

Adam Ziolkowski

THE TEMPLES
OF MID-REPUBLICAN ROME
AND THEIR HISTORICAL
AND TOPOGRAPHICAL
CONTEXT

«L'ERMA» di BRETSCHNEIDER

ADAM ZIOLKOWSKI
*The Temples of Mid-Republican Rome
and their Historical and Topographical Context*

© Copyright 1992 by «L'ERMA» di BRETSCHNEIDER
Via Cassiodoro, 19 - Roma

Fotocomposizione: Centro Fotocomposizione Calagreti L. e C. s.n.c.,
Città di Castello (PG)

Tipografia «Ottavia», Via dei Pedagogisti, 19 - Roma

Tutti i diritti riservati. È vietata la riproduzione
di testi e illustrazioni senza il permesso scritto dell'Editore

ISBN 88-7062-798-5

Volume pubblicato a cura della Scuola Storica italo-polacca di Roma
dell'Istituto Luigi Sturzo

SAGGI DI STORIA ANTICA

4

Diretti da
AUGUSTO FRASCHETTI
E ANDREA GIARDINA

INDEX

| | | |
|--------------------|----|---|
| PREFACE | p. | 5 |
| INTRODUCTION | » | 7 |

PART ONE

A CATALOGUE OF MID-REPUBLICAN TEMPLE FOUNDATIONS

| | | |
|---|---|-----|
| I Foreword | » | 13 |
| II The catalogue | » | 17 |
| III The list of Mid-Republican temple foundations | » | 187 |

PART TWO

HISTORICAL ASPECTS OF MID-REPUBLICAN TEMPLE FOUNDATIONS

| | | |
|---|----|-----|
| I The right to found public temples: <i>votum, locatio, dedicatio</i> | » | 193 |
| 1. <i>Votum</i> | » | 195 |
| 2. <i>Locatio</i> | » | 203 |
| a) meaning of the term | » | 203 |
| b) <i>locatio-inauguratio</i> | » | 209 |
| c) selection of a temple's site | » | 214 |
| 3. <i>Dedicatio</i> | p. | 219 |
| a) the law of 304 and the <i>lex Papiria</i> | » | 220 |
| b) relationship between the two laws and the dating of the <i>lex Papiria</i> | » | 224 |
| c) the scope of the law of 304 and of the <i>lex Papiria</i> | » | 231 |

| | |
|--|-------|
| II Historical comment on Mid-Republican temple foundations | » 235 |
| 1. «Individual» versus «communal» character of Roman temples | » 235 |
| 2. The years 396-299 | » 236 |
| 3. The years 298-219 | » 244 |
| a) generals' vows | » 244 |
| b) aedilician foundations | » 258 |
| c) temples ordered by the priestly colleges | » 261 |

PART THREE

TOPOGRAPHICAL ASPECTS OF MID-REPUBLICAN TEMPLES FOUNDATIONS

| | |
|--|-------|
| I Temples <i>intra pomerium</i> | » 268 |
| II Temples <i>extra pomerium</i> | » 283 |
| III Mid-Republican temples and the spatial development of the City | » 296 |

CONCLUSIONS

| | |
|---|-------|
| I Recapitulation | » 307 |
| II Mid-Republican temple founding and the history of Rome | » 310 |

| | |
|--------------------|-------|
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | » 319 |
|--------------------|-------|

PREFACE

The bulk of this work was written in 1985-1987, when I held a scholarship of the Scuola Storica Italo-Polacca di Roma dell'Istituto Luigi Sturzo. It assumed its definite form, save for a handful of last-minute alterations, in summer 1988, thanks to a grant from the Associazione Pier Giorgio Frassati. To both these institutions I am deeply grateful for their generosity which enabled me to spend a total of twenty-four months in Rome. Special words of gratitude are offered to Signora Wanda Gawronska, the acting head of the aforementioned Associazione, for her friendly consideration and generous help, so familiar to every Polish student in the Eternal City.

