002, 44.
[55] *LTUR* IV, 286 (La Rocca); McDonald, 2002, 13.
[56] *LTUR* IV, 291 (Coarelli).

suitably conspicuous. The tomb of Sulla was but one in a long line of tombs and *ustrina* that were constructed on the Campus Martius which functioned to promote in death the military deeds of the Roman leader during his lifetime. As such they were physical representations of the personal achievements of the individual and exemplify political competition on the Campus Martius. The tombs of Phase Four were representative of the power and influence of the individual Roman general in the late Republic. Consequently figures with personal political ambition and a desire for public support, such as Sulla, Julius Caesar, and ultimately Augustus himself, constructed their tombs on the Campus Martius.

5.1.4. Tumulus Juliae

The Tomb of Julia, the daughter of Caesar and the wife of Pompey the Great, is located by the ancient sources within the Campus Martius (Livy, *Epit.* 106; Plutarch, *Pomp.* 53; Plutarch, *Caes.* 23; Dio, 39.64). Julia died in childbirth in 54 BC and was buried in the Campus Martius (Suetonius, *Caes.* 23.3) in an area that had already witnessed the burial of Sulla and which was normally reserved by the Senate for *'sepulcra publica'* (Appian, *B. Civ.* 1.500; Strabo, 5.3.8; Servius, *Ad Aen.* 9.272). The decision to bury Julia in this area was not universally popular and the consul for 54 BC, Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, opposed the decision, as did the Senate, but to no avail (Dio, 39.64).[57]

The *tumulus* of Julia was constructed at the behest of Caesar who used his right to construct a familial mausoleum in the area.[58] Julius Caesar had planned to have his own ashes buried in this location and as a result he constructed a *ustrinum* next to the *tumulus*.[59] Due to the fact that Caesar's body was hastily cremated in the Forum Romanum, the *ustrinum* itself remained unused though his ashes were placed within the *tumulus* (Dio, 44.51; Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.8; Suetonius, *Caes.* 84.).[60]

---

[57] *LTUR* IV, 291 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 1997, 593.
[58] *LTUR* IV, 291 (Coarelli).
[59] Favro, 1996, 80.
[60] Favro, 1996, 80.

Aside from the burial of Julia, the literary sources are a little confusing and it is rather uncertain which other members of the Julian family were buried within this monument.[61] A segment of Livy (*Per.* 142) states that Drusus was buried within this tomb, though other sources, including Dio (78.24.3) state that he was buried in the other great Julian tomb of the Campus Martius, the Mausoleum of Augustus.[62] A possible reason for this discrepancy is that Drusus was at first interred within the *tumulus*, and was only later moved to the Mausoleum of Augustus by order of the Emperor Claudius.[63] Poppaea's body may also have been placed within the Tomb of Julia, though the possibility remains that she too was buried within the Mausoleum of Augustus (Tacitus, *Ann.* 16.6).[64]

The location of the *tumulus* remains uncertain, though it was likely placed close to the tomb of Sulla and so located in the centre of the Campus Martius close to the Caprae Palus (Appendix: 2.3.3), the Ovile/Saepta Julia (Appendix: 5.3.9) and later the Pantheon (Appendix: 5.3.7). Physical evidence that the tomb was located close to the Pantheon comes from an inscription on a piece of marble reused in the Hadrianic Pantheon (Fig. 122).[65] The inscription dates to the 1st century BC and quite clearly refers to the burial of a woman who may be Julia, though this is not certain.[66] It may be assumed therefore that the *tumulus* of Julia was moved, or removed, from the central Campus Martius in order to facilitate the construction of the Hadrianic Pantheon.[67] It is also possible, as with the tomb of Sulla, that the *tumulus* of Julia was no longer visible by the time Hadrian constructed his Pantheon, with the marble inscription the only remnant of the original tomb, which was then incorporated into the Pantheon. Coarelli has suggested that the *tumulus* was positioned north of the later Temple of Hadrian, where the temple of S. Stefano in Trullo now stands, though provides little evidence to support his claim.[68] A position closer to the Agrippan Pantheon and the Caprae Palus seems far more likely based on the location of other 1st century BC tombs.

By positioning his family tomb and his *ustrinum* in this area, Julius Caesar set the trend for future imperial rulers to place their *ustrinua* on the Campus Martius. The most

---

[61] *LTUR* IV, 291 (Coarelli); Platner & Ashby, 1926, 542; Coarelli 1997, 593-5.
[62] La Rocca, 1984, 98-9; Coarelli, 1997, 594-5. See also: Richardson, 1992, 402.
[63] *LTUR* IV, 291 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 1997, 596-9.
[64] Coarelli, 1997, 593; Richardson, 1992, 402.
[65] Coarelli 1997, 596.
[66] Coarelli, 1997, 596.
[67] *LTUR* IV, 291 (Coarelli); *LTUR* IV, 286 (La Rocca); Coarelli, 1997, 598-9.
[68] *LTUR* IV, 291 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 1997, 598.

obviously visible monument of this type was the Mausoleum of Augustus, while Antoninius Pius and Marcus Aurelius also had their *ustrinua* constructed here and had their ashes buried in the Mausoleum of Augustus.[69] Caesar had abided by Roman rules regarding burial and had continued the popularity of extra-pomerial burial on the Campus Martius but had, at the same time, used the opportunity to amass public support by making sure his monument was a visible marker in the centre of the Campus Martius and located close to the politically sensitive area of the Campus Martius close to the voting precinct. By doing so he was ensuring that he benefitted from the monumentality of the location, the political associations of the area and ensured that his family benefited from his death in terms of public recognition and career advancement.

5.1.5. Temple of Isis and Serapis

The year in which the temple of Isis was vowed and constructed is uncertain, as are the names of those responsible for the construction, but numerous archaeological excavations, and a number of ancient and modern literary references locate the temple of Isis on the Campus Martius (Fig. 123).[70] It is very clear from the literary sources that both Augustus and Tiberius disliked the cult of Isis, Tiberius himself actually destroying the original temple building and throwing the cult statues into the Tiber (Josephus, *A.J.* 18.4).[71] The cult, and the temple itself, found far better patronage under the rule of Caligula and Domitian, both of whom ensured that the temple was restored following the attack by Tiberius and the fire of AD 80 respectively.[72] Because of the inherently foreign nature of the cult and its association with Egypt, the temple of Isis and Serapis was located outside of the *pomerium* in the Campus Martius as the Romans were wary of its deities and its religious practices (Martial, 2.14.7; Apuleius, *Met.* 11.26). The *Notitia* of the Regionary Catalogue lists the temple of Isis between the Porticoes of Meleagri and Argonautarum, the temple of Minerva Chalcidia and the Divorum (*Reg.* IX).[73] Juvenal (6.528) also records the location of the temple as close to the Ovile/Saepta Julia.[74] Fragments 35t and 35s of slab V-12, along with other fragments of the FUR

[69] Favro, 1996, 117.
[70] *LTUR* III, 107-8 (Coarelli); Roullett, 1972, 23-4.
[71] Roullett, 1972, 23; Favro, 1996, 105. See also: Richardson, 1992, 211; Coarelli, 2007, 291.
[72] Richardson, 1992, 211.
[73] *LTUR* III, 108 (Coarelli).
[74] *LTUR* III, 108 (Coarelli); Roullett, 1972, 23.

representative of the area, corroborate the location of the temple of Isis and Serapis to the east of the Ovile/Saepta Julia (Fig. 125).[75] The most likely date for the construction of the temple is 43 BC based in part on a reference by Dio (47.15.4).[76] It seems unlikely that this temple was ever totally destroyed as a result of the prohibition on Egyptian cults, as this ban seems to have applied only to temples within the *pomerium* and those within 500 yards of this boundary. However the temple was destroyed by the fire of AD 80 (Dio, 66.24.2) and subsequently rebuilt by Domitian.[77]

The Forma Urbis Romae provides a substantial amount of information which allows for the reconstruction of the plan of the temple of Isis and Serapis in the 2nd century AD. While this source dates to two hundred years later than the original foundation it may be accepted as a relatively reliable source as excavations carried out so far corroborate similarities between the original 1st century BC building and the Severan representation. Coupled with information that has arisen as a result of archaeological investigations and chance finds in the area to the east of the Saepta Julia, the location and plan of the site can be thoroughly investigated (Fig. 124).[78] The temple had a north-south axis and had a format that had much in common with Egyptian temple design. It was constructed in three sections, with the temple of Isis to the north, the temple of Serapis to the south, and a connecting *dromos* which could be accessed by two transverse arches.[79] Martial (2.14.7) compared it to the Serapeum of Memphis and comparisons show that the two complexes had many similarities.[80] In relation to the modern map of Rome the temple of Isis lay to the north of Via Pie' di Marmo while the temple of Serapis was to the south (Fig. 126).[81] The comparison of the plan of the temple as it appears on the FUR to the modern Roman street map has helped to determine the exact location of the complex. As a result it can now be concluded that the Temple of Isis and Serapis was bounded to the north by Piazza S. Macuto and Via del Seminario, south by Via di S. Stefano del Cacco, to the east by Via di S. Ignazio and to the west by Via del Gesú and in its entirety measured *c.*220m x 70m (Fig. 126).[82]

---

[75] *LTUR* III, 108 (Coarelli); Roullett, 1972, 24; Richardson, 1992, 211.
[76] *LTUR* III, 107 (Coarelli). See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 283; Coarelli, 2007, 291.
[77] *LTUR* III, 107 (Coarelli); Roullett, 1972, 30.
[78] Roullett, 1972, 23-5.
[79] *LTUR* III, 108-9 (Coarelli); Roullett, 1972, 83-5. See also: Coarelli, 2007, 290.
[80] Roullett, 1972, 24.
[81] Coarelli, 2007, 290.
[82] *LTUR* III, 108 (Coarelli); Roullett, 1972, 24-5; Coarelli, 2007, 291.

The northern section of this tripartite temple contained a temple of Isis and was surrounded by a portico and accessed by the *dromos*.[83] Only a small stretch of this piazza is preserved on fragment 36a of slab III-9 of the FUR, along the west side, on the boundary with the Porticus Meleagri. The fragment itself is now lost though its information is preserved in a Renaissance drawing (*Cod.Vat.Lat.* 3439) (Fig. 127; Fig. 124). This fragment indicates four dots that are arranged symmetrically along the boundary wall and, according to the scale of the FUR, were positioned c.15m apart from each other. As this measurement is too wide for the positioning of the columns of a portico, it is possible that the dots represent obelisks that were set up within the courtyard.[84] Unfortunately the FUR does not preserve more of this northerly section, however given the indication that the southern section of the complex was known as the Serapeum, it is probable that the northerly section was used for the worship of Isis.[85] While there is no archaeological evidence for the temple of Isis itself, and while it is not preserved on the FUR, there is a representation of the temple of Isis on two Vespasianic coins (*RIC* II, 70 N. 453; *RIC* 78 N. 537) (Fig. 128).[86] According to these numismatic representations the temple of Isis had a prostyle tetrastyle façade on a raised platform and was preceded by a staircase which was flanked by bases, likely for the display of Egyptian style statues.[87] The size of the coin and the scale of the representation does not allow for much accuracy in the depiction of the temple. However this representation is reminiscent of the Alexandrian plan of the temples of Isis and is similar to the Serapeum built by Hadrian at Luxor.[88] In the centre of the doorway of the temple is depicted a female cult statue holding a container in her right hand representing the cult statue of Isis.[89]

The central section of the tripartite complex is shown as a rectangular area and corresponds to the area of modern Via Pie' di Marmo (Fig. 129).[90] It acted as an intermediary central courtyard and was accessed from the north by an entrance that is marked on the FUR by three columns (Fig. 130).[91] It could also be accessed via two transverse arches, one to the east and one to the west, the latter adjoining the Porticus

---

[83] *LTUR* III, 108 (Coarelli); Roullett, 1972, 27.
[84] *LTUR* III, 108 (Coarelli); *LTUR* III, 358-9 (Grenier); Roullett, 1972, 27.
[85] *LTUR* III, 108 (Coarelli); Roullett, 1972, 27.
[86] *LTUR* III, 108 (Coarelli); Roullett, 1972, 30-1. See also: Richardson, 1992, 211.
[87] Roullett, 1972, 30-1; Richardson, 1992, 211.
[88] Roullett, 1972, 99
[89] *LTUR* III, 108-9 (Coarelli); Roullett, 1972, 32.
[90] *LTUR* III, 108 (Coarelli).
[91] *LTUR* III, 108 (Coarelli).

Meleagri (Fig. 131). The arch to the west was visible as late as 1872, though soon after it was demolished to facilitate the construction of a tenement block.[92] It was a very large arch, far larger than the arch on the eastern side of the rectangular area, and was four sided with three arched entrances and measured 26.24m by 27m high.[93] The position of the arch meant that it interrupted the Porticus Meleagri and may have functioned to physically join the new complex to the Saepta Julia thereby facilitating the movement of people through the two complexes. The four piers of the arch are recognisable on the FUR and indicate that the arch had three archways/fornixes. Given the manner in which the arch connects the central section to the Saepta Julia it is possible that it was a later addition to the temple of Isis and Serapis, constructed after the rebuilding of the Ovile/Saepta Julia that was started by Caesar and completed by Agrippa in 26 BC (Appendix: 5.3.9). The arch to the east was known as the Arco di Camigliano.[94]

The piazza of this central section underwent excavation in 1923 and it was discovered that it was paved in travertine.[95] Fragment 35t of slab IV-5 of the FUR shows the footprint of two central monuments within the piazza, as indicated by a square, measuring *c.*2m x 2m, and a circle, with a radius of *c.*3m (Fig. 132).[96] The square has since been recognised as the base of an obelisk that was later moved to the Circus Maximus and which now sits in the middle of Piazza Navona.[97] The circle meanwhile may represent a fountain or monument. It has been suggested by Coarelli that this central piazza may have been the original location for the pinecone which is now on display in the Vatican Museum and which is thought to have come from this area, though he cites no evidence for this interpretation.[98] There are three additional areas marked on the FUR in the south-eastern corner of the central complex. These appear as three small rectangular spaces, though their function is unknown (Fig. 133).

The third section of this temple is located in the southernmost section of the complex and was the area associated with Serapis. The Serapeum was entered via the central intermediate courtyard and through a central entrance marked on the FUR. South of this entrance lay a transverse porticoed area with columns to the south, from where one could

---

[92] *LTUR* III, 108 (Coarelli).
[93] *LTUR* III, 108 (Coarelli).
[94] *LTUR* III, 108 (Coarelli). See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 285; Richardson, 1992, 212.
[95] *LTUR* III, 108 (Coarelli).
[96] *LTUR* III, 108 (Coarelli); Roullett, 1972, 25-6.
[97] *LTUR* III, 108 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 2007, 290.
[98] *LTUR* III, 108 (Coarelli).

enter the Serapeum (Fig. 134). The Serapeum consisted of a large semi-circular exedra which according to the FUR was marked by external columns. From this semi-circular building opened a central apse which was likely the cult temple. It was preceded by a staircase which was flanked by two bases, likely for the display of statues.[99] The FUR shows that two further exedras opened up off of the semi-circular portico (Fig. 134), one to each side of the temple, with a third, more pronounced exedra open on the eastern side of the portico. This third exedra is known only from a Renaissance drawing of the FUR (*Cod.Vat.Lat.* 3439) (Fig. 135). The entrance of all three exedras is marked on the FUR and on the Renaissance drawing by two columns.[100] The function of these rooms is uncertain and they may have been simple storage rooms or possibly more intimately linked to the practices of the cult.

A number of Egyptian style statues have been found in this area, as well as fragments of what may have been a cult statue of Isis.[101] The most visible statue fragment is the foot that gives its name to Via Pie' di Marmo. The scale and material of this large marble foot suggests that it belonged to a cult statue of the temple.[102] Meanwhile, what remains of the female bust on the corner of Piazza S. Marco, which is commonly referred to as 'Madama Lucrezia', suggests that it, too, was a cult statue of Isis (Fig. 136).[103] This statue does not date to the original construction and dedication of the cult, but rather dates to the first half of the 3rd century AD, suggesting it was associated with a restoration of the temple by Alexander Severus.[104] The statues representing the rivers Nile and Tiber, which can now be viewed in the Vatican and Louvre museums respectively, also originated in this complex (Fig. 137; Fig. 138).[105] A third statue, depicting Ocean, was also found here but has since been lost.

The temple of Isis and Serapis was placed in this area because it was outside of the *pomerium*. Its acceptance in Rome in the 1st century BC was based in part on the acceptance of the cult by Caesar and Agrippa. The temple physically represents Rome's activities in Egypt in the 1st century BC and highlights how the Campus Martius was used as an area for the display of a number of different cultures. While Greek culture may have

[99] *LTUR* III, 109 (Coarelli).
[100] *LTUR* III, 109 (Coarelli).
[101] Roullett, 1972, 33-5; Richardson, 1992, 212.
[102] Coarelli, 2007, 291.
[103] *LTUR* III, 109 (Coarelli).
[104] Roullett, 1972, 22; Coarelli, 2007 291.
[105] *LTUR* III, 107 (Coarelli); Roullett, 1972, 33-5. See also: Coarelli, 2007, 290.

been commonly represented throughout the Campus Martius on a subtle level, the temple of Isis was a loud, ostentatious statement of Egyptian culture in Rome. As such it was representative of Rome's relationship with Egypt and its rulers in the 1st century BC. Rome's tumultuous relationship with Egypt was further exacerbated by Mark Antony, to the point where the Roman Senate were forced into a military encounter with Antony and Cleopatra. The defeat of Antony also resulted in the deaths of two prominent Roman senators whose death was publically commemorated on the central Campus Martius.

5.1.6. Tombs of Pansa and Hirtius

Aulus Hirtius and C. Vibius Pansa were the leaders of the Senatorial army who died at the battle of Mutina (Modena) against Antony in 43 BC in the same year as their consulate. Both tombs were erected in the Campus Martius at public expense (Livy, *Epit.* 119; Velleius Paterculus, 2.62; Valerius Maximus, 5.2.10).[106] The location of the Tomb of Pansa was discovered in 1899 when a travertine block was uncovered with an inscription noting the dedication of the tomb (*CIL* VI 37077).[107] The inscription reads:

Ex s(enatus) c(onsulato)/
C. Vibio C.f.Pa(n)sae/
Caetronian(o) con(n)s(uli)

The travertine block was found at 209 Corso Vittorio Emanuele, on the corner adjoining Vicolo Savelli and had been re-used as a building block for a later building. The evidence from Livy regarding the location of the burial of Pansa in the central Campus Martius indicates that originally the tomb lay not far from where this inscription was found. Only 400m from this site another inscription was discovered (*CIL* VI 3542) which appears to record the burial of Pansa's grandson (though the provenance of this inscription is controversial).[108]

---

[106] *LTUR* IV, 290 (Coarelli); *LTUR* IV, 302 (Macciocca); Coarelli, 1997, 557; Hope, 2007, 160. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 480, 482; Richardson, 1992, 358; Coarelli, 2007, 274.
[107] *LTUR* IV, 302 (Macciocca); Coarelli, 1997, 557. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 482; Richardson, 1992, 358; Coarelli, 2007, 274.
[108] Platner & Ashby, 1926, 482; contra *LTUR* IV, 302 (Macciocca); Richardson, 1992, 358; Coarelli, 1997, 557.

The tomb of Hirtius was discovered in 1937-8 under the north-west corner of Palazzo della Cancelleria, facing towards Corso Vittorio Emanuele (Fig. 139).[109] The tomb was a square enclosure measuring 6m long by 2.65m high. It was built entirely from brick and is one of the earliest surviving and datable examples of the use of brick in Rome.[110] On top of the walls lay one of the earliest example of travertine coping suggesting that the architectural form of this tomb was particularly different, if not experimental.[111] Little else remains of the enclosure, while the actual tomb or sarcophagus for the remains of Hirtius has never been found.[112] The ground level around the tomb became elevated towards the end of the first century AD and again at the beginning of the second century AD, by which time it appears that the tomb, or the immediate area around it, was used as an office for the distribution of marble.[113] Both the Altar of the Vicomagistri and the Cancelleria Relief were found at this site.[114] The tomb was completely lost from sight when the ground level was again elevated during the reign of Hadrian.[115]

The identification of this site as the tomb of Hirtius is dependant upon three *cippi* which were found at the corners of the site with an inscription that reads *A. Hirtius A. f.* (*ILLRP* 419).[116] These *cippi* provide solid evidence for the identification of the site. As Hirtius and Pansa were killed at the same battle and as both were granted a burial in the central Campus Martius by decree of the Senate, it is highly likely that they were buried in close proximity to each other. Given the location of the tomb of Hirtius under Palazzo della Cancelleria and the location of the inscription relating to the tomb of Pansa on Corso Vittorio Emanuele, the latter tomb must have been placed close to Corso Vittorio Emanuele (Fig. 139).

Both tombs were therefore located in an area that was associated with the assembly and departure of triumphal parades from the Campus Martius. Such a setting is of particular significance as both consuls were killed while fighting for the senatorial army against Antony (Suetonius, *Aug.* 1-11). Pansa and Hirtius were honoured with burials that would

---

[109] *LTUR* IV, 290 (Coarelli); Richardson, 1992, 356; Coarelli, 1997, 557; Coarelli, 2007, 482. Coarelli, 1997, 557 & 2007, 482 state that the tomb was under the north-west corner of Palazzo della Cancelleria, while Coarelli (*LTUR* IV, 290) states that is was placed in the south-west corner.
[110] *LTUR* IV, 290 (Coarelli); Richardson, 1992, 356.
[111] Coarelli, 2007, 482.
[112] *LTUR* IV, 209 (Coarelli).
[113] *LTUR* IV, 209 (Coarelli).
[114] *LTUR* IV, 209 (Coarelli); Lugli, 1946, 7-8.
[115] *LTUR* IV, 209 (Coarelli).
[116] *LTUR* IV, 209 (Coarelli).

be associated with the triumphs of the Roman state for generations to come. Their tombs were the last to be constructed on the Campus Martius for people who were not members of the Imperial family. In 33 BC Augustus started the construction of his magnificent mausoleum in the northern Campus Martius (Suetonius, *Aug.* 100).[117] This mausoleum made an enormous visual statement and towered over the Campus Martius and the generations of tombs in the area that preceded it.

The first half of the 1st century BC witnessed a final flurry of independent construction on the Campus Martius with tombs and victory temples constructed in the area. While a number of independently vowed temples and buildings would go on to be constructed in the area, by and large the Campus Martius, and the central Campus Martius in particular, became the construction ground for large scale building projects funded by Roman politicians seeking personal, and often Imperial, power. Pompey's theatre complex, Agrippa's bathing complex and Caesar's Saepta Julia, all constructed in the second half of the 1st century BC, are physical reminders of the evolution of the Republic into an Empire and the ultimate rise to power of Augustus. These buildings also represent the way in which the politicians of the later 1st century BC used buildings and construction projects to promote political agendas and garner public support with the ultimate aim of gaining sole control of the faltering Republican system.

[117] Platner & Ashby, 1927, 332; Davies, 2004, 49-51; Hope, 2007, 142.

5.2. Pompey's Theatre Complex.

Gn. Pompeius Magnus' theatre was the first permanent stone theatre constructed in Rome (Pliny, *H.N.* 7.158; 34.40; 36.115; Tacitus, *Ann.* 6.45.2; 13.54.3; Suetonius, *Tib.* 47.1; Vitruvius, *De Arch.* 3.3.2; Dio, 68.8.3).[118] Vowed in 61 BC and inaugurated in 55 BC it represented the power, influence and ambition of Pompey the Great (Cicero, *Fam.* 15.1). At the same time it represented a dramatic development in the evolution of theatre construction in Rome. Despite numerous attempts since the 2nd century BC no permanent stone theatre had ever been constructed in Rome (Livy, 40.51; *Per.* 48). The reasons for this are varied and complex and warrant further investigation before embarking upon a detailed analysis of Pompey's theatre complex.[119]

Prior to 55 BC all theatres in Rome were temporary constructions. Throughout the second century BC these temporary buildings became more lavish as the manipulation of spectacle as a political statement grew. Yet, despite the vast amounts of money needed for the construction of temporary theatres, permanent theatres remained prohibited.[120] Livy (40.51) records that in 179 BC Aemilius Lepidus planned to construct a stone theatre next to the temple of Apollo, in the area south of the Circus Flaminius.[121] The theatre would have had a close association with the temple and with the *ludi Apollinares* held on the site. As the temple of Apollo Sosianus had not been refurbished since 353 BC (Livy, 7.20.9) the new theatre would have rejuvenated the area and possibly provided additional viewing space for theatrical performances.[122] However, the construction of the theatre was halted by a senatorial decree, an act that highlights the negative attitude present at the time regarding the construction of permanent stone theatres in Rome (Livy, 40.51.3).

Livy (*Per.* 48) records a second attempt to construct a permanent theatre in Rome, this time in 154 BC by the censors M. Valerius Mesalla and C. Cassius Longinus, who attempted to build a permanent theatre near the Palatine Hill. However in 151 BC, two years after building works had begun, P. Scipio Nascia urged the Senate to have the

---

[118] *LTUR* V, 35-6 (Gros); Hanson, 1978, 48; Beacham, 1999, 56; Coleman, 2000, 220; Futrell, 2001, 42; Sear, 2006, 54.
[119] Sear, 2006, 54.
[120] Gruen, 1992, 205; Beacham, 1999, 56-7.
[121] Gruen, 1992, 206; Coarelli, 1997, 604; Coleman, 2000, 220; Sear, 2006, 54.
[122] *LTUR* I, 49 (Viscogliosi); Goldberg, 1998, 10.

theatre demolished, as it was '*useless and injurious to public morals*'.[123] It seems likely that this perceived threat to public morals stemmed from the extravagant nature of the productions that were being provided for the public. It may have been feared that such productions undermined the traditional *virilitas* and *severitas* of the Roman population.[124] It was likely for similar reasons that in the year 151 BC, following the demolition of Longinus' and Mesalla's part-built theatre, seating was also banned from all temporary theatres following a *senatus consultum*, as it was thought that to remain standing for the performances built greater character and also avoided creating a lethargic population (Orosius, 4.21.4; Livy, *Epit.* 48; Valerius Maximus, 2.4.2; Velleius Paterculus, 1.15.3).[125] It was traditional to stand for public assemblies in Rome, and it was feared that the Roman populace may have begun to hold political meetings in the theatre, as was traditional in Greek cities, a development that could in time pose a threat to the power of the Senate (Cicero, *Pro Flac.* 16).[126]

The notion of a threat to morals is supported by the events of 58 BC when an extraordinary temporary theatre was constructed by the *aedile* M. Aemilius Scaurus (Pliny, *H.N.* 36.114-5; Cicero, *Sest.* 116).[127] Pliny the Elder (*H.N.* 36. 114-5) describes the building as '*the grandest edifice ever wrought by man, even when meant to be permanent*'. However, the building of this theatre was not interpreted as such a positive event by Vitruvius (*De Arch.* 7.5.3) who, following his description of the *scaena frons,* wrote '*If we approve of such pictures which can have no basis in reality, we shall, like those other communities, be deemed idiots, because of such faults*'.[128] These two statements represent the conflicting nature of the argument. On the one hand theatrical performances and temporary theatres were embraced as key elements of Rome's life. Yet on the other hand these displays could be interpreted as overly lavish and consequently disrespectful of Roman *gravitas*. Given the political instability of the 1st century BC, theatrical displays and the construction of large theatres that enabled the congregation of great numbers of Roman citizens could have been interpreted not only as injurious to

[123] Ross-Taylor, 1966, 30-1; Gruen, 1992, 206; Beacham, 1999, 29; Coarelli, 1997, 605; Coleman, 2000, 220; Futrell, 2001, 42; Sear, 2006, 54-5.
[124] Gruen, 1992, 208; Coleman, 2000, 220; Sear, 2006, 54-5.
[125] Ross-Taylor, 1966, 30-1; Gruen, 1992, 208; Coarelli, 1997, 606; Coleman, 2000, 220; Bell, 2004, 181-2.
[126] Balsdon, 1969, 254; Gruen, 1992, 207-8; Sear, 2006, 54.
[127] *LTUR* V, 38 (Gros); Beacham, 1999, 57-9; Coleman, 2000, 220; Sear, 2006, 55.
[128] *LTUR* V, 38 (Pollard).

morals, but as a threat to ruling political powers.[129] It was here, in large, spacious, comfortable buildings, that dissidents could meet and political factions could co-ordinate.

Due to the impermanent nature of temporary theatres none have ever been identified in the archaeological record, though the literary sources record a number of occasions and locations when temporary theatres were erected.[130] For example theatrical displays were often carried out in religious precincts in association with religious festivals, for example the *ludi Megalenses* at the temple of Magna Mater on the Palatine (Cicero, *De Har. Resp.* 24) (Fig. 140).[131] Temporary theatres, particularly those that were erected in association with theatres, would have required little construction as the steps of the temple functioned as the viewing area and there was likely only a small stage or scene (Tacitus, *Ann.* 14.20).[132] There are many reasons why temporary theatres continued to be used for such a long period of time. For example, it may have been the wish of the upper classes and governing elite to appear benevolent. Whatever the reasons for the construction of temporary theatres over a long period of time, it would appear that the practice continued for social, and not economic, reasons.[133] Religious conservatism, public benevolence and fears for political stability appear to have been the driving influences behind temporary theatre construction.

Remains of the first three permanent theatres of Rome have been identified within the archaeological record of the Campus Martius (theatre of Pompey, theatre of Balbus, theatre of Marcellus). The scale of these buildings would have been far greater than temporary theatres erected in a temple precinct and would have been capable of seating many more spectators. The amount of free space available for development on the Campus Martius, and the level nature of the ground, ensured that any permanent theatre would be highly visible rendering it a very successful tool for prominent political statements.[134] Also, the extra-*pomerial* location of the Campus Martius also meant that the theatres could be intimately and publically associated with the name of the constructor of the building, maximising the potential personal benefits that the building could bring. It

---

[129] Ross-Taylor, 1990, 30; Gruen, 1992,205-10; Sear, 2006, 56.
[130] Lomas, 2003, 34.
[131] Goldberg, 1998, 12; Coleman, 2000, 220; Flower, 2004, 325; Sear, 2006, 54.
[132] Beacham, 1999, 26-8; Coleman, 2000, 220; Sear, 2006, 54.
[133] Gruen, 1992, 105-7.
[134] Sear, 2006, 12.

was for all of these reasons that in 61 BC Pompey the Great decided to construct his theatre-temple complex on the Campus Martius.