Many were those who helped me with this work. The late Professor Ferdinando Castagnoli and Professors Filippo Coarelli, Augusto Frascetti, Andrea Gardina, Gerhard Koeppe, Jerzy Linderski, Russell Scott and Tadeusz Zawadzki kindly consented to read parts of the text and offered their critical comments. The heaviest burden fell upon my revered mentors, my late Mother, Dr Hanna Ziolkowska, and Professor Jerzy Kolendo, who went through the whole text. I wish to thank them all for their learned advice. Special thanks go to Alexandre Grandazzi, Simon Pratt and Brian Rose, who assisted in this work from its conception to completion and whose help never failed me, whether in sharpening the argument or polishing the form of the text. The figures were drawn by Simon Pratt, with minor changes added by Daniel Pröchniak. My sister, Zofia Ziolkowska, checked the English. May they be thanked for their friendly effort. I am also grateful to the participants of the City of Rome Colloquium, held in Cambridge in April 1989, whose sympathetic reception urged me to add to Part Three of the present work the substance of the paper I had read for the occasion. It goes without saying that the blame for all the errors is mine alone.

Most particularly, I wish to offer my warm thanks to Professor Gabriele De Rosa, the director of the Istituto Luigi Sturzo, and to Professors Augusto Frascchetti and Andrea Giardina for helping with the publication of this volume.

I dedicate this work to my wife, Maria Ziolkowska, in thanks for her patience and in recollection of the ordeal she went through during our stay in Rome and its happy outcome.

A.Z.

INTRODUCTION

My original intention was to retrace the urban development of Rome in the times of the Middle Republic, yet for several reasons I have been forced to modify this project. A discussion of the urban development of a city requires a clear framework – topographical and chronological – of elements which constitute the city landscape: walls and gates, streets, public buildings, shrines and residential areas. In the case of Mid-Republican Rome the overwhelming majority of these elements about which we have some evidence are city walls and temples. And since the Republican «Servian Wall» was but a restoration and strengthening of the fortifications from the Archaic age, a study of Rome's urban development during the Middle Republic is actually little more than a study of the chronology and topography of her temples founded in that period. The other reason was the following. In spite of, or because of, the enormous literature on the subject it is well nigh impossible to indicate more than a handful of Mid-Republican constructions whose dating or location (or both) are generally agreed upon. Hence in a study of the City in that period one is constantly obliged to take sides, to make personal judgements in topographical matters. This makes some sort of declaration of an author's views on the position and dating of relevant objects a prerequisite for any discussion of more general a nature.

One solution would be to base one's research on some reference book. Yet while our knowledge of Rome's topography has advanced considerably – and the progress had never been greater than after the Second World War – the only true topographical reference book of a catalogue type we possess is still the superb but sexagenarian *Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* by Platner and Ashby¹. The much more recent *Pictorial Dictionary of*

¹ Platner-Ashby.

Ancient Rome by Nash², very useful owing to updated bibliography, is handicapped by its conception which takes as its starting point the existing structures or their visible remains. The vulgate of Rome's topography in general, ie. the most authoritative topographical description, region after region, of the City in Antiquity is of even earlier vintage, since it reaches back to Hülsen and his volume of Jordan's *Topographie der Stadt Rom in Alterthum*, published in 1907³. Coarelli's excellent, continually updated archaeological guide of Rome (*Guide Archeologiche Laterza*)⁴ deals mainly, like Nash's, with visible remains; besides, being addressed to the general public, it lacks the apparatus necessary for scholarly investigation.

One is tempted to say that in the field of Rome's topography the broader the scope of a work, the earlier its date of publication. This paradoxical situation is well illustrated by the fact that by far the best treatment of the topography of the Campus Martius remains Castagnoli's monograph published in 1948⁵, ie. twelve years before Gatti's discovery which revolutionized our knowledge of the area⁶. Recently things have begun to change: witness eg. Coarelli's volumes on particular regions of the City⁷. But the regional approach does not suffice if the subject of study is the whole of Rome in a given period; in such case the formula of a dictionary is more useful. Today, Platner-Ashby written anew and not merely updated would probably be a task beyond the capacity of a single scholar (and even more so of a single volume); a catalogue, confined typologically and/or chronologically to some category of objects in a specified period seems to provide the most promising basis for further analysis.

Rebus sic stantibus, the subject I have chosen to discuss in this work is Mid-Republican temple foundations. Although its opening and closing dates may vary slightly from one author to another, the Middle Republic, broadly corresponding with the fourth and third centuries, is an extremely well-defined period of Rome's irreversible political, demographic and economic expansion in the homogenous context of the Italic cultural *koine* before the old

² Nash 1968.

³ Hülsen-Jordan.

⁴ Coarelli 1985A (the third edition of the Laterza guide of Rome).

⁵ Castagnoli 1948.

⁶ Gatti 1960.

⁷ Coarelli 1983, Coarelli 1985, Coarelli 1988.

world was shattered in the Second Punic War and the cultural revolution of the second century.

A Mid-Republican temple is defined in this work as the *aedes publica populi Romani*⁸, a construction erected to a deity recognized and worshipped by the state and containing a cult statue of the deity, situated in an inaugurated *templum* and dedicated in the years 396-219. The *terminus ante quem* requires no comment; as for the *terminus post quem*, I have opted for 396 rather than the rival date of 367 because the fall of Veii not only marks the beginning of the ascent of Rome (the Gallic sack notwithstanding), a factor of utmost importance for temple founding, but is also of truly symbolic significance to my subject as the occasion on which the first *evocatio* of a foreign deity took place.

My principal intention is to establish the list of Mid-Republican temples and their basic «personal files». Hence the major part of this work is a catalogue of temples certainly, probably or possibly founded in the years 396-219, together with the discussion of their locations, *dies natales*, chronology and, if possible, circumstances of founding. On the other hand, I am not concerned with later history of these temples or with their architecture; given this perspective, archaeological evidence is discussed only in the context of a given temple's identification, location or dating.

The second aim of this work is to provide a historical and topographical setting for Mid-Republican temple foundations. I begin by trying to establish the legal framework of temple founding, namely who possessed the legal capacity of founding an *aedes publica* to a given deity in a given *locus*. Then follows a historical comment on Mid-Republican temple founding with the emphasis on the individual versus communal character of these foundations. In the topographical section I discuss the distribution of temples inside and beyond the pomerium and finally try to assess the role of temple founding in the spatial development of the Mid-Republican City.

I purposely exclude from my discussion the religious context of Mid-Republican temple founding as such. This omission may look strange considering the subject of this work, but seems none the less inevitable. An adequate treatment of this aspect would lead to hypertrophy of my already lengthy work; it would therefore be better to save it for a separate study.

⁸ On the typology of Roman places of worship, see Jordan 1879, Castagnoli 1984.

**PART ONE:
A CATALOGUE OF MID-REPUBLICAN
TEMPLE FOUNDATIONS**

I. FOREWORD

As has been said in the Introduction, the aim of this catalogue is to establish the list of public temples founded in the years 396-219. Since the majority of Roman temples cannot be accurately dated, by necessity the catalogue contains a good number of chronologically uncertain cases: some whose yearly dates are not known and some about which it is not even certain whether their founding fell within the chronological limits defined above. Further uncertainty results from the lack of precision in the use of terms denoting various categories of sanctuaries on the part of Roman writers: hence the number of presumed temples whose typology is open to doubt.

All this requires a set of rules governing the inclusion in the catalogue of those cases which are chronologically or typologically suspect. The sanctuaries included in my catalogue comprise: 1) undoubted cases: shrines known to have been *aedes publicae* founded in 396-219; 2) undated *aedes publicae* known to have existed during the Republic - within this category the question is whether a given temple dates from 292-219 or 179/166-91 (see below); 3) shrines mentioned in the calendars. The overwhelming majority of feasts to particular deities in the Roman calendar were *dies natales* of temples. This is especially true in those cases when the deity was not a native Roman one and when the entry's daily date has no obvious connection with the deity involved (like feasts to Jupiter on the Ides): in these instances we are almost certainly dealing with a temple; 4) shrines known to having existed during the Republic but which are denoted in our sources without a recourse to the term *aedes*; in this category ascertaining a shrine's typology is as important as its chronology.

The following categories of shrines are not included in the catalogue: 1) Republican temples of uncertain date certainly built after 179-166: such were the two temples of Hercules Victor and

the temple of Castor et Pollux in *Circo Flaminio*; 2) temples which existed in Late Antiquity and about which nothing else is known, namely those of Minerva *extra Portam Capenam* and Bonus Eventus in *Campo Martio*; 3) sacred places of whose exact character there are no clues in the extant sources; to this group belonged the shrines of Iuno Populonia, Mefitis and Luna Noctiluca; 4) temples hypothesized by modern scholars - to a degree I am convinced by Coarelli's identification of the two structures shown on fragment 672 of the Pianta Marmorea as the temples of Dis Pater and Proserpina vowed in 249¹, but since no ancient source mentions such sanctuaries I have not included them in my catalogue; 5) the temple of Apollo whose dedication is mentioned by Livy under 353 and which can only be the temple of that god vowed in 433 and dedicated in 431².