The complex that was vowed by Pompey in 61 BC and dedicated by him in 55 BC comprised a grand permanent stone theatre, a large portico that enclosed formal gardens, sculptural displays and a *curia*, and a temple dedicated to Venus Victrix.[135] While each of these elements can be investigated in more detail individually, the constituent elements functioned to create a huge complex that was riddled with visual propaganda and self promotion.[136] The complex was a massive advertisement for the personal success of Pompey and Rome's advancement at his hands and provided the inhabitants of Rome with a leisure facility on a scale never before witnessed in Rome. Located close to the triumphal route, Pompey engaged in the same self promotion as the previous generation of Roman generals, though on a much grander scale. This building signified many firsts for the city of Rome and it was only against the backdrop of the political instability and the political in-fighting of Pompey, Caesar and Crassus that such a construction project could go ahead. Pompey's theatre complex is an excellent example of how a physical building in Phase Four could be used to promote political issues and themes to a literate and illiterate audience.

5.2.1. The Theatre

Construction on Pompey's theatre started following Pompey's triumph in September of 61 BC, though the dedication did not take place until Pompey's second consulship in 55 BC (Cicero, *Fam.* 15.1) (Fig. 141).[137] According to a number of sources the theatre was vowed and dedicated in the same year (Velleius Paterculus, 2.48; Tacitus, *Ann.* 14.20; Dio, 39.38).[138] However, a reference by Tertullian (*De Spect.* 10) suggests that Pompey was in his third consulship when the theatre was dedicated as he debated whether or not to use *tertium* or *tertio* in the dedicatory inscription. This would place the dedication in 52 BC.[139] It is possible though that this inscription and the *scaena* on which it was inscribed

[135] *LTUR* V, 35-6 (Gros); Coleman, 2000, 221; Sear, 2006, 56.
[136] Sear, 2006, 12.
[137] *LTUR* V, 35-6 (Gros); Sear, 2006, 57.
[138] Platner & Ashby, 1926, 515.
[139] *LTUR* V, 36 (Gros). See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 516; Richardson, 1992, 384; Sear, 2006, 58.

were constructed at a later date. Consequently 55 BC is the most commonly accepted date of inauguration.[140]

The theatre was located in the south central Campus Martius, in an area that provided sufficient space for the entire complex while at the same time it was located as close as possible to the Circus Flaminius and the route of the triumphal procession. It would have been far easier, and indeed less costly, to construct this theatre against a hillside, in the traditional Greek style, for example like the theatre of Dionysus in Athens, or even on a partial embankment like the theatre at Bologna.[141] Had he done so Pompey would not have required the radiating vault which supported the *cavea* of his theatre. However, the benefits of the location far outweighed the cost and technical challenges of constructing a theatre on a level site. By placing his theatre in the open area of the Campus Martius and on flat, level, ground, Pompey was ensuring that he had enough space to provide a large portico beside his theatre which would allow the complex to become associated with entertainment and leisure. Also, such a conspicuous building, placed on a level site, and with extended use of arcades and vaulting, ensured that his monument was innovative and attention grabbing, maximising the personal recognition he achieved for such a construction project.[142] Pompey's complex towered over the Campus Martius and would have been visible from as far south as the Capitoline Hill.

As it had previously been unthinkable to build a stone theatre in Rome, Pompey constructed a temple to Venus Victrix at the top of the *cavea*, in the centre, and proposed that the rows of seats beneath it were actually steps leading up to the temple (Fig. 142).[143] Two references in the literary sources suggest that the whole complex was dedicated as a temple and not as a theatre, though this seems unlikely (Tertullian, *De Spect.* 10; Pliny, *H.N.* 8.20).[144] The construction of a temple at the top of a set of monumental steps was not unique to the theatre of Pompey and was known from other sanctuaries of the 2nd and 1st centuries BC, including the sanctuary of Juno at Gabii which was just 15km outside of Rome.[145] A great many temples located in Latium used the stairs of a temple as seating for theatrical displays, these included the temple of Fortuna at Praeneste which dates to

---

[140] *LTUR* V, 36 (Gros); Platner & Ashby, 1926, 516; Richardson, 1992, 384; Beacham & Denard, 2003, 129; Sear, 2006, 58.
[141] Sear, 2006, 51.
[142] Hanson, 1978, 48.
[143] *LTUR* V, 36 (Gros); Gleason, 1994, 21; Sear, 2006, 58. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 516.
[144] Sear, 2006, 58. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 516; Richardson, 1992, 384.
[145] *LTUR* V, 36 (Gros); Coleman, 2000, 221; Sear, 2006, 45.

the 2nd century BC.[146] Such constructions had been witnessed in Rome too, with the temple of the Magna Mater facilitating theatrical displays on the Palatine Hill (Fig. 140).[147] The fact that the building itself was commonly known by the term *theatrum* suggests that the people of Rome more commonly recognised it as an actual theatre and not as a large temple complex.[148] However, the sources use several names when referring to the temple, for example *theatrum Pompei, theatrum Pompeianum* (Pliny, *H.N.* 34.39, 36.115; Suetonius, *Tib.* 47, *Claud,* 21; Tacitus, *Ann.* 6.45; Martial, 6.9, 10.51.11) and *theatrum marmoreum* (*Fast.Amit.*), *theatrum Magnum* (Pliny *H.N.* 7.158) and sometimes just *theatrum* (Cicero, *Att.* 4.1.6; Suetonius, *Ner.* 13; Dio 50.8.3).[149] The variety of names used is an indication of the different contexts and situations with which the theatre of Pompey was associated.

The theatre was restored by Octavian in 32 BC, at which point he removed a statue of Pompey that had been located in the Curia Pompei where Caesar had been murdered, and placed it instead in the theatre (Suetonius, *Aug.* 31).[150] In AD 21 the theatre burned down and was reconstructed by Tiberius as no family members of Pompey were thought responsible enough to undertake the reconstruction (Tacitus, *Ann.* 3.72; Velleius Paterculus, 2.130).[151] As part of this reconstruction Tiberius placed a bronze statue of Sejanus in the theatre (Dio, 57.21.3; Seneca, *Marc.* 224).[152] The restoration was not completed during Tiberius' lifetime and the work was continued by Caligula and was dedicated by either Caligula or Claudius (Suetonius, *Calig.* 21.1; Suetonius, *Claud.* 21.3; Dio, 60.6.8).[153] Claudius inscribed Tiberius' name on the *scaena* and constructed a marble arch in his honour which was located close to the theatre (Suetonius, *Claud.* 11).[154]

The theatre is represented on fragments 37ac and fragments 39abc of slab III-11 of the Severan Marble Plan, and fragments 37bde and 39de which are now missing and are only

---

[146] Gleason, 1994, 21; Kuttner, 1999, 347; Sear, 2006, 45.
[147] Goldberg, 1998, 12; Coleman, 2000, 220; Flower, 2004, 325; Sear, 2006, 54.
[148] *LTUR* V, 35 (Gros); Coleman, 2000, 221; Sear, 2006, 57.
[149] *LTUR* V, 35 (Gros); Platner & Ashby, 1926, 515; Sear, 2006, 57.
[150] *LTUR* IV, 148 (Gros); *LTUR* V, 35-6 (Gros); Gleason, 1994, 24; Favro, 1996, 80; Sear, 2006, 58. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 516; Richardson, 1992, 384.
[151] Richardson, 1992, 384; Favro, 1996, 110; Sear, 2006, 58.
[152] *LTUR* V, 37 (Gros); Platner & Ashby, 1926, 516; Richardson, 1992, 384; Sear, 2006, 58.
[153] *LTUR* V, 37 (Gros); Platner & Ashby, 1926, 516; Richardson, 1992, 53; Sear, 2006, 58.
[154] *LTUR* V, 37 (Gros); Platner & Ashby, 1926, 516; Richardson, 1992, 384.

preserved on Renaissance drawings (*Cod.Vat.Lat.* 3439) (Fig. 143).[155] On this plan the theatre is depicted with a permanent *scaena* which serves to separate the portico from the theatre. Given the Republican tradition for the construction of the *scaena* on an ad hoc basis, it seems plausible that the *scaena* was temporary when the complex was first constructed and was only erected when required.[156] When it was not in place there would have been an un-obscured view of the *cavea* and the temple of Venus Victrix from as far back as the *curia*, a view that would have aided Pompey's justification that the auditorium was simply monumental steps for the temple of Venus Victrix (Fig. 157).[157] Those who entered the theatre from the portico would have been met with the imposing site of the temple of Venus Victrix sat atop the *cavea*.[158] It is likely that a permanent *scaena* was added in the Imperial period, possibly following the fire of AD 64 (Dio, 66.24) (Fig. 143).[159] In addition, a temporary scene building meant that when there was no play in production the complex of Pompey would have been viewed as an open, cohesive, complex, with free movement between the portico, *cavea* and temple. As such it would have provided a more user friendly and multifunctional leisure complex with a more cohesive and accessible political message.

Though there has been little excavation carried out in relation to the complex, remnants of the theatre, portico and temple have been found in the area north of the Circus Flaminius. Buildings have been found built into and on top of the radiating concrete vaults on which the *cavea* was constructed (Fig. 144; Fig. 145).[160] As a result of the difficulties involved in accessing the material built into the post-antique buildings, a virtual reality project known as the Pompey Project has been launched to try and tie the available physical and literary remains together.[161] This virtual reality project is still underway but has already produced a number of reconstructions of the theatre and theories about the way in which the space was used.[162] Also, excavations undertaken beneath the restaurant 'Da Pancrazio' are to be published in 2009 as part of the Pompey Project.[163] Concrete walls with *opus reticulatum* facing constructed on blocks of tufa and peperino have been found in the basements of a number of buildings around the theatre, particularly under S. Maria

---

[155] *LTUR* V, 37 (Gros).
[156] Gleason, 1994, 21; Coleman, 2000, 222; Contra Sear, 2006, 60.
[157] Gleason, 1994, 24.
[158] Coleman, 2000, 222.
[159] Gleason, 1994, 24; Coleman, 2000, 222;Sear, 2006, 61.
[160] Coleman, 2000, 221; Sear, 2006, 59-61.
[161] Beacham & Denard, 2003, 129-39.
[162] Beacham & Denard, 2003, 129-39.
[163] www.pompey.cch.kcl.ac.uk/news/htm.

de Crypta Pincta.[164] Remains of the temple of Venus Victrix have been found beneath Palazzo Pio Righetti and the *scaena* in Piazza dei Satiri (Fig. 150).[165] The form of the theatre is preserved in modern streetscape of Rome, particularly around Via Grottapinta and Piazza Campo dei Fiori (Fig. 146). The curve of the *cavea* is preserved and visible in the modern streets, while the bulge between Piazza dei Biscione to the north and Via dei Giubbonari to the south can be reconstructed as the apse of the temple of Venus Victrix.[166] These remnants in the modern street plan can be clearly identified in aerial photographs (Fig. 147).[167] Archaeological excavation has determined that the façade of the *cavea* contained three levels of arcades, each decorated with columns (Fig. 142). It is likely that these followed the traditional order with the lowest level decorated with Doric columns, the second with Ionic, and the topmost with Corinthian.[168] This was the same sequence of orders as would be used for the decoration of the theatre of Marcellus in 13/11 BC (5.4.3).[169] While the system of entrance and exit arches and corridors can no longer be determined, it was likely similar to the theatre of Marcellus, though possibly slightly less sophisticated.[170]

The sheer scale of the theatre was enormous, and the roof of the temple stood a staggering 45m above ground level, the second highest building in Rome after the temple of Jupiter on the Capitoline Hill.[171] The theatre's diameter was 150-160m and the length of the *scaena* was *c.*95m.[172] The stage of the theatre was so large that it would have been equivalent to half of the arena of the Colosseum.[173] Pliny (*H.N.* 36.115) records that the theatre could seat 40,000 spectators, though this is most likely an exaggeration, while the Regionary Catalogues records a more sustainable 17,500 *loca* (*Reg.* IX).[174] The calculation of the number of people that could be contained in Roman theatres is very difficult and it is possible that the temple held closer to 10,000-11,000 people though Beacham & Denard have recently estimated that it held *c.*25,000 spectators (Fig. 148).[175]

---

[164] *LTUR* V, 37 (Gros); Coleman, 2000, 221. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 517; Richardson, 1992, 385.
[165] *LTUR* V, 37 (Gros); Sear, 2006, 59.
[166] Coleman, 2000, 221; Sear, 2006, 60.
[167] Hanson, 1978, 43; Coleman, 2000, 221. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 517.
[168] *LTUR* V, 37 (Gros); Planter and Ashby, 1926, 517; Richardson, 1992, 385.
[169] Fr theatre of Marcellus: *LTUR* V, 33 (Ciancio Rossetto).
[170] Richardson, 1992, 385.
[171] Coleman, 2000, 221; Beacham & Denard, 2003, 129.
[172] *LTUR* V, 37 (Gros); Coleman, 2000, 221. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 517; Richardson, 1992, 385.
[173] Richardson, 1992, 385; Coleman, 2000, 222.
[174] *LTUR* V, 36 (Gros); Nordh, 1949, 87; Richardson, 1992, 385; Sear, 2006, 57.
[175] Platner & Ashby, 1926, 517; Coleman, 2000, 221; Beacham & Denard, 2003, 129.

5.2.2. Temple of Venus Victrix

The temple that was constructed at the top of the *cavea* of the theatre was dedicated to Venus Victrix (Tertullian, *De Spec.* 10; Aulus Gellius, 10.1.7). Little remains of the temple within the archaeological record, though it is preserved on the Renaissance recording of fragments 39de of slab III-11 of the FUR (*Cod.Vat.Lat.* 3439) (Fig. 149). The FUR shows a semi-circular apse on the central axis of the theatre's auditorium, likely representing the temple.[176] In 1860 remains of a wall, perpendicular to the outer *cavea* wall and at the midpoint of the *cavea,* were found beneath Palazzo Pio Righetti (Fig. 150).[177] Fragments of engaged columns were also found at this location.[178] Unfortunately not enough of the structure remains to reconstruct the temple with any certainty, though it is clear that the rear of the temple ended in a semi-circular apse. As the theatre extended beyond the western boundary of the *cavea* it would seem that the foundations for the temple had to be built up from the ground level independent of the foundations of the *cavea.*[179] It is possible that it was these built up foundations that Plutarch equated to a tower behind a great ship (Plutarch, *Pomp.*40.5) and which may have been a private residence for Pompey.[180]

This temple was not the only one in Rome dedicated to Venus, though it was the first time that the epithet 'Victrix' was used to describe the goddess. This epithet was used by Pompey to denote his personal victory over Mithradates in 62 BC as well as to mark the greater Roman victory (Pliny, *H.N.* 7.98; 37.12.16; Appian, *Mith.* 17.117).[181] Venus was very popular amongst politicians in late Republican Rome. Sulla, also, had strong connections with the goddess as exemplified by the dedications made within Sulla's colony of Pompeii.[182] Caesar also actively associated himself with Venus and according to Appian (*B.Civ.* 2.68.281) vowed a temple to Venus Victrix prior to the battle of Pharsalus, though he later changed the dedication to Venus Genetrix.[183] The association between Sulla and Pompey on this occasion is particularly noteworthy as both men had at

[176] *LTUR* V, 120 (Gros); Hanson, 1978, 44; Sear, 2006, 60.
[177] *LTUR* V, 37 (Gros); *LTUR* V, 120 (Gros); Hanson, 1978, 44.
[178] Hanson, 1978, 44.
[179] Hanson, 1978, 44.
[180] Richardson, 1992, 385; Coleman, 2000, 222; Sear, 2006, 60.
[181] *LTUR* V, 120 (Gros); Degrassi, 1963, 493-4; Kuttner, 1999, 345; Miles, 2008, 233.
[182] Hanson, 1978, 50.
[183] Hanson, 1978, 51.

one time privately owned the land on which the complex of Pompey was constructed.[184] Sulla was first to take the land into private ownership before Pompey took it over. On the latter's death Mark Antony inherited the land briefly before it came to Caesar and Augustus and into Imperial ownership (Cicero, *Phil.* 2.64; Orosius, 5.18.27).[185]

Other aspects of the complex were also of religious importance. The *Fasti Amiterni* and the *Fasti Alliferni,* both dating to the mid 1st century AD, record four additional shrines which were placed within the auditorium.[186] The deities of three of the four shrines can be identified as Honos, Virtus and Felicitas, though unfortunately the deity of the fourth shrine is not known.[187] It is uncertain how these shrines were arranged in relation to each other, to the temple of Venus Victrix, and to the theatre in general. It is likely, based on a statement by Suetonius (*Claud.* 21.1) that they were arranged symmetrically in relation to the temple of Venus Victrix which sat at the top of the central aisle, with four shrines, two on each side of the temple of Venus Victrix, placed at the top of the radiating aisles.[188] This reconstruction would also correspond to Suetonius' comment that Claudius carried out a sacrifice 'beside' the largest temple (Suetonius, *Claud.* 21.1).

5.2.3. The Portico

The portico of Pompey was an integral part of the wider Pompeian complex. Set out with its long axis running from east to west the portico facilitated the display of art, and incorporated open gardens, markets and areas of shade.[189] The portico was an important part of Pompey's complex and provided not only an area in which visitors to the theatre could escape the rain or midday heat, but an area in which political support could be won and in which a visitor's interaction with the built space could be manipulated through the use of decoration and perspective.[190] Running from behind the *scaena frons*, the portico stretched from Via dei Chiavari in the Campo dei Fiori in the west to the *area sacra* of

---

[184] Purcell, 1996, 185.
[185] Zanker, 1990, 14; Richardson, 1992, 66-7; Coarelli, 2007, 265.
[186] *LTUR* V, 120 (Gros); Degrassi, 1963, 493-4.
[187] *LTUR* V, 36 (Gros); Degrassi, 1963, 493-4; Hanson, 1978, 52. See also: Richardson, 1992, 411 who believes that the missing deity is Victoria.
[188] Hanson, 1978, 53.
[189] Farrar, 1998, 181.
[190] Gleason, 1994, 13.

Largo Argentina in the east (Fig. 146).[191] As such it measured *c.*180m x 135m and was surrounded by a colonnade and divided into five aisles, lengthways, by columns and rows of trees and shrubs (Fig. 151).[192] The form that the portico took is recorded in fragments 39 ac of slab III-11 of the FUR (Fig. 143).[193] It should be noted though that in comparing the FUR to the archaeological remnants of the area it has been discovered that the Severan representation renders the portico much shorter than it actually was in the late Republic.[194]

Fragments of the FUR, in association with a number of literary sources (Martial, 2.14.10), have been of some help in the reconstruction and interpretation of the internal area of the portico. The central axis of the building, which was emphasised by the mirroring locations of the *regia* and *curia*, was further emphasised by a double grove of trees which ran through the centre of the gardens (Fig. 143). Martial (2.14.10) calls these two groves of trees a *nemus duplex,* or double grove, and notes that it was planted with plane trees imported from Asia and decorated with fountains and statues.[195] This *nemus duplex* is represented on the FUR (39ac of slab III-11) as two long rectangles that run either side of the central path of the open portico area.[196] On the FUR the groves are surrounded by evenly distributed symbols of a square with a central dot. This symbol can be used to depict either columns or trees and was also used to indicate the entrance to the Porticus Metelli (4.3.2) (Fig. 152).[197] Nothing remains in the archaeological record that could clarify if on this occasion they were trees or columns which defined the border of the *nemus*.[198]

An excavation of the site was carried out in the eastern area of the portico, close to the temples of Largo Argentina and indicates that plants were grown on the site. These excavations found evidence for two periods of planting, one from the original Republican planting by Pompey, another from Augustus' restoration.[199] Unfortunately the rest of the garden was lost because of development of the site during the medieval period. It is noted

---

[191] *LTUR* IV, 149 (Gros); Richardson, 1992, 385; Gleason, 1994, 14; Coleman, 2000, 222.
[192] *LTUR* IV, 148 (Gros); Hanson, 1978, 53; Sear, 2006, 61.
[193] *LTUR* IV, 148 (Gros); Sear, 2006, 61.
[194] Gleason, 1994, 14.
[195] Gleason, 1994, 19, 26; Farrar, 1998, 181; Kuttner, 1999, 347, 369; Coleman, 2000, 222; Miles, 2008, 233.
[196] Gleason, 1994, 14; Farrar, 1998, 181.
[197] Gleason, 1990, 10; Farrar, 1998, 181.
[198] Gleason, 1994, 19.
[199] Gleason, 1990, 11.

by Propertius (2.32.11-2), who was writing in the late 1st century BC, that the precinct had fountains. At the time of its construction the Porticus Pompei had no direct water supply from an aqueduct and therefore if the fountains were present in the original quadroportico they must have been fed by a local spring or were simply still pools.[200] Alternatively, it is possible that the fountains were an early Augustan addition to the quadroportico, by which date the Aqua Virgo could have been tapped to supply the site.

Together the four sides of the quadroportico formed the boundary of the Republican complex, but simultaneously each side retained its own particular function. The northern portico was known as the Hecatostylon and was named for the one hundred columns that ran its length (Martial, 2.14.9).[201] Martial (11.47) notes that the Hecatostylon ran beside a row of plane tress which was interspersed with statues of wild animals.[202] The Hecatostylon was also known as both the Porticus Lentulorum and the Porticus ad Nationes, based in part on the statues that were contained within it.[203] Unfortunately nothing is known of this northern portico from the archaeological record. Similarly, the southern portico is unknown in the archaeological record and must be reconstructed from fragments of the FUR, though in this case a passage by Appian (*B. Civ.* 2.7.118) suggests that the portico functioned as an area for markets and shops.[204] The western portico stood behind the scene building and contained three ceremonial entrances. The central entrance was known as the *regia* and was flanked by two *hospitalia* which acted as the entrances to the theatre and portico for the spectators (Fig. 143).[205] In the centre of the eastern portico, the *curia* reflected the position and axis of the *regia*. Following a fire which destroyed the *curia* of the Forum Romanum, the *curia* of the Porticus Pompei was used as a meeting room that was also used for senatorial congregations (Dio, 44.16).[206] It was in the *curia* of Pompey's complex that Julius Caesar was killed on the 15th of March 44 BC (Cicero, *Div.* 2.23; Suetonius. *Caes.* 80-1; Plutarch, *Caes.* 66).[207] The *curia pompei* sat between two small adjacent rooms which reflected the position of the *hospitalia* of the western portico and further reflected the division of the western portico.

---

[200] Gleason, 1994, 19.
[201] *LTUR* III, 9-10 (Coarelli); Sear, 2006, 61.
[202] Gleason, 1990, 9; Gleason, 1994, 14; Farrar, 1998, 182.
[203] *LTUR* IV, 125-6 (Orlandi); Coarelli, 1997, 167; Sear, 2006, 61.
[204] Gleason, 1990, 9.
[205] Gleason, 1990, 8-9; Sear, 2006, 87.
[206] *LTUR* IV, 148-9 (Gros); Gleason, 1990, 9. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 143, Sumi, 2005, 50.
[207] *LTUR* IV, 148 (Gros); Beacham & Denard, 2003, 129; Sear, 2006, 58.

The location of a statue of Pompey within the *curia* may have made a visible association with the cult of Venus at the western end of the complex and further emphasised the parallels between the eastern and western porticoes.[208] The placing of a statue of himself at the eastern extreme of the portico ensured that Pompey's statue had symbolic and visual dominance over the temple of Venus Victrix, and all of the many female statues that decorated his portico.[209] Augustus later had this statue removed and placed in the theatre. He also had the *curia* closed and deemed it a *'locus sceleratus'*.[210] The complex of Pompey can be sub-divided and interpreted in a number of ways. For example, the temple of Venus Victrix mirrored the axial position of the *curia,* creating a line of sight and association within the complex.[211] The *cavea* of the theatre and the porticus can also be seen to be determined by two circles of equal size.[212] This would have further highlighted the axial association of the *curia* and the temple, while also dividing the space between the *cavea* of the theatre and the *nemus* (Fig. 153). The same proportions and division can be applied to the *nemus* itself (Fig. 154).[213]

The four sides of the quadroportico framed the garden and provided controlled access to the richly adorned internal area.[214] The portico that was constructed by Pompey behind the theatre reflected the requirements as set out by Vitruvius that theatre goers should have an area in which to stroll (Vitruvius, *De Arch.* 5.8).[215] The two *hospitalia* that flanked the *regia* would have provided access to this area from the theatre and allowed for the movement of people between the theatre and portico. However, the portico was not reserved for use only when theatrical displays were on show. The internal area of the portico was used as the first public park of Rome and as such served as a welcomed recreational space for the inhabitants of the densely populated city.[216] It is important that the entire complex should not be viewed as a series of unrelated areas but rather they should be look on as a recreational area that facilitated a number of types of entertainment and recreations. Pliny (*H.N.* 35.59, 114, 126, 132) records that along the covered colonnaded part of the portico were displayed works of art, some likely taken as spoils of

[208] Kuttner, 1999, 346.
[209] Kuttner, 1999, 346.
[210] *LTUR* IV, 148 (Gros); Sear, 2006, 58.
[211] Gleason, 1994, 18.
[212] Gleason, 1994, 18.
[213] Gleason, 1994, 19.
[214] Gleason, 1990, 9; Gleason, 1994, 19.
[215] *LTUR* IV, 148 (Gros).
[216] Farrar, 1998, 180-1.

war, while others may have been commissioned for display in the portico.[217] These pieces created a themed environment, and represented the cult of Venus and its association with theatre and poetry. Meanwhile the artwork on display from Pergamum represented Pompey's desire to promote himself as a type of Hellenistic king, while the statues and other works that were displayed amongst the trees and shrubs celebrated his victory in Asia Minor (For more on the particular works of art on display in the Porticus of Pompey, see section: 6.1.2).[218] A group of Muses that were found during excavations are similar in style to those on display at the Great Altar of Zeus at Pergamum and there is a possibility that they were commissioned specially for display in Pompey's garden.[219]

The portico was a particularly popular recreational area of Rome and the literary sources record many of the ways in which the portico was used and make particular reference to those who walked in the garden. For example, Martial noted the idleness of those who walked around it: '*A crowd more idle not Pompey's Portico contains....*' (Martial, 11.1.11). The portico was also specifically mentioned as a location in which men and women could fraternise.[220] '*[Women] you may, and with profit, walk through the Pompeian shade, when the head is scorched with the Maiden's celestial steeds*' (Ovid, *Ars Am.* 1.67).[221] Martial also recorded the association between the portico and the meeting of men and women: '*Why does Lattera avoid all baths attended by crowds of women? That he may not be tempted. Why does he not idly stroll in the shade of Pompey's portico...? That he may not be tempted*' (Martial 11.47.3.).

Within the wider Pompeian complex the portico acted as a symbolic processional route into the theatre (Fig. 155; Fig. 156; Fig. 157 and Fig. 158).[222] The 9m wide path that ran between the two rows of trees emphasised the route between the *curia, regia*, theatre and temple of Venus Victrix.[223] The path itself, taking in along the way the thematically arranged artwork, may have acted as a space in which the triumph of Pompey of 61 BC could be permanently remembered, re-enacted and re-experienced on a frequent basis. The trees were planted at very regular intervals, and from the perspective of the visitor may have resembled troops arranged prior to battle or the procession of a triumph through

---

[217] Coleman, 2000, 222; Edwards, 2003, 59.
[218] Coleman, 2000, 222.
[219] *LTUR* V, 37 (Gros); Gleason, 1994, 19; Kuttner, 1999, 344; Edwards, 2003, 65.
[220] Gleason, 1994, 24.
[221] Gleason, 1990, 9.
[222] *LTUR* V, 38 (Gros); Hanson, 1978, 54.
[223] Gleason, 1990, 10.

the streets of Rome.[224] A clue to the message of self promotion and aggrandisement inherent in the building lies in the way in which the western end of the portico, behind the scene building, contained three separate entrances into the theatre, with arches that resembled triumphal arches.[225] The axial and regular arrangement certainly directed the eye up the avenue and towards the theatre building.

It is possible to compare the form of this complex to that of a Hellenistic Kaisareion, a rectangular space surrounded by porticoes which was used for the celebration of a ruler cult and which was particularly popular in Alexandria.[226] While in very general terms it may be reminiscent of the architectural form of a Kaisareion, though lacking the central shrine, there is no evidence to suggest that Pompey was trying to establish a ruler cult of any type within Rome. In fact there is only one external influence which is recorded in the sources which may suggest an origin for the theatre, temple and portico of Pompey. According to Plutarch (*Pomp.* 42) Pompey was influenced in his decision to construct his complex by his visit to the theatre of Mytilene.[227] Unfortunately this theatre no longer exists and therefore direct comparison is impossible. It is noted by Plutarch that while in the theatre of Mytilene Pompey was the recipient of much personal praise and adulation.[228] This experience may have provided the catalyst for Pompey to set about constructing a similar complex in Rome with the ultimate aim of gaining greater public recognition and support for himself. Pompey may not have borrowed the architectural traits of a Hellenistic Kaisareia, but he certainly embraced and promoted the idea of religio-political glorification that was associated with such buildings.[229]

The theatre and portico complex was restored a number of times, most notably by Augustus, who tried to remove the Pompeian message behind the building and associate it with his Imperial rule. The *curia* was subsequently turned into a public toilet, something that also occurred to an apse in the portico behind the theatre of Balbus (5.4.2) (Dio, 47.19.1).[230] The two rooms that flanked the *curia* were also turned into public latrines, the

---

[224] Gleason, 1994, 19.
[225] Gleason, 1994, 21.
[226] Hanson, 1978, 54.
[227] *LTUR* V, 36 (Gros); Hanson, 1978, 54; Richardson, 1992, Farrar, 1998, 181; 384; Miles, 2008, 233.
[228] Hanson, 1978, 54.
[229] Hanson, 1978, 54-5.
[230] See below, section 5.4.2 for Crypta Balbi latrines: *LTUR* I, 328 (Manacorda); Sear, 2006, 66; Coarelli, 2007, 282.

remains of which were found during the excavations of Largo Argentina.[231] From the limited available material that has been found on the site it has been ascertained that while the form of the portico was not overtly altered by Augustus, a number of the materials used on the site were altered. For example, the low wall that surrounded the *nemus duplex* and which ran between the column bases (or trees, dependant upon the interpretation of the plan) was constructed by Pompey from ashlar blocks, but was reconstructed by Augustus in concrete.[232] The portico complex of Pompey continued to be used for a further three centuries, until AD 290 when reconstruction following a fire saw the portico divided into two sections and renamed, with one of these porticoes called the Porticus Iova, and the other called the Porticus Herculea (*CIL* VI 255; *CIL* VI 256).[233] Further alterations were made to the site, but the portico seems to have no longer functioned as a leisure park. The theatre meanwhile continued to be used into the 6th century AD.[234] With the downfall of the city of Rome came the movement of the population of the city into the area of the Campus Martius. The development of this area saw a degeneration of the Republican and Imperial buildings and the alteration of these sites to fulfil the need for housing. As the area became more urbanised the open areas of the Campus Martius were used for tenement housing, including the open areas of the portico of Pompey, and the portico behind the theatre of Balbus.