Also, I would like to state in advance the two basic principles on which I shall constantly draw in my catalogue. One is that in a single calendar or contemporary calendars, two entries quoting one deity on two different days testify to the existence of the deity's two separate temples. Mommsen's inconsequent reductionism, based on a fanciful assumption that a temple's *constitutio* and *dedicatio* could be separated by days or months, and that both days might or might not have figured in the official calendar³, is methodologically unsound. The solution of Aust and Wisowa, who usually settled such cases with an all too easy explanation of an Augustan rededication following the original one on a different day, is fully legitimate only if a given temple is quoted in the *Res gestae* (the same applies, of course, to temples mentioned by Tacitus as rededicated under Tiberius).

The second principle is that Livy duly recorded every temple's dedication, no matter whether he drew his information directly from the *annales maximi* or, more probably, from the earlier annalists. The result is that if a temple's dedication is not mentioned in Livy's extant books the temple can be dated only to the years 292-219, covered by Livy's lost second decade, or to the period after the final break of his narrative in 167 (or, more safely, in 180, after Book 40.37.3, the last that survived in full) and before the outbreak of the Social War in 91, which paralyzed

¹ Coarelli 1968B, Coarelli 1977. For a criticism of his hypothesis, see Quilici Gigli 1983, Di Manzano 1984.

² Platner-Ashby, p. 15 s.v. *Apollo, aedes*.

³ Mommsen in *CIL* I² p. 304.

public building activity for many years (with the return of more or less normal conditions there begins the period of Rome's history that we know best thanks to Cicero's writings). This fundamental principle, formulated by Wissowa, was still respected, though less rigorously, by De Sanctis: this is why the datings of temples proposed by these scholars are still valuable. Unfortunately, subsequent generations discarded this principle with deplorable results that are best visible in the chronological list of Roman temples in Latte's *Römische Religionsgeschichte*⁴, full of dates not only fanciful but outright impossible - a great step backwards compared with the analogous list in Wissowa's *Religion und Kultus der Römer*⁵. The archaeologists forgot about this principle, too; hence, eg., obdurate dating Temple C of the Largo Argentina to the fourth century, though up to the first break of his narrative Livy does not say a word about any temple founded in the Campus Martius. Recently Wissowa's rule has been revived by Coarelli; let us hope that his approach is universally adopted.

Finally, one more thing about the catalogue. As has been said in the Introduction, since I am not concerned with later history and architecture of Mid-Republican temples, I have not utilised all the evidence we have on them but only that part which in my view is relevant to the subject of my work. As for the rest, I have provided each entry in the catalogue with a reference to Platner-Ashby; this also exempts me from quoting earlier discussions about particular temples' locations or identifications if they had already been rejected by the time *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* made its appearance.

⁴ Latte 1960, p. 415-418.

⁵ Wissowa 1912, p. 594-597.

II. THE CATALOGUE

AESCULAPIUS in Insula

Platner-Ashby, p. 2-3

The temple of Aesculapius was vowed in 293 during a plague, on the orders of the *libri fatales* ¹. In the account of *de viris illustribus, Romani ob pestilentiam responso monente ad Aesculapium Epidauro arcessendum decem legatos principe Q. Ogulnio miserunt. Qui cum eo venissent et simulacrum ingens mirarentur, anguis e sedibus eius elapsus venerabilis, non horribilis, per mediam urbem cum admiratione omnium ad navem Romanam perrexit et se in Ogulnii tabernaculo conspiravit... et cum adverso Tiberi subveheretur, in proximam insulam desilivit, ubi templum ei constitutum et pestilentia mira celeritate sedata est* ².

Under 1st January the *Fasti Antiates Maiores* read: *Aescula (pio)* ³; in Ovid's *Fasti* for that day we find: *accepit Phoebus nymphae Coronide natum insula, dividua quam premit amnis aqua* ⁴. The temple was dedicated soon after 291, but the exact year is not known ⁵.

The temple of Aesculapius is generally situated on the site of the present church of S. Bartolomeo ⁶, in the southern part of the *Insula Tiberina* ⁷.

¹ Liv. 10.47.6-7; Oros. 3.22.5; Val. Max. 1.8.2; Strabo 12.5.3; Nepotian. *Epit.* 9.3; Augustin. *CivDei* 3.17.