Whether the theatre and portico complex had any influence on other urban garden developments and construction in Rome is debatable. It should be noted though that after the dedication of the complex of Pompey, Julius Caesar went about constructing his own forum in close proximity to the Forum Romanum. Caesar even began the construction of a senate house, or *curia*, in 44 BC in a space adjoining the Roman Forum to replace the one that had burnt down (Dio, 44.5).[235] His hope was perhaps to create an environment, enclosed by porticoes, which would be seen as a place of serious politics and government, in comparison to Pompey's frivolous leisure park on the Campus Martius.[236]

Pompey's complex is a physical representation of the competitive nature of late Republican politics. The fervour with which the politicians of the late Republic embraced

---

[231] Gleason, 1990, 9; Gleason, 1994, 24.
[232] Gleason, 1990, 12; Kuttner, 1999, 350.
[233] *LTUR* IV, 149 (Gros); Gleason, 1990, 13. See also: Richardson, 1992, 319.
[234] Gleason, 1994, 24.
[235] Gleason, 1994, 26. See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 143.
[236] Gleason, 1994, 26.

the challenge of acquiring public support can be traced through Pompey's complex, to Caesar's Forum and Saepta Julia, and the Agrippan and Augustan development of the central Campus Martius. The ultimate aim was to rule the crumbling Republican system and instigate an imperial, or perhaps monarchical, system of government.

5.3. Agrippa's Building Programme

Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa engaged in a major building programme just north of the theatre of Pompey in Phase Four (early 1st century BC to late 1st century BC). Agrippa was an eminent politician of the 1st century BC and was closely aligned to Caesar and subsequently to Augustus. He was also of intrinsic importance at the battle of Actium and was partially responsible for Augustus' naval victory against Antony (Dio, 51.3.1-2; Suetonius, *Aug,* 17). He was loyal to those politicians, such as Caesar and Augustus who so boldly vied for leadership in the late Republic, though he seems not to have sought such power himself and was happier to remain the supporter of the victor. Though he was awarded three triumphs, he celebrated none of them and deferred his power to Augustus (Dio, 54.24.7-8).[237] As a result he oversaw a number of construction projects on the Campus Martius on behalf of both Caesar and Augustus. The interpretation of these buildings tells us much, not only of the character and ambitions of Agrippa himself, but of Caesar and Augustus and their programme of actions designed to gain public support in the foundation of their new rule.

The role Agrippa played in late Republican politics and the foundation of Imperial rule is complicated and often difficult to determine. The buildings attributed to him by the sources can also often be attributed to Caesar and Augustus, and it is impossible to ascertain who was thought of as the provider of the buildings by the Roman public.[238] Unlike politicians before him such as M. Aemilius Lepidus, Sulla and Pompey, Agrippa did not seek individual ruling power in Rome, nor did he construct large ostentatious victory monuments to commemorate his personal role in military conflicts. Instead, he seems to have been content as a supporter of the Julian family and benefited from removing himself from the power struggle of the second half of the 1st century BC. His support for Caesar and Augustus resulted in his position as overseer of the building programme in the central Campus Martius on behalf of Caesar and Augustus, a role that reflects the esteem in which he was held by the Julian family and his position in the evolving Imperial household.

---

[237] Favro, 1996, 88, 115.
[238] Fagan, 2005, 109.

An understanding of the role held by Agrippa within the Julian family and within late Republican politics allows for greater insight into the motivations behind the construction project on the central Campus Martius and who paid for and initiated the programme. In 33 BC Augustus appointed Agrippa to the post of *aedile* (Dio, 49.42-3).[239] Given that Agrippa had held the consulship in 37 BC his appointment as *aedile* could be seen as a demotion, though it was one that he willingly embraced in his support for Augustus and Augustus' plans for the Campus Martius. The *aedile* was responsible for the upkeep of the city, for the roads, aqueducts and the general *cura urbis.*[240] This position had been a particularly popular one during the early to mid Republic as it was used by ambitious young politicians as a way to gain public recognition and secure political advancement. However, by 33 BC the position had been vacant for a number of years as it became apparent to ambitious politicians that such activities were unlikely to secure political success under Augustus.[241] By placing Agrippa in the position of *aedile* and charging him with the upkeep of the city, Augustus was able to use the position to advertise the fact that he was concerned with the tradition of the Republic and the concerns of the common man.

As part of his role as *aedile,* Agrippa gave huge numbers of games and literally rained gifts on the inhabitants of Rome (Dio, 49.43.2-4). He gave gifts of oil, salt and money to the people of Rome and allowed them free access to the baths and to barbers.[242] Most importantly he repaired the roads, sewers and aqueducts. All of these actions won great support for Augustus and helped Agrippa solidify his position within the ruling house of Augustus. In 23 BC Agrippa became son in law to Augustus and was granted *imperium proconsulare* and in 21 BC was left in charge of the city when Augustus went to visit the western Empire (Dio, 54.6.4-5; Suetonius, *Aug.* 63). In 18 BC he was also given the power of *tribunicia potesta* (Dio, 54.12.4). The positions granted to Agrippa indicate that, in the event of the death of Augustus, Agrippa was seen as the most obvious person to succeed him as ruler of Rome. However, the powers granted to Agrippa did not render him an equal to Augustus, nor was Rome becoming a dual principate. Augustus' powers were permanent and did not require renewal, while the powers and positions granted to Agrippa required renewal every eight years.[243]

---

[239] Favro, 1996, 101; Taylor, 2000, 136.
[240] Favro, 1996, 101; Taylor, 2000, 79; Favro, 2005, 240.
[241] Beacham, 2005, 158.
[242] Favro, 1996, 101; Beacham, 1999, 103; Kyle, 2001, 206, n.69.
[243] Rehak, 2006, 96.

The positions that Agrippa held, and his relationship to Augustus, aid in the interpretation of the building programme of Agrippa on the Campus Martius. The sources often confirm that buildings such as the Aqua Virgo, Pantheon and Saepta Julia were constructed by Agrippa, with little reference to the source of the money used for their construction. It is not helpful at this point to espouse the view that the buildings on the Campus Martius were funded either by the private wealth of Agrippa and Augustus or the public monies of the state.[244] Instead, it must be understood, that at this point, Augustus wielded such power as leader of Rome that private and public wealth were one and the same. Agrippa was not working independently of Augustus when he initiated the construction programme on the Campus Martius, but with him, and as such the money used for the project likely came directly from Augustus, and it was state money used to better the city. As such the buildings constructed in the Campus Martius, including the Horti Agrippae, the Stagnum Agrippae, the Thermae Agrippae and the Aqua Virgo should not be interpreted as monuments of Agrippa's personal victory or as attempts by Agrippa to garner public support for himself. Rather, they should be interpreted as state monuments, constructed by the emperor, via his faithful colleague, to better the city and provide the inhabitants of Rome with facilities to improve their lives. As such they were tools used by Augusts to gain public support for his newly founded Imperial power. The only personal areas owned by, and perhaps funded by, Agrippa were likely his personal villa and the Horti Agrippae, though this is difficult to prove and only one reference remains to his private land (*CIL* VI 29781, *M. Agrippa(e) private(um) iter*).[245]

5.3.1. Aqua Virgo

Agrippa's first act to improve public amenities was the rejuvenation of the water supply of Rome, a project that was initiated in the late 40's BC, after the death of Caesar.[246] Agrippa constructed the first aqueduct to supply water directly to the Campus Martius, the Aqua Virgo, and also reconstructed the Aqua Julia and the Aqua Tepula (Horace, *Satire,* 2.2.185; Frontinus, *Aq.* 1.9, 98; Dio, 49.31).[247] Agrippa greatly increased the quantity and quality of water supplied to regions II, III, V, VI, VIII, X and XII, while

[244] Fagan, 1999, 109.
[245] La Rocca, 1984, 96; Taylor, 2000, 83.
[246] Evans, 1982, 411; Rabun, 2000, 136.
[247] Evans, 1982, 401; Evans, 1994, 106; Favro, 1996, 101; Favro, 2005, 240.

regions VII, IX and XIV were newly provided with water by the Aqua Virgo.[248] It is apparent from the size and scale of this project that Agrippa had embarked upon a systematic programme for the development of Rome's water supply.[249] Prior to the construction of the Aqua Virgo only a small amount of piped water ever reached the Campus Martius. The southernmost area of the Circus Flaminius received some water from the Aqua Appia (Frontinus, *Aq.* 79.2, 80.2, 81.2), but it was insufficient for the size and needs of the area.[250] The fact that the aqueduct was not listed amongst the buildings donated to Rome by Agrippa following his death suggests that he constructed the Aqua Virgo, from the outset, as a public amenity.[251] Agrippa's activities in relation to the provision of water to the city of Rome were recognised by Augustus who formed the *cura aquarum* in honour of Agrippa after his death.[252]

The Aqua Virgo was constructed by Agrippa and finished in 19 BC (Frontinus, *Aq.* 1.10; Pliny, *H.N.* 36.121).[253] While it was a fundamental element of Agrippa's development of the central Campus Martius, it was one of the last elements to be finished, though the importance of the Aqua Virgo is such that it needs to be addressed first. The origin of the name of the aqueduct was an issue which interested many late Republican and Imperial writers. Frontinus (*Aq.* 10) suggests that the name derived from a myth whereby a young girl showed some troops a local water source.[254] However, the simplest and most persuasive argument is that the aqueduct derived its name from the freshness and purity of the water which it carried (Pliny, *H.N.* 31.42; Martial, 6.42.18, 7.32.11, 11.47.6).[255] Another possible interpretation is that the aqueduct derived its name from its dedication to the Vestal Virgins.[256] While there is no literary tradition for this theory, it should be noted that the day of inauguration of the aqueduct was the 9th of June 19 BC, the same day as the festivities of the Vestal Virgins.[257] The sources make no comment on the significance of these dates and the fact that they coincided so it is more than likely that this was simply a coincidence and the Vestal Virgins had no formal association with the aqueduct. The water that flowed via the aqueduct rose in the Lucullan estate east of Rome in a marsh on

---

[248] Lloyd, 1979, 195; Evans, 1982, 408; Evans, 1994, 106; Favro, 2005, 240.
[249] Evans, 1994, 109; Taylor, 2000, 136.
[250] Evans, 1982, 408; Evans, 1994, 106-7.
[251] Taylor, 2000, 104-5.
[252] Lloyd, 1979, 193, n.3; Evans, 1982, 401; Favro, 1996, 134-5.
[253] *LTUR* I, 72 (Le Pera); Lloyd, 1979, 193; Fagan, 1999, 107.
[254] *LTUR* I, 72 (Le Pera). See also: Richardson, 1992, 19.
[255] *LTUR* I, 73 (Le Pera).
[256] *LTUR* I, 72 (Le Pera); Van Deman, 1934, 167.
[257] *LTUR* I, 72 (Le Pera).

the 8th mile of the road to Collatina (Frontinus, *Aq.* 10.5; Pliny, *H.N.* 31.3).[258] In order that the construction of the aqueduct did not interfere with the already urbanised areas of Rome, it bent sharply northwards towards the Anio River upon entering the city. This route may also have had the aim of providing this northerly area with water though the Campus Martius was its primary intended area (Fig. 159).[259] Problems with the purchase of land to route the aqueduct through may also have affected the route of the aqueduct.[260] The aqueduct then turned south along the Viale Romania and through the areas of the later Villa Borghese and Villa Medici before rising out of the ground at the foot of the Pincian hill (Fig. 159).[261] According to Frontinus (*Aq.* 1.10, 1.22) it then travelled 700 paces on arches before ending in front of the Saepta Julia.[262]

The arches on which the Aqua Virgo travelled have been excavated and recorded on a number of occasions on the Campus Martius and east of the Via Flaminia (Via del Corso), and have all been dated to the Imperial period (Fig. 160).[263] Given the work involved in planning and constructing an aqueduct it is possible that these Imperial remains preserve the original, late Republican, route of the Aqua Virgo. A number of arches were discovered in the cortile of 14 Via del Nazareno (Fig. 161).[264] These remains consist of travertine arches and date from the Claudian reconstruction of the aqueduct.[265] The aqueduct continued from this point in a south-westerly direction, via what is now the Trevi fountain, before crossing Via Flaminia at Palazzo Sciarra where Claudius erected an arch to commemorate his victory in Britain in AD 32 (Fig. 160).[266] It was here that a number of arches were excavated in 1878.[267] Further remains of the arches on which the aqueduct was carried were discovered on Via Caravita and Via del Seminario in 1871 (Fig. 160).[268] Some puzzling remains of a water distribution system were discovered in the 17th century in front of the church of S. Ignazio (Fig. 162).[269] At first these remains were thought to have been at odds with Frontinus' description (*Aq.* 1.10, 1.22) of the Aqua Virgo, which stated that the aqueduct terminated in front of the Saepta Julia, as the

---

[258] *LTUR* I, 72 (Le Pera); Lloyd, 1979, 193; Evans, 1982, 408; Evans, 1994, 105.
[259] *LTUR* I, 73 (Le Pera); Evans, 1982, 408; Evans, 1994, 105; Aicher, 1995, 69.
[260] Taylor, 2000, 105.
[261] *LTUR* I, 73 (Le Pera); Evans, 1982, 408; Aicher, 1995, 71.
[262] *LTUR* I, 73 (Le Pera); Lloyd, 1979, 193; Aicher, 1995, 71.
[263] *LTUR* I, 72-3 (Le Pera); Lloyd, 1979, 194; Aicher, 1995, 71; Claridge, 1998 198-9.
[264] *LTUR* I, 73 (Le Pera); Aicher, 1995, 71; Claridge, 1998, 98.
[265] *LTUR* I, 73 (Le Pera); Lloyd, 1979, 194; Aicher, 1995, 71.
[266] Evans, 1994, 109; Aicher, 1995, 71-3.
[267] *LTUR* I, 73 (Le Pera); Van Denman, 1934, 175; Lloyd, 1979, 194; Evans, 1994, 105.
[268] *LTUR* I, 73 (Le Pera); Lloyd, 1979, 194.
[269] Van Deman, 1934, 177-8; Lloyd, 1979, 195; Evans, 1994, 109; Aicher, 1995, 73.

remains indicated that the aqueduct continued beyond the front of the Saepta Julia and continued on a route across the Campus Martius from east to west. The 17th century discoveries included a long section of lead piping from the Claudian or Hadrianic period and another very large pipe whose end was never found. Given the nature of these remnants it seems likely that the pipes belonged to a *castellum.*[270] From this point the Aqua Virgo continued to cross the Campus Martius on arches which terminated in front of the Saepta Julia before continuing westward to feed the baths and the Stagnum of Agrippa and the Euripus. It appears then that Frontinus notes only the location at which the arches ceased to be used for the conveyance of the aqueduct, while the water continued to be carried westwards via pipes or other less conspicuous means beneath ground level.[271]

The Aqua Virgo continued to travel west and traversed the Tiber via the Pons Agrippa in order to supply water to the Transtiber area in Regio XIV (Fig. 163).[272] The reason for the construction of this bridge may primarily have been to provide water to the opposite side of the Tiber and perhaps to allow easy movement for Agrippa and his family as they moved between their private land on the Campus Martius and their residence in the Transtiber region.[273] On its way to the Tiber the Aqua Virgo circumvented the *cavea* of the theatre of Pompey (Fig. 164). The name of one road in this area, Vicolo delle Grotte, may recall the position of a final *castellum* prior to the aqueduct crossing the river Tiber.[274] The word *grotta* translates literally as an underground chamber and may be taken to mean a crypt associated with the theatre of Pompey's substructure. However, Taylor has convincingly argued that medieval and later sources use the word *grotta* to describe a water cistern or tank, as is the case for the Colle Grotta dell'Acqua along the Aqua Marcia.[275] In the plural it can refer to a *castellum* with many tanks, as is the case for the Grotte Sconce near Tivoli.[276] While there is no archaeological evidence yet uncovered for a *castellum* of the Aqua Virgo close to the theatre of Pompey, the argument is persuasive, especially considering the route that the aqueduct must have traversed on its way from the Stagnum Agrippae to the Pons Agrippa.

---

[270] *LTUR* I, 73 (Le Pera); Lloyd, 1979, 195; Taylor, 2000, 159.
[271] Lloyd, 1979, 195; Aicher, 1995, 73.
[272] Shipley, 1933, 66; Evans, 1994, 106; Aicher, 1995, 73.
[273] *LTUR* IV, 108 (Coarelli); Lloyd, 1979, 201; Evans, 1982, 409; Evans, 1994, 107; Coarelli, 2007, 265.
[274] Taylor, 2000, 159.
[275] Taylor, 2000, 159.
[276] Taylor, 2000, 159.

Frontinus provides a great deal of information about the way in which the water delivered to the Campus Martius was divided and used, indicating that the Aqua Virgo had a specialised distribution system more advanced than those of previous aqueducts (Frontinus, *Aq.* 1.10; 70.1-3).[277] The statistics provided by Frontinus add substance to what is known about the nature of the Campus Martius in the late Republic and early Empire (Frontinus, *Aq.* 70.4, 84.2). Of the 2,304 *quinariae* that were delivered into the area only 338 *quinariae* (or 14.7%) were distributed to private houses, an indication of how few residences there were in the area (Frontinus, *Aq.* 70.4, 84.2).[278] It is likely that a large proportion of these private houses were actually located in the densely populated area on the west bank of the Tiber as the area was by its very nature far more residential than the Campus Martius.[279] One very important statistic provided by Frontinus (70.4, 84.2) is that 1,457 *quinairae,* or 63.2% of the total water provided to the area, was used for *usibus publicis,* or public uses, which must include the baths of Agrippa, the Saepta Julia and, given the date of the sources, the Porticus Vipsania.[280] It should also be noted that of the 63.2% of water provided for public uses 19.9% is noted as being used by the Euripus alone.[281] These statistics emphasise the fact that the Aqua Virgo, while created in order to provide water to areas that had previously been under-supplied, functioned primarily to provide water to the Augustan and Agrippan projects of the baths, Stagnum and Euripus. As such the water provided by the Aqua Virgo was not a commodity for daily life, but rather it was provided as an amenity for leisure and pleasure. The organisation required to plan and enact the building projects and water supply emphasises the fact that the area of the central Campus Martius was designed as a cohesive complex for use primarily by the inhabitants of the city.

5.3.2. Pons Agrippae

The Pons Agrippa was constructed by Agrippa 160m upstream of the modern Ponte Sisto (Fig. 165).[282] The location of the bridge is known from the remains of four piers

---

[277] Evans, 1994, 108; Taylor, 2000, 43-51.
[278] Evans, 1982, 409; Evans, 1994, 107-9; Taylor, 2000, 43-7.
[279] *LTUR* V, 79-80 (Maischberger); Evans, 1982, 409.
[280] Evans, 1982, 409; Evans, 1994, 108-9; Taylor, 2000, 45-6.
[281] Evans, 1982, 409; Evans, 1994, 109; Aicher, 1995, 74.
[282] *LTUR* IV, 107 (Coarelli); Frothingham, 1887, 479; Platner & Ashby, 1926, 398; Lloyd,1979, 200; Aicher, 1995, 73.

discovered at the bottom of the river in 1887.[283] It is referred to in a number of literary sources and inscriptions; however due to the late date of these sources it is not always referred to by its original name (*CIL* VI 31545; *CIL* VI 31402-4). The inscriptions show that while the bridge was still known as the Pons Agrippae in the early Imperial period it was subsequently known as the Pons Antonini due to the restoration dedication placed on the bridge following a restoration in AD 147 by Antoninus Pius (*Fasti Ostiensis*).[284] Subsequently the bridge was also referred to as the Pons Valentiniani following another major reconstruction around AD 366-7.[285] Some confusion regarding the initial identification of this bridge comes from its proximity to the piers to the Pons Aurelius, located on the site of the modern Ponte Sisto.[286] At first it seems unlikely that two bridges would have been constructed so close to each other and as a consequence the piers were initially identified as belonging to the Pons Aurelius.[287] This is now widely accepted as incorrect as it is almost certain that the Pons Agrippa and the Pons Aurelius were two separate bridges.[288] A very persuasive argument for the reason why the bridges were located so close to each other and why none of the superstructure of the Pons Agrippa survives is that the Pons Agrippa was used as a parallel workstation for the construction of the Pons Aurelius.[289]

The identification of these piers as those of the Pons Agrippae is confirmed by the discovery of a Claudian *cippus* (*CIL* VI 31545) at S. Biagno della Pagnotta. This *cippus* and the inscription upon it is very important for the location of the Trigarium (see section: 2.3.2), and it can also be used to corroborate the position for the Pons Agrippae.[290] The inscription reads '*a trigario ad pontem Agrippae*'.[291] This indicates only a very rough location for the bridge in relation to the Trigarium but does at least suggest that a location upstream of the modern Ponte Sisto is possible. Another inscription that was found further downstream, close to the Ponti Garibaldi, reads '*M.Agrippa(e)/Privat(um)/iter*' (*CIL* VI 29781)(Fig. 166).[292] The private land which is referred to in this inscription must be that of the Horti Agrippae and consequently the bridge may have marked the south-

[283] *LTUR* IV, 107 (Coarelli); Frothingham, 1887, 478-9; Platner & Ashby, 1926, 398; Lloyd, 1979, 200.
[284] Taylor, 2000, 146.
[285] *LTUR* IV, 107 (Coarelli); Taylor, 2000, 220.
[286] *LTUR* IV, 107 (Coarelli); Taylor, 2000, 146.
[287] Lloyd, 1979, 200-1; Taylor, 2000, 146-7.
[288] Lloyd, 1979, 201; Taylor, 2000, 147.
[289] Frothingham, 1887, 479; Lloyd, 1979, 201.
[290] Frothingham, 1887, 478-9; Shipley, 1933, 66.
[291] Shipley, 1933, 66; Taylor, 2000, 147 n.51.
[292] *LTUR* III, 52 (Coarelli); *LTUR* IV, 108 (Coarelli); La Rocca, 1994, 96; Taylor, 2000, 83, 147.

west limit of Agrippa's private land.[293] It is also likely that Agrippa owned land on the opposite site of the Tiber in the area known as the Villa della Farnesina where he had a private villa constructed in this period.[294] In this case the bridge would have been used as a link between his two areas of private land on the eastern and western sides of the Tiber. As the bridge facilitated movement between two areas of private land it is very likely that Agrippa funded this bridge with his own money and not with public money provided by Augustus.[295] The construction of the bridge did not cause the layout of the streets on the Transtiber side to be altered. This is a further indication that the bridge was a private construction and not linked to any urban development on the Transtiber side, though it was likely liable to laws regarding public access (Ulpian, 43.8.2.21) and as a result was almost certainly accessible to the public.[296] The bridge therefore served Agrippa's private needs while at the same time offering him the opportunity to supply water to the residents of Regio XIV. As such it should be interpreted as both a private convenience and a civic amenity.

5.3.3. Thermae Agrippae

The baths of Agrippa were not just important for the development of the central Campus Martius, but for the whole of Rome as they were the first large-scale public baths of Rome.[297] These baths seem to have been at least part funded and privately owned by Agrippa who willed the baths to the people of Rome in perpetuity with an instruction to Augustus to take care of their maintenance after his death (Livy, 29.4; Dio, 54.29.4).[298] The literary sources record that there was a charge imposed for use of the baths, a fact that suggests that the baths were run as a commercial concern. The charge was abolished upon the death of Agrippa indicating that the baths were more than likely funded by Augustus and Agrippa.[299] The baths were fed by the Aqua Virgo, a public water source, and Agrippa may have used his position as constructor of the aqueduct to justify its use

[293] Lloyd, 1979, 199; Taylor, 2000, 147.
[294] *LTUR* IV, 107 (Coarelli); La Rocca, 1984, 96; Taylor, 2000, 148-9; Clarke, 2005, 271.
[295] Taylor, 2000, 83, 148.
[296] Robinson, 1994, 31; Taylor, 2000, 82-3.
[297] Yegül, 1992, 133; Fagan, 1999, 107.
[298] Yegül, 1992, 133; Aicher, 1995, 73; Favro, 1996, 115.
[299] Fagan, 1999, 108, n.12.

within the bath complex.[300] The construction of the baths began in 25 BC, prior to the construction of the Aqua Virgo, and was not completed until 12 BC (Dio, 54.29.4).[301] The baths were called a *laconicum* by Dio (53.27.1) who stated that they were dedicated in 25 BC. The word *laconicum* indicates that they were a hot-air baths (Vitruvius, *De Arch.* 5.10.5).[302] It is likely therefore that the baths operated for some period of time without water until the completion of the Aqua Virgo when they operated with running water and were described by Pliny the Elder as *thermae* (Pliny, *H.N.* 35.26).[303] Hot air baths, be they wet steam or dry steam, were traditionally associated in Greece and in Campania with gymnasiums, and as a consequence it is possible that prior to the completion of the Aqua Virgo the *laconicum* of Agrippa also acted as a gymnasium.[304]

There are a number of literary sources which describe the baths as they stood in the early Imperial period.[305] Pliny the Elder (*H.N* 34.62; 35.26; 36.189) described the decoration of the baths and wrote that the *caldarium* was covered in fine marbles and paintings with frescoes drawn on tiles (Pliny, *H.N.* 36.189).[306] One room in particular contained two paintings, one representing Aphrodite, the other Ajax. These, Pliny the Elder reports, Agrippa bought at vast personal expense in Cyzicus (Pliny, *H.N.* 36.26). Pliny the Elder also described the Apoxyomenos of Lysippus which he states was erected at the entrance of the baths (Pliny, *H.N.* 34.62).[307] This was not the only building or area in which Agrippa placed works by great Greek artists. The Horti and Stagnum of Agrippa also had such fine works on display (5.3.4; 5.3.6).

The baths were destroyed in the great fire of AD 80 which decimated the Campus Martius (Dio, 66.24), and were rebuilt almost immediately by either Titus or Domitian (Martial, 3.20.15; 36.6).[308] The baths saw subsequent reconstructions and alterations under Hadrian *(Historia Augusta* (*Hadrian*, 19); *CIL* VI 9797), the Severans and finally by Constantine and Constantine II in AD 344-5 [309] An inscription (*CIL* VI 1165) marking this fourth century restoration was found at the church of S. Maria in Monterone, just west of the

---

[300] Taylor, 2000, 104.
[301] Favro, 1996, 115; Fagan, 1999, 107.
[302] Nielsen, 1990, 44; Yegül, 1992, 133, 383.
[303] Yegül, 1992, 135.
[304] *LTUR* V, 40 (Ghini); Platner & Ashby, 1926, 518; Shipley, 1933, 48; Yegül, 1992, 133-5, 384.
[305] *LTUR* V, 41 (Ghini); Platner & Ashby, 1926, 518-9; Favro, 1996, 115.
[306] Nielsen, 1990, 42; Favro, 1996, 115.
[307] Shipley, 1933, 48; Nielsen, 1990, 42; Yegül, 1992, 137; Farrar, 1998, 180; Fagan, 1999, 110.
[308] Shipley, 1933, 49; Yegül, 1992, 135.
[309] Shipley, 1933, 49-50; Yegül, 1992, 135.

baths.[310] The baths continued to be mentioned in later literary sources and were noted as still being in operation as late as the fifth century AD (Apollinarius, *Carm.* 23.496).[311] After this date the baths became a quarry for building materials and by the 17th century the site had become a limery.[312] This last function is preserved in the name for the immediate vicinity, which has been known as the Calcararium since the medieval period.[313]

Little is known about the layout of the baths in their original format in the late Republic/early Imperial period. Fragment 38 of slab III-10 of the FUR preserves the form the baths took in the Severan period and likely represents the baths following their reconstruction under Hadrian (Fig. 169).[314] It is possible that this plan reflected some of the elements of the Agrippan baths, as irregularities in the plan are present that must have originated in the Agrippan version and are unlikely to have dated to Hadrian.[315] The rooms were arranged irregularly, but symmetrically, around a circular hall. The Severan reconstruction of the rotunda in brick faced concrete can now be seen, cut in half, on Via dell'Arco della Ciambella (Fig. 168).[316] In the Agrippan plan of the baths this rotunda may have been placed in the centre of the building, on an east-west axis.[317] This central rotunda is particularly noteworthy yet rather difficult to interpret. It was very large, with a diameter of 25m.[318] It had six doors opening off of it and the size and quantity of doors suggests that it was not a *laconicum* or frigidarium, but may instead have been a general reception/assembly area.[319] The three rooms to the west contained pipes and evidence of a hypocaust have been found, indicating that these rooms were heated.

The interpretation of this plan is complicated and it is with great difficulty that many scholars have attempted to associate the rooms depicted on the Marble Plan with the various functions facilitated by a bath building.[320] It is particularly useful to trace the modern locations in which parts of the Hadrianic bath building have been found, as by

---

[310] *LTUR* V, 41 (Ghini); Platner & Ashby, 1926, 519.
[311] Yegül, 1992, 135.
[312] *LTUR* V, 41 (Ghini); Yegül, 1992, 135.
[313] Platner & Ashby, 1926, 518; Shipley, 1933, 50; Yegül, 1992, 135.
[314] Yegül, 1992, 133.
[315] Yegül, 1992, 135.
[316] *LTUR* V, 41 (Ghini); Platner & Ashby, 1926, 519; Yegül, 1992, 136; Aicher, 1995, 73; Coarelli, 2007, 286.
[317] Yegül, 1992, 135.
[318] ; *LTUR* V, 41 (Ghini); Platner & Ashby, 1926, 519; Yegül, 1992, 136. See also: Coarelli, 2007, 286.
[319] Yegül, 1992, 136; Contra Nielson, 1990, 44 who interprets it as a *frigidarium*.
[320] For examples of such attempts see *LTUR* V, 41 (Ghini); Yegül, 1992, 135-6.

doing so it is possible to allocate a rough position for the baths and estimate their approximate size as they stood at the end of the Republic and the beginning of the Empire. Given the locations in which parts of the Imperial baths have been found it seems reasonable to locate Agrippa's bath building between the following limits: Piazza S. Chiara to the north, Via dei Cestari to the east, Via di Torre Argentina to the west and Largo Argentina to the south (Fig. 167; Fig. 125, no.8).[321] The baths, at least in this form, measured 100-120m long, north to south, and 80-100m wide, east to west.[322] These limits may constitute a larger baths complex than was originally constructed by Agrippa, but even in its initial phase the baths of Agrippa would have been placed in this general area, between the Saepta Julia to the east, the Stagnum Agrippa to the west and the victory temples of the *area sacra* to the south. The construction of the Pantheon would have created a northern boundary for the area. The only evidence for the Agrippan phase of the baths is a note from an excavation carried out in 1884 stating that reticulate walls and a tufa block were found under Piazza Strozzi.[323]

5.3.4 Stagnum Agrippae

To the west of the baths of Agrippa were the artificial pool and gardens of Agrippa, known as the Stagnum and Horti Agrippae (Ovid, *Pont.* 1.8.37-7; Strabo, 13.1.19) (Fig. 125 no.7 and 8 and Fig. 171).[324] The artificial pool is mentioned by Ovid (*Pont.* 1.8.38), Strabo (13.1.19) and by Tacitus, (*Ann.* 15.37), the latter recording that during the reign of Nero a magnificent boating party was held here.[325] This passage suggests that the site remained important into the Imperial period (Tacitus, *Ann.* 15.37). An inscription (*CIL* VI 39087) also records the existence of a pool or piscine, likely referring to the Stagnum.