² *de vir.ill.* 22.1-3.

³ *InsIt XIII* 2, p. 2, see p. 388.

⁴ Ovid. *Fasti* 1.288-294.

⁵ Besnier 1902, p. 184, for no apparent reason dates the temple's dedication «sans doute deux ans plus tard, en 465/289».

⁶ On the continuity of the temple's site functioning as a place of healing, see Guarducci 1971.

⁷ Besnier 1902, p. 185-188, Pensabene-Rizzo-Roghi-Talamo, p. 16-20.

BELLONA in Circo Flaminio

PLATNER-ASHBY, p. 82-83

The temple of Bellona was vowed by Ap. Claudius Caecus cos. II 296 during a battle with the Etruscans and the Samnites. In Livy's account: *dicitur Appius in medio pugnae discrimine, ita ut inter prima signa manibus ad caelum sublatis conspiceretur, ita precatus esse «Bellona, si hodie nobis victoriam duis, ast ego tibi templum voveo»*. The temple was dedicated a few years later, after 293, on 3rd June; see Ovid's *Fasti* for that day: *Hoc sacrata die Tusco Bellona duello... Appius est auctor* ², and the *Fasti Venusini: Bellon(ae) in cir(co) Flam(inio)* ³.

The *Fasti Venusini* and the references to the *columna bellica* which stood *in circo Flaminio... ante aedem Bellonae* ⁴ situate the temple in the Circus Flaminius, no doubt at one of its ends, as indicated by Ovid's opposing *prospicit a templo [Bellonae] summum brevis area Circum* to *altera pars Circi Custode sub Hercule tuta est* ⁵. Coarelli has decisively proved, on the basis of the circumstances in which Cicero delivered his lost speech *de Othone*, that the temple of Bellona stood at the south-eastern end of the Circus Flaminius, next to the temple of Apollo ⁶. As tribune of the plebs in 67, L. Roscius Otho passed a law that reserved the first fourteen rows of seats in the theatre to the equites ⁷. Consequently, when in 63 he was officiating as praetor at the *ludi scaenici*, the plebs' jeers and the knights' applause brought about a riot that was quelled by the consul Cicero, who led the people out of the theatre to the temple of Bellona and there delivered his speech in Otho's defence ⁸. Since the only *ludi scaenici* given by praetors were the *ludi Apollinares* ⁹, held in temporary theatres on the site next to the temple of Apollo, later occupied by the *Theatrum Marcelli* ¹⁰, the temple of Bellona – obviously the nearest available site commanding an open area large enough to accommodate the theatre audience – must have been a very close neighbour of both the theatre and Apollo's temple.

The one structure that met all these requirements was the so-called «tempio sconosciuto», the podium next to the temple of Apollo, opening on the Forum Holitorium. Its identification with the temple of Bellona is thus conclusive ¹¹.

¹ Liv. 10.19.17. See *InsIt* XIII 3, no. 12, 79.

² Ovid. *Fasti*, 6.201, 203.

³ *InsIt* XIII 2, p. 58.

⁴ Serv. auct. *ad Aen.* 9.52, see Ovid. *Fasti* 6.205-208.

⁵ Ovid. *Fasti* 6.205, 209. On *summum circum* meaning «the edge of the circus», see Wiseman 1974, p. 15.

⁶ Coarelli 1965-67, p. 53-72, esp. p. 67-72, Coarelli 1968C.

⁷ Cass. Dio 36.42.1; Asc. *in Corn.* 107.

⁸ Plut. *Cic.* 13.2-4, esp. (4): ἐπεὶ δ'ὸ Κικέρων ἦκε πυθόμενος καὶ τὸν δῆμον ἐκκαλέσας πρὸς τὸ τῆς Ἐνυσοῦς ἱερὸν...

⁹ Liv. 27.23.5.

¹⁰ Hanson 1959, p. 18-24.

¹¹ I do not discuss Coarelli's other arguments, on which see Wiseman 1974, p. 14-17.

BONA DEA sub Saxo

Platner-Ashby, p. 85

The Regionary Catalogues list *aedem Bonae Deae subsaxanae* in the Twelfth Region ¹; in Ovid's *Fasti* for 1st May, the temple's site is described as follows: *est moles nativa, loco res nomina fecit: appellant Saxum... templa patres illic oculos exosa viriles leniter adclivi constituere iugo* ². The temple thus stood right under the summit of the Lesser Aventine, on a gentle slope, most probably near the church of S. Saba ³. As for the temple's dedication day, we do not find it in the calendars, but Ovid's date is corroborated by Macrobius: *auctor est Cornelius Labeo huic Maiae, id est terrae, aedem kalendis Maiis dedicatam sub nomine Bonae Deae* ⁴.

Ovid says that the temple was dedicated by a Vestal Claudia: *dedicat haec veteris Clausorum nominis haeres* ⁵. This assertion, whatever it is worth, is of no use for dating the temple's construction. What we do know for certain is that the temple had already existed for quite a long time by the end of the first century, when it was restored by Livia ⁶.

In modern historiography, this temple is dated either to the fifth century ⁷ or to the years soon after the fall of Tarentum ⁸ but, as rightly pointed out by Latte ⁹, the *terminus post quem* of its construction is 123. Cicero says that in that year, *cum Licinia, virgo Vestalis... aram et aediculam et pulvinar sub Saxo dedicasset, nonne eam rem ex auctoritate senatus ad hoc collegium [pontificium] Sex. Iulius praetor rettulit? Cum P. Scaevola pontifex maximus pro collegio respondit: «Quod in loco publico Licinia Cai filia iniussu populi dedicasset, sacrum non viderier»*. Upon this verdict

a *senatus consultum* was issued: *videtisne praetori urbano negotium datur ut curaret ne id sacrum esset et ut, si quae essent incisae aut inscriptae litterae, tollerentur*. Cicero adds: *post autem senatus in loco augusto consecratam iam aram tollendam ex auctoritate pontificum censuit, neque ullum est passus ex ea dedicatione litterarum exstare monumentum*¹⁰. In fact, it would be difficult to explain Licinia's building an altar, a temple and a pulvinar to Bona Dea *sub Saxo*, ie. in the place where our sources locate the temple of the goddess, if the temple had already been in existence, the more so as Cicero's passage makes it clear that, in the senate's opinion, the Vestal intended to dedicate an *aedes publica populi Romani* to Bona Dea. The reason for Ovid's making Claudia the founder of the shrine might be sought in the fate of the temple's real founder, buried alive ten years later for failing to keep her virginity¹¹. All that subsequent generations could do was to impose *damnatio memoriae* on Licinia and put forward in her stead some irreproachable paragon of chastity.

It would be simplest to assume that Licinia's foundation continued as the temple of Bona Dea. Although some scholars hold the view that Licinia shrine was destroyed¹², as suggested by Cicero's *senatus... aram tollendam... censuit*, this is plainly contradicted by the next part of the same passage: if the temple had been destroyed, there would have been no need to erase the *litterae*. The wording of the *senatus consultum* is unequivocal, too: the praetor was obliged to remove from Licinia's foundation everything that might have suggested public character of the shrine. Even more significant is what Cicero does not say. This is true specifically because of the context of the passage, which is one of the precedents by means of which the orator strives to present as invalid the dedication of a part of his house to Libertas by P. Clodius. There is little doubt that, if Licinia's foundation had actually been destroyed, Cicero would have nagged about it *ad nauseam*, in *de domo sua* and other anti-Clodian speeches and writings.

There remains the question of the temple's status: did it ever acquire the rank of *aedes publica* or remain a *sacrum privatum*? The absence of its feast from the calendars favours the latter possibility, especially in view of the quoted passage by Macrobius, which strongly suggests that this omission is not due to chance: to find the *dies natalis* of the temple of Bona Dea the author apparently had to dig in the antiquarian tradition. Furthermore, the worship of Bona Dea was exclusively feminine: men were not even allowed to enter her precinct¹³ and the temple itself did not house any *sacra publica* that would have made the cult communal, as

was the case with the temple of Vesta. Ovid's allegation that the temple of Bona Dea was founded *ex senatus consulto* was probably meant, like his replacing Licinia by Claudia as its founder, to exalt the pedigree of the shrine that had just then been restored by Augustus' wife¹⁴. One might even suggest that the senate actually issued such a decree with regard to Livia's restoration. This, however, would have only been an act of courtesy towards the emperor's wife, insufficient to raise the temple of Bona Dea to the status of *aedes publica*.

¹ Nordh 1949, p. 92.

² Ovid. *Fasti* 5.149-150, 153-154.