The Stagnum was located on the lowest area on the Campus Martius, close to the Caprae Palus (Appendix: 2.3.3).[326] This natural depression aided in the accumulation of water from the Aqua Virgo and also from a small river that flowed from the Sallustian valley on

---

[321] *LTUR* V, 41-2 (Ghini); Aicher, 1995, 73.
[322] *LTUR* V, 40 (Ghini); Platner & Ashby, 1926, 519; Yegül, 1992, 133; Coarelli, 2007, 285.
[323] *LTUR* V, 42 (Ghini).
[324] *LTUR* IV, 344 (Buzzetti); Platner & Ashby, 1926, 496; Shipley, 1933, 49; Coarelli, 2007, 286; Contra Lloyd, 1979, 195; Yegül, 1992, 136; Aicher, 1995, 74.
[325] Shipley, 1933, 54; Yegül, 1992, 137; Aicher, 1995, 74; Farrar, 1998, 180.
[326] Johnson, 1963, 28; Palmer, 1974, 8; Rehak, 2006, 10.

its way to the Tiber and which entered the river around the area of Tiber Island.[327] The limits of the Republican Stagnum can be determined from the archaeological record and from a study of the other buildings located in the area. Consequently the Stagnum was located north of Corso Vittorio Emanuele, south of Via dei Sediari, and west of the baths of Agrippa and Via dei Nari/Monterone (Fig. 170).[328] The western limit of the Stagnum is uncertain but may have been in the area of Corso del Rinascimento. A monumental entrance for the Stagnum was discovered in 1984 around the northern limit close to the later baths of Nero (Fig. 172).[329] This entrance was excavated 2.5m below Piazza di S. Eustacio and dates to the Augustan era (Fig. 173).[330]All of these pieces of information help to locate the Agrippan Stagnum.

It is significant that there is no reference at all within the literary sources to the Stagnum Agrippae after AD 68 (Nero's death).[331] This probably means that the area had become disused or was no longer deemed necessary, hence opening the area up to further urban development, a theory that is corroborated by archaeological evidence. Stretches of pavement have been found in the area of the Stagnum with substantial amounts of granite and travertine discovered, suggesting that the Stagnum had been paved over and turned into a piazza.[332] This may have been connected with the construction of the temple and porticus of Bonus Eventus whose date of construction is difficult to determine but which was constructed in the early Imperial period (Fig. 171).[333]

Given the close proximity of the Stagnum to the Baths of Agrippa, it is likely that the Stagnum was fed directly by the Aqua Virgo and acted as an open air plunge pool for the baths. This theory is not universally accepted. For example Lloyd proposes that the Stagnum was fed by the dirty waste water from the baths.[334] Comparison with other Roman baths, the extant archaeological information for this area of the Campus Martius, and the inscriptions found to date render this theory unlikely.[335] Firstly, it was unheard of for the used water of a bath building to accumulate in an open air Stagnum of this type. Commonly, the used and dirty water from the baths ran into underground pipes and was

---

[327] *LTUR* IV, 344 (Buzzetti); Yegül, 1992, 136.
[328] Platner & Ashby, 1926, 496; Shipley, 1933, 54; Coarelli, 2007, 286.
[329] *LTUR* IV, 344 (Buzzetti).
[330] *LTUR* IV, 344 (Buzzetti).
[331] *LTUR* IV, 344 (Buzzetti).
[332] *LTUR* IV, 344 (Buzzetti).
[333] *LTUR* I, 202 (Buzzetti); *LTUR* IV, 344 (Buzzetti). See also: Platner & Ashby, 1926, 86.
[334] Lloyd, 1979, 196; Evans, 1994, 106.
[335] Lloyd, 1979, 197.

dispersed elsewhere, on this occasion most probably into the Tiber.[336] Secondly, Tacitus records an Imperial boating party that was held on the Stagnum by the Emperor Nero (Tacitus, *Ann.*15.37). It is unthinkable that an emperor would have chosen to hold a boating party on a lake full of dirty water from the baths of Agrippa. Thirdly, Lloyd provides no explanation as to how the Stagnum would have been drained as it continued to fill with used bathwater. The idea that the Stagnum was an open air pond full of dirty water within Agrippa's magnificent complex of leisure facilities can be dismissed. It seems much more probable that the Stagnum of Agrippa was fed directly by the Aqua Virgo and acted as an open air plunge pool for the baths or was simply a decorative water feature of the central Campus Martius.[337]

5.3.5. Euripus

As the Stagnum Agrippae was supplied directly by the Aqua Virgo, it also required a drainage system. This drainage was supplied, in my opinion, by a man-made open channel called the Euripus which branched off from the Stagnum in a north-westerly direction towards the Tiber (Fig. 174).[338] There are relatively few references to the Euripus in the ancient sources, though Strabo (13.1.9) and Ovid (*Pont.* 1.8.38) do make note of it, at least during the Augustan period.[339] Seneca (*Ep.* 85.3) meanwhile recalls how people used to dive into the Euripus to celebrate the first day of the New Year, substantiating the theory that the water was clean and that it was not dirty water from the baths. This also indicates that the Euripus was an open channel and that it was not beneath ground level.[340] Frontinus (*Aq.* 84) notes that the full title of the Euripus was '*Euripus Virginis*', again emphasising the fact that it was supplied with clean water from Agrippa's aqueduct.

Frontinus records that 19.9% of the Aqua Virgo's water supply was fed into the Euripus in the Imperial period. It should be noted though that Frontinus' study of the Roman water supply was carried out under the reign of Nerva (AD 97), by which time the

---

[336] Dodge, 2000, 191-3
[337] *LTUR* II, 237 (Coarelli); *LTUR* IV, 344 (Buzzetti).
[338] Contra Aicher, 1995, 74 who believes the Euripus was unconnected to the Stagnum.
[339] *LTUR* II, 237 (Coarelli).
[340] Shipley, 1933, 54; Evans, 1982, 408; Yegül, 1992, 137; Evans, 1994, 106; Aicher, 1995, 74 who calls it a plunge pool.

Stagnum of Agrippa had been filled in and paved over. It seems plausible then that at the time of its initial construction the Euripus acted as a drainage channel for the water of the Stagnum of Agrippa and was supplied with water from the Aqua Virgo indirectly via the Stagnum. Then, upon the construction of the temple and porticus of Bonus Eventus in the 1st century AD, the water from the Aqua Virgo that had supplied the Stagnum Agrippae was diverted directly into the Euripus. As a result of the alteration the Euripus became an ornamental water channel of the Campus Martius.

There is epigraphic evidence for the location of the Euripus and its association with the Stagnum Agrippa. *CIL* VI 39087, while heavily defaced, can be seen to read:

> '*[public]um Augusti Caes(aris)--- a piscine usqu]e ad Tiberim p(edes) m(ille) [--- /secundum Tibe]rim ad Euripu[m p(edes) --- /secundum Eurip]m ad piscinam [p(edes)---]*'[341]

> *'a thousand (?) feet to the Tiber, [...] feet along the Tiber to the Euripus, [...] feet along the Euripus to the piscina'.*[342]

On this occasion the Stagnum is referred to as a *piscine* again emphasising how the water was deemed clean enough to swim in. While ascertaining a link between the Euripus, the Stagnum and the Tiber, this *cippi* can also be interpreted as a boundary marker of Agrippa's private land, perhaps erected after Agrippa's death when Augustus took over management of the area.[343]

As the location of the Stagnum is known with relative certainty an initial point of the route of the Euripus can be established. Archaeological investigations and random excavations of the Campus Martius since the 19th century have, on occasion, unearthed sections of the Euripus. These sections have aided in the plotting of a route for the channel which ran through the western Campus Martius in a south-east to north-west direction.[344] The information suggests that the Euripus took a similar route to the modern Corso Vittorio Emanuele, before finally emptying into the Tiber between the modern Ponte S. Angelo (the ancient Pons Aelius) and the modern Ponte Vittorio Emanuele (Fig.

---

[341] *LTUR* II, 238 (Coarelli); Taylor, 2000, 147.
[342] Translation from Taylor, 2000, 147.
[343] *LTUR* II, 238 (Coarelli); Taylor, 2000, 147.
[344] *LTUR* II, 238 (Coarelli); Coarelli, 2007, 286.

174; Fig. 175; Fig. 176).[345] This route is not universally accepted and attempts have been made to place the route of the Euripus close to that of the Aqua Virgo as it traversed the Campus Martius towards Transtiberim.[346] However, based on the interpretation of the excavated areas this seems unlikely as the seven sites found to date accurately reflect the information provided by the literary sources and locate the Euripus between the Stagnum and Pons Aelius.

In total, seven significant stretches of the Euripus have been unearthed at various locations since 1863 (Fig. 175).[347] The first stretch of the Euripus which was identified was found beneath Piazza S. Andrea della Valle in 1863 and was the first of four such finds in the late nineteenth century.[348] In 1886 a small stretch was found in the middle of Vicolo del Pavone, while the following year another stretch, this time 30m in length, was found beneath Via dei Cesarini, near S. Maria in Vallicella.[349] In 1898 a section of the Euripus was also discovered beneath the Farnesina ai Baullari.[350] In 1923, a large 50m tract was found between Corso Vittorio Emanuele and Via del Pellegrino (though closer to the latter) during the excavation of foundations for the new central telecoms building.[351] Seven years later, in 1930, the section of the Euripus closest to the Tiber was discovered, indicating the location at which the Euripus entered the river. On this occasion the tract was discovered beneath Piazza Pasquali Paoli during testing for the construction of the Ponte Vittorio Emanuele. The final stretch to be excavated in recent years was discovered in 1938-9 and is arguably the most important stretch yet recorded. On this occasion a long stretch of the Euripus was discovered beneath Palazzo della Cancelleria. While all of these stretches of the Euripus aid in the formation of the route of the channel, it is this last tract which reveals the most about the architectural format of the Euripus.

In general these sections of the Euripus have revealed that the channel was open and was 3.35m wide by 1.73m deep in the centre, providing an adequate depth of water for the diving described by Seneca (*Ep.* 85.3) [352] The stretches that have been excavated all date

---

[345] *LTUR* II, 238 (Coarelli); Platner & Ashby, 1926, 396; Shipley, 1933, 54, n.99; Coarelli, 2007, 286.
[346] Lloyd, 1979, 197.
[347] *LTUR* II, 238-9 (Coarelli)
[348] *LTUR* II, 238 (Coarelli); *BullCom,* 1886, 346.
[349] *LTUR* II, 238 (Coarelli); *BullCom,* 1886, 282.
[350] Le Pera Buranelli, 2004, 193.
[351] *LTUR* II, 238-9 (Coarelli).
[352] For argument regarding the shallowness of the proposed channel of the Euripus see Lloyd, 1979, 198.

from the Augustan period, with travertine and marble the primary construction materials. The walls of the channel are constructed from *opus quadratum* and *opus reticulatum* which were executed very accurately and finely.[353] The inside of the channel itself had been plastered and would have allowed for a rapid flow of water from the Stagnum to the Tiber. The section excavated at Palazzo della Cancelleria is particularly important as it preserves the surrounding area of the channel (Fig. 177 and Fig. 178).[354] Here a cross section of the Euripus shows that two parallel walls ran along the north side of the channel. The first lay 3.2m from the edge of the channel and was constructed in concrete and faced with *opus reticulatum*. The second wall lay 6m from the edge of the channel (2.7m beyond the first wall) and was constructed from *opus quadratum* with a top slab of travertine. This second wall also contained threaded holes that were likely used to hold a railing.[355] Both walls were originally covered with slabs of travertine. The function of these walls is rarely discussed in detail in modern treatises. It is possible that these walls acted as a type of flood prevention measure to stop the floodwater from the Tiber crossing into the southern Campus Martius.[356] Another interpretation of these walls is that they acted as a border for the Euripus to prevent people from falling into the moving water. However, as these railings are present only on the northern side this seems unlikely. As by the time of Augustus the Euripus may have represented the limit of Agrippa's donated land after his death, the railings may best be interpreted as a visible border for the parkland which had originally been Agrippa's private land on the Campus Martius. The open areas of Agrippa's land which were enclosed by the Euripus, Tiber and baths were known as the Horti Agrippa.

5.3.6 Horti Agrippae

The Horti of Agrippa are mentioned in a number of literary sources, including Tacitus' description of Nero's boating party on the Stagnum Agrippae (Tacitus, *Ann.* 15.37; Strabo, 13.1.19). On this occasion particular note is made of the *nemus* which was located in the vicinity. This reference suggests that the gardens, including a wooded area, were

[353] *LTUR* II, 238 (Coarelli).
[354] *LTUR* II, 239 (Coarelli).
[355] *LTUR* II, 240 (Coarelli).
[356] Lloyd, 1979, 198.

placed close to the Stagnum Agrippae.[357] Given the locations of the monuments already described, it seems most likely that this open parkland extended as far south as the limits of the baths and Stagnum and as far west as the Tiber (Fig. 180). While the exact limits of the Horti, as they stood in the late Republic, are uncertain, the area is mentioned in a number of ancient sources, frequently in relation to Agrippa's private residence. According to the reconstruction of an inscription (*CIL* VI 39087) the estate of Agrippa lay on the Campus Martius between the Tiber, Euripus and Stagnum (here called a *piscina*).[358] This description suggests that the eastern and western boundaries of Agrippa's land were the Stagnum and Tiber respectively. Further evidence that Agrippa owned this land comes from the aforementioned *cippus CIL* VI 29781, which was found near the Ponte Garibaldi and reads '*M.Agrippa(e)/Privat(um)/iter*' (*CIL* VI 29781).[359] Evidence for the connection between the Euripus and Agrippa's parkland in the central Campus Martius comes from Strabo (13.1.9) albeit in a rather convoluted manner. Strabo notes that Agrippa placed a bronze statue of a lion of Lysippus from Lampsacus in the *nemus* '*between the Stagnum and the Euripus*'.[360] This *nemus* was most probably a wooded part of Agrippa's private land.

With the provision of these gardens, a bath house, a fresh water pool and an associated channel, Agrippa had created a leisure park of unsurpassed opulence and importance. Such a park, with its associated buildings, would have been a powerful tool of self promotion both for Agrippa and his associate Augustus. The donation of these areas to the people of Rome upon Agrippa's death signifies an act of benevolence on a scale equalled only by Caesar and later Roman emperors. As such these lands and buildings should not be viewed in the same way as the porticoes of Phase Three and the theatre complex of Pompey the Great, all of which were constructed to garner public support for the provider. Rather, Agrippa, and his buildings, represented a new type of Roman statesman, one who used his popularity and public standing to garner support not for himself, but for another Roman politician, on this occasion, Augustus. Other buildings whose construction Agrippa oversaw on the Campus Martius include the Pantheon, Diribitorium, Saepta Julia and Basilica of Neptune. These buildings were most probably constructed by Agrippa on behalf of Caesar and Augusts and reflect more accurately the role of *aedile* which was held by Agrippa from 33 BC. These buildings and facilities also represent a planned,

[357] Farrar, 1998, 180.
[358] *LTUR* II, 238 (Coarelli); Taylor, 2000, 147.
[359] *LTUR* II, 238 (Coarelli); *LTUR* III, 52 (Coarelli); *LTUR* IV, 108 (Coarelli).
[360] Shipley, 1933, 49.

cohesive, monumentalisation of the area that facilitated politics, religion, art and leisure on the Campus Martius.

5.3.7. Pantheon

The Pantheon, as it stands today, is located between Piazza della Rotunda to the north, Via della Rotunda to the west, Via della Palombella to the south and Via della Minerva to the east (Fig. 181). This version of the Pantheon is significantly different to the Pantheon constructed in the late first century BC by Agrippa and more accurately reflects in plan and construction Hadrian's Pantheon of the 2nd century AD. As it stands today, and in its original format, the Pantheon's northern limit stood in line with the other buildings whose construction Agrippa oversaw in the area, namely the Saepta Julia (Appendix: 5.3.9) and the Baths of Agrippa (Appendix: 5.3.3), as well as the earlier temple of Isis and Serapis (Appendix: 5.1.5) (Fig. 125). As such the Pantheon was set out in a near rectilinear manner in relation to the other buildings of the area, a technique favoured by the Romans and employed for the construction of army barracks and planned towns.[361]

The construction of the original late Republican Pantheon is remembered in the architrave frieze of the Hadrianic Pantheon. The frieze reads M.AGRIPPA L.F.COS.TERTIVM FECIT (*CIL* VI 896.1) (Fig. 182). Hence, Hadrian chose to commemorate the original construction on this spot. According to the inscription the Pantheon was completed in 27 BC, which was the third year of Agrippa's consulate.[362] However, this date is disputed by Dio (53.27.1-2) who records that the temple was constructed, along with a number of other buildings constructed in the area by Agrippa, in 25 BC. The later date is the one that is more generally accepted as it coincides with the building projects for the rest of the area.[363] While the Pantheon may remain as one of the most iconic and visually stunning remnants of Roman civilisation within the modern urban setting of Rome, the Pantheon, as it stood in the first century BC, was a great deal different to the current edifice, both in scale and in architectural format. There are few literary references to the Pantheon in the first centuries BC and AD, and none of them relate any information regarding the plan of

[361] McDonald, 2002, 27.
[362] Favro, 2005, 242.
[363] *LTUR* IV, 54 (Ziolkowski); Shipley, 1933, 57.

the building. As a result the small amount of archaeological evidence that came to light at the end of the 19th century must be utilised in order to confirm the original format of this unique temple.[364]

According to a small amount of accessible archaeological information, the building was south facing, with an entrance on its southern façade, and a north-south axis that mirrored the axis of the other Agrippan buildings constructed in the central Campus Martius in the first century BC (Fig. 183).[365] The temple had a transverse *cella* that measured 43.76m wide by 19.82m deep and was entered via a *pronaos* which measured 21.26m wide, but whose depth has not been determined.[366] Both of these elements were constructed from travertine blocks and covered with a marble veneer. These dimensions rendered the Pantheon rather squatter than was common for other temples in Rome and it resembled in plan the temple of Concord in the Forum Romanum (Fig. 184).[367] The possibility remains that the format of the temple was dictated by the space that was available to Agrippa at the time of construction, as was the case for the temple of Veiovis which was constructed between the Arx and the Capitolium in 196 BC (Fig. 185).[368] However, given that Agrippa had a huge amount of space available to him for the construction of this temple, it must be assumed that either he was so determined to create a straight line between the Pantheon, baths and Saepta that he was willing to adopt this uncommon temple design, or else that the format of a transverse *cella* was particularly appealing to him.

While the initial form of the temple can be seen to be radically different to the Hadrianic Pantheon, with its vast dome and north facing façade, regarding proportion and location there are a number of parallels that can be drawn between the two buildings (Fig. 186). Firstly, the width of the Agrippan *cella* is nearly identical to the inner diameter of the Hadrianic rotunda at 43.76m, while, the depth of the original Agrippan Pantheon was 19.82m and sat in the space now occupied by the Hadrianic *pronaos.*[369] It is not just the fact that measurements of the original Pantheon and the later *pronaos* corresponded, but also that 19th century excavations have shown that the original Pantheon sat in the space

[364] *LTUR* IV, 54 (Ziolkowski); Shipley, 1933, 55-62; Coarelli, 2007, 286.
[365] Shipley, 1933, 62-4; De Fine Licht, 1966, 172-9.
[366] *LTUR* IV, 55 (Ziolkowski); Shipley, 1933, 62.
[367] *LTUR* I, 318 (Ferroni); *LTUR* IV, 55 (Ziolkowski); Shipley, 1933, 62.
[368] Winter, 2006, 197.
[369] *LTUR* IV, 54 (Ziolkowski).

now occupied by the *pronaos*. In fact, the doorway to the two Pantheons coincided nearly perfectly, albeit that they were approached from opposite directions.

While the Pantheon sat amid other buildings of Agrippa's construction programme, archaeological excavation has suggested that the Pantheon itself was part of a smaller complex constituted by the temple itself and the Basilica of Neptune.[370] By the time of Hadrian's Pantheon the Basilica of Neptune sat to the south of the Pantheon, behind the rear of the temple, though excavation has suggested an alternate orientation in the late first century BC. The original arrangement of the building saw the Pantheon and the Basilica of Neptune face each other across an open piazza on a north-south axis.[371] The open space was originally an open air piazza that was later enclosed within the rotunda of Hadrian's Pantheon.[372] Two layers from the original piazza have been discovered within the archaeological record. The first, earliest, level of pavement was found constructed straight onto the soil at Republican ground level and lay around 4m below the modern floor of the Pantheon's rotunda.[373] This level of pavement was formed by a layer of concrete which measured 1.20m thick.[374] This level represents the ground level of Agrippa's open piazza of 25 BC. Another layer that was excavated measured 0.30m thick and lay 2.45m below the modern floor of the Pantheon. It is likely that these layers of concrete were the foundational strata for a more ornate decorative marble paving.[375] The pavement sloped outwards from the centre towards the circumference, possibly in an attempt to drain the pavement of rainwater.[376] While the lowest level was Agrippan, it is likely that the second level belonged to a Domitianic version of the Pantheon complex.[377] Around the circumference of the paving was a wall which surrounded the piazza and which contained niches.[378] Shipley has suggested that these niches contained statues of the gods, though this is entirely speculative.[379]

While there appears at first glance to be relatively little archaeological and literary material available to determine the form and function of Agrippa's Pantheon, there is

---

[370] *LTUR* IV, 55 (Ziolkowski).
[371] *LTUR* IV, 55 (Ziolkowski).
[372] *LTUR* IV, 55 (Ziolkowski).
[373] *LTUR* IV, 55 (Ziolkowski).
[374] *LTUR* IV, 55 (Ziolkowski).
[375] *LTUR* IV, 55 (Ziolkowski).
[376] Shipley, 1933, 64.
[377] *LTUR* IV, 55 (Ziolkowski); Shipley, 1933, 64.
[378] *LTUR* IV, 55 (Ziolkowski); Shipley, 1933, 64.
[379] Shipley, 1933, 64.

enough material to determine the size, shape and location of the Pantheon, Basilica of Neptune and piazza complex. However, the theory of the Pantheon-Basilica arrangement is not universally accepted. For example, the direction by which one might enter the Pantheon has been challenged, with suggestions stating that it may have been approached from the northern façade.[380] In order to fit this hypothesis the open piazza is interpreted as an enclosed *cella* while the transverse *cella* is interpreted as the *pronaos* through which visitors would have entered. This seems very unlikely for a number of reasons. The scale of the supposed *pronaos* would have been far too large for the period in question, and even for the Imperial period. The reconstructed porch would have been 50% deeper and 30% wider than any *pronaos* recorded in Augustan Rome.[381] Also, the span of 43m for the supposed *cella* would have been a challenging architectural construction in the late first century BC, and even if it had been possible, it would surely have found note within the literary sources, particularly by either Dio or Pliny, both of whom record the remarkable 100 foot larch beams which supported the roof of the Diribitorium (Pliny, *H.N.* 16.201, 36.102).[382] Consequently it seems far more likely that the Pantheon was approached from the south.[383] Given the way in which the Campus Martius had developed to this point it is logical to assume that the entrance to Agrippa's Pantheon lay on the southern side of the building. The increased building activity in the Campus Martius in Phases Three and Four (from the mid 2nd century BC to the end of the 1st century BC) meant that an entrance that faced to the south would have allowed the Pantheon to face towards the important monuments of the *area sacra* of Largo Argentina and would likely have overlooked the triumphal procession. These factors must have contributed to Agrippa's decision to orientate this building in this manner.

Some information regarding the decoration of Agrippa's Pantheon does survive. Pliny the Elder (*H.N.* 34.13) remarked that the capitols of the columns were made from bronze, the second time that a decoration of this type was used in the Campus Martius after the Porticus Octavia (Appendix: 4.3.1).[384] Pliny the Elder (*H.N.* 36.38) also noted that the gable sculptural decoration was carried out by Diogenes of Athens. Dio (53.27.2-4) states that within the *pronaos* were two statues, one of Augustus and one of Agrippa himself,

---

[380] LTUR VI, 280-1 (La Rocca).
[381] *LTUR* IV, 55 (Ziolkowski).
[382] *LTUR* VI, 282 (La Rocca).
[383] *LTUR* IV, 55 (Ziolkowski); Shipley, 1933, 60.
[384] For Porticus Octavia: *LTUR* IV, 140 (Viscogliosi); Olinder, 1974, 88; Coarelli, 1997, 522.

while a statue of Caesar was placed inside the *cella.*[385] A statue of Venus was also displayed in the Pantheon and was adorned with the pearl earring of Cleopatra (Pliny, *H.N.* 9.121; Macrobius, *Sat.* 3.18.18).[386]

The decoration of the building with statues of Augustus, Agrippa and Caesar strongly suggests an association between the Pantheon and the *gens* Julia and as a result Agrippa's Pantheon can be interpreted as a type of dynastic temple concerned with the worship of the gods associated with the *gens* Julia.[387] This argument relies on the fact that the temple contained a statue of Venus, who was particularly associated with the *gens* Julia, to substantiate it. However, the temple also contained a statue to Mars who did not have such links to the family but who may have been placed in the temple as Venus' consort.[388] Dio (53.27.2-3) relates how Agrippa had wished to place a statue of Augustus within the temple, but was forced by the emperor to place it in the *pronaos* instead.[389] Consequently Agrippa placed a statue of Caesar within the temple as he had already been deified.[390] The interpretation of Agrippa's Pantheon as a Julian temple is not without its drawbacks. For example, Pliny the Elder (*H.N.* 36.38) calls the building a *templum,* suggesting that it was a public temple, while the *frates Arvales* also met here, indicating that it was in some way open to public use (*CIL* VI 2041).[391] As a result it is impossible to state with absolute confidence that the Pantheon was built by Agrippa, on behalf of Augustus, as private dynastic temple for the Julian family.

The literary sources are also ambivalent regarding the original name of the temple. Dio (53.27.2-3) can only proffer suggestions as to how the temple later gained the title Pantheon. He suggests that it may have originated from the domed roof which resembled the heavens. Here Dio, writing in the early 3rd century AD, proves that he was unaware of the original architectural form of the temple prior to Hadrian's new Pantheon building. That the title Pantheon was a nickname that later developed for the building is proved by Macrobius (*Sat.* 3.17.18) who wrote *'in templo quod Pantheum dicitur'* suggesting that while people may have traditionally called it the Pantheon, this was neither the official, nor original, name for the building. The word 'Pantheon' is normally interpreted to mean

---

[385] Shipley, 1933, 56.
[386] *LTUR* IV, 55 (Ziolkowski).
[387] *LTUR* IV, 56 (Ziolkowski); Shipley, 1933, 58.
[388] *LTUR* IV, 56 (Ziolkowski); McDonald, 2002, 77.
[389] Favro, 1996, 109; Favro, 2005, 242.
[390] McDonald, 2002, 76-6.
[391] *LTUR* IV, 56 (Ziolkowski).

that the building was dedicated to all of the gods, though an alternative interpretation translates as 'very holy'.[392] As there is no suggestion within the sources, literary or archaeological, of any one god to whom the building was vowed and dedicated, or any reference to an official name given to the building, we must for now only accept the later nickname given to the building and use this title when exploring the nature, location and function of this Agrippan edifice.

A significant reconstruction of the Pantheon was undertaken by Domitian following the fire of AD 80 (Dio, 64.24.2) though nothing is known of the form of this version in the archaeological record. The Pantheon went on to be redeveloped as part of a massive programme embarked upon by Hadrian. The design and function of the Hadrianic Pantheon lies beyond the remit of this work. The building has a vast, and arguably incomparable, literary and archaeological tradition. The name and nature of the Agrippan Pantheon remain open to interpretation and may perhaps only be clarified upon the discovery of new sources of evidence and further archaeological excavation.

5.3.8. Basilica Neptuni

The Basilica of Neptune was constructed by Agrippa in 25 BC (Dio, 53.27) and, as was the case for the Pantheon, rebuilt by Hadrian in the 2nd century AD.[393] There are few literary references to the original Agrippan basilica, and as a consequence the function of the building is uncertain. There are no Agrippan remains of the original basilica extant in the area so any reconstruction of the Agrippan version of the basilica must be based upon the available Hadrianic evidence. The Basilica of Neptune was located south of the Agrippan Pantheon and the two buildings were separated, in the first century BC at least, by an open air piazza (Fig. 183).[394] Together the Basilica of Neptune and the Pantheon may have created a complex, though as of yet there has been no evidence found to suggest that the two buildings were enclosed in any way.[395]

---

[392] Platner & Ashby, 1926, 382; McDonald, 2002, 76.
[393] *LTUR* I, 182 (Cordischi); Favro, 1996, 115.
[394] De Fine Licht, 1966, 155-6.
[395] *LTUR* IV, 56 (Ziolkowski).

The Hadrianic Basilica of Neptune is now partially covered by Via della Palombella and the Palazzo dell'Accademia Ecclesiastica.[396] Remnants of the Hadrianic basilica can still be seen on Via della Palombella and consist of a niched wall with a central apse which is flanked by Corinthian columns (Fig. 187).[397] In total the 2nd century AD basilica was 45m long by 19-20m deep and ran along the same east-west axis as the Pantheon (Fig. 188).[398] Therefore in width, depth and axis it reflected the plan of the Agrippan Pantheon, a fact that is difficult to attribute to coincidence. The building contained a central apse on its northern side (which may at one time have been used to house a cult statue) and had two large rectangular apses on the eastern and western walls.[399] The internal side of the northern wall was covered with marble slabs and was decorated with eight large columns and an entablature with dolphins and tridents and is still visible on Via della Palombella (Fig. 189). Sections of the Hadrianic building have been found to the south of Via della Palombella, however it is uncertain if these rooms were part of the Hadrianic reconstruction of the Basilica of Neptune or part of the Baths of Agrippa.[400]

Due to the lack of extant archaeological remains in this area, it is uncertain as to how one would have entered the Basilica of Neptune. It may be assumed, based on the orientation of the surrounding buildings, that at least in Hadrian's version the basilica was entered from the south. The location of the original Agrippan entrance is even less certain. As the basilica had the same axis as the Pantheon it may be assumed that it, too, was entered from the southern side. It is impossible to believe that those travelling through the Campus Martius from the more commonly inhabited and visited southern area would have been forced to circumvent the building in order to enter it from the north. It is also possible, given the thematic similarities and dates of construction, that Agrippa's basilica was entered via the Porticus Argonautarum of the Saepta Julia, though again there is no archaeological or literary reference to confirm that this was the case.[401]

The lack of archaeological information regarding the entrance to the Agrippan basilica and the paucity of references in the literary sources to the function of the building in the Republican and early Imperial period may be related. A hypothetical reconstruction of the

---

[396] *LTUR* I, 182 (Cordischi).
[397] Coarelli, 2007, 289.
[398] *LTUR* I, 182 (Cordischi).
[399] *LTUR* I 182 (Cordischi).
[400] *LTUR* I, 183 (Cordischi).
[401] *LTUR* I, 183 (Cordischi).

basilica, piazza and Pantheon complex could render the basilica of Neptune a monumental entrance for the Pantheon. Therefore, those wishing to visit the Pantheon would have had to first enter the Basilica of Neptune before exiting at the north of the building. The exit from the basilica would likely have been through an egress placed in the position of the later Hadrianic apse which would have been directly to the south of the entrance to the Agrippan Pantheon (Fig. 190). Upon crossing the open air piazza one would have been able to enter the Pantheon. This is a new interpretation of the Agrippan Basilica of Neptune but one which allows for a close interaction between the Pantheon and Basilica and one which also corresponds with the provision of an open air piazza.

Dio (53.27.1) records that the Basilica of Neptune was constructed to commemorate Agrippa's naval victories.[402] This is likely a mistake on the part of the author who confused the Basilica Neptune with the temple of Neptune in the Campus Martius. This is not the only instance of Dio confusing the temple and Basilica of Neptune. Dio (66.24.2) lists the buildings that were destroyed in the great fire of AD 80.[403] Included in this list are the Saepta Julia, the Temple of Isis, the Baths of Agrippa, the Pantheon and the Temple of Neptune. This final reference has led to some controversy with three possible interpretations of the reference. Firstly this may be a mistaken reference to the Basilica of Neptune. Secondly, it may be taken as a reference to the Temple of Neptune constructed *in Campo* and which celebrated its *dies natalis* on the 23rd of September (*Fasti Fr.Arv.* 23rd September).[404] Thirdly it may refer to the temple of Neptune that stood in the Circus Flaminius. As all of the buildings listed by Dio as damaged by fire are in the central Campus Martius, the third option seems particularly unlikely. Also, given the location and nature of the buildings listed the simplest explanation is that Dio erroneously called the basilica of Neptune a temple of Neptune. This confusion may have arisen due to the manner in which the basilica was used in the first century BC and the fact that it was so strongly associated with the Pantheon.

[402] *LTUR* IV, 56 (Ziolkowski).
[403] *LTUR* I, 183 (Cordischi); *LTUR* IV, 56 (Ziolkowski).
[404] *LTUR* III, 342 (Viscogliosi); Degrassi, 1963, 199, 487, 533.

5.3.9. Saepta Julia and the Diribitorium

The Saepta Julia was constructed to the east of the Pantheon and replaced the Ovile which was constructed in the 4th century BC. According to Cicero (*Att.* 4.16.14) Caesar originally planned to construct a porticoed building with an external colonnade with a total external length of one mile around the Saepta (Fig. 125).[405] While Caesar initiated the construction of this building, he certainly did not finish it and upon his death the project was continued by Lepidus before its final completion and dedication by Agrippa in 26 BC (Dio 53.23).[406] Caesar's role in the construction of the building is preserved in the name of the building as it was named in honour of his deceased daughter Julia (see section: 5.1.4).

Archaeological excavations have determined that the Saepta Julia measured 310m long, north to south, by 120m wide, east to west, and was bounded by Via dei Cestari to the west, Via del Gesú to the east, and Via del Seminario to the north (Fig. 191 and Fig. 192). The southern limit of the Saepta was marked by the Diribitorium (Fig. 192 and Fig. 193). The northern limit of the Saepta stood in line with the Pantheon and the temple of Isis and Serapis.[407] The constituent parts of the Saepta Julia were known individually by different names. While the building as a whole was known as the Saepta, Saepta Iulia, Porticus Agrippiana (Scholia Juvenal, 6.154) or even the Ovile, the porticoes on the long sides of the building were known by individual names. The portico on the eastern side of the Saepta Julia was known as the Porticus Meleagri (*Reg.* IX) while the western portico was known as the Porticus Argonautarum (Pliny, *H.N.* 36.29; Martial, 2.146).[408] Both of these porticoes received their names from the artwork that was displayed within them, the former displaying paintings of Chiron and Achilles, the latter displaying a series of paintings depicting the Argonauts (Pliny, *H.N.* 36.29; Martial, 2.146).[409] It is likely that the images of the Argonauts were placed within the portico in order to recall Agrippa's naval victory at Actium.[410]

---

[405] Shipley, 1933, 37.
[406] *LTUR* IV, 118 (Guidobaldi); *LTUR* IV, 228 (Gatti); Shipley, 1933, 37; Favro, 1996, 87.
[407] Coarelli, 2007, 289.
[408] *LTUR* IV, 118 (Guidobaldi); *LTUR* IV, 130 (Guidobaldi).
[409] *LTUR* IV, 228 (Gatti); Favro, 1996, 115.
[410] Shipley, 1933, 44; Favro, 1996, 115.

Both the Porticus Meleagri and the Porticus Argonautarum are traceable within the archaeological record and can be seen within the modern street plan. Via dei Cestari now runs along the line of the western Porticus Argonautarum, while Via del Gesú runs along the line of eastern Porticus Meleagri (Fig. 191: Fig. 195).[411] Remnants of the Porticus Argonautarum can still be seen today to the east of the Pantheon (Fig. 194). These bricks date to Hadrian's Pantheon and would originally have been clad in marble.[412] Until 1934 the Saepta Julia was mistakenly located further east and was associated with the remains at Palazzi Doria e Boneparte and the remains beneath the church of S. Maria in Via Lata.[413] This interpretation was based on the misinterpretation of two fragments of the FUR but has since been proved incorrect by Gatti who correctly identified 35p, aa, bb; 36 of slab IV-5 as representing the Saepta.[414] Work is currently underway to identify the remains beneath the church of S. Stimmate di S. Francesco and to determine if they belong to the southern end of the Saepta though it is possible though that the remains beneath the church belong to the Diribitorium, which marked the southern limit of the Saepta Julia (Appendix: 5.3.9).[415]

During Phase Four, from the early to late 1st century BC, the Saepta Julia functioned as a voting house in much the same way as the Ovile had earlier in the Republic. The development of the building by Caesar and Agrippa helped not only to physically enlarge the building but also to give it a far greater public profile, consequently rendering it capable of promoting political messages and amassing public favour for Caesar and Augustus. These very long porticoes that surrounded the central space would, for all intents and purposes, have served to make the building reminiscent of the quadroporticoes of the Circus Flaminius. As the quadroporticoes of the Circus Flaminius were both physically and symbolically associated with triumph, Caesar, or possibly Agrippa, may have sought to apply that same architectural element and its associations to the newly constructed Saepta Julia. The impact of the porticoes on the inhabitants of Rome is noted in the literary sources. For example, Martial (2.14.6; 3.20.11; 9.1.12) noted that the Saepta Julia was one of the most frequented porticoes in Rome.

---

[411] *LTUR* IV, 228 (Gatti); Coarelli, 2007, 290.
[412] Coarelli, 2007, 290.
[413] *LTUR* IV, 228 (Gatti); Hülsen, 1893, 127.
[414] *LTUR* IV, 228 (Gatti).
[415] *LTUR* IV, 229 (Gatti).

At the southern limit of the Saepta lay the Diribitorium (Fig. 195). It was here that the votes cast in the Saepta Iulia were counted by the *diribitores* or officials (Varro, *R.R.* 3.5.18).[416] Agrippa vowed the construction of this building and oversaw its initial construction, though upon his death the project was uncompleted and was officially dedicated by Augustus in 7 BC (Dio, 55.8). Originally built as a counting house to work in tandem with the Saepta Julia, once voting was removed from the Saepta by Tiberius the Diribitorium was no longer required to fulfil its original function. Caligula placed benches inside the building and used it as a type of indoor theatre when it was too hot for such displays outside (Dio, 59.7), while Claudius watched the fire of the Horrea Aemiliana in AD 38 from the roof of the Diribitorium (Suetonius, *Claud.* 18). After the building went out of use, it was used as a bath-house, despite its proximity to the baths of Agrippa.[417]

The Diribitorium was particularly noted in antiquity for its impressive wooden roof, which had the widest span of any roof in Rome until AD 230.[418] The extended construction period of this building may have stemmed from the difficulty in obtaining the correct building materials for the roof.[419] It was spanned by a series of larch beams which were 100 feet long and 1½ foot thick. The beams were so impressive that one additional un-used beam was put on display in the adjoining Saepta Julia and attracted many visitors (Pliny, *H.N.* 16.201, 36.102).[420] The roof of the Diribitorium may have been the same one as was mentioned by Cicero (*Att.* 4.16.8) as a project embarked upon by Caesar, though this is far from certain.[421] When the Diribitorium was badly damaged by fire around AD 150 it was left in partial ruins as it was no longer possible to repair the vast roof span.[422]

Fragments 35lpqr of slab IV-5 of the FUR preserves part of the plan of the Diribitorium, and is the basis for Cozza's and Gatti's reconstruction and interpretation of the form and function of the building (Fig. 196).[423] According to the plan, the Diribitorium was an elongated rectangular building with a width of over 120m. The eastern end of the building

---

[416] Platner & Ashby, 1926, 151; Shipley, 1933, 40.
[417] *LTUR* II, 18 (Torelli).
[418] Platner & Ashby, 1926, 151.
[419] *LTUR* II, 17-9 (Torelli).
[420] Shipley, 1933, 41.
[421] *LTUR* II, 17 (Torelli).
[422] *LTUR* II, 18 (Torelli); Shipley, 1933, 41.
[423] Carrettoni, Colini & Cozza et.al., 1960, 97-102.

extended beyond the width of the Saepta, which stood to its north.[424] The FUR depicts columns and niches within the Diribitorium which indicate that the columns were sturdy enough to support the heavy roof and buttresses that would have been required to withstand the weight of the 100ft larch beams. The FUR depicts no visible connections or openings between the Diribitorium and the Saepta, however it has frequently been the assumption, given the function of the building, that such an opening or passageway must have existed, at least in the early Imperial period when the Diribitorium was still used as a counting house for votes cast in the Saepta Julia. On FUR fragments 35lpqr, of slab IV-5, the ends of a centrally located rectangular structure are depicted with a niche on the southern side, just north of the Diribitorium, within the Saepta Julia (Fig. 196). This is possibly the *pons,* or bridge, over which voters passed to gain access to the voting enclosure of the Saepta.[425] Such bridges are recorded in the literary sources, especially Suetonius (*Caes.* 80), who describes that the conspirators against Caesar planned to wait until Caesar was standing on the wooden bridge on his way to vote and topple it over, stabbing him when he hit the ground. This bridge is depicted on a coin attributed to P. Licinius Nerva dating to 113/2 BC (*RRC* 292/1) (Fig. 197).[426] It is likely that the wooden bridge depicted on this coin ran into the Ovile and was a forerunner of the bridge that carried people into the Saepta Julia from the Diribitorium. However, due to the fragmentation of the FUR and its Severan date, this rectangular structure may in fact be a later addition to the Saepta and may be completely unrelated to the movement of voters between the Diribitorium and the Saepta Julia.

The location of the Diribitorium is confirmed by the FUR in relation to the Saepta Julia and consequently can be mapped with relative ease onto the modern street plan (Fig. 195). Unfortunately very little of the actual building has been discovered within the archaeological record. In 1884 a wall was discovered during work on Corso Vittorio Emanuele that could correspond to the southern boundary, while a wall under the church of S. Stimmate can be interpreted as part of the northern boundary wall of the Diribitorium.[427] Beyond this little else is known.

The Diribitorium is the latest datable building constructed by Agrippa on the Campus Martius. Throughout Phase Four Agrippa oversaw a hugely important development of the

[424] *LTUR* II, 18 (Torelli).
[425] Adam & Wilson, 1830, 87; Harlow & Laurence, 2002, 118.
[426] *LTUR* IV, 258 (Gatti).
[427] *LTUR* II, 18 (Torelli); *BullCom,* 1893, 190.

central Campus Martius. While construction of some buildings, including the Saepta Julia, and perhaps the Pantheon, may initially have been instigated by Caesar, and while the Diribitorium was formally dedicated by Augustus, Agrippa was responsible for what may be considered as one of Rome's earliest imperial construction programmes. Prior to Augustus' redevelopment of the Forum Romanum Agrippa constructed an area that took into account the traditional functions of the Campus Martius, such as voting, leisure and religious worship, but at the same time imbued the area with a sense of evolution and development and introduced buildings with a wider political function. Agrippa's participation in this programme of development did not stem from a personal desire to seize political power and gain wealth and power, but from what appears to be a loyalty to the Julian family and a wish to see them take hold of power in Rome.

5.3.10. Tomb of Agrippa

According to Dio (54.28.5) Agrippa constructed his own tomb on the Campus Martius though ultimately Augustus did not allow his friend and colleague to be buried within it when he died in 12 BC and instead insisted that he be buried in the Mausoleum of Augustus.[428] This can be interpreted as an acknowledgement by Augustus that Agrippa had played an important part in solidifying the Julian family's imperial rule of Rome. As a consequence he was buried within the Imperial tomb and not in a tomb reminiscent of the 1st century BC generation of Republican politicians such as Sulla, Pansa and Hirtius (Appendix: 5.1.3; 5.1.6). Be that as it may, the physical existence of a tomb is attested by Dio (54.28.5) who relates that the original tomb was called a *mnema*, deriving from the Greek word for memory. As such it may not have been a tomb in the traditional sense, but rather a cenotaph or location for heroic worship.[429] Conflicting accounts from the literary sources leads to confusion as to whether or not Agrippa's sons were buried in their own purpose built funerary monument, the *mnema* of Gaius and Lucius Caesar, within their father's monument, or alternatively in the Mausoleum of Augustus (Dio, 78.24).[430] By interpreting the term *mnema* as a cenotaph and not an actual tomb in the traditional sense, the report that Gaius and Lucius Caesar, along with Agrippa, were buried within the

[428] Shipley, 1933, 64; Favro, 1996, 117.
[429] *LTUR* IV, 273 (La Rocca); Jokilehto, 2002, 4.
[430] *LTUR* IV, 273 (La Rocca); Favro, 1996, 132.

Mausoleum of Augustus would make far more sense. Further confusion arises when Dio's account (79.24.3) is taken into consideration as he records that Julia Domna was buried within the *mnema* of Gaius and Lucius in AD 217 before her sister moved her body to the Mausoleum of Hadrian.[431] This suggests that the tomb of Gaius and Lucius was a more traditional construction and was not simply a cenotaph. This reference highlights how confusing this case is and emphasises how difficult it is to pinpoint both the nature and location of the tomb of Agrippa.

An earlier misinterpretation of fragments 35u, 35o, 35aa of slab IV-5 of the FUR erroneously located the tomb of Agrippa on modern Via del Gesú.[432] These fragments have since been re-interpreted as sections of the Porticus Meleagri and the Saepta Julia.[433] As a result an alternative location for the tomb of Agrippa has been sought in the central and western areas of the Campus Martius where a number of Republican tombs are known to have been placed (for example the tombs of Pansa, Hirtius, Julia and Caesar) (Appendix: 5.1.6; 5.1.4). As a consequence, the architectural remains discovered in 1887 beneath Piazza Sforza Cesarini have been identified as the tomb of Agrippa (Fig. 199 and Fig. 200).[434] This site had been previously incorrectly identified as the subterranean altar of Dis Pater and Proserpina, while Wiseman's suggestion that the site represented the tomb of Julia seems unlikely given that an inscription from the tomb of Julia was used further to the east in Hadrian's Pantheon.[435] Had the tomb of Julia been located this far west in the Campus Martius, it would not have been demolished and the dedicatory inscription would not have been used in Hadrian's reconstruction of the Pantheon.[436]

The remains of this site are complicated and difficult to interpret, adding even more uncertainty regarding the nature and position of the tomb of Agrippa. On this site a peperino fence creating a small enclosure was found close to the route of the Euripus. Within the enclosure were a series of finds that can be reconstructed as either three concentric fences or as the remains of two altars.[437] The reconstruction of the remains as three concentric fences would render the form of the site similar to that of the *ustrina* of

---

[431] *LTUR* IV, 273 (La Rocca); Platner & Ashby, 1926, 477.
[432] Platner & Ashby, 1926, 476; Gruen, 2005, 44.
[433] *LTUR* IV, 274 (La Rocca); Carrettoni, Colini & Cozza et.al., 1960, plate 31.
[434] *LTUR* IV, 274 (La Rocca); La Rocca, 1987, 87.
[435] *LTUR* IV, 274 (La Rocca); Wiseman, 1987, 473.
[436] *LTUR* IV, 274 (La Rocca); La Rocca, 1987, 87-9.
[437] *LTUR* IV, 274 (La Rocca); La Rocca, 1987, 87-91; Coarelli, 1997, 553-4.

Montecitorio.[438] However, recent excavations indicate that this site more than likely contained more than one monument or altar, located within the enclosure.[439] This reconstruction is particularly appropriate as it allows for the cenotaphs of both Agrippa and his sons to be located next to each other within an enclosed space. This interpretation is hypothetical and relies heavily on the association between the location of the monument in the western Campus Martius and its location in the Horti Agrippae.

The fact that some of Agrippa's earliest buildings were planned by Caesar, and his final construction project was dedicated by Augustus, emphasises the important role Agrippa played in a troubled and unstable political era. In many ways Agrippa may be seen as the stabilising force on Rome's road to Imperial rule. Agrippa's development of the central Campus Martius should not be viewed as a natural evolution of the topography of the central and southern Campus Martius, but rather as a physical representation of the fall of the Republic and the birth of imperial power. Where previously the Campus Martius had witnessed development by singular, independent, Roman senators and generals with individual aims and goals who lacked the authority to embark upon large scale developments, Agrippa represented the power, strength and authority of the developing Roman Empire. Phase Four, and Agrippa's work on the Campus Martius on behalf of the Julian family in particular, highlights the fact that the topographical development of the Campus Martius was reflective of the expansion of Roman power, Roman hegemony and the creation of empire. Agrippa did not completely reject the tradition of construction on a personal level to garner public support as, like the generals of Phases Two and Three, he too constructed buildings such as baths to gain favour and express personal development and gain. However, he did not use these opportunities to rise to the highest political office possible, instead he used his influence, power, popularity and name in order to propel Augustus to power. As such he was a consummate politician, aware of the fact that by the mid 1st century BC it was safer to be the follower of a successful politician than it was to place oneself in the limelight with the aim of individual rule, as politicians such as Pompey the Great and Caesar had attempted before him.

---

[438] La Rocca, 1987, 87-9.
[439] *LTUR* IV, 274 (La Rocca).

5.4. Theatrical Displays on the Campus

An amphitheatre and two further permanent stone theatres were permitted to be constructed on the Campus Martius at the end of Phase Four signifying that social and political changes that had taken place throughout the 1st century BC. While political stability was still uncertain, the Republic was rapidly evolving into an empire under the power of Augustus. The expansion of that empire, and the growth of imperial power in Rome was physically recorded on the Campus Martius in the final thirty years of the 1st century BC. The amphitheatre of Statilius Taurus and the theatre and Crypta Balbi represent the final instances of individual construction projects on the Campus Martius before Augustus and the Imperial family began to dominate building in the area.[440] The fact that after Balbus only members of the Imperial family were allowed to celebrate a triumph in Rome is a clear indication of the ultimate fall of the Roman Republic and the rise of Empire while the construction of the theatre of Marcellus by Caesar and Augustus shows the instigation of Imperial rule and construction.

5.4.1. Amphitheatre of Statilius Taurus.

The amphitheatre of Statilius Taurus was constructed in 29 BC by Statilius Taurus, one of Octavian's generals, and was the first amphitheatre constructed from stone in Rome (*CIL* VI 6226; VI 6227; VI 6228; Dio, 51.23; Suetonius, *Aug.* 29, *Cal.* 18; Tacitus, *Ann.* 3.72; Strabo, 5.3.8;).[441] According to Dio (51.23.1) it was constructed from the *manubiae* given to Taurus for securing the province of North Africa in 34 BC.[442] The amphitheatre of Statilius Taurus was still standing and in use during the reign of Caligula but was deemed to small for displays by the emperor (Dio, 59.10.5). While it was the first stone amphitheatre constructed in Rome, it was probably at least partially constructed from wood, as Dio (62.18.2) records that it burnt down in the fire of AD 64.[443] It is possible that the exterior elements of the building were constructed from stone while the interior, including the seating, were constructed in wood. This practice was not unusual for the era

[440] Coleman, 2000, 223; Sumi, 2005, 249; Beard, 2007, 302.
[441] Platner & Ashby, 1926, 11.
[442] Favro, 1996, 88; Coleman, 2000, 228.
[443] *LTUR* I, 36 (Viscogliosi); Coleman, 2000, 228

and the same practice can be seen at other Roman buildings, including the Circus Maximus.[444]

Prior to the recognition of the nature and location of the Circus Flaminius it was assumed that the remains excavated underneath Monte dei Cenci were those of the theatre of Balbus, while the remains beneath Via dei Calderari were associated with the Crypta Balbi.[445] As a result of further examination of the FUR by Gatti, Cozza and others in the early 20th century, it was discovered that the theatre of Balbus was in fact located to the north-east of the Circus Flaminius, rendering the previous hypothesis invalid.[446] The remains beneath Monte dei Cenci have consequently been identified as those of the amphitheatre of Statilius Taurus with a position between Piazza dei Cenci, Via Monte dei Cenci and the church of San Tommaso (Fig. 201).[447] This location fits with the known location of the Circus Flaminius while corresponding with the description of the area provided by Strabo (5.3.5), writing in the first two decades of the 1st century AD, who wrote that the Circus Flaminius was surrounded by porticoes, three theatres and an amphitheatre, an appropriate description based on what is now known about the location and surrounding buildings of the Circus Flaminiuis (Fig. 201 and Fig. 202).[448]

The amphitheatre of Statilius Taurus was not a building constructed and funded by the Roman state and consequently was not the primary venue for all state games.[449] Evidence for the private ownership of the amphitheatre comes from within the familial columbarium of Statilius Taurus, where inscriptions belonging to those who worked for the Statilii family were found which read '*custos de amphitheatro*' and '*ostiariius ab amphitheatro*', or custodian and porter/doorman of the amphitheatre.[450] This suggests that the amphitheatre remained a possession of the Taurii family and was not given entirely to the people of Rome for their use (*CIL* VI 6226-8). As a result state funeral games, which included gladiatorial displays, were not held in this amphitheatre as a matter of course. Consequently the funeral games of Agrippa in 7 BC, and the games associated with the inauguration of the Temple of Mars Ultor in 2 BC, were not held in the amphitheatre as it

---

[444] *LTUR* I, 36 (Viscogliosi); Coleman, 2000, 228; Golvin, 1988, 52; Contra Richardson, 1992, 11.
[445] *LTUR* I, 37 (Viscogliosi); Wiseman, 1974, 10-11.
[446] *LTUR* V, 31 (Manacorda); Carrettoni, Colini & Cozza et.al., 1960, 106, plate 32.
[447] *LTUR* I, 37 (Viscogliosi); Wiseman, 1974, 10-11; Contra Richardson, 1992, 11 who argues for a very unlikely position east of the Via Lata.
[448] *LTUR* I, 37 (Viscogliosi); Wiseman, 1974, 11; Coarelli, 1997, 519.
[449] Coleman, 2000, 227.
[450] *LTUR* I, 36 (Viscogliosi); Platner & Ashby, 1926, 11; Golvin, 1988, 53, n.97; Coleman, 2000, 228.

would have been inappropriate for state games and important political funerals to be held in what was fundamentally a private amphitheatre strongly associated with one particular family. [451]

The difference between the construction of victory monuments such as temples and porticoes and the construction of the amphitheatre of Statilius Taurus are very obvious and reflect a change in the ethos of the Campus Martius from the early Republic to the 1st century BC (Phase One to Phase Four). Where in previous phases it had only been allowable to build a statement of Roman state victory with a hint of personal recognition, it was now acceptable to build a large private amphitheatre from *manubiae* that may have represented Roman victory, but that at the same time remained a personal possession. That such a construction was permitted is emblematic of the power held by the individual in the late Republic and shows how it had become possible by the time of Augustus for such an individual to seize power for oneself.

5.4.2. Theatre and Crypt of Balbus

The theatre of Balbus was vowed by L. Cornelius Balbus the Younger, the consul of 32 BC, from the *manubiae* acquired during his defeat of the Garamantes of Africa, for which he celebrated a triumph in 19 BC.[452] Balbus' triumph in 19 BC is notable as it was the last triumph by somebody who was not a member of the Imperial family. The right of triumph became the sole prerogative of the Imperial family at the beginning of the 1st century AD.[453] The theatre was dedicated in 13 BC during a great flood, and those attending were required to travel to the theatre by boat (Dio 54.25.2; Suetonius, *Aug.* 29). This underlines the nature of the Campus Martius and also how liable it was to flooding and how such natural events failed to deter construction projects.[454]

The earliest reference to the theatre of Balbus comes from Ovid (*Ars Am.* 3.349, 633), while the earliest descriptive passage comes from Pliny the Elder (*H.N.* 36.60), writing in the mid 1st century BC, who noted that the architectural decoration included four small

---

[451] *LTUR* I, 36 (Viscogliosi); Coleman, 2000, 228.
[452] Sear, 2006, 65. See also: Coarelli, 2007, 281.
[453] Coarelli, 2007, 281.
[454] Claridge, 1998, 220; Beacham, 1999, 120; Sear, 2006, 65; Aldrete, 2007, 24-5.

onyx columns.[455] The theatre was badly damaged in the fire of AD 80 (Dio, 66.24.1-2) and was reconstructed in the Flavian era.[456] The theatre of Balbus was the smallest of the three theatres of the Campus Martius with the radius of the *cavea* measuring approximately 30.60m and the theatre's total diameter measuring just 90m.[457] The theatre is noted in the Regionary Catalogues (*Reg.* IX) and is listed as having 11,510 *loca* and may have held just 8,500 spectators.[458]

Until 1960 the Theatre of Balbus was believed to have been located beneath Monte dei Cenci but these remains are now recognised as the amphitheatre of Statilius Taurus (5.4.1) (Fig. 202).[459] By correctly identifying the nature and location of the Circus Flaminius the location of the theatre of Balbus was identified and resultantly located between Via delle Botteghe Oscure, Via Caetani, Via dei Funari and Piazza Paganica, with the curved end of the theatre, previously identified as the curved end of the Circus Flaminius, beneath Palazzo Mattei-Paganica (Fig. 203 and Fig. 204).[460] This places the theatre, and the Crypta Balbi, on an east-west axis in an area to the south of the Porticus Minucia Vetus.[461] The *scaena* marked the eastern end of the theatre complex and the *cavea* marked the westerly limit, while the Crypta Balbi continued to the east along the same axis (Fig. 205).[462]

A number of pieces of the theatre and Crypta Balbi are still visible beneath and above the modern ground level of this area. Three *cunei*, interspersed by a number of radial support walls which were constructed from perfect *opus reticulatum* with travertine ashlars and blocks of tufa, are still visible in the cellars and on the first floor of the Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana on Piazza Paganica (Fig. 206).[463] Parts of the theatre were also seen during the widening of Via delle Botteghe Oscure in 1937 and 1941, while part of the elevation, constructed from blocks of travertine, is conserved in the courtyard of Palazzo Paganica.[464] Meanwhile the cellars of Palazzo Caetaini and No. 7a Via Paganica

---

[455] *LTUR* V, 30 (Manacorda); Platner & Ashby, 1926, 513; Gatti, 1979, 240; Sear, 2006, 66.
[456] *LTUR* V, 31 (Manacorda).
[457] Sear, 2006, 66; Coarelli, 2007, 281.
[458] *LTUR* V, 31 (Manacorda); Platner & Ashby, 1926, 513; Gatti, 1979, 241; Sear, 2006, 66.
[459] *LTUR* I, 37 (Viscogliosi); Carrettoni, Colini & Cozza et.al., 1960, plate 31; Gros, 1979, 251; Wiseman, 1974, 10-11; Sear, 2006, 66; Coarelli, 2007, 281.
[460] *LTUR* V, 31 (Manacorda); Arena & Delogu et.al., 2000, 10-12; Sear, 2006, 66; Coarelli, 2007, 281
[461] Arena & Delogu et.al, 2000, 10; Sear, 2006, 66.
[462] *LTUR* V, 31 (Manacorda).
[463] *LTUR* V, 31 (Manacorda); Sear, 2006, 66; Coarelli, 2007, 281.
[464] *LTUR* V, 31 (Manacorda); Gatti, 1979, 301-3; Arena & Delogu, et.al., 2000, 10.

also preserve structural elements (Fig. 203 and Fig. 204).[465] Nothing remains of the *scaena* of the theatre, nor the columns of which Pliny the Elder made particular note, though Coarelli has suggested that the Arco dei Funari and the Arco dei Ginnasi, which are no longer in existence, were likely the arches that originally stood between the scaena and the *cavea*.[466]

To the east of the theatre stood a large construction referred to by the Regionary Catalogue as the 'Crypta Balbi' (*Reg.* IX).[467] The literary evidence for the Crypta Balbi is rather late in date as it appears not to have warranted any particular attention from the writers of the first century BC and first century AD. Fortunately this area is preserved on fragments of the Severan Marble Plan (30abc, slab V-11) (Fig. 207). On the FUR the Crypta Balbi is represented as a large open area that was almost square. It is enclosed on the north, east and south sides by a wall with a series of columns and arches running around its interior (Fig. 204, Fig. 205).[468] A large exedra is shown projecting from the eastern end which was later converted into a latrine during the reign of Hadrian.[469] Enclosed in the centre of this square complex was a building, found on fragment 30c, slab VII, of the FUR (Fig. 208 and Fig. 209).[470]

Following several surveys in 1961 the area was then systematically excavated from 1981-1989 with the modern, medieval and ancient levels examined.[471] The excavations determined that the crypt was located within the limits of Via delle Botteghe Oscure to the north, Via M. Caetani to the west, Via dei Delfini to the south and Via dei Polacchi to the east (Fig. 203, Fig. 204 and Fig. 209).[472] Specifically, the northern boundary of the crypt has been found in the cellars of Nos. 17 to 28 Via delle Botteghe Oscure, while the southern limit has been identified in the cellars of Nos. 5 to 10 on Via dei Delfini.[473] Originally the entire width of the monument from north to south was 93.60m, while the length of the area from the internal northern colonnade to the internal southern colonnade measured 67m.[474]

---

[465] Gatti, 1979, 259-62; Sear, 2006, 66; Coarelli, 2007, 281.
[466] Gatti, 1979, 299; Coarelli, 2007, 282.
[467] Arena & Delogu, et.al., 2000,12, 15; Sear, 2006, 66; Coarelli, 2007, 282.
[468] Gatti, 1979, 242; Sear, 2006, 66.
[469] *LTUR* I, 328 (Manacorda); Coarelli, 2007, 282; Sear, 2006, 66.
[470] *LTUR* I, 327 (Manacorda).
[471] *LTUR* I, 326 (Manacorda).
[472] *LTUR* I, 326 (Manacorda); Sear, 2006, 67. See also: Coarelli, 2007, 282.
[473] Coarelli, 2007, 282.
[474] *LTUR* I, 327 (Manacorda).