³ Merlin 1906, p. 107-110, Hülsen-Jordan, p. 181-183, Platner-Ashby, p. 85.

⁴ Macr. *Sat.* 1.12.21.

⁵ Ovid. *Fasti* 5.155. The next line (156: *virgineo nullum corpore passa virum*) rules out reading *Crassorum* in place of *Clausorum* (as in Teubner 1978 edition of the *Fasti*), see below.

⁶ Ovid. *Fasti* 5.157-158.

⁷ Merlin 1906, p. 171-177.

⁸ Wissowa in *RE* 3.1 (1897), c. 689-690 s.v. *Bona dea*, Wissowa 1912, p. 216-217, Platner-Ashby, p. 85.

⁹ Latte 1960, p. 229 n. 3.

¹⁰ Cic. *de domo* 136-137.

¹¹ On the scandal of 114-113, see now Frascchetti 1981, *passim*. The sources are in Greenidge-Clay, p. 58-60.

¹² Eg. Frazer 1929, 4, p. 17, Platner-Ashby, p. 85.

¹³ Festus 348 L.

¹⁴ Grimal 1952, p. 192, emphasizes in this context the role of the temple's rebuildler, Livia, who «reprenait une tradition de la *gens* Claudia, à laquelle l'avait liée son premier mariage». It would be well to add that Livia herself was a Claudia by blood, her grandfather having been a patrician Claudius adopted by the Livii Drusi (Suet. *Tib.* 3.1).

CONCORDIA in area Volcani

PLATNER-ASHBY, p. 138

Livy records that in 304 Cn. Flavius as curule aedile *aedem Concordiae in area Vulcani summa invidia nobilium dedicavit*¹. Pliny adds: *hoc actum P. Sempronio L. Sulpicio coss. Flavius vovit aedem Concordiae, si populo reconciliasset ordines, et, cum ad id pecunia publice non decerneretur, ex multatitia faeneratoribus condemnatis aediculam aeream fecit in Graecostasi, quae tunc*

supra comitium erat ². It is with this temple that the prodigies of 183 and 181, reported by Livy and Obsequens, are to be linked ³.

The Fasti Antiates Maiores for 22rd July read: [*Concor*] *diae* ⁴; the Fasti Pinciani: *Concor(diae)* [---] ⁵. According to Degrassi ⁶, this might be the dedication day of Cn.Flavius' temple, though Momigliano ⁷ points out that Opimius' foundation is just as good a candidate for this date, 16th January being the day of this temple's rededication by Tiberius ⁸. The two views can be easily reconciled if we assume that Opimius' temple was a restoration and monumentalization of Flavius' *aedicula*.

¹ Liv. 9.46.6.

² Plin. *NH* 33.19.

³ See below, p. 23, and Momigliano 1942, p. 116.

⁴ *Inst* XIII 2, p. 15.

⁵ *Inst* XIII 2, p. 47.

⁶ Degrassi in *Inst* XIII 2, p. 486.

⁷ Momigliano 1942, p. 117.

⁸ See also Gros 1976, p. 32, who does not, however, take into consideration Cn. Flavius' temple.

CONCORDIA in Foro

Platner-Ashby, p. 138-140

The only information about the temple of Concordia, said to have been vowed in 367 by M. Furius Camillus as a thank-offering for the reconciliation of the orders, are the passages in Plutarch: ὑποσχόμενος ναὸν Ὀμονοίας ἰδρύσειν τῆς ταραχῆς καταστάτης... τῇ δ' ὑστεραία συνελθόντες ἐψηφίσαντο τῆς μὲν Ὀμονοίας ἱερόν, ὡςπερ ἠῤῥατο Κάμιλλος, εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν καὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἀποπτον ἐπὶ τοῖς γεγενημένοις ἰδρύσασθαι ¹, and in Ovid's *Fasti* for 16th January ²:

Candida, te niveo posuit lux proxima templo
qua fert sublimes alta Moneta gradus:
nunc bene prospiciens Latiam, Concordia, turbam,
nunc te sacratae constituere manus.
Furius antiquam, populi superator Etrusci,
voverat et voti solverat ille fidem.
Causa, quod a patribus sumptis secesserat armis
volgus, et ipsa suas Roma timebat opes.

It has been conjectured that the building of the temple of Concordia by L. Opimius cos. 121 was actually a restoration of