Much is known of the perimeter walls, particularly the northern and southern walls, as a result of the excavations carried out in the 1980's. The *opus quadratum* wall sat on a concrete foundation. On top of this foundation were eleven courses of yellow tufa (from Grotta Oscura) each block with a height of 60cm. The twelfth course was formed by two blocks of travertine, measuring 20cm and 40cm respectively. Above this travertine level ran a course of tufa.[475] In total the height of the *opus quadratum* wall was 8m.[476] The level of the wall was elevated by the addition of brick and concrete courses, raising the wall height by a total of 3.4m.[477] Some of this brickwork is still visible from Piazza Lovatelli, to the right of the church of S. Caterina.[478] The form of the north wall was not identical to the south while the form of the northern wall at its eastern end differed from its form at its western end, near the theatre. At the eastern end of the southern wall ran a series of four niches on a rectangular plan with an architrave of travertine on the inside of the niche (Fig. 210).[479] These niches were not present on the western end of the wall, where the straight wall was divided by a series of pillars on its exterior side.[480] These niches may have been an attempt at decoration and may have resembled 2nd style wall painting. The width of the wall along both stretches reached 1.5m. The reason for these differences between the eastern and western ends of the northern wall is unclear as it seems not to have had any discernable architectural function. It was perhaps just a decorative motif used to display and promote Balbus' awareness and appreciation of eastern architecture.

The three internal walls of the monument shown on the FUR have unfortunately not survived and were not found in the archaeological record. It seems likely that they were destroyed during the earthquakes of either AD 801 or AD 847.[481] These walls possibly took the form of a series of brick arches on rectangular columns, though these were likely part of a later imperial reconstruction.[482] The three walls with the brick arches would have formed a walkway with the perimeter wall 10.65m in depth. This was very probably an *ambulatio* which was open on the internal side to the courtyard. The two courses of

[475] *LTUR* I, 327 (Manacorda).
[476] *LTUR* I, 327 (Manacorda); Gros, 1979, 259-60; Sear, 2006, 66.
[477] *LTUR* I, 327 (Manacorda); Claridge, 1998, 220.
[478] Claridge, 1998, 220.
[479] *LTUR* I, 327 (Manacorda); Gatti, 1979, 242, 280; Sear, 2006, 66; Coarelli, 2007, 282.
[480] *LTUR* I, 327 (Manacorda).
[481] *LTUR* I, 327 (Manacorda);
[482] *LTUR* I, 327 (Manacorda).

travertine which were present in the upper part of the perimeter wall must have marked the location where a vault, which was supported on one side by the internal arches, was secured into the perimeter wall.[483] The evidence suggests that during the reign of Hadrian these brick pillars and the vault were reconstructed as a more straightforward portico with brick columns and engaged half-columns.[484] However, the Crypta Balbi can not technically be called a *porticus post scaenum* as it did not meet all the criteria set out by Vitruvius (D*e Arch,* 5.9.1-5) though it must originally have functioned in a somewhat similar manner.[485]

Much remains unknown about the Crypta Balbi, regarding both the architectural form and development of the building and the manner in which it was used. While archaeological excavation of the crypt has been suspended at present, the nature of the area suggests that much more will be discovered about it in time. It is hoped that the form and nature of the central building of the crypt may be revealed. At present there are various theories as to what the building may be. Coarelli suggests that it might be the temple of Vulcan, though equally it may be an honorary monument, temple or fountain.[486] Any theory of its function and dedication remains uncertain pending further excavation and interpretation.

5.4.3. Theatre of Marcellus

Like the Saepta Julia, the Theatre of Marcellus was a building which was initially planned by Caesar and finished by Augustus after Caesar's death (Suetonius, *Caes.* 44; Dio, 43.49.2, 53.30.5). The site of the theatre is easily recognisable within the modern city of Rome and is located close to the visible remains of the temple of Apollo Sosianus and the remains of the Porticus Octaviae on Via della Teatro di Marcello (Fig. 211 and Fig. 212).[487] As such it occupied a prime location close to the triumphal route as it passed through the Circus Flaminius and into the Forum Boarium. Even in antiquity the theatre was used as a topographical marker with temples frequently described as *ad theatrum*

[483] *LTUR* I, 327 (Manacorda).
[484] *LTUR* I, 327 (Manacorda); Arena & Delogu et.al., 2000, 12.
[485] *LTUR* I, 328 (Manacorda).
[486] *LTUR* I, 327 (Manacorda); Coarelli, 2007, 283.
[487] Sear, 2006, 62-3.

Marcellum.[488] The site had been associated with theatrical displays for at least three centuries prior to the construction of the theatre of Marcellus with theatrical displays held here in association with the *ludi Apollinares* (Livy, 40.51.3).[489] It was likely on this same site that M. Fulvius Nobilior and M. Aemilius Lepidus attempted to construct a theatre during their year as joint censors in 179 BC (Livy, 40.51) (see section: 4.2.1).[490] Caesar saw to it that a number of buildings on the site were demolished in order to make way for the theatre, for example the temple of Pietas (Pliny, *H.N.* 6.121; Dio, 43.49.3) (Appendix: 3.3.3).[491] When Augustus inherited the project from Caesar, the emperor bought even more land in the vicinity in order to increase the size of the project and make it a grander example of the power of the Imperial family and the power they held for construction projects (Augustus, *Res.Ges*, 21.1).[492]

While the location of the theatre has always been clear and visible, the literary sources are contradictory when it comes dating the theatre. Named in honour of Augustus' nephew Marcellus, who died in 23 BC, the theatre must have reached near completion by 17 BC when games associated with the *ludi saeculares* were held here (*CIL* VI 32323).[493] Dio (54.26.1) notes that the actual dedication of the theatre occurred in 13 BC, while Pliny the Elder (*H.N.* 8.65) records a date of 11 BC. With regard to the decoration of the theatre Augustus placed four marble columns which originated from Scaurus' house on the Palatine into the *regia* of the theatre (Asconius, *Scarus*, 45). Augustus also placed a bronze statue of Marcellus in the theatre, depicting Marcellus sitting on a *curile* seat wearing a crown (Dio, 53.30.6).[494] Following the death of Augustus, Livia and Tiberius dedicated a statue in the theatre to the deceased emperor (Tacitus, *Ann.* 3.64).[495] The importance and grandeur of the theatre was remarked upon by Martial (10.51.11), writing in the late first century AD, who listed the theatre of Marcellus, along with the theatre of Pompey, as one of the most important buildings of the entire city of Rome.[496] The theatre underwent some degree of restoration, possibly to the stage building, during the reign of Vespasian (Suetonius, *Ves.* 19), while it was again used for the *ludi saeculares* under

---

[488] *LTUR* V, 32 (Ciancio Rossetto); Platner & Ashby, 1926, 514; Degrassi, 1963, 131.
[489] *LTUR* V, 31 (Ciancio Rossetto); Coarelli, 2007, 267.
[490] Sear, 2006, 61.
[491] *LTUR* V, 31, 35 (Ciancio Rossetto); Sear, 2006, 62; Coarelli, 2007, 267.
[492] *LTUR* V, 31 (Ciancio Rossetto).
[493] *LTUR* V, 31 (Ciancio Rossetto); Platner & Ashby, 1926, 513; Sear, 2006, 62. See also: Coarelli, 2007, 268.
[494] *LTUR* V, 32 (Ciancio Rossetto).
[495] Sear, 2006, 62.
[496] *LTUR* V, 32 (Ciancio Rossetto).

Septimius Severus in AD 204.[497] The theatre was still in use in AD 421 when the Praefectus Urbis, Petronius Maximus, placed statues within the theatre, though by this date there must have been significant damage to the fabric of the building as blocks of travertine had been removed from the theatre in order to repair the Pons Cestius in AD 370.[498]

Quite a lot of information can be garnered from what remains of the theatre. Between 1926 and 1932 the theatre was restored with a number of later attachments removed from the building.[499] The theatre itself was constructed on a flat area and with a semi-circular *cavea,* constructed from concrete and *opus reticulatum* and with a travertine façade, that was arranged on a very complex articulated substructure (Fig. 213 and Fig. 214).[500] The theatre had three storeys, two of which are preserved, the lower two consisting of open arcades or porticoes (Fig. 215). Behind the original façade of 41 arches ran a barrel vaulted passageway, measuring 3.5m in width, from which 39 vaults opened radially (Fig. 213).[501] These vaults helped to divide the internal space and direct the spectators to their seats. 7 of the vaults led to the *ima cavea* by way of an internal annular passageway. 6 of the vaults were actually ramps that led upwards and double backed on themselves to lead to the *ambulacrum* of the second storey, while 20 of the vaults were dead-ends and were used as both storerooms and also as areas for commercial activities.[502] The division of the space was ingenious and allowed for the easy movement of spectators through a well lit and relatively open environment. Inscriptions relating to the site indicate that a money collector worked in, or near, the theatre (*CIL* VI 33838a; *coactor a theatro Marcelliano*), while it is also known that fabrics were treated and military cloaks made on or near the site (*CIL* VI 956, 9868 *sagari a theatro Marcelli*).[503] In total the *cavea* would have measured 129.80m in diameter and could have held up to fifteen thousand people.[504] The *Curiosum* (*Reg.* IX) records that there were 20,000 *loca,* while the *Notitia* (*Reg.* IX) notes that there were 20,500 *loca*, which corresponds to an estimated 13,500 to 15,000 seats.

[497] *LTUR* V, 32 (Ciancio Rossetto); Sear, 2006, 62; Coarelli, 2007, 268.
[498] *LTUR* V, 32 (Ciancio Rossetto); Platner & Ashby, 1926, 514; Sear, 2006, 63.
[499] Heffner, Legrain & Robinson, 1927, 383; Coarelli, 2007, 268.
[500] *LTUR* V, 33-4 9 (Ciancio Rossetto); Sear, 2006, 135-6.
[501] *LTUR* V, 33-4 9 (Ciancio Rossetto); Sear, 2006, 136.
[502] *LTUR* V, 33 (Ciancio Rossetto); Sear, 2006, 62, 136.
[503] *LTUR* V, 33 (Ciancio Rossetto); Sear, 2006, 62.
[504] Coarelli, 2007, 269.

However, the calculation of seating in theatres is somewhat of an inexact science and this may not be a completely accurate figure.[505]

The façade was divided into three stories (Fig. 215). The arcade of the lowest level was higher than the other two storeys, measuring 19.88m, and was decorated with half columns of the Doric order.[506] Above these columns ran an entablature with a frieze and architrave.[507] Above this ran an attic base of 1.09m in height which projected by 0.673m and which supported the bases of the second level of columns.[508] The second level had columns either side of the arcades in the Ionic order. This level also had an entablature with an architrave and three projecting ledges.[509] The third and final level displayed a decoration of Corinthian pilasters which have since been almost totally destroyed.[510] The keystones of the arches of the first and second storeys of the building were decorated with large white marble masks, many fragments of which have been found to date, which were held in place by metal poles.[511] It is likely that these masks represented the three types of Greek drama facilitated by the theatre; tragedy, drama and satire.[512] The total height of the theatre would have been around 32.60m, though only 20m now remains.

Within the outer walls a total of thirteen piers have been excavated. These piers measured 3m wide by 2m thick and were buried to one third of their height. The radial walls of the *cunei*, for only the first 10m, were constructed from *opus caementicium* with a reticulate facing and with tufa ashlars. Meanwhile the interior corridors were constructed from brick and are an important example of the way in which brick was used in the Augustan period.[513] The vaults themselves were constructed from concrete.[514] The central internal area was decorated with a white stucco surface which gave a feeling of continuity throughout the interior of the building.[515]

The *scaena* is now entirely missing from the site but is known from Renaissance drawings of the FUR (31 mt; *Cod.Vat.Lat.* 3439) (Fig. 216). This drawing, in association

[505] Sear, 2006, 62.
[506] *LTUR* V, 33 (Ciancio Rossetto); Platner & Ashby, 1926, 514-5; Sear, 2006, 135-6.
[507] Sear, 2006, 63.
[508] *LTUR* V, 34 (Ciancio Rossetto); Platner & Ashby, 1926, 514; Sear, 2006, 63.
[509] Platner & Ashby, 1926, 515; Sear, 2006, 63.
[510] Coarelli, 2007, 268.
[511] *LTUR* V, 34 (Ciancio Rossetto); Sear, 2006, 136. See also: Coarelli, 2007, 269
[512] *LTUR* V, 34 (Ciancio Rossetto).
[513] Coarelli, 2007, 269.
[514] Coarelli, 2007, 269.
[515] *LTUR* V, 34 (Ciancio Rossetto).

with fragments 31eno, 31il, and 31qrs of slab V-12 of the FUR, shows that the *scaena frons* was rectilinear and likely measured 80-90m in length and was 20m deep (Fig. 217).[516] At each end of the *scaena* was an apsidal hall, sometimes referred to as a *regia*, each measuring around 25m x 15m. These rooms were open on the long side and were reached through a colonnade that ran *post scaeneum.*[517] These apsidal halls may have been a type of wing/alia of the portico that ran behind the *scaena.*[518] A small part of the eastern apsidal room has survived with extant sections of paving in the form of thick slabs of travertine as well as a pilaster in the north-western area of the room.[519] Fragment 31s of slab V-12 of the FUR also depicts two small areas at the back that may be interpreted as shrines (Fig. 217). As has been discussed in some detail already, these shrines may have been constructed in order to atone for the destruction of the temples of Pietas and Diana (Appendix: 3.3.3; 3.3.5).[520] Some excavations have been carried out in this area of the theatre and traces of foundations did come to light which are possibly those of a shrine to Pietas.[521] The rear of the theatre complex was marked by a rectilinear wall with a central exedra which is shown on the FUR. Given the location of the theatre and the close proximity of the theatre to the Tiber it seems likely that this was some type of simple flood defence.[522]

The theatre of Marcellus can be interpreted as the first truly Imperial construction on the Campus Martius. Built by Caesar and Augustus and named in honour of a family member, it was the first time that the emperor dedicated a building of such personal importance on the Campus Martius. The theatre of Marcellus was a statement of Imperial power and was constructed on a site which required the demolition of Republican victory monuments. The theatre was not a statement made on behalf of the Roman Republic, but was a personal statement made by an Imperial family advertising a new ruling power and the dawn of the Empire. The fact that it was constructed in the southern Campus Martius, in close proximity to the victory temples and porticoes of the Circus Flaminius, indicates that this imperial statement was mindful of the importance of the Republic and was aware of the power and potential benefits of political statements in the Campus Martius.

---

[516] *LTUR* V, 35 (Ciancio Rossetto); Coarelli, 2007, 269.
[517] *LTUR* V, 35 (Ciancio Rossetto); Sear, 2006, 136.
[518] *LTUR* V, 35 (Ciancio Rossetto).
[519] *LTUR* V, 35 (Ciancio Rossetto).
[520] *LTUR* V, 35 (Ciancio Rossetto); Coarelli, 1997, 451, 486.
[521] *LTUR* V, 35 (Ciancio Rossetto).
[522] *LTUR* V, 35 (Ciancio Rossetto).

Conclusion

The first century BC was a time of great change for Rome. It was in this century, which constitutes Phase Four of this study, that Rome fully evolved from a Republican power with power over much of Italy, North Africa and Spain, to an Empire with its sights on a farther horizon. This evolution can be witnessed in the way the Campus Martius was used for political statements. No longer was it deemed appropriate to hold a triumph and construct a small building representative of Roman political, social and cultural advancement as it had been in Phases Two and Three. Rather, it was in the central Campus Martius that the charismatic leaders such as Pompey, who sought personal advancement and political power, chose to make permanent statements of Roman victory and individual success on a grand scale.

Pompey's theatre complex represents the power that could be held by a single individual in the first century BC and indicates how buildings could be used as tools of self promotion. Yet while Pompey's complex was a great success and was lauded by the inhabitants of Rome, his political career ultimately failed at the hands of the Julius Caesar and the Senate. Where Pompey failed, Caesar and Augustus succeeded as they instigated a construction project on the central Campus Martius that rivalled Pompey's complex in scale and political and personal advancement. With the aid of Agrippa, the systematic development of the Campus Martius was a step on the road to Imperial construction projects. Funded by both Augustus and Agrippa, and incorporating building plans outlined by Caesar, the baths, Stagnum and gardens of Agrippa, along with the Pantheon and Saepta Julia, created a civic space that rivalled the Forum Romanum and the later Imperial fora.

The factors that had influenced construction on the Campus Martius in the early and mid-Republic were still present in the 1st century BC. The route of the triumph and the association with military victory was likely the most important factor for the construction of the buildings of Phase Four as it increased the potential of these buildings for personal promotion. So too Greek culture, be it in the form of works of art, building materials and building function were present in Phase Four, albeit in a slightly more subtle form. Gone were the days where Greek culture represented an overtly foreign influence on the city of Rome and on the Campus Martius. Rather, the influences from the eastern Mediterranean

were an integral part of Roman culture and part of the fabric of the Campus Martius in the 1st century BC.

Chapter 6. Hellenism and the Campus Martius

Introduction

By the first century BC (Phase Four) the temples and quadroporticoes that lined the triumphal route were adorned with the spoils of war. The splendour and grandeur of these exhibitions spoke of victory on a personal as well as on a state level. Of course the Campus Martius was not the only area of Rome that commemorated Roman military and political expansion, the Forum Romanum and Capitoline Hill also marked Roman success with buildings and commemorative statues. However the extra-pomerial location of the Campus Martius and its close association to the triumphal route helped to create a very specific type of Roman commemoration space.

The extra-pomerial location, in association with the triumphal route afforded freedoms that meant that elements of foreign culture imported into Rome following victory abroad could be accommodated. The display of works of art, the worship of foreign deities and the use of new, foreign building materials not seen as suitable for prominent displays within the city of Rome all found space on the Campus Martius. The reason for their display on the Campus Martius was not due simply to a fear for Roman *gravitas* and moral standards in central Rome, but because of the personal benefits that Roman military leaders could reap through prominent, personal display on the Campus Martius.

The archaeological and literary sources explored thus far in this work have determined that it was frequently the case that physical representations of Roman success abroad embodied Greek aspects or associations with Hellenism, for example, the display of Greek art and the utilisation of Greek building materials. On occasion, even when the Roman triumph occurred in a non-Hellenised region, the victory was still celebrated in Rome through a language of victory closely associated with Hellenism. An example of this is Flaccus' construction of a temple complete with marble roof tiles from the temple of Hera at Croton (Livy, 42.3) following his victory in Hispania Citerior (Appendix:

3.3.6).[1] The reasons why Greek culture was chosen as a physical reminder of Roman expansionism, and an examination of those Roman generals and politicians who were most lauded or criticised for their introduction and promulgation of this practice, is the prime issue explored by this chapter. Only by understanding how, why, when and by whom Greek culture was used on the Campus Martius can one truly understand how it influenced the development of the Campus Martius. Of course this is not to argue that Greek culture was the preserve of the Campus Martius alone, as examples of Greek construction materials, deities and architectural form and decoration can be found throughout central Rome, the Forum Romanum and the Forum Boarium.[2] However it was only on the Campus Martius that sufficient freedom was granted for the large scale, ostentatious display of aspects of Hellenic culture and its association with politics and the political individual.

[1] *LTUR* II, 268 (Coarelli); Degrassi, 1963, 495; Richardson, 1992, 155; Coarelli, 1997, 269
[2] For Etruscan examples in the Forum Boarium: Colini, 1980, 45, 49; Cornell, 1995, 162; Rasmussen, 1997, 27-8; Smith, 2000, 23; Forsythe, 2005, 121

6.1 The Development of Hellenism in Phases

In the same way as the topographical development of the Campus Martius can be divided into phases, so too the way in which Rome interacted with, accepted, promoted and displayed Roman victory and triumph on the Campus Martius can also be accommodated by these same phases. In particular it becomes clear that while there were trends in the way in which victory was commemorated, so too there were trends in the way certain Roman generals chose to utilise and display Greek culture as a statement of victory. By dividing the commemoration of victory and the influence of Hellenism on the Campus Martius into these same four phases, it becomes clear that while Greek culture was present in Rome as a result of cultural exchange on a local and international level from an early date, by the mid-Republic (Phase Two) aspects of Greek culture were actively imported into the city of Rome and prominently displayed on the Campus Martius. These acted as reminders of Rome's power in the Mediterranean and the victories won by the military generals of the Roman Republic. This active importation of Greek culture had a significant impact on the Campus Martius and created an extra-pomerial area that was culturally expressive and progressive.

The leaders and politicians of Rome who had power over the construction of buildings in Rome, and on the Campus Martius in particular, expressed not only their victories through the construction of victory monuments, but also expressed their world-view and personal experiences through these constructions.[3] For example, the construction of the Porticus Metelli and the use of marble in the temple of Jupiter Stator (Velleius Paterculus, 1.11.5) (Appendix: 4.3.2) reflect not only Metellus' victory in Macedonia, but also the way he thought about and accepted Greek art and its display, as well as the esteem he had for Greek building materials.[4] While the buildings constructed on the Campus Martius in Phases One to Four may be interpreted as representative of the experiences and desires of the person responsible for its construction, it should also be recognised that these buildings, and their forms, were also manipulated by the provider to invoke desired responses from the public and in order to promote their own personal causes and

[3] Lomas, 2003, 29
[4] Viscogliosi, 1999a, 130-1; Coarelli, 1997, 529; Coarelli, 2007, 271-2; Richardson, 1976, 61; Richardson, 1992, 315; Morgan, 1971, 480; Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 128-34

agendas.[5] It was frequently the case that aspects of Greek culture were incorporated into the buildings and sites of the Campus Martius, but manipulated in such a way as to render them appropriate for the setting and serve the motives and needs of the constructor of the building. For example the use of marble on the temple of Jupiter Stator (Velleius Paterculus, 1.11.5) and the display of Greek art in triumphal displays were used to advertise victory abroad and were used as visible reminders of the personal success of the Roman general.[6] New, foreign or unusual materials or objects would have attracted spectators and added to the general's reputation as a military success.

The manner in which Rome interacted with Greek culture altered over the four phases of the Campus Martius' development and continued to do so into the Imperial period. In Phase One Rome's interaction with the eastern Mediterranean came primarily through trade and peer-polity interaction and not through a planned or programmatic movement of material from Greece to Rome. The effect of trade and peer-polity interaction was such that in Phase One commonalities can be seen in aspects of Greek, Roman, Italian and Etruscan religions, social hierarchy, temple form and art.[7] However, increasing Roman military strength and Rome's ongoing political and social exchanges with Greece and the wider Mediterranean from Phase Two onwards ultimately led to the active importation of Greek culture into the city of Rome by triumphant Roman military generals who used physical elements of Greek culture to represent victorious campaigns in the city of Rome. This trend grew in force through Phases Two, Three and Four as increased Roman military expansion and ongoing conflicts in the eastern Mediterranean resulted in ongoing Roman victories and a subsequent increase in the quantity of booty brought to Rome to celebrate and advertise Roman success abroad.[8] This gradual and steady increase in the use of Greek culture to promote Roman success rendered Greek culture a physical language of Roman success, on a personal and state level. This is not to say of course that Greek culture was the only external cultural influence on Rome. Evidence for Rome's interaction with Etruria and Italy are present in the form of temple design and inscriptions amongst other formats, while statues were also imported from North Africa (for example

---

[5] Lomas, 2003, 29

[6] Edwards, 2003, 57; For the temple of Jupiter Stator: *LTUR* IV, 131 (Viscogliosi); Morgan, 1971, 484; Richardson, 1976, 61; Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 132-3; Coarelli, 2007, 271. For art in triumphal displays: Wiseman, 1974, 5-8; Pollitt, 1978, 155-7.

[7] For the temple of Jupiter Stator: *LTUR* IV 131 (Viscogliosi); Morgan, 1971, 484; Richardson, 1976, 61; Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 132-31 Gruen, 1992, 116, 137; Coarelli, 1997, 488; Coarelli, 2007, 271.

[8] Gruen, 1992, 89; Miles, 2008, 61

a statue of Hannibal. Livy, 43.42).[9] However, Rome's strong trade links with Greece coupled with Rome's continued exposure to Hellenic culture over the course of many centuries rendered it the most accessible cultural influence, while the foreignness and fineness of Greek materials such as marble rendered Greek art and construction materials particularly appealing.

6.1.1 Phase One

(From the foundation of Rome to the beginning of the 3rd century BC)

In Phase One there were few buildings constructed on the Campus Martius and the area was used for a number of open air activities that did not require permanent buildings. While physical and literary sources are scarce for this phase, enough information can be derived from the archaeological and literary sources to show that Phase One set the scene for the way later military generals used the space for state and personal gain. For example, the Villa Publica (where the census was taken, Appendix: 2.4.3) and the voting precinct of the Ovile (Appendix: 2.4.2) were both constructed in this phase, making this a politically relevant area and leading the way for triumphal displays in the future.[10] The political functions that the Ovile and Villa Publica housed meant that the surrounding area of the Campus Martius was set to become a perfect location for political advertisement and self-promotion. These two buildings were frequented by the political elite on a regular basis and as a consequence a victory monument or statue placed in this area would be particularly conspicuous and a prominent advertisement for victorious Roman generals.[11]

The lack of archaeological evidence and literary references to the Campus Martius in this phase does not preclude the presence of cross-cultural trading with Italy, Greece and Etruria and the presence of various cultures on the Campus Martius. An appreciation of the complexity of cultural interaction and exchange throughout Italy and the Mediterranean is essential in order that the development of the Campus Martius be properly understood within the wider Mediterranean world. Only by grasping the

---

[9] Edwards, 1993, 63.
[10] For Ovile: *LTUR* IV, 228 (Gatti); Platner & Ashby, 1926, 373; Shipley, 1933, 38; Ross Taylor, 1990, 47; Mouritsen, 2001, 26. For Villa Publica: *LTUR* V, 202 (Agache); *LTUR* III, 224 (Coarelli); Platner & Ashby, 1926, 581.
[11] Favro, 1996, 86.

fundamental aspects regarding peer-polity exchange, inter-cultural, and arguably, international, exchange during the earliest phases of Rome's development can one understand the basis of Roman cultural exchange in succeeding centuries. In recent years, a great many archaeologists and historians have started re-evaluating cultural influences that impacted upon the development of archaic Rome. In particular the question of Etruscan influence on the development of the linguistic and material culture of early Rome is currently being re-assessed.[12] There has yet to emerge any great agreement regarding these influences and the impact that they had on Rome's development, but a brief survey of the available evidence and current theories aids in the reconstruction of the Campus Martius in Phase One and the impact that Hellenic culture had on the area.

The argument as to whether or not Rome was ruled by Etruria for a period of time prior to the foundation of the Republic is complicated and relies on the interpretation of fragments of pottery and remnants of burials. Admittedly there is evidence for a greater level of contact between Rome and Etruria than between Rome and Greece, though this may well arise as a result of Rome's physical proximity to Etruscan culture in central and northern Italy. There are only four Etruscan inscriptions known in Rome which have been used to support the theory that there was an elite, Etruscan speaking contingent within the city of Rome.[13] In comparison it should be noted that in non-Greek Campanian cities of Italy (for example Capua), Etruscan inscriptions are very common, indeed dominant, suggesting that these Campanian cities were the subject of an Etruscan invasion which did not occur, at least on the same scale, in Rome.[14] The small number of Etruscan inscriptions in Rome supports the idea that Rome was the subject of a small scale economic migration from Etruria and not a large scale military invasion by the Etruscans.[15]

Epigraphic evidence can also be used to determine the presence of a Greek speaking community in Rome. A number of Greek inscriptions and fragments of statues have been found close to the temple of S. Omobono in the Forum Boarium, an area known for trade and the movement of goods from as early as the 8th century BC.[16] A 7th century BC fragment of Corinthian pottery found on the Esquiline was inscribed with a Greek name (*Ktektos*), likely by a Greek artist working in Rome, further substantiating the theory that

---

[12] Renfrew, 1986, 1-18; Cornell, 1995, 151-3.
[13] Cornell, 1995, 89, 157; Adams, 2003, 160-1.
[14] Cornell, 1995, 153.
[15] Cornell, 1995, 156-9; Rasmussen, 1997, 24.
[16] Colini, 1980, 45, 49; Cornell, 1995, 162; Rasmussen, 1997, 27-8; Smith, 2000, 23; Forsythe, 2005, 121.

there was at the very least a small working Greek population in Rome from an early date.[17] Due to the fact that the Forum Boarium was an area heavily involved with trade, these inscriptions cannot be used as solid proof of a Greek speaking community in Rome, and may simply provide evidence of Roman trade links in this period.[18] Nor can inscriptions be used as proof for Etruscan domination of trade links between Greece and Rome as it is similarly likely that these Greek pots were traded directly with Rome.[19] The examples of Greek and Etruscan languages used in inscriptions in Rome in the Archaic period suggests that Rome had a Latin speaking population who tolerated outsiders, including the Etruscans, and who allowed diverse groups of people to settle within the city and set up inscriptions in their native language. Thus, from an early date Rome can be seen as a culturally progressive and tolerant place.[20] This multi-cultural facet of the city of Rome continued throughout the Republic and Empire with people from the western Mediterranean, North Africa and Asia Minor coming to Rome to trade, live and work. While these cultures may not have made much of a physical mark on the landscape of Rome, and on the Campus Martius in particular, they never the less exerted an influence over the cultural development of Rome.

6.1.2. Phase Two

From the beginning of the 3rd century BC to the mid 2nd century BC

Greek culture was more obviously present and actively displayed on the Campus Martius in Phase Two. In Phase Two Roman military generals commonly celebrated a Roman victory abroad by vowing a temple to a deity in Rome as well as by celebrating, if possible, a triumphal procession.[21] During the course of this triumphal procession the booty recovered in the defeated country or province was displayed for the people of Rome as the parade made its way from the Campus Martius to the Capitoline (Livy, 45.39.10, 30.15.12; Tacitus, *Ann.* 4.58.6; Plutarch, *Aem. Paul.* 33-34).[22] Cart loads of bronze statues, paintings and coinage were hauled through the southern Campus Martius on the way to the Capitoline.[23] For those involved in the procession, and those who

[17] Ross Holloway, 1994, 22; Rasmussen, 1997, 28.
[18] Smith, 2000, 23.
[19] As is argued by Smith, 2000, 23.
[20] See Cornell, 1995, 157-8; Cornell, 1997, 11.
[21] Beard, North, Price, 1998a, 34-5; Orlin, 1997, 121-36; Miles, 2008, 54-8.
[22] Wiseman, 1974, 5-8; Pollitt, 1978, 155-7; Favro, 1994, 151-3; Beard, 2007, 92-6.
[23] Favro, 1994, 154-6.

watched it, the Campus Martius would have served as the gateway to the centre of Rome, and so too it acted as an entrance to the city for many works of Greek art such as the Granikos monument displayed by Metellus within his quadroportico (Velleius Paterculus, 1.11.3-4; Pliny, *H.N.* 34.64).[24]

As only portable goods could be brought to Rome from defeated regions it was most commonly the case that money, silver and gold, captured peoples and works of art were imported.[25] The artworks that were imported into the city by the generals were commonly displayed around their own victory temple so as to associate their names with their own victory monument (Cicero, *Verr.* 2.1.55).[26] This created a victory complex which promoted an integrated message of Roman victory and personal military success.[27] The artworks were commonly placed on bases that displayed inscriptions stating the name of the victor and reason for importation of the work (For example, the statue of Hercules *tunicatus* in the Forum Romanum, Pliny, *H.N.* 34.93).[28] Works of art from defeated countries and regions had been brought to Rome from as early as the 3rd century BC.[29] Often these artworks were religious in nature, but were brought to Rome as profane ornaments. By removing the statues from their original context and displaying them in the city of Rome, more often than not these statues became works of art instead of religious offerings.[30] These foreign cult statues were remarkably different to the traditional Roman statue form, and as such they would have been seen as innovative, different and ultimately desirable, if only for their rarity value.

The city of Rome did, of course, have its own native artistic traditions, including sculptures, paintings and other art forms, which should not be denigrated or thought of as rough or inelegant.[31] The Roman artistic tradition varied greatly from the imported Hellenic statues of Phase Two; Roman statues were commonly constructed in terracotta and then painted (Pliny, *H.N.* 34.34, 35.154-58).[32] To the modern art historian this Roman technique renders the statues less refined than the contemporary Greek marble examples. However, early Roman art, and statuary in particular, was dependant upon available

[24] Pollitt, 1978, 158; Gruen, 1992, 143; Coarelli, 1997, 532
[25] Gruen, 1984, 289-90; Stambaugh, 1988, 29; Cornell, 1995b, 128.
[26] Orlin, 2002, 132; Edwards, 2003, 50.
[27] Edwards, 2003, 51.
[28] Edwards, 2003, 49, 57.
[29] Gruen, 1992, 86-9.
[30] Gruen, 1992, 92; Edwards, 2003, 50.
[31] Gruen, 1992, 138.
[32] Gruen, 1992, 138; Edwards, 2003, 53.

materials and as a result Roman artists were particularly skilled with clay, bronze and silver.[33] Unfortunately there are few examples remaining of the native Roman artistic traditions, due in part to the fragility of clay sculptures as well as the later smelting and re-use of bronze and silver. The theory that the bronze sculpting tradition was likely quite advanced, is based in part on the fine example of the Capitoline Brutus (dating from the early 3rd century BC), though unfortunately few other examples survive.[34] Rome had limited experience with marble in the Republican period due to the lack of availability in Italy and as a result Rome relied on Greek artists and architects to work with marble within the city. As marble was imported into the city of Rome as a result of military advancement in Greece, so too those who were capable of working with the material were brought to Rome. This is likely the reason why Greek architects were employed for temple construction projects where marble was the prime construction material, for example Hermodorus of Salamis was the architect of the temple of Jupiter Stator.[35] But it was not simply the material involved in the creation of the statues that varied between Greece and Rome, but also the subject matter and the manner in which it was portrayed. Greek artists commonly sculpted their deities in the nude, while Roman sculptors chose to depict their gods clothed.[36] The inhabitants of Rome who viewed Greek statues as part of a triumphal procession would have been struck by the differences in construction and presentation.[37] The wonder and awe inspired by these imported artworks would have been reflected onto the victorious Roman general as he was carried past in the triumphal procession.

Phases Two and Three saw a massive increase in the quantity of art imported into the city of Rome by triumphal military generals. Far more works of art were imported directly from Greece than were created by Greek artists within the city of Rome.[38] Even though the cultural enrichment of Rome was not the primary motivating factor behind the importation of material wealth and artistic treasures from the eastern Mediterranean, it proved to be an added benefit and enhanced the artistic development of the city.[39] It has often been suggested that the looting and sacking of a city or region by the Roman military was executed as a means of off setting the costs incurred during a campaign,

---

[33] Gruen, 1992, 139.
[34] Gruen, 1992, 138.
[35] Gruen, 1992, 139.
[36] Edwards, 2003, 54-5; McDonnell, 2006, 74.
[37] Edwards, 2003, 54.
[38] Rawson, 1989, 433.
[39] Beard, 2007, 161; Miles, 2008, 60.

particularly during active periods of military activity, for example during the Punic Wars.[40] However, the fact that works of art were put on public display and housed in private collections emphasises the fact that these works were used to gain public attention and curry public and political support. Had the majority of statues been sold, or had bronze statues been melted, only then could it be argued that their importation was primarily to off set the cost of military encounters. This is not to say that generals did not profit at all from their military encounters as they did require funding to support their political careers. However, these revenues could have been derived from the importation of coinage or slaves without the importation of art.

M. Claudius Marcellus became infamous for the vast quantity of Greek art he imported into Rome following his victory over Syracuse in 211 BC (Livy, 26.21.1; Plutarch, *Marc.* 22.1) though unfortunately no source records in detail the actual items imported into Rome, either due to the destruction of the art or simply due to the incomplete nature of the texts.[41] Marcellus had requested a triumph following his defeat and sack of Syracuse in 211 BC, however the Senate refused to grant him one because he had failed to return to Rome with his army, and he had not technically ended the war there (Plutarch, *Marc.* 22.1; Livy, 26.21.1-4).[42] Marcellus revived the ancient rite of the *ovatio* in order that he might still make the most of his triumph in Syracuse and foster public acclaim.[43] According to Plutarch (*Marc.* 1.1 and 21) Marcellus was a well-known devotee of Greek education, art and culture. Marcellus also made it fashionable for Roman politicians to embrace and promote aspects of Greek culture, including Greek language, art and architecture.[44] These politicians would go on to continue the tradition of importing artistic riches from Greek areas and displaying fine works of art in both public and private collections with the aim of cultivating support and stimulating career advancement.[45]

Marcellus came in for fierce criticism from later Republican authors who deemed his behaviour and his respect for Greek culture 'un-Roman'. In particular the orations of Cato the Elder represent the idea of overt anti-Hellenism, in which those objects that were imported into Rome, and those Roman leaders responsible for their importation, came in

---

[40] For examples see Gruen, 1992, 85-6.
[41] Rawson, 1989, 432; Gruen, 1992, 94; Edwards, 2003, 58; Miles, 2008, 61-5.
[42] Gruen, 1990, 130; Miles, 2008, 62.
[43] Bonfante-Warren, 1970, 50-1; Versnel, 1970, 165-6; Beard, 2007, 62.
[44] Gruen, 1992, 241-2.
[45] McDonnell, 2006, 83.

for lively criticisms (Cicero, *Tusc.* 1.3).[46] Marcellus was by no means a revolutionary leader; he operated within the set parameters of the Roman political system and was responsible for significant military advancements. However, his interaction in the Greek areas of the Mediterranean went far beyond the interaction of any previous Roman military leader. Prior to his victory in Syracuse in 211 BC, he personally made an offering of a gold bowl to Delphi in 222 BC (Plutarch, *Marc.* 8.6; Livy, 24.21.9). This highlights a new level of courteous interaction with Greece by senior politicians, and in particular a friendly and non-aggressive acknowledgement of Greek religion by Marcellus. On this particular occasion Rome's involvement with a Greek deity did not stem from a period of great disaster or following a consultation with the Sibylline Books.[47] Rather, Marcellus' dedication highlights a development in Greco-Roman relations and is an example of a Roman statesman making a concerted effort to forge a religious link with the Greek oracle away from the backdrop of crisis. Marcellus also dedicated statues and paintings at sanctuaries on Rhodes and on Samothrace indicating his acceptance and admiration for Greek religion and culture (Plutarch, *Marc.* 30.4-5).[48] To add to his achievements he was personally responsible for the construction of a gymnasium at Catana in Sicily (Plutarch, *Marc,* 30.4).[49] It was no wonder then that he was criticised by Plutarch (*Marc.* 21) and Livy (25.40.1-3) for un-Roman behaviour.[50] However, this criticism should be viewed against the social and political backdrop of the writers' environment in the 1st century BC - 1st century AD, when Greek culture was interpreted as a tool used by charismatic leaders to garner public support to the detriment of the Republican system of government.

M. Fulvius Nobilior is another example of a Roman general of Phase Two who introduced Greek culture to the Campus Martius through the display of art and the construction of a victory monument inspired by personal experiences in the eastern Mediterranean. Following his victory in Ambracia he vowed a temple to Hercules Musarum which was subsequently constructed on the Campus Martius and imported vast quantities of art to be displayed in his triumphal procession and around his temple (Livy, 39.5.13-6). It is particularly significant that he chose only to import the finest quality artworks and chose to leave behind any terracotta works (Pliny, *H.N.* 35.66), providing some indication that works of art were imported to Rome for their novelty value and their

[46] Gruen, 1992, 94-5; McDonnell, 2006b, 221.
[47] Gruen 1990, 9.
[48] McDonnell, 2006, 84.
[49] Rawson, 1989, 433; McDonnell, 2006, 84.
[50] Rawson, 1989, 422; Gruen, 1992, 94-100; Edwards, 2003, 52-4; Miles, 2008, 62-3.

inimitability as well as for their association with Greece.[51] This supports the theory that imported works of art were used as tools to cultivate popular recognition and support. On the occasion of his victory in Ambracia in 188 BC a number of Greek artists came to Rome to honour Nobilior and in 186 BC competitive athletic games were held for the first time in Rome (Livy, 39.22.2).[52] Aspects of Nobilior's life highlight his acceptance and active promotion of Greek culture in Rome and on the Campus Martius in particular. The nature of the deity honoured and the artwork displayed within the temple, along with the references from ancient texts, all attest to the fact that Fulvius Nobilior was appreciative of Hellenic culture and wished to advertise his personal tastes in Rome. The decision to honour Hercules Musarum with a temple in Rome was possibly influenced by the poet Ennius, who travelled with Nobilior on his campaign to Aetolia, documented his exploits, and wrote a drama based on the expedition (a work called the *Ambracia* while he also chronicled the journey in his *Annales*).[53] The inclusion of a poet on campaign was a Hellenistic practice, and something that Alexander the Great himself had done.[54] Ennius had quite an impact on the decisions made by Nobilior and it is entirely feasible that he exerted an influence over Nobilior's decision to dedicate a temple to the unusual deity Hercules Musarum.[55]

Both ancient and modern authors suggest various ways in which the unusual cult of Hercules Musarum came about and how the two cults became merged.[56] While Hercules was already present and well known in Rome by Phase Two, with altars and temples constructed on the Forum Boarium, the Muses were a new arrival to the city. The Muses were particularly associated with southern Italy and were worshipped in Croton, an area where Hercules was also particularly popular. Ennius came from this area and it was a place that was influenced by Pythagorean ideals and the Pythagoreans themselves worshipped the Muses as their patron deity.[57] While it was arguably the influence of Ennius that introduced Nobilior to the cult of Hercules Musarum, the association of Hercules with the Muses can be interpreted as representative of two aspects of Nobilior's personality.[58] Hercules represented the consul as a traditional victorious Roman general

---

[51] Rawson, 1989, 441; Gruen, 1992, 108.
[52] Gruen, 1992, 134.
[53] *LTUR* III, 17-18 (Viscogliosi); Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 99-100; Rawson, 1989, 442; Gruen, 1992, 110-4.
[54] Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 100.
[55] Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 100; Coarelli, 1997, 455.
[56] Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 1999; Gruen, 1992, 109.
[57] Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 100; Rawson, 1989, 442.
[58] Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 99.

while the Muses promoted his personal acceptance of Greek culture. It is possible that the original temple on the Campus Martius was dedicated to Hercules alone and that the cult of the Muses was added later by Philippus, the step-father of Augustus, in 29 BC during his reconstruction of the complex (Suetonius, *Aug.* 29.5).[59] Given the philosophical and artistic nature of this association, it seems likely that even if the idea for the introduction of the cult to Rome did not come directly from Ennius, his place of birth coupled with his position as poet to Nobilior give credence to his being influential in the spawning of the idea to merge the two cults.

That Nobilior was receptive to Pythagorean ideas and theories is further emphasised by his desire to associate himself with King Numa, and the desire to make a physical connection between his temple to Hercules Musarum and Pythagorean ideals. When in 181 BC the Romans believed that they had discovered the original tomb of Numa (Livy, 40.29; Valerius Maximus, 1.1.12), which contained the books on agriculture and which espoused a relationship between Numa and Pythagorean philosophy, Nobilior used the opportunity to stress his acceptance of Pythagorean ideas, thereby forging a strong connection between his new and curious cult of Hercules Musarum, and the traditional Roman King Numa.[60] In the early second century BC it was commonly believed that Pythagoras had been a master to Numa (Ovid, *Fast.* 3.151-4; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 2.59).[61] While this is recognised by modern historians to be anachronistic, it was accepted in Rome at the time.[62] According to Servius (Servius, *Ad Aen.* 1.8) Nobilior built into his new temple an *aedicula* for the bronze *camenae* which had been stored in the temple of Honos and Virtus and originated from the times of Numa Pompilius.[63] By creating a physical association to Numa within his temple complex, Nobilior was again strengthening his association with Pythagoras, and also with the cult of Hercules Musarum.

In Phase Two building materials such as marble began to be brought into Rome from Greece to be used in the construction of temples. These materials preserve a substantial amount of information about the political and military state of the Republic at the time. For example, the attempted use of marble roof tiles by Flaccus in the temple of Fortuna

---

[59] *LTUR* III, 18 (Viscogliosi); Richardson, 1992, 187; Coarelli, 1997, 457.
[60] Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 102; Gruen, 1990, 158-70.
[61] Gruen, 1990, 158, 167; Farney, 2007, 100.
[62] Gruen, 1990, 167; Farney, 2007, 100.
[63] Gruen, 1990, 117; Richardson, 1992, 187; Sciarrino, 2002, 45.

Equestris in the 170's BC indicates the way in which marble was seen as a desirable and opulent commodity (Livy, 42.3).[64] These aspects were enhanced by the very fact that it was not available in Italy and had to be imported. Visually, the marble would have been seen as a beautiful, exotic and lavish alternative to the rustic local material of tufa and travertine. When the first marble temple of Rome was constructed by Metellus in 131 BC (the temple of Jupiter Stator in the Porticus Metelli, Velleius Paterculus, 1.11.5) it was a clear statement by Metellus of Rome's power over Greek materials and how accessible they had become to Rome. Metellus also employed Hermodorus of Salamis, a Greek architect, to carry out the construction (Vitruvius, *De Arch.* 3.2.5). This same Greek architect was also responsible for the design and construction of the temple of Mars in the Circus Flaminius vowed by D. Brutus Callaicus a decade later (Pliny, *H.N.* 36.26).[65]

While Phase Two saw Roman statesmen working ostensibly for the benefit of the state, men such as Nobilior and Marcellus succeeded in personalising Roman triumph and chose to use Greek culture as a physical and more prominent statement of their role. In so doing they set the scene for the political leaders of Phases Three and Four to more boldly personalise victory by associating it publically, and physically, with their names (such as the Porticus Metelli in the 2nd century BC and the Baths of Agrippa in the later 1st century BC). The archaeological record of the Campus Martius in Phases Two, Three and Four helps to preserve this evolution in political power and this subtle change in the power and influence that politicians and generals had.

6.1.3. Phase Three

From the mid 2nd century BC to the early 1st century BC

Phase Three is categorised by the construction of porticoes as victory monuments on the Campus Martius. One of the most important factors that influenced the construction of quadroporticoes on the Campus Martius was its secular nature and the fact that it could be named in honour of the person who vowed it and not the name of a deity to whom it was dedicated. As such the quadroportico was an obvious choice for a victory monument that promoted the role of the individual in the success of the Roman state abroad. The manner in which art was displayed in and around the quadroporticoes is uncertain. It is possible

[64] For roof tiles: Pietilä-Castrén, 1987, 116; Richardson, 1992, 155; Coarelli, 1997, 269.
[65] Gruen, 1992, 137.

that these works were displayed amongst the columns of the quadroporticoes, or in the central open space, or a mixture of both. Despite the lack of literary descriptions, an interpretation of the architectural form indicates that the combination of the enclosed space, created by a building constructed as a victory monument, and decorated with works of art taken from defeated countries, rendered the monument an important statement of Roman personal victory.

In Phase Three, from the mid 2nd century BC to the early 1st century BC, six large scale triumphs took place in Rome, all of which incorporated the importation of Greek art. The six largest recorded Republican triumphs were celebrated by Flaminius (194 BC; Plutarch, *Flaminius*, 14), M. Fulvius Nobilior (187 BC; Livy, 39.5.13), L. Scipio (186 BC), Aemilius Paullus (168 BC; Plutarch, *Aem. Paul.* 33-4), Q. Metellus (146 BC; Livy, *Per.* 52; Valerius Maximus, 7.5.4) and Mummius (146 BC; Livy, *Per.* 52). During this same time period five porticoes were constructed in Rome. Two of them were for trade and transport and were ostensibly functional buildings (the Porticus Post Spei and the Porticus Post Navalia) while three of them were associated with triumphal display and the display of art (Porticus Octavia, Porticus Metelli and the Porticus Minucia Vetus). The clear association between the desire for personal political support and the display of art can be witnessed in the location chosen for the construction of the quadroporticoes, as the three quadroporticoes that were most obviously concerned with the display of art were situated in close proximity to either the Circus Flaminius (Porticus Metellus and Porticus Octavius) or the triumphal route (Porticus Minucia Vetus). These locations guaranteed a clear association with past and future military triumphs as well as a heavy footfall of visitors from people who used the area for recreation, exercise or religious devotion.

There are few works of art that are specifically mentioned in the ancient sources or recovered *in situ* from the archaeological record that are known for certain to have been displayed within the quadroporticoes of the Campus Martius. The Granikos monument, displayed in the Porticus Metelli, is one such example, as is the statue of Cornelia, mother of the Grachhi, which was also displayed in the Porticus Metelli (*CIL* VI 31610; Pliny, *H.N.* 34.31.14).[66] Bronze Corinthian capitals are also recorded on display in the Porticus Octavia (Pliny, *H.N.* 34.13).[67] So renowned were the Porticus Octavia and the Porticus

[66] Gruen, 1992, 120; Harlow & Laurence, 2002, 68.
[67] Gruen, 1992, 138.

Metelli for the display of art that Velleius Paterculus wrote that they were examples of *publica magnificentia* (Velleius Paterculus, 2.1.1-2).[68]

The display of art within a long colonnaded space that was accessible to the public was also common to Greek architecture, as exemplified by the stoas of Greece that were placed around the agora, for example the stoas constructed around the Athenian agora (see section: 4.1.1).[69] However, there were a number of differences in the ways the Romans and the Greeks displayed art in such spaces. The Greeks considered statues capable of withstanding the elements, and as a result statues were often placed in a row outside of the colonnade of the stoa.[70] There were so many statues on display at the stoa of Philip on Delos and the stoa of Attalos at Delphi that the stoas themselves were nearly completely obscured from public view.[71] In Rome it would appear that the works of art were generally housed within the roofed space of the portico, protecting the statues from the weather and quite literally physically associating them with the victory monument. Unlike in Greece, the art on display in the porticoes of the Campus Martius in Phase Three was not on display for altruistic reasons. Foreign artworks were displayed in the quadroporticoes of the Campus Martius as spoils of war, with the aim of promoting Roman success abroad as well as the personal achievements of the monument's provider. The display of works of art in and around victory temples and porticoes rendered the Campus Martius a physical record of Republican expansion. The art works obtained by Marcellus (211 BC), Fabius Maximus (209 BC) and Flaminius (194 BC) were all trooped through the Campus Martius as part of triumphal processions. The construction of physical buildings for the permanent display of such artistic spoils, by triumphant Roman generals such as Metellus and Octavius, ensured that their victory and success would become a permanent exhibition and live long in the Roman collective memory. They were attempting to appeal to the evolving sense of Roman history and tradition while at the same time attempting to consolidate their success and ensure their own position was recorded in history.

The triumph that was celebrated by Aemilius Paullus in 167 BC to celebrate his victory in Macedonia was one of Rome's largest displays of foreign art and fortunately is one of the best documented triumphal processions (Plutarch, *Aem. Paul.* 33-4). The triumph was

---

[68] *LTUR* IV, 140 (Viscogliosi); Gruen, 1992, 115.
[69] Coulton, 1976, 9.
[70] Coulton, 1976, 9.
[71] Coulton, 1976, 9, n.3.

held in order to celebrate the mammoth Roman victory at the battle of Pydna (Plutarch, *Aem. Paul.* 28).[72] So many works of art were brought back to Rome on this occasion that it was impossible to see them all in one day (Plutarch, *Aem. Paul.* 32.3). A total of 350 wagons were required to transport statues, items made from silver, bronze and ivory as well as paintings that Paullus brought back to Rome from Macedonia.[73] Fortunately, the sources mention one of the works imported by name, a statue of Athena sculpted by the Greek sculptor Phidias which was later displayed in the temple of Fortuna Huiusce Diei (Pliny, *H.N.* 34.54).[74] It would appear from this example, and the comment by Velleius Paterculus (2.1.1-2), that Paullus did not seize and import Greek art of poor quality, but ensured that the works that were imported were the best that Greece and Macedonia had to offer. His actions also encouraged a number of Greek artists and intellectuals to travel to Rome with him, including the Athenian painter and philosopher Metrodorus (Pliny, *H.N.* 35.135), an Asian painter by the name of Marcus Plautius (Pliny, *H.N.* 35.115) and Demetrius, an Alexandrian landscape painter (Diodorus, 31.18.2; Valerius Maximus, 5.1.1).[75] It seems likely that Paullus was actively attempting to vary the type of art brought to Rome on this occasion as he did not rely simply on Greek statues to advertise his personal success. This likely stems from an awareness on the part of Paullus that the general population of Rome might be jaded by further displays of statues. By importing more varied works of art Paullus was ensuring that his triumphal display was as innovative and awe inspiring as the imported statues of Phase Two had been.

During Phase Three, when Rome was deeply involved in Greek politics and many triumphs were taking place to celebrate victories in the eastern Mediterranean, imported art symbolised the defeat of the foreign enemy as well as the opportunity for personal political advancement. Avarice was not the sole motivation behind the importation of so much booty. Rather, art could be displayed in a secular environment to physically represent and promote what otherwise may have been a fleeting, incorporeal, victory celebration. The result of Phase Two's and Phase Three's continued exposure to Greek culture was a growing familiarity on the part of the generals with Greek language, history, philosophy and literature, and a desire, to some extent, to promote their personal tastes to a Roman population. For example, Aemilius Paullus took a great many books from the Greek library at Pydna, had his children taught by a Greek master and toured around

[72] Gruen, 1992, 114.
[73] Gruen, 1992, 114; Beard, 2007, 79.
[74] Gruen, 1992, 115; Miles, 2008, 72.
[75] Gruen, 1992, 115, 135.

Greece, even erecting an equestrian statue of himself in Delphi on a plinth that had originally been constructed for a statue of Perseus (Plutarch, *Aem. Paul.* 28.11; Livy, 45.27.-8; Polybius, 30.10.3). All of these actions came in for criticism by a later generation of Roman authors who viewed such behaviour as harmful to Roman morals and culture.

Authors such as Cato the Elder, Polybius and Plutarch failed to recognise Greek culture as a tool for expression of Roman victory, though they were partially correct in their assertion that Greek culture was harmful to the Republic. While they are not critical of all forms of Greek culture, they frequently take the line that the importation of Greek art and the personal acceptance of Greek language and practices was immoral and unacceptable, while the use of Greek culture (such as certain theatrical performances), if used for the benefit of the Roman State, was acceptable. The distinction, made by writers such as Cato and Polybius, between the harmful personal use and positive state use of aspects of Hellenism highlight the complicated way in which culture and foreign cultural influence were viewed in Rome. To state that the inhabitants of Rome were commonly aware of which aspects of their daily lives were Roman and which aspects were foreign is a misinterpretation of the evidence. Rather, the ever evolving nature of culture in an area of the Mediterranean that was accessed by innumerable trade routes, peoples and ethnicities, meant that what may be deemed by critics, and by Romans, as fundamentally native culture often evolved through, or was influenced by, contact with other regions of Italy and the wider Mediterranean. The distinction that the sources often failed to make was that it was not the fact that Greek culture itself was harmful to the Republic in the 2nd century BC, but rather it was the ideals of personal support and public recognition which the generals attempted to promote through Greek culture that would ultimately lead to the decline of the Republic. These traits, and the increasing power held by the individual charismatic leader were particularly visible in Rome, and on the Campus Martius, in Phase Four.

6.1.4. Phase Four

From the early first century BC to the late first century BC

In Phase Four the Campus Martius was used for large scale thematic programmes of development, first by Pompey the Great with his large theatre-temple complex and then by Caesar, Agrippa and Augustus. All of these programmes of development used a variety of foreign cultural reminders to draw attention to personal achievements and successes. By far the most common way of expressing such achievements was through Greek architecture, decoration and materials as such items had, by the 1st century BC, become an easily recognisable marker of political success. These major construction projects included a marked increase in the provision of entertainment and leisure facilities.[76] Theatres, baths, gardens and pools were constructed on the Campus Martius with the aim of promoting a political agenda to the general population of Rome. Where as in previous phases temples and quadroporticoes provided limited opportunity for close personal interaction between the politicians and the inhabitants of Rome, these entertainment and leisure facilities could be used on a frequent basis and provided a great amenity for the public and in doing so acted as tools of personal advertisement through perceived benevolence.

One of the greatest complexes constructed on the Campus Martius during the Republic was the theatre and portico of Pompey (Pliny, *H.N.* 7.158; 34.40; 36.115; Tacitus, *Ann.* 6.45.2; 13.54.3; Vitruvius, *De Arch.* 3.3.2; Dio, 68.8.3). According to Plutarch (*Pomp.* 42) Pompey was inspired to construct his theatre and portico complex following a visit to the theatre of Mytiline where Pompey was lauded and celebrated by his hosts.[77] This experience undoubtedly impressed upon Pompey the benefits to be gained in terms of popularity, personal recognition and political support, by being associated with an entertainment complex. As a consequence Pompey constructed a theatre complex on a massive scale, filled with physical reminders of his victories abroad and of his experiences in Greece and Asia Minor, including living trees imported from Asia Minor and Judaea (Pliny, *H.N.* 12.111, 12.20).[78] The importation of trees may have been an attempt by Pompey to quite literally transplant a reminder of his triumph over Mithridates of Pontus from the eastern Mediterranean to the city of Rome.[79] Between the trees of his quadroportico were displayed works of art imported from the eastern Mediterranean and displayed by theme.[80] A number of these works were imported from defeated countries,

---

[76] Lomas, 2003, 33-4
[77] *LTUR* V, 36 (Gros); Hanson, 1978, 54; Richardson, 1992, Farrar, 1998, 181; 384; Miles, 2008, 233.
[78] Kuttner, 1999, 345; Rehak, 2006, 18; Miles, 2008, 233.
[79] Kuttner, 1999, 345; Beard, 2007, 31-2.
[80] Gleason, 1990, 9; Kuttner, 1999, 361; Miles, 2008, 234.

while others were commissioned by Pompey and constructed from Pentelic marble from Greece.[81]

A number of the statues used to decorate the internal space of the quadroportico are listed in the ancient literary sources providing information about the particular sculptors and the thematic tone of Pompey's quadroportico. Pliny then Elder records Varro's description of the 14 female statues sculpted by Coponius and used to represent the 14 nations defeated by Pompey (Pliny, *H.N.* 36.41.7).[82] According to Pliny (*H.N.* 7.34), Pompey decorated his complex with statues depicting 'famous miraculous events' many of which originated in Greek mythology. Tatian (*Ad Gr.* 34-5), who lived in Rome around AD 150-172, recorded many of the statues on display in the quadroportico, including Ganymede and the eagle by Leochares, Europa on a bull by Pythagoras and Europa on a calf with Victory by Mikon as well as a statue of a woman called Alkippe giving birth to an elephant, sculpted by the Athenian artist Nikeratos.[83] A painting by the 5th century BC Greek artist Polygnotos was hung in front of the *curia* and was most likely imported to Rome by Pompey (Pliny, *H.N.* 35.58-59). Bronze statues of wild animals were also placed amongst the trees, adding to the mythical theme promoted throughout the quadroportico (Martial, 11.47).

The manner in which Caesar, Augustus and Agrippa displayed, manipulated and promoted Greek culture on the Campus Martius was subtly but importantly different to Pompey. Agrippa, often working on behalf of Augustus, used physical representations of Greek culture, such as art and marble, to bring people to the central Campus Martius in order to promote Augustus as an ideal leader and politician.[84] Agrippa was not manipulating aspects of Greek culture in order to further his own political career, but the career of his colleague and friend Augustus. As such his role may be interpreted as that of an intermediary on behalf of Augustus. Agrippa appears to have been amongst the first prominent politicians and generals of the late Republic to recognise the inherent dangers of seeking public recognition and popular support in the era of the crumbling Republic. So too, Augustus had learnt from the example of the deaths of Pompey and Caesar and used Agrippa, and the role of *aedile,* to remove himself from prominent association with the building projects of the central Campus Martius. The construction projects undertaken

[81] Kuttner, 1999, 346; Edwards, 2003, 59.
[82] Gruen, 1993, 134; Kuttner, 1999, 346; Edwards, 2003, 65; Miles, 2008, 234.
[83] Pollitt, 1986, 148-9; Kuttner, 1999, 347, n.8; Sear, 2006, 61; Rehak, 2006, 18.
[84] Fagan, 2005, 109.

by the professional pairing of Agrippa and Augustus included the Pantheon, Stagnum and baths and while individual credit cannot be attributed to either man, between them they were each aware of the potential benefits that Greek and Roman entertainment facilities could bring and how they might aid in the creation of public solidarity behind the public face of Augustus.

By the 1st century BC physical reminders of Greek culture such as statuary, architectural form and construction materials had for more than three centuries been used as tools to gain public recognition. As such it no longer held the power to easily awe and inspire but rather had become a natural and automatic choice for the physical representation of military advancement and expansion in the Mediterranean. As a result it is unlikely that imported statuary or marble would have been viewed by either the politicians of Rome or the general inhabitants of the city as overly foreign. Indeed these physical representations were more than likely viewed as a common Roman cultural expression of victory and were used by Agrippa and Augustus as part of a tradition that had been created for expression through Greek material culture, rather than a desire to import 'new' and inspiring representations of victory.

Agrippa and Augustus were strong supporters of Greek art and were responsible for the display of many examples of Greek statuary around the central Campus Martius. According to Strabo (13.1.9) Agrippa placed a bronze statue of a lion of Lysippus by Lampsacus in the *nemus* '*between the Stagnum and the Euripus*'.[85] Agrippa also placed numerous paintings in the Saepta Julia (Dio, 53.23.1-2) and decorated the fountains of Rome with huge quantities of sculptures (Pliny, *H.N.* 36.121).[86] Agrippa not only imported statues, he also imported a number of famous paintings and frescoes. The *caldarium* of Agrippa's baths were decorated with frescoes on tiles as well as paintings (Pliny, *H.N.* 36.189) while paintings of Aphrodite and Ajax that Agrippa bought in Cyzicos at personal expense were also displayed in the bath building and at the entrance of the baths stood the Apoxyomenos of Lysippus (Pliny, *H.N.* 34.62).[87] The activities of Agrippa, both as *aedile,* and as supporter of Augustus, helped to enrich the Campus Martius with leisure facilities and decorative ornaments, all of which helped to adorn and ultimate monumentalise the central Campus Martius.

---

[85] Shipley, 1933, 49.
[86] Favro, 1996, 101; Lott, 2004, 70.
[87] Shipley, 1933, 48; Yegül, 1992, 137; Nielsen, 1990, 42; Farrar, 1998, 180; Fagan, 1999, 110.

By the end of the Republic the public display of art had become so intrinsically tied to the personal promotion of Augustus, and ultimately to the State, that Agrippa voiced a desire to nationalise art within the city of Rome (Pliny, *H.N.* 35.26).[88] Since Phase Two, works of art taken as *spolia* from defeated regions had been placed on public display in order to promote the military advances of the Roman state as well as advertise the conquests of the individual Roman general. By the late Republic this public display became ever more important for Augustus and Agrippa who wished to show their concern for the inhabitants of the city and promote the reasons for their decisions. Mark Antony came in for particular criticism from Augustus when he moved the sculpture on display in Caesar's gardens to a private location (Cicero, *Phil.* 2.42.109). By nationalising the works of art on display in Rome and turning them into State property, Agrippa and Augustus would have been able to manipulate the locations in which they were displayed as well as the messages that they promoted. Art could therefore become a malleable tool of Imperial propaganda.[89] Agrippa and Augustus would have been able to take the works of art previously used to promote individual success by military generals, and transform them into a cohesive message of Roman rule. The idea to nationalise art in Rome was never put into action, but the fact that it was planned at all shows an awareness on the part of Agrippa and Augustus of the power of art in Rome, and on the Campus Martius, in Phase Four.

In Phase Four, Greek culture, be it in the form of art, building materials or architectural format, continued to be a popular method for the expression of Roman victory. It was often the case by this phase that works of art were commissioned by Roman politicians rather than imported, reflecting Rome's diminishing conquests in the eastern Mediterranean and perhaps also indicating that there were a growing number of Greek artists present in the city of Rome.[90] As Greek culture was no longer the foreign entity that it had been in Phase Two, and to some extent in Phase Three, it was used on a larger scale and was more easily accommodated within a Roman setting as many aspects would no longer have been deemed foreign by the general population, but rather would have been viewed as a traditional method for the expression of victory in the wider Mediterranean. The construction of large-scale entertainment complexes provided a

[88] Favro, 1996, 101; Edwards, 2003, 55.
[89] Favro, 1996, 101.
[90] Gruen, 1992, 131; Gruen, 1996, 137; Edwards, 2003, 59.

typical Roman inhabitant with the opportunity for actual physical contact with a monument which was constructed with the objective of garnering public attention and support for its provider. Where in Phases Two and Three permanent victory monuments were used as a way to promote personal and state success abroad, the complexes of the Campus Martius in Phase Four were constructed to solidify popular support, not always necessarily as a result of victory abroad, but with the hope of finally achieving and attaining rule over the city, its territories and its ruling institutions. Greek culture had been used as a tool for personal political expression for so long in Rome, that by the end of the Republic it was the automatic way of expressing a desire for political power; the only difference being that the ultimate goal had changed to emperor, and as a result the scale of the monument had increased.

6.2. The Evolution of Hellenism on the Campus Martius; An Overview

From Phase One to Phase Four the steady rise in visible reminders of Greek culture on the Campus Martius attests to the general acceptance of Greek culture by the inhabitants of the city of Rome and by the politicians of the Republic. Greek culture in the form of art, theatre production, language and construction materials became so popular that by Phase Four, large scale entertainment complexes displayed Greek art, held theatrical productions and provided public bathing facilities.

Hellenism, and physical representations of Greek culture in particular, did not effect the Campus Martius alone. Pomerial Rome also witnessed a growth in the acceptance and presence of Greek statuary, architecture, building materials, language and theatrical production, though such examples are less obvious and frequent in central Rome. There is no doubt that aspects of Hellenism were present in this area, but they were not displayed as innovative, unusual and unique foreign trophies in the same way as they were on the Campus Martius. The Forum Boarium and Forum Romanum offered only limited opportunity for the self-promoting benefits of Greek culture and as a result Greek culture in central Rome is far more subtle in the literary sources and archaeological record than it is for the Campus Martius.

6.2.1. Roman anti-Hellenism?

While the archaeological record of the Campus Martius attests to the potential political benefits of Greek culture, there were also critics who disdained the importation of aspects of Greek culture into the city. For example dinner party amusements, side boards and one legged tables came in for scrutiny (Livy, 39.6.7).[91] For the main part critical Roman commentators such as Cato the Elder and Polybius chose to focus their censure on those elements of Greek culture which they deemed most inappropriate and most overtly 'foreign' and 'un-Roman'. As a result in addition to what were considered the oddities of Greek culture (such as one legged tables) works of art displayed on the Campus Martius often came in for particular criticism, likely because they represented the scale of

[91] Pollitt, 1983, 41; Beard, 2007, 68.

personal celebration and victory as well as the evolution of the ambitious politician who was a threat to the traditional Republican governing system.

As already observed, M. Claudius Marcellus came in for personal criticism from the authors of the 1st century BC and 1st century AD for his importation of Greek art following the sack of Syracuse.[92] Livy (25.40.1-3) suggests that before Marcellus' importation of Greek art in 211 BC the Romans rarely, if ever, looted sacred temples or took religious idols. However, it should be remembered that Livy was writing in the late 1st century BC and was retrojecting the practice of Roman looting of temples onto the 3rd century BC and using one specific Roman military leader as the origin for the 1st century BC lootings of his time.[93] Polybius (9.10.1-2) wrote that before Marcellus showed excess to the Romans the city's inhabitants lived simply and without any extravagances. Again, Polybius, writing towards the end of the 2nd century BC, is using the famous example of Marcellus to justify and explain the behaviour of a later generation of Roman generals.[94] Polybius is also romanticising the past as it was not the case that Rome lived so simply and without crime prior to the actions of Marcellus. Finally, Plutarch (*Marc.* 21.1-5) suggests that prior to the activities of Marcellus the city of Rome was adorned only with trophies and captured arms. Again, this is historically incorrect and shows a desire by the late 1st century AD writer to idealise the past and, like Polybius, use rhetorical contrast in order to try and appeal to the morals of a simpler, though non-existent, Roman era.[95] Marcellus and the imported works of Syracusian art can be seen to have been used as scapegoats for the habits and 'un-Roman' behaviour of a later generation of 'Greek-loving' Romans. Only Cicero (*Verr.* 2.2.4, 2.1.55, 2.4.120) promotes Marcellus as a good Roman who decorated the city with the spoils of war.[96] One may accept elements of historical data as presented by these authors, but at the same time one must be careful not to over-simplify these comments and view them as a reflection of the views held by the Roman population of the late 3rd century BC.[97]

Marcellus was not the only Roman politician to be criticised for his acceptance of Greek culture. P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus represents a Roman general who was openly

---

[92] Gruen, 1992, 84.
[93] Gruen, 1992, 98.
[94] Gruen, 1992, 95.
[95] Gruen, 1992, 95-8; McDonnell, 2006, 78.
[96] Gruen, 1992, 96.
[97] Edwards, 2003, 60.

receptive of Greek culture.[98] Famed for his defeat of Hannibal at the battle of Zama in 202 BC, Scipio Africanus is recognisable as a prominent military general that accepted and embraced Greek culture and lifestyle.[99] His vigorous appreciation of Hellenic culture led to many criticisms from his Roman contemporaries (Livy, 29.19.11-13). Plutarch's account of the life of Cato the Elder includes some of the charges that were levelled against Scipio Africanus by the staunch Roman Republican Cato the Elder (Plutarch, *Cat. Mai.* 3.7), which included the charge of un-Roman behaviour. It is interesting to note that it was not the practices he indulged in that were actually criticised, for example the fact that while in Syracuse he read Greek books, dressed in a Greek fashion and used a gymnasium (Livy, 29.19.11-20), but rather the fact that for a Roman general of such importance this behaviour was deemed to be undignified and improper.[100] This criticism obviously reflects the fact that authors such as Cato the Elder and Plutarch were aware of the influence that Roman statesmen such as Africanus held and were conscious of the potential outcome of the relationship between Hellenism and the individual. This is a good example of how Greek culture was acceptable when used for the benefit of the state, but not for the personal gain of the individual.

The criticism of Republican politicians and generals by later authors was not the only form of Republican anti-Hellenism, nor was it just Greek art that came in for criticism. Occasionally overt gestures were made by the Roman Senate or senior politicians that seemingly displayed Rome's desire to rid itself of Hellenism. For example, in 213 BC Rome attempted to destroy prophecies, prayers and books of sacrifice based on foreign superstitions (Livy, 25.1.6-12) while in 181 BC the Books of Numa and Pythagoras were supposedly ceremonially burnt as they suggested a link between the origin of Roman religion and the development of Greek philosophy (Pliny, *H.N.* 13.84-6).[101] In 161 BC a decree was made to expel all Greek philosophers and rhetors from Rome (Suetonius, *Gram,* 25).[102] There is no evidence to suggest that this decree was ever acted upon. It would appear, therefore, that this decree and the acts of 213 BC, 181 BC and 161 BC were simply gestures, propagandistic in nature, used to promote Roman culture in the face of growing Hellenism in Rome. These acts signify awareness on the part of the Roman government of an increase in the presence of Greek culture. However, it seems more than

[98] McDonnell, 2006b, 207; Rawson, 1989, 440-1.
[99] McDonnell, 2006b, 207.
[100] Gruen, 1984, 255; Gruen, 1990, 101-2.
[101] Gruen, 1990, 40.
[102] Rawson, 1989, 465-6; Gruen, 1990, 171.

likely in the face of the available material that it was not the culture itself that was disliked so obviously, but the power held by those military generals and politicians who utilised Greek culture for personal gain and career advancement.

It should be noted that Greek culture was not the concern and remit of the political and social elite alone. Such a 'top-down' view fails to take into account the actions and views of the lower classes of Roman society.[103] Public promotions of Roman culture at the expense of Hellenism were arranged by the political and social elite in order to influence the general population of Rome. The decree of the Senate in 161 BC that rhetors be immediately driven from the city can be seen as an attempt to make a statement to the general population of Rome. The political Roman elite often employed Greek rhetors, philosophers and educators within their households, and there is no indication in the sources that the decree was followed through by the employers. The reason for the public decree must therefore be seen as an attempt to manipulate the consciousness of the general population and to promote Roman culture over the rapidly increasing Hellenic influence in Rome. The Roman elite were well aware that they were importing elements of culture from the eastern Mediterranean, yet public statements of Romanism at the expense of Hellenism had to be made in order that the general population did not embrace Hellenism too whole-heartedly, possibly to the detriment of Roman culture. Roman politicians, senators, orators and playwrights all promoted what can be considered a 'healthy' anti-Hellenism that was just strong enough to promote the values of Roman culture above Greek ideals. It seems likely that the Roman political elite stimulated and orchestrated this anti-Hellenism in order that the general populace could actively appreciate and protect their traditional culture. At the same time the elite population of Rome managed to retain those parts of Greek culture that best suited them and their lifestyles.

6.2.2. Hellenism and Republican Instability

The evolution of the relationship Rome had with Greek culture can be more properly understood against the political background of each phase. Only by understanding the social and political situation in Rome can a comprehensive picture of Rome's relationship

---

[103] Lomas, 2003, 29.

with Greece and the eastern Mediterranean be understood. The importation of large quantities of physical representations of Greek culture did not truly begin until Phase Two when Rome's political interaction with the eastern Mediterranean increased. At this point the existence of a stable system of government ensured that while Roman generals personally embraced Greek culture, and the permanent victory monument displayed in Rome was still ostensibly a statement of Roman, and not personal, achievement. While statesmen such as Marcellus and Nobilior revelled in their acceptance and promotion of Greek culture, a myriad of Roman generals continued to commemorate their victories on the Campus Martius and throughout Rome through the dedication of traditional victory temples.

Phases Three and Four (from the mid 2nd century BC to the late 1st century BC) witnessed a dynamic alteration in the stability of Republican government due to the increasing burden of a growing empire. This instability is reflected by the growing competition for political recognition by powerful Roman generals. Such men saw an opportunity for personal wealth and power in the face of a crumbling Republican system and used physical representations of Greek culture to draw attention to themselves. By naming victory monuments on the Campus Martius after themselves and displaying Greek art to the public, they ensured that they used every available tool to amass support through spectacle and show. But ultimately it would take a more coherent, well orchestrated and intricately planned attempt by a team of politicians to wrangle power away from traditional Republican hands and into the lap of Augustus. Between them, Julius Caesar, Agrippa and Augustus managed to manipulate political competition and used what was by the 1st century BC a common, arguably traditional, form of physical representation of Roman power (namely culture that was Greek in origin) to place the newly born empire into the hands of one man. With the stabilising force of Augustus' principate came a new respect for aspects of Greek culture, as the emperor used Greek culture on the Campus Martius and throughout Rome to provide the city's inhabitants with much needed facilities, and in doing so inspired confidence in the new imperial power.

Conclusion

By examining Rome's political situation during the four phases of the development of the Campus Martius it becomes apparent that the acceptance and promotion of Greek material culture increased in line with ongoing victorious military conflicts in the eastern Mediterranean and the subsequent increase in the importation of the spoils of war. This does not represent a diminishment of native Italian or Roman modes of cultural expression, but rather a diversification in the language of victory in this, a very multi-cultural, city. Phases Two and Three best exemplify periods of active importation of Greek material culture into the city of Rome as it was in this period (between early 3rd century BC and the early 1st century BC) that Rome was most militarily active in the eastern Mediterranean. It was also the case that in Phases Two and Three Roman military leaders were looking for physical reminders of personal and state victory that could be brought to the city of Rome in order to draw attention to their personal success in order to garner further popular political support.

The Campus Martius did not evolve in isolation from the rest of the city of Rome. The relationship that existed between the city of Rome and the Campus Martius was in many ways reflective of the relationship that existed between the Roman Republic and Greek culture. Both the Campus Martius and Greek culture were used by charismatic leaders and politicians for the physical display of Roman victory and personal success. Both the Campus Martius and large displays of Greek culture were generally kept at arm's length from the centre of Roman society by the *pomerium*. Finally, both the Campus Martius and Greek culture were manipulated by the Roman state and Roman politicians so as to benefit the inhabitants of the city of Rome. As a result, it was only fitting that both the Campus Martius and Greek culture should be so intimately linked and that the Campus Martius became an area in which particularly visible aspects of Greek culture, such as building techniques, materials and deities, should be facilitated.

A study of the use of Greek culture on the Campus Martius indicates that for the political elite of the mid to late Republic, symbols of Hellenic culture were used as physical reminders of personal and state success abroad. As such, Greek culture became a language of triumph and victory on the Campus Martius. Greek statues were paraded through the Campus Martius on the way to the Capitoline for the inhabitants of Rome to

see. These statues were later displayed in quadroporticoes and temples, constructed from Greek marbles imported specifically for the construction of victory monuments on the Campus Martius. The bases of these Greek statues were inscribed with the names of the men responsible for the importation, indicating a desire by the triumphant general to promote his victories and successes through the language of Greek culture. The use and manipulation of Greek culture is not surprising given the audience to which the politicians and generals were pandering; it provided the opportunity to interact with the literate and illiterate population of Rome alike, as well as the politically astute and the politically unaware. Greek culture was such a successful language of Roman victory that by the early empire Augustus was still using imported imagery and commissioning new works of art in the Greek tradition to decorate the city of Rome and promote Rome's dominance in the Mediterranean.

Hellenism on the Campus Martius should not be viewed as an overtly foreign influence over Rome and one which intimidated the growth of native Roman culture. This view is imprecise and relies too heavily on the Catonian attitude promoted by early Imperial writers. The study of Greek culture on the Campus Martius is not so much a study of foreign influence on Rome, but a study of Rome itself, its internal political struggle, its relationship to its military leaders, and its social and political view of external cultural influences. By examining the extant remains of Greek culture on the Campus Martius it is possible to draws conclusions about the political struggles of the Republic, Rome's growing Imperial power in the Mediterranean and Rome's growing cultural awareness and development.

Conclusion

This investigation into the development of the Campus Martius has explored a number of issues regarding the ethos behind the area's development and has contributed to a wider understanding of the role the Campus Martius played in the physical and cultural development of Republican Rome. The investigation into the Campus Martius in these four phases, which allows for a chronological approach while taking into account thematic concerns, has shed light on how the construction of buildings in the area can be understood in relation to the wider social and political context of the Roman Republic. It also highlights how, by studying the buildings of the Campus Martius in relation to each other, a more in-depth and meaningful interpretation of the area can be achieved. In particular, the application of four phases to the development of the Campus Martius has emphasised how important victory, triumph and Hellenism were for the physical and symbolic development of the area.

While it has been necessary to place certain limitations on this investigation, particularly in terms of time and thematic criteria for phases, this study has addressed a number of problems that have beset previous studies of the development of the Campus Martius and offered some solutions. For example, by applying chronological and thematic phases it has become even more apparent that the role of the individual Roman victorious leader was of prime importance for the topographical and thematic evolution of the Campus Martius. This is a role that has often been overlooked in previous studies which have chosen instead to focus on specific areas or individual buildings regardless of their wider importance for the Campus Martius and Rome as a whole.[1] That the Campus Martius was capable of evolving into an expressive, monumental and multi-cultural area is a reflection of the ability and tenaciousness of the victorious generals and politicians of the Republican period who were willing to test the boundaries of contemporary political limits and were rewarded with career advancement and public recognition. These four phases have aided in clarifying how Hellenic culture was viewed, utilised and displayed in the area. What has become apparent is the way in which Greek culture became synonymous with Roman victory by the mid 3rd century BC, and by the time of Augustus Greek culture had for all intents and purposes become a Roman language of victory. The traditional aspects of the Campus Martius, such as military drilling and voting, continued

[1] For example: De Fine Licht, 1966; Olinder, 1974; La Rocca, 1984; Rehak, 2006.

to influence the way in which the area was used well into the Imperial period and triumphs continued to be celebrated here by the Imperial family, while the area continued to accommodate new and innovative representations of Roman expansionism, for example in the construction of the Stadium of Domitian and the temple of Hadrian.[2] The flexibility of the space allowed for the traditional and the innovative to be accommodated and led to the creation of a space on the fringes of central Rome that appealed to the Roman state as well as to the individual as a place where myriad aspects of society, be they physical, multi-cultural or symbolic, could find expression. While the Forum Romanum, and from the 1st century AD the Imperial fora, provided locations for the symbolic expression of victory and expansionism, the Campus Martius had become a traditional location for such statements and continued to be used for such expression despite the opening up of new locations for political, cultural and social statements.

While a great deal can be gained from applying the methods and themes inherent in this work to the Republican period, I believe that it would be particularly helpful to investigate the way in which Augustus and his successors continued to view, use and manipulate foreign culture on the Campus Martius into the Imperial period. Of particular interest are the reasons why they continued to use this floodplain in light of the fact that they developed their own Imperial fora and were capable of constructing monuments in the Forum Romanum. An investigation into Imperial construction on the Campus Martius does not have to be limited to the use of Greek culture in the area, but as a result of Imperial expansionism could include an exploration of the impact that cultures of the eastern and western Empire had on the city of Rome and the Campus Martius in particular. Such an investigation would be facilitated by the availability of a greater number of literary sources for this period, as well as the improved quality of the archaeological record. Buildings and complexes such as the Mausoleum of Augustus, the Ara Pacis and the temple of Hadrian would benefit from an examination of not only how they represented Rome's territorial advancement in the 1st and 2nd centuries AD, but how they interacted with and integrated into the existent buildings of the Campus Martius from the Republican period. An examination of how Imperial policy influenced, and perhaps dictated, the way in which the Campus Martius was used would be particularly interesting and useful and would provide new interpretations of buildings of the Campus Martius that have become isolated by previous generations of scholarship.

---

[2] *LTUR* III, 7-8 (Cipollone); *LTUR* IV, 341-3 (Virgili).

During the Republic the Campus Martius evolved from an extra-pomerial floodplain used for crop production and military drills but unsuitable for habitation into an area that was actively developed as a location for military commemoration, triumphal display, political advertisement, and ultimately, Imperial expression. This evolution was a reflection of the development of the city of Rome, its territorial gains, its political development and its cultural evolution. As a result the development of the Campus Martius over the four phases applied by this work should not be understood in isolation. Rather, the evolution of the Campus Martius should be examined and interpreted in relation to the wider development of the city of Rome.

The development of the Campus Martius physically represents the power of the Roman Republic and the way in which the rulers of the city and its territories could interact with, use and manipulate even the most unappealing and uninhabitable area. As a result the Campus Martius became an area that preserved a physical record of Rome's interaction with foreign countries and cultures and became a commemoration of Rome's territorial expansions and military victories. The centuries of Republican victory commemoration turned the Campus Martius into a physical reminder of generations of victory and as a result rendered the Campus Martius itself a testimony to Roman Republican history. Due to the fact that politically and religious important areas of central Rome such as the Forum Romanum and Capitoline Hill were restricted in terms of physical development due to the nature of their surrounding topography and the symbolic restrictions of the *pomerium,* they could not be used as permanent reminders of past actions. Instead, they developed to reflect the current political situation as well as carefully chosen statements of past Roman achievements deemed suitable for the contemporary period. Buildings that were retained in central Rome as reminders of Rome's past history were often kept due to contemporary political and religious concerns, for example the temple of Jupiter on the Capitoline and the temple of Castor and Pollux in the Forum Romanum. In contrast, the buildings of the Campus Martius were not arbitrarily retained or destroyed due to a concern for current social and political situations, but were allowed to remain because of their location outside of the *pomerium* and the availability of space afforded by the floodplain. As such, the Campus Martius should be seen as a physical record, retained by the Romans, of their social, political and cultural conquests, encounters and victories. The Campus Martius was not just a tangible record of Republican and Imperial expansion but

was a physical record of Rome's historical past that could be read by the illiterate and literate alike, by the inhabitants of Rome and by the visitors to the city.

The desire to construct monumental buildings in order to preserve a particular experience, event or person for posterity was, from an early time, a common feature in Mediterranean architecture and urban planning. The great pyramids of Egypt, the temples and mausolea of Greece and Persia, all attest to a desire by different cultures to commemorate events and individuals for future generations.[3] By creating such structures on the Campus Martius in the Republican and early Imperial period the provider of the monument was associating himself with the past glories of Roman history as well as aligning himself with Rome's future. In so doing he hoped that the monuments might stand as markers on the Roman landscape, with the aim of embedding social standards and historic commemoration for a future generation of Roman people.[4]

An interpretation of the victory monuments of the Campus Martius as physical historical records is a valid exercise that has precedence in the ancient world. In antiquity the Egyptians were recognised by Plato as particularly successful in their attempts to remember their history and commemorate it through monumental architecture. Herodotus (2.143; 7.204) was awed by the Egyptian capacity for oral tradition and memory, a tradition physically exemplified through the display in Thebes of 349 statues of Egyptian priests which were used to represent the successive generations of Egyptian religious rule.[5] In Greece traditional genealogical records went back as far as sixteen generations.[6] While the victory monuments constructed on the Campus Martius during the Republic were not constructed in order to commemorate genealogical or priestly tradition, the example of Egyptian and Greek lineage show that in antiquity there was an awareness of the historical era and the passing of time together with a recognition on the part of the elite of the importance of providing a record of past events, families and individuals. As a consequence, the victory monuments constructed on the Campus Martius should not be interpreted merely as a commemoration of a specific event or person, but rather as an attempt by Republican politicians to write themselves into the history of Rome. A physical building offered a great opportunity for this as it would remain visible for a number of generations, far longer than the memory of a triumphal procession. The fact

[3] Edwards, 1996, 1-3; Davies, 2000, 137-9; Thomas, 2007, 165.
[4] Davies, 2000, 139.
[5] Marincola, 1997, 225; Thomas, 2007, 166.
[6] Marincola, 1997, 225; Braun, 2004, 288.

that the temple was the most popular architectural format for Republican victory monuments is particularly telling, as a religious building was possibly an attempt to associate Roman victory and the victorious general with the enduring, timeless world of Roman religion and deities.[7]

The theatre of Pompey and the Porticus Octavia, as well as other monuments of the Circus Flaminius and central Campus Martius, stood as reminders of Republican victory well into the Imperial period. With a small number of exceptions (such as the theatre of Marcellus) these statements became invisible beyond the fall of Rome when the population of the city of Rome contracted into the Campus Martius and began to live within and around the Republican and Imperial monuments, obscuring the format and original function of the buildings.[8] While the individual statements of victory and personal achievement did not survive intact, the name of the Campus Martius and its associations has survived into the modern period and retains and promotes a great many of the original associations witnessed by the Campus Martius in Rome in the Republican and Imperial period.

One of the most famous examples in the modern world is the Champ de Mars in Paris, named directly after the Campus Martius in Rome.[9] The Champ de Mars was originally used for military drills, an activity which was likely one of the original influencing factors behind the naming of the area. Now located between the Eiffel tower and the École Militaire, the association with the army and military celebration is not the only similarity between the Champ de Mars and the Campus Martius. The Champ de Mars was also used as an area for the display of French and foreign cultures, as exemplified by the Expositions Universelle (World Fair) of 1889.[10] This world famous event was used as an opportunity to display various trades, products and innovations from abroad, and to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the storming of the Bastille and the beginning of the French Revolution.[11] As such it represents a merging of cultural expression, political advertisement, foreign cultural interaction and military commemoration in much the same way as the triumphal processions and *ludi saeculares* held on the Campus Martius.

---

[7] Thomas, 2007, 165-6.
[8] Richardson, 1992, 67; Coulston and Dodge, 2000, 6
[9] Wiles, 2003, 86; Crowther, 2007, 102.
[10] Crowther, 2007, 102.
[11] Everdell, 2000, 177.

The ethos and association of the Campus Martius is preserved in a much more contemporary example in the Campus Martius Park in central Detroit, Michigan, where a great many of the activities that were held on the Campus Martius of Rome are recalled.[12] Campus Martius Park in Detroit was originally located on a low-lying marshy site that was deemed undesirable for the construction of permanent buildings.[13] It was here that colours were presented to the 1st Michigan Regiment before they went to join the American Civil War in 1861.[14] The area remained a military congregation space until the early 1900's when roads were put through it and it became a vehicular area. As a result of this change in designation the Campus Martius was re-founded on a smaller scale and was re-dedicated on November 19th 2004. The new Campus Martius Park contains a number of monuments commemorating the area's historic associations with the American military, including the Michigan Soldiers' and Sailors' monument of the American Civil War.[15] The similarities between the Campus Martius Detroit and the Campus Martius Rome are not restricted to military commemoration alone. The park contains many decorative sculptures, two stages for music festivals and theatrical productions, public recreational space and, in the winter, an ice-rink. Public entertainments such as concerts are held here on a regular basis and the annual Motown Winter Blast attracts 450,000 people into the area.[16]

The Campus Martius Park Detroit is a multi-functional site that provides historic commemoration and recreational space for the inhabitants of the city of Detroit and the wider state of Michigan. This park, through its very name, proclaims an association with the Campus Martius of Rome, and in its nature and function echoes some of the imagination and innovation brought to public spaces by Roman leaders such as Flaccus, Pompey and Augustus. The benefits of modern technology mean that the Campus Martius Park of Detroit can speak to a world wide audience, something that many Roman generals and emperors could only have dreamed of doing. The erection of a live web camera in Campus Martius Park means that a worldwide community can view the plaza twenty four hours a day.[17] On the Campus Martius of Rome the publically accessible technology provided by Google Maps allows the virtual visitor to Rome to walk around the *area*

[12] Neill, 2004, 150-3; Crowther, 2007, 102.
[13] Gouin, 2005, 85.
[14] Neill, 2004, 150; Gouin, 2005, 85.
[15] Neill, 2004, 151.
[16] Neill, 2004, 151-2.
[17] Neill, 2004, 151-2; http://campusmartiuspark.org.

sacra and the streets of Rome using the perspective of the first person, facilitating virtual walks around the streets that preserve the locations of Roman temples and the plans of Republican theatres.[18] The Roman generals and politicians of the Republican period could not have hoped to speak to an audience of the 21st century, but in their efforts at commemoration on the Campus Martius this is what they have done, and in so doing have written themselves into Roman history and enriched the cultural lives of the modern audience. They have succeeded in speaking to an audience that can not recall their victory, or even know their name, but who nonetheless, albeit unknowingly, witnesses and experience their triumph.

In the modern city of Rome the Campus Martius has evolved into an area popular with tourists and is known and signposted as the '*centro storico*'. Monuments such as the Pantheon, Stadium of Domitian and the temple of Hadrian have become major tourist attractions and are visited by people from all over the world. Those who throng the streets of Rome do so not only to appreciate the monuments for their connections to ancient Rome but also to see and appreciate the evolved form of the monuments following re-developments in medieval and Renaissance times (for example the Pantheon which is now the church of Santa Maria de Martiri and the Stadium of Domitian which is now Piazza Navona). Unlike the Forum Romanum, Palatine Hill or Colosseum the monuments of the Campus Martius have been concealed by two millennia of development and habitation. The *area sacra* of Largo Argentina remains one of the few Republican monuments easily visible from ground level. The Circus Flaminius and its monuments are no longer visible but elements of the plan of the area are preserved by the Jewish ghetto which was itself founded in 1555.[19] Post-antique development has resulted in the Campus Martius becoming a warren of streets with a myriad of historical associations. Yet the area retains much of its late Republican associations as the modern parliament building is located just 300m north of the site of the Ovile/Saepta Julia, numerous Roman Catholic churches dot the Campus Martius and are decorated with masterpieces by artists such as Caravaggio and Rafael, while the buildings of the Campus Martius are adorned with some of the finest examples of Renaissance, Gothic and Baroque architecture and decoration.[20] In particular the church of S. Maria Sopra Minerva, located above the site of the Temple of Isis and Serapis (5.1.5) is one of the finest examples of Gothic Baroque architecture

[18] http://maps.google.com/.
[19] Kessler & Wenborn, 2005, 166.
[20] Richardson, 1992, 67.

and decoration in Rome. Hundreds of restaurants and cafes serve some of Rome's finest food to the natives of the city and visitors alike, while artists sit in Piazza Navona (the site of the Stadium of Domitian) and sell their wares to tourists. All of these aspects of the modern Campo Marzio help to retain the multi-functional nature of the Republican floodplain and ensure that the area remains an attractive area for politics, daily life, religious worship and recreation. The sentiments of Strabo (5.3.8), recorded in the 1st century AD, are still applicable to the modern *centro storico*. On any given day, and in any part of the modern Campus Martius, the area presents to the eye the appearance of a stage painting, and all this affords a spectacle that one can hardly draw away from